

# Minutes for Kansas City Neighborhood Advisory Council (KCNAC) on Tuesday, June 14, 2005

**KCNAC members in attendance:** Lynda Callon, Jay R. Stock, Rodney Sampson, and Forestine Beasley

**Absent Members:** Greg Hugeback, Bruce Pennington, Cynthia Canady, *Steve Eklund* and *Dennis Carroll*

**City staff in attendance:** Renea Nash, David Reynolds, David Parks, Les Washington, Daisy Dixon, Dee Ann Gregory, Michael Shaw, Scott Huizenga and Cathy Le

**Guests:** Ruth Austin, Israel Mendez, Victor Shumake, Pecho (?), Luke Hackbart, Michael Duffy and Edward Hurtado

**Meeting called to order at ? p.m. by Jay R. Stock.**

Jay Stock welcomed the guests and expressed appreciation of their presence at the meeting. The minutes of the previous meeting was not approved because a quorum was not present. Therefore the approval of the minutes is tabled for the next meeting.

## **Old Business:**

### **Neighborhood Tour**

The tour was initiated and sponsored by KCNAC as an effort to view the conditions of neighborhoods such as the good and the nuisance issues within neighborhoods to see how the neighborhood could be impacted with available resources. The Mayor, City Council, Department Heads, and Neighborhood Leaders are asked to join the tour to be acknowledgeable of the neighborhood conditions/issues as summarized by Les Washington and Jay Stock.

Renea Nash provided a 'tour' update. The tour schedule date is Saturday, June 25, 2005 at 10 a.m.—12:00p.m. A designated Metro bus departs from the Mohart Center, (3200 Wayne) on a pre-determined route through selected neighborhoods.

## **Subcommittee reports:**

Waste Management-Jay: No report.

Property Maintenance-Rodney: No report.

Liquor Control- : No report.

Community Policing- : No report.

## **New Business:**

### **Liquor Ordinance**

Michael Duffy, Legal Aid, presented a 'concept' proposal. In the past, restaurants were able to serve alcoholic beverages with meals. Five years ago (2000), the City Council amended the ordinance to ensure that the liquor licenses are a safe distance (at least 300 feet) from schools and churches. The stated proposal is to request an amendment to the proposal. A meeting has taken place with Councilman Glover, and Judy Hadley. The City Council suggested that the proposal be taken to KCNAC. The proposal is to request a 'special district' in the Westside that is different from the other 'special districts' throughout the city. The unique difference of this proposal would be that the restaurant owners would have to obtain written consent from the schools and/or churches (in the area) when applying for an application (liquor by the drink). This gives the schools and/or churches the power the veto the consent for the liquor license. The second part of the proposal is that the proposal would be good for a specified period (3 or 4 years). If a problem has occurred when the restaurant owners requests a renewal from the city after the expired time, the schools and/or churches could veto the renewal request because the written consent would be apart of the renewal request. The license would never become a permanent license.

**Discussion:** Jay Stock presented a scenario that could be a problem for a good business when opposing representatives from an institution could veto the consent. He cautioned ‘abuse’ of the proposal. Arbitration process should be an apart of the process as protection from abuse. He stated that he is not in favor of a permanent liquor license.

Lynda Callon asked, “Why 3 or 4 years?”

Les Washington interjected with that during a committee meeting this time frame seemed best, which was suggested by a neighborhood representative. The Liquor Appeal Board could serve in that capacity in an arbitration process. Judy Hadley acts as the hearing officer in certain cases.

Lynda Callon stated that businesses should be able to make a profit and most of the businesses have a working relationship within the area. The CAN center is a plus in the area because most of the businesses has been responsive when a problem occurred. She named several churches in the area and a school that would affect a one of the business owners.

Les Washington asked whether this proposal was to relax the restriction between churches and schools as opposed to the density. Someone replied, “Yes.”

David Reynolds asked whether the proposal is geared toward restaurant licenses and not tavern. The answer was “yes”.

Lynda Callon stated that this does allow the restaurant to have their own café area on their properties.

Rodney Sampson suggested disallowing ‘grandfather licensing’.

Les Washington stated that ‘grandfather licensing’ could discouraged new licenses.

Michael Shaw stated if a liquor establishment is grandfathered then the same should apply to the churches/schools. Increased churches in an area could deny a business liquor license.

Les Washington stated that arbitration is looking at the owner as a bad operator.

David Reynolds and Jay Stock stated that a church could veto the renewal request only if the church has been in existence longer than the renewal.

Forestine Beasley stated that she liked the idea of being on the offensive—business is business—and that it is more by the drink than the liquor establishment.

The boundary for this proposal is West of Broadway to the Bridge.

Jay Stock made a motion to support the proposal to include the 4-year time frame with Arbitration and a church/school must have existed throughout one (1) veto period. The motion was seconded by Rodney Sampson. The motion passed. Lynda Callon stated that a letter of support would be sent to Councilman Glover and copies sent to Michael Duffy, Les Washington, Judy Hadley and the businesspersons involved.

### **Semi-Automated Trash Collection**

**Michael Shaw**, Solid Waste Division, introduced his colleagues as Cathy Le, City Manager Office, Dee Ann Gregory, Recycling Coordinator, and Scott Huizenga, Office of Management and Budget, Public Works Budget Analysis. He distributed the handouts entitled *Transition to Semi-Automated Trash Collection, Summary* and *Automated Trash Collection, City Research*. The bid came in lower at \$4.95 per household per month, which would allow the city to implement the carts in the trash collection. The current price is \$4.45. The cart implementation would be a \$.50 increase. It costs more to implement the carts. He listed such cities as Atlanta, GA, Fort Worth, TX, Davis, CA, Glasgow, KY, Oklahoma City, OK, and Olathe KS.

The number one reason for the implementation is to have a ‘cleaner’ city and the cart would ensure a ‘cleaner’ city. It is not acceptable to place bags on the ground. The service still would be equivalent to the current services. The carts would reduce the litter that is caused by the dogs, birds...The second benefit would reduce the injury rate of the workers.

Lynda Callon asked whether the cities research could see the reduction in the injury claims. Michael replied with “yes.”

Michael clarified the percentage of trash collection by the city and the contractor to Forestine Beasley. He stated that city workers collected the trash from the river to 63<sup>rd</sup> Street where as Deffenbaugh collected the trash north of the river and south of 63<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Lynda Callon asked whether this would be to early to see any reduction. Claim reductions should reduce the rates. She asked whether Deffenbaugh would pass on the savings to the city. Michael stated that the savings is included in the price.

The third benefit is adding values to services. The final benefit is increased citizen satisfaction. He listed the pros of having the carts implemented in the trash collection. The pluses include savings in money and time, reduce labor/injury/turnover, and eliminate contact of hazardous materials...

Lynda Callon asked about the price of the carts. Michael stated carts could cost \$35 to \$40 and it would cost \$2.3 Million to implement this project but it would be phased in over a three-year budget. There are no changes to recycling, bulky, or leaf and brush collection programs. Challenges could occur in the terrains, hills, etc, but there are many advantages of implementing the carts.

The project would be phased in being November 1<sup>st</sup> to include 27,500 and February 1<sup>st</sup> the remaining 27,500 to include the entire urban core in this budget year. The next budget year, May 1<sup>st</sup>, phase in the 47,500 and November 1<sup>st</sup> the remaining 47,500. New developments would automatically go to the carts.

Lynda Callon asked, "How the city would deter persons from pushing the carts around the cit?"

Michael stated that each cart would have a serial number imprinted on the carts.

Forestine Beasley asked whether a vacant property would receive a cart. Michael replied with only occupied properties would receive the carts. New residents would request a cart when they request solid waste services.

Renea Nash spoke of an experience that was told to her by a participant at the NUSA Conference in May 2005. The trucks were damaging the carts and the city was left with a large number of unusable carts.

Rodney Sampson stated that it could happen during freezing weather.

Michael stated that the city has a cart maintenance program to replace the damage due to normal wear & tear. The carts have a ten-year warranty. By giving everyone a cart would eliminate the value of the cart, each cart would include the city's logo and a serial number.

Jay Stock asked whether a color has been selected for the carts. Michael stated that color has not been selected. Michael replied to Jay question as to how to obtain a cart, which would be to request a cart by calling the Action Center. Solid Waste would confiscate the carts that are not at the registered address, because the carts are city property. Some of the features of the carts are rubber wheels, in-mold labeling, kick holes...the in-mold labeling would be in color and shown as pictures.

Lynda Callon asked whether special carts could be made for specific languages. Michael stated that labels could be made but not the specialized carts.

Renea Nash asked, "How did the Chicago deal with the citizens removing the carts from the curbs and putting them away?"

Michael Shaw stated that most cities has ordinance regarding the time limit at the curb. Special services are available to the elderly and handicap.

Lynda Callon stated that the cart would eliminate the two bags limit.

Rodney Sampson suggested implementing alley pickup.

Michael Shaw stated that alley pickup is an option only where it is feasible for the trucks to drive down the alley. Certain things are not covered by cart warranty but would be covered under the cart maintenance program. Citizens are encouraged to bag the trash inside the carts. Options may be discussed depending on circumstances.

David Reynolds asked about the research findings for cities with extreme weather. Michael stated that the study has not been found concerning the carts in extreme weather.

Jay Stock stated that codes have the knowledge and capability to enforce the codes regarding the carts.

Forestine Beasley asked whether a citizen puts out one bag of trash would the bag be picked up.

Michael Shaw stated that citizens are encouraged to use the cart regardless if a person has only one bag.

Daisy Dixon stated she once lived in a city that used the cart for trash collection. The experience was pleasant, but the homeowner/resident had to wash the cart themselves.

Michael stated that under the city maintenance program the cart would be washed free by the city. The cart washing may happen at the resident or take the cart to a designated place.

Rodney Sampson asked, "How bad does this impact the trucks?"

David Reynolds asked whether this would mean getting all new trucks.

Michael stated that all of the current trucks could be retrospectively fitted for \$120,000 collectively. It is \$8,000 to \$10,000 per truck.

Rodney Sampson asked whether the new trucks would come already semi-automated. Michael replied with that the new trucks would be fully automated. Lynda Callon asked whether this method of trash collection would reduce the amount of time at each address. The saving is having the reduction of the number of persons on the truck. Semi-automated would include the driver and two other workers whereas a fully automated truck would have one person—the driver.

David Reynolds asked, “How would this method affect the landfill space and lower truck maintenance?” Michael stated a fully-automated truck would be better than the semi-automated truck, a particular truck type has a maintenance cost. Under this project, most people would not fill the carts to the rim. Ultimately, the amount of trash collected would be the same as the current collection. November is the targeted start date of this project.

Lynda Callon asked for the time frame to obtain more neighborhoods response to this project. The time frame suggested by David was 3 weeks. Renea Nash suggested a longer time than 3 weeks to bring in more neighborhood involvement.

Jay Stock asked whether a city ordinance would enforce issues regarding the carts or trash bags at the curb. He stated that an ordinance is not in place for quick enforcement.

Michael cautioned against waiting to long before having a meeting because a contract has to be awarded.

Renea Nash stated that she strongly believe in letting the people really visualized the process in order to shift the attitude of the neighborhoods. The purpose of the meeting is to obtain input from the neighborhoods rather than requesting approval.

Michael stated that he could work toward getting visuals for the presentation. November 1<sup>st</sup> is when the contract ends which already has an extension.

Jay stated that early July meeting would not be enough time to pass the ordinance and implement it by November 1<sup>st</sup>.

Lynda Callon stated that if this process were implemented then more neighborhoods would buy-in because they would be made to feel as though they were a part of the process. A meeting during the week of July 11<sup>th</sup> with a daytime and evening meeting would be feasible was the consensus of the members.

Michael stated the contract could be awarded before the actual buy-in of the neighborhoods with some revisions to the contract.

Jay Stock suggested tabling the discussion on ‘dumpsters’ until the next meeting.

Lynda Callon asked whether Center for Community Solutions Staff could arrange a meeting for neighborhood input.

### **Weekly recycling**

The city has weekly recycling budgeted in this year budget, which is being pushed by Councilman Rowland. Currently, Michael is in discussion with Deffenbaugh about the weekly recycling. He has preliminary numbers from the company that would come in below budget. He asked for comments regarding the weekly recycling. No one disagreed with the concept of weekly recycling.

Lynda Callon stated that it would be more helpful in finding out where we are in composing to get rid of the tree limbs and yard debris.

Micheal stated that he has reached an agreement with Missouri Organic, but must be put in a contract form. It would be a 7 day a week operation with a minimum number of hours to be opened. Tire, appliance, leaf & brush, and recycling drop-off would be available at the new campuses; however there is a provision for bulky drop. Grass clippings would also be accepted. A set rate would be implemented during the week, Monday through Thursday. A Kansas City weekend special would be \$12 per pickup load. KCMO residents would be able to take up to five (5) bags of grass clippings/leaf & brush to the campuses at no charge. Neighborhood groups would have an exemption. The sites began opening under the new contract, August 1<sup>st</sup>. The first site is at 7700 East Hwy 40. The second site is under construction at 87<sup>th</sup> and Prospect on 5—10 acres. The future site is near the new police academy at Pleasant Valley Park. Once the Prospect site is opened then the Raytown Road site would be closed. Deramus would close when Pleasant Valley Park opens. The campus would have extended hours, 6pm weekdays.

**Lynda Callon, President of KCNAC, adjourned the meeting at ? p.m.**