

Minutes for Kansas City Neighborhood Advisory Council (KCNAC) on Tuesday, September 13, 2005

KCNAC members in attendance: Lynda Callon, Jay R. Stock, Rodney Sampson, Cynthia Canady, and Greg Hugeback

City staff in attendance: David Reynolds, Michael Shaw, Renea Nash, Les Washington and Daisy Dixon

Absent Members: Forestine Beasley and Bruce Pennington

Guests: None

Meeting called to order at 3:47 pm by Lynda Callon, KCNAC President.

Old Business:

- Members reviewed the **July and August minutes**.
 - July Minute Corrections: **David Reynolds** asked for a correction to be made in the July minutes. By inserting the word—minority—on the last page, the minutes read as ‘David Reynolds stated that the [KCPD] *minority* recruitment rate is up by 40%.’ **Jay Stock** asked that he not receive credit for the free dumpster program because someone else brought the idea to him. On page 2, remove ‘he’ and replace with ‘someone’. The minutes read as ‘Jay Stock stated that to improve the program, *someone* suggested including an incremental (30-40%) participation of neighborhoods and continue to use the 70% participation of neighborhoods.’
Changed the date in the footer to read ‘*July 12, 2005*’.
 - **Rodney Sampson** made a motion to approve July minutes. **Cynthia Canady** seconded the motion. **Lynda Callon** called for votes. Minutes approved. **Rodney Sampson** made a motion to approve August minutes. **Lynda Callon** called for votes. **Jay Stock** seconded the motion. Minutes approved.
- **Neighborhood Tour:** **Lynda Callon** explained to the Michael Shaw the reason for the bus tour (formerly named the ‘trash’ tour) as many of the decision makers declared not being aware of the trash problem in the city.
Renea Nash reported that she had not received many RSVPs from department directors or others. One of the goals was to contact the department directors, which had not been done.
Lynda Callon asked whether the tour should be proposed until after the trash cart program has been implemented.
Renea Nash suggested that proposing the tour would be a good idea, because those invited should see “what’s in it for me”. She stated that the tour should be a partnership of coming together to address the situations.
Jay Stock stated that until someone recognizes that there is a problem then the problem will not be solved. He stressed that policy makers and decision makers should know what is going on within the city and the problems that are so prevalent. City government should know whether tires are piled up in a particular area, etc.
Lynda Callon asked whether she should phone the department directors to invite them to participate in the tour. She stated that maybe the city thinks that the carts are the solutions.
Rodney Sampson commented that in the *Kansas City Star* there are at least three dozens people in the hauling business. He asked, “*Where does the debris end up?*” His answer was “*back on the streets again.*”
Lynda Callon stated that it would not be necessary or cost efficient to spend the money on the bus if it would only be the KCNAC members. She suggested education on the trash carts system and see what happens.
Greg Hugeback asked, “What was the proposed tour?”

David Reynolds stated the tour would start at the Robert J. Mohart Center, do down to Woodland to 39th, go across the old school and fire station, down 39th and Prospect, pass Ivanhoe Park, down 55th and Jackson just east of Hwy 71, go down Swope Park down Hwy 71, go north to Crestwood, Chaumiere, Ravenwood Summerset and Chouteau. He concluded that the tour would not only show the illegal dump site but, included the beautiful parks and well-kept areas along the way.

Jay Stock stated that an overgrown property in Crestwood has been repeatedly reported. No response after the numerous of calls made to various numbers including a councilman office, he stated that the record shows the property belongs to KCMO.

Renea Nash suggested working as a partnership by completing a survey that includes what both sides—department heads and neighborhoods—are concerned with in the neighborhoods. She proposed that this would levitate the ‘pick on me’ attitude.

Rodney Sampson inquired that Pearline McFall attend the PMAC meetings. He stressed that she has not attended a meeting as requested.

Michael Shaw stated that a neighborhood assessment would identify the specific needs of the neighborhood. Jay commented that some services should be a given.

Lynda Callon made an executive decision and cancelled the tour that was scheduled for Saturday, September 24, 2005 due to various variables. She suggested going to another plan.

Renea Nash suggested as a possibility to use Emergency Management elaborate computer system to view different portions of the city at street level.

Jay Stock asked whether it is an aerial view.

David Reynolds stated that most of it is aerial and some is at street level, especially downtown.

Michael Shaw emphasized the neighborhood assessment plan as a way to find out what services the neighborhoods need such as trash, weeds, vacant houses... He stated that this would be an excellent way for the city to work with the neighborhoods to eliminate living in frustration.

Jay Stock commented that this would be the wrong ‘gauge’ because there are many organized neighborhoods that care about their neighborhoods and will clean up the area. Those unorganized neighborhoods are jungles... *“What about the building that has been boarded up for 6 months and no one has chased this guy down...making excuse”*, said Jay. He referenced the state law that states that says *“city shall maintain a landlord registration...”* He expressed his frustration of how the city ignores this state law.

Michael Shaw commented that there is a need for growth and improvement because *“if we did not then we would not be any good...in the interim those organized areas needs can be addressed because their needs have been identified through the neighborhood assessment”*, said Michael.

Renea Nash commented that calls are made into the Action Center regarding complaints or needed services.

Jay Stock stated this is not necessarily the case in those organized neighborhoods with issues.

Michael Shaw commented that it is a systematic problem, which is not what he was referring by using the neighborhood assessment. He added, *“...the city can clean but the neighborhoods would have to maintain. We would have to do both clean up the needed areas and maintain what has been cleaned up.”*

Jay Stock inquired about the ‘free dumpster program’ in which he stated that the promises made were not met.

Michael Shaw presented a scenario regarding the request for service. He stated that neighborhoods of 20 homes requested dumpsters and were served. Unfortunately, when the neighborhoods of 300 homes requested dumpster, the money had been depleted in the budget. This scenario forces some restrictions or guidelines as to who or what neighborhoods can receive free dumpsters, subdivisions are forced to work with their neighborhood groups.

Greg Hugeback asked, *“How many free dumpsters were distributed under the program?”*

Michael Shaw stated that he was aware of the actual number but from a budgetary perspective—*“18% of the dumpsters were free dumpsters and the 70% percentile has grown from about 8 neighborhoods to 17 neighborhoods...some neighborhoods did not fill up the dumpsters...”* He stated that packer trucks become more cost efficient than distributing the dumpsters to the

neighborhoods. He commented that the dumpsters are contracted out—city pays \$250 for half-full dumpsters.

Greg Hugeback asked for clarification as to the neighborhood assessments—it is a clean sweep? Is it more a Solid Waste Division matter? Or a Neighborhood Preservation matter? He asked whether the neighborhoods were receiving training in neighborhood assessments or the neighborhoods are providing the information on their own. He commented that his neighborhood received grants to clean up but he did not recall receiving clean sweep from the city. Michael replied, “No, its total.”

Lynda Callon recalled the ‘past’ clean sweep program system of serving the designated neighborhoods on alternating years. It was effort to utilize all of the city departments. She reviewed the scope of the services received under ‘past’ clean sweep program, which was more of a ‘community bonding’ effort rather than just a ‘clean up’ effort. She commented on the how the community’s pride was increased after cleaning their neighborhoods—the feeling was priceless. The ‘past’ clean sweep allowed every residents the opportunity to participate regardless of their age—civic involvement.

Michael Shaw stated that the manager has expressed starting weekly cleanups in every neighborhood possibly next spring...maybe bringing back the clean sweep program with some of similarities of the ‘past’ program.

Lynda Callon stated that the ‘backbone’ of the clean sweep in the past was the efforts of ‘Carol and George’ who worked hard for every neighborhood. She suggested that Michael consider asking Carol to act as a consultant in the ‘new’ clean sweep program.

Michael Shaw commented on some tentative plans for the ‘new’ clean sweep program that will help neighborhoods—creative solutions are needed to make things work.

Jay Stock stated that the one of the problem is that people are not fulfilling their job descriptions. He referred to the properties owned by the city that are not mowed, but on record as ‘mowed’.

Lynda Callon suggested that Jay contact the northland district manager, Mike, in the Parks & Recreation Department, to find out about the status of the properties.

Cynthia Canady added, “Call Joan Fenley.”

- **KCNAC Elections:** **David Reynolds** distributed the books that were mailed out to neighborhoods. He announced that the website is “up” and not many have responded to the site as of yet. He planned to contact the Community Action Network (CAN) Centers, Community Program Officers and Community organizations for additional ‘prospective’ applicants. David requested from each current member to identify their position—at large or in district. Current members do not have to run for re-election. After discussion, the conclusion was that Jay Stock, Lynda Callon, Rodney Sampson and Cynthia Canady will hold ‘in district’ positions, which leaves Greg Hugeback and Forestine Beasley in ‘at large’ positions. Bruce Pennington would be contacted for his remarks regarding his position.

Lynda Callon announced that several people at the KC Roundtable had the ‘KCNAC booklets’ and showed interest. Lynda stated that she would attend neighborhood meetings to discuss what the KCNAC do for those who are interested in being a part of KCNAC.

- **Charter Review Proposal:** The Charter Review proposal postponed to the April ballot. The Charter changes are currently in Finance.

Renea Nash relayed Les Washington’s request that KCNAC create a subcommittee with recommendations as to how to keep Neighborhood & Community Services Department habituated.

Lynda Callon and Jay Stock agreed to be apart of the subcommittee for the charter. Jay asked for clarification of the position that they are taking with the Charter changes. Lynda explained to her understanding that Neighborhood & Community Services Department would no longer be a department but a division within another department to be determined.

Greg Hugeback asked whether it has been decided as to what department. Lynda replied with *City Planning & Development* as a possibility. Greg asked whether the reasoning for the making NCSD a division had been announced.

Lynda Callon replied, “No.” She announced that the next Kansas City Roundtable meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 5th, 6:00 pm. Sherry Ward who is the Chair of the Charter Review Committee will address the Roundtable. Networking and light meal starts at 5:30 pm.

- **Trash Cart proposal:** **Michael Shaw**, Solid Waste Division, stated that the trash carts and the recycling proposal has to be presented to the council. Councilman Rowland sponsors the recycling ordinance and Councilman Riley sponsors the trash carts ordinance. The trash cart proposal is scheduled before council committees and full council on the following dates:
 - Wednesday, September 21, 2005 at 9 am, 26th floor, Operations Committee
 - Thursday, September 22, 2005 at 1:45 pm, 10th floor, Business session
 - Thursday, September 22, 2005 at 3 pm, 10th floor, ‘Full’ council

If the trash cart proposal is approved, then the program would be phased into the city in four phases.

Rodney Sampson asked whether the [nuisance] ordinance would be reviewed due to the changes.

Michael Shaw indicated that there is a hesitation in the Chapter 62 revisions, which maybe amended depending on whether the ordinances are passed. Chapter 48 maybe up for revision because the ‘26 hour rule’.

Lynda Callon asked whether those individuals who cannot physically carry the carts to the curb have an alternative such as a sticker or marker to place on the cart. The sticker or marker would prevent the individual from being ticketed or receiving a warning letter every month for non-compliance. Lynda stated that she was referring to those who have stairs leading to the curb due to 25-30 feet retaining walls or clefts. These individuals would not be able to take the carts up and down the stairs for trash pickup.

Michael Shaw stated that the front door service is available for those who cannot physically take the carts to the curb.

Renea Nash commented when neighbors see the carts out and are not aware of the stickers given to those under special circumstances. Neighbors may perceive that it is ok to leave the carts at the curb. She suggested distributing another color cart for those who cannot transport the cart from the residence to the curb due to terrain.

David Reynolds asked whether Lynda was trying to stream line the front door pickup and the enforcement side. She declared that it is not a disability issue but ‘cannot physically’ move the carts.

Michael Shaw stated that Neighborhood Preservation, Pearline McFall, would be working with neighbors in cart placement and elderly. An alley collection may be an alternative for neighborhoods, however the pickup type would be based on the type of neighborhood as far as the terrain.

- **Weekly recycling proposal:** **Michael Shaw** stated that this proposal would be presented to the ‘Full’ council on Thursday, September 15, 2005, at 3 pm, 26th floor, City Hall.
- **Leaf and Brush:** **Michael Shaw** stated that the leaf and brush site is in a holding status due to contract delays. The project would have to go before the ‘Full’ council currently the proposal is on hold in the Operations Committee until the dirt issue is resolved. Other options are to leave the sites ‘as is’ and open up a vendor site at Highway 40. Neighborhood groups with ‘letter of use’ may use the site 7 days a week—as a relief until the other sites are available. Michael clarified that the ‘letter of use’ is the same as the neighborhood ‘letterhead’.

Lynda Callon asked what would be the earliest that neighborhoods could use the sites if the ‘letter of use’ and all matters worked out. Michael stated that it would be 30 to 60 days out. Lynda verified that November 1st would be the date.

- **Bulky item:** **Michael Shaw** stated that he would discuss in the future ways to improve the bulky item program by making it more effective for the customers. He indicated that he would like to ensure that all the programs are meeting the customers needs and utilized by the customers.

Lynda Callon stated that when the leaf and brush was picked up twice—Spring and Fall. It worked better. She added that hopefully the agreement with Missouri Composite works because then leaves and brush along with grass clippings could be dropped off at the designated sites.

Michael Shaw stated that the new site locations would accommodate and be equipped for grass clippings. He stated that one of his strategies in revamping the bulky item program is to have bulky

item pickup on the same day as the trash day. For instance, if your trash day is Monday, then your bulky item pickup would be the first Monday of the month. This does a couple of things by moving the entire city back to bulky item pickup every month and prevent people from putting things out other than on the trash day—proactive approach.

Jay Stock asked whether the bulky item contract could be the same as the regular trash day contract. He stated that on economical standpoint it would be better if those items currently being pickup by the bulky item trucks could be picked by the trash trucks—at least in the Northland.

Michael Shaw stated that there has been discussion along this line of thinking. As for the trash carts, the carts can hold some of the smaller items that are put out for bulky item pick up. One other way to improve services could be by adding a ‘clam’ on trash day.

Jay Stock asked whether a ‘clam’ could be added to the trash trucks. As a result, it would be very little of what the trucks could not pick up.

Michael Shaw stated that he could not see logistically how a ‘clam’ could be put on a packer because of the different mechanism. He stated that there are several packers already on routes. The idea is to reduce the need for ‘clams’ in the bulky program. Michael indicated that they may try different avenues—special projects—as a test.

Greg Hugeback asked whether neighborhoods could be notified when special projects are scheduled for their neighborhoods. He suggested notification because the city would not want people to assume regardless of what they put out the city would pick it up. Greg indicated that a penalty should be enforced.

Michael Shaw stated that sometimes *“the ends do not justify the means”* which means it would be easier for the trucks to pick up the trash rather than codes ticketing the property.

Greg Hugeback commented that this reaction is a proactive solution unlike in the past efforts. Greg asked whether the containers would have to be on the curb or in the street, because some neighborhoods do not have driveways.

Michael Shaw stated that in the semi-automated system it does not matter because the workers will roll the carts to the truck. He reminded the council that the cart maintenance program would be in place. Either residents can take the carts to the city to be cleaned or the city will clean the cart on site.

Cynthia Canady asked about the illegal dumping process. She stated that there are a lot of illegal dumping on vacant properties in her neighborhood—not done by residents. The problem had been reported to illegal dumping but the trash/debris has not been picked up.

Michael Shaw stated that the illegal dumping cleanup is still in the Solid Waste Division, but the illegal dumping hotline and enforcement is a part of Neighborhood & Community Services—Neighborhood Preservation. He continued by stating that the typical process is for Neighborhood & Community Services to prescreen and collect information to form an enforcement case and then send it to Solid Waste Division to clean up. Sometimes, the neighborhoods will pick up the trash and call Solid Waste for pick up after the enforcement piece.

Cynthia Canady stated that trash escalates when the trash truck does not pick up the debris. She asked, *“What kind of ‘effective’ enforcement?”* Michael replied with, *“more effective in finding the responsible parties, writing tickets for illegal dumping...”*

- **Committee reports:** No reports issued from Waste Management, Property Maintenance, Community Policing or Liquor Control.

New Business:

Legislative, Rules & Ethics Committee:

- KCNAC members were asked to turn in their recommendations by completing forms that will be given to the Legislative, Rules, and Ethics Committee. These forms will be given to Les Washington to pass on the committee.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm by Lynda Callon, KCNAC President.