

Solid Waste District Committee
May 2, 2007

Leigh Lockhart
Rosie Gerding
John Ott
Mark Timberlake
Mary Wilkerson
Skip Walther

Richard Wieman
Carrie Gartner

Gartner introduced the goals of the meeting, which were to reassess the SWD Plan (as per request by Director of Public Works John Glascock) and begin the process of addressing John Ott's request to remove trash services from block 27 to aid in alley redevelopment. The committee agreed that reviewing the SWD plan first would give the committee a framework from which they could review Ott's request.

Ott- Current plan needs a criteria for compactor placement, a solution to grease vats, and better maintenance. Believes compactors should be on public rather than private property.

Wilkerson- Since no one wants trash, we need an objective criteria to determine placement.

Wieman- System does have a criteria, it's based on how much trash is created by the block, ie, number of dumpsters. That determines when a compactor is financially feasible. Also, placed on private land because goal was to open up the larger public alleys for use. Believes private land has more oversight so cleaner.

Skip- We will always have maintenance issue regardless of where it is placed. The solution there may be to have the SWD provide better maintenance service to keep area clean.

Wilkerson- That would make people easier with compactors near them.

Timberlake- Don't we have problems placing them?

Walther- In the past, through discussion, people generally agree to placement without condemnation. Have never used condemnation.

Ott- Need better maintenance of grease vats, more control.

Walther- SWD is not authorized to handle grease, Council would need to authorize that. Since we are not familiar with all the issues, we would need a report from Wieman before addressing.

Timberlake-We should try to address.

Gerding- Questions about how grease disposal works.

Quick review of how it works: Out of state company, no charge for placement and emptying of vats but as a result, restaurants have little control. Carrying grease to the vat means it often

spills into alley. Overall, the compactor locations were designed with space for grease even though not part of SWD.

Ott- Discussed the benefits of his proposal for block 27.

Walther- If there are few and fewer locations for trash disposal, that may discourage businesses from locating here.

Wilkerson- The trash does need to go somewhere.

Timberlake- We should look at the top blocks with dumpsters and place compactors there.

Wieman- Glascock is looking for a reaffirmation of the current criteria and current locations from the board. He is wary of going forward with placement without this.

Walther- We want compactors everywhere it is economically feasible—all agreed. Then are existing compactors appropriately placed?

Ott- Compactors should be placed where there is heavy restaurant use.

Gerding- Asked for clarification of the history of the BCNB and Puckett's compactor removals and if the 7 compactors initially planned have been placed.

History reviewed. Four new compactors placed (3 from initial plan and 1 in new SBD expansion area) but 2 older ones removed. The one behind the Tiger Hotel and BCNB was removed and it had been initially agreed to place a compactor on the next block for their use instead. That process was halted by the city pending this review. General sense that we are moving backwards.

Walther – Since there is a relationship between the number of dumpsters and the amount of trash- proposed that blocks with 4 or less compactors receive no compactor.

Timberlake- The business mix changes all the time, why can't the SWD plan change as well?

Wieman- The expense, time and effort it takes to place a compactor (through lease agreement or condemnation) means that changing a plan in mid course is difficult. We need to resolve any issues before moving forward.

Gartner clarified history of block 27. In April of 2004, SBD Board agreed to condemn the alley for compactor placement. When Ott made his request and the Board asked the condemnation be put on hold, the city had been working to make the condemnation possible for sometime.

Walther- It was bad timing, the board needed time to review the request but it appeared as if the condemnation action was being undermined. Proposed blocks for compactors based on the criteria that there needs to be more than 4 dumpsters per block. Listed blocks: 15, 24, 25, 29, 34, 35 and 41 as all meeting the compactor criteria. Blocks 34, 35, 41 and 29 seem ok; 24 and 25 may be grouped together; and 15 and 27 need more review (15 for level of use.) But all should be on the list of possible locations.

Discussion began on Ott's request. He suggested people on block 27 walk to block 35 to dispose of trash.

Wieman- Asked why block 35 would agree to "import" trash.

A brief discussion of recycling.

Ott renewed request, Said easier for Broadway businesses to cross Broadway and dispose of trash in the Formosa alley than to use alley behind them. The t-shaped alley is a unique opportunity and the compactor would block access from the private to the public alley.

Timberlake- Pointed out that there are other blocks with t-alleys.

Skip- We are dealing with competing issues: Balance the desire for attractive alleys with the need for effective trash service. Usually, we end up with a compromise between the two. Eliminating trash services from a block will have negative consequences. We need to find a compromise.

Ott- It is a heavy retail block but not a heavy trash producing block.

Gartner- Is there a compromise solution available? For instance, can all trash services be moved to the private alley and screened to protect the businesses in the public alley?

Ott- No, the t-alley is necessary for pedestrian traffic from Cherry.

Walther- Maybe the dumpsters are the compromise because people can pass by them easier.

Ott- Any decision shouldn't hurt future economic development.

Walther- **Motion: Establish blocks 15, 24/25, 27, 29, 34, 35, and 41 as possible locations for compactors.**

Gerding- Seconded motion.

Ott- That motion is not what Glascock is asking for. He would also alter motion to remove block 27. (no second offered.)

Wilkerson- We need to consider it just like every other block.

Ott- How is this request different than the agreement reached with blocks 24 and 25?

Wilkerson- This motion means we are looking at the block, that we don't want it completely off the table. Also, everyone on the block agreed to the removal.

Walther- It gives us a starting point.

Wilkerson- We should also ask for the city's preferred location in each of these blocks.

Question called: 6 yeas, no nays

Walther- Now, how do we proceed on block 27? The board had requested a test removal if the majority of users agreed to it.

Ott- We should wait until the stores open to remove dumpsters for the test.

Committee reviewed Ott's signature pages and SBD survey results on the issue. Questions arose on who to ask (property owners or users; first floor or also second floor tenants.)

Gartner- Suggested that the committee start thinking about criteria that can be objectively applied to all exceptions. So far, committee members have mentioned: agreement by users on the block, amount of money invested in back alley development, benefit/harm to businesses, type of businesses and number of alley businesses. Also reminded the board that issues such as recycling and grease will need attention soon.

Next step:

- Recommendation presented to SBD Board.
- Committee would like to visit the blocks.
- Wieman will evaluate trash use on block 15.
- Solid Waste reviews all options in a block for compactor placement and SWD committee reviews.