



City of Broken Arrow
Minutes
Broken Arrow Municipal Authority

City Hall
220 S 1st Street
Broken Arrow OK
74012

Chairman Craig Thurmond
Vice Chair Richard Carter
Trustee Mike Lester
Trustee Johnnie Parks
Trustee Scott Eudey

Tuesday, August 16, 2016

Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

Chairman Craig Thurmond called the meeting to order at approximately 7:12 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present: 5 - Scott Eudey, Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Richard Carter, Craig Thurmond

3. Consideration of Consent Agenda

Chairman Thurmond asked if there were any items to be removed from the Consent Agenda. There being none, he asked for a motion.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mike Lester, seconded by Richard Carter.

Move to approve the Consent Agenda as presented

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Scott Eudey, Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Richard Carter, Craig Thurmond

- A. 16-952 Acknowledgement of submittal of the Broken Arrow Municipal Authority's Water Supply Report for the month of July 2016**
- B. 16-985 Approval and authorization to execute an architectural / engineering agreement for design of Haikey Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (HCWWTP) Maintenance Building**
- C. 16-1002 Approval and authorization to execute Amendment No. 2 to the Professional Consulting Services Agreement with HDR Engineering, Inc. for odor control design of Lynn Lane Wastewater Treatment Plant Headworks Replacement (Project No. 165420 & 165423)**
- D. 16-1017 Approval and authorization to execute Amendment No. 2 to the Professional Consulting Services Agreement with HDR Engineering, Inc. for on-call professional services at the Verdigris Water Treatment Plant**
- E. 16-991 Approval and authorization to execute an amendment to the Professional Engineering Services Agreement with Holloway, Updike and Bellen, Inc. for services associated with the replacement of capital equipment at the Haikey Creek Waste Water Treatment Center**
- F. 16-986 Acknowledgement of Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) Permit No. ST000072160376 for construction of the Haikey Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Flow Equalization Basin (Project No. HC1103)**

- G. 16-989 **Broken Arrow Municipal Authority Meeting Agenda Page 1 8/16/2016 Acknowledgement of Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) Permit No. WL00007216018 for construction of the Tulsa Water Connection at Albany and Olive (Project No. WL1611)**
- H. 16-980 **Approval of the Broken Arrow Municipal Authority Claims List for August 16, 2016**
- I. 16-826 **Approval of the Broken Arrow Municipal Authority Claims List for August 16, 2016**

4. Consideration of Items Removed from Consent Agenda

There were no items removed from the Consent Agenda. No action was required or taken.

5. Public Hearings, Appeals, Presentations, Recognitions, Awards

A. 16-988 **Presentation, discussion, consideration and possible approval of the telephone survey of public opinion regarding curbside collection service**

General Services Director Lee Zirk recalled that in January 2016 the Municipal Authority approved a professional services agreement with Gershman, Brickner and Bratton, Inc. (GBB) and ShapardResearch, LLC, to conduct a survey. He reported that the survey was conducted during the week of May 9th through May 13th. Mr. Zirk introduced Kate Vasquez of GBB and Bill Shapard of ShapardResearch, who would be address the Council and give their presentations on the project.

Ms. Vasquez, after providing a small background of her expertise, explained that communication was an essential and critical aspect of a solid waste management program, pointing out that participation by the public was necessary for a system to work and be successful.

Mr. Shapard introduced himself, stating that as a full service market research firm, they were one of only a few firms in Oklahoma that performed their own data collection. He added that they were also SoonerPoll.com, the States only independent, non-partisan polling firm. He related that the survey was conducted as SoonerPoll, a brand widely recognized by citizens throughout the State. The survey was conducted using landline and cell phone connections. The sample was purchased from Survey Sampling International (SSI) which provided a probability sample. Four hundred participants within the community at large were selected at random, putting the results at just under 5% margin of error. The process was to come by an instrument whereby there was buy-in from all the different players within the community. Demographical information was collected, as well. The objective was to discover the attitudes residents had toward the existing and trash recycling program and the culture they had built around it, i.e. why they did what they did in connection with curbside collection service.

Returning to the lectern, Ms. Vasquez stated that there were different categories of questions on what people did, what they thought, along with specific questions on recycling. Seven general questions about changing curbside service were asked.

Highlighting the results, Ms. Vasquez summed up that people were generally happy with the bag voucher system; they saw recycling as a valuable service and an asset and realized that improving service might incur a cost; and openness to rolling carts was guarded. In the absence of hard data, the survey enabled them to gain some insight into what people were setting out at the curb, which was chiefly boxes and tree branches or landscaping material, both recyclable items. With regard to opinions on carts, the most popular answer was "extremely favorable," while the next popular one was, "extremely unfavorable," with only 3.5% separating the two groups of respondents. The results could be seen as an invitation to seek more information on what people's concerns or objections were, or what they liked about the idea. Renters favored rolling carts most, whereas retirees and disabled people opposed them most. With regard to recycling, a majority of people felt that not

having curbside recycling was behind the times. Overall, citizens didn't make a connection between having or not having recycling and economic development of the City, though younger persons were more likely to make the connection. Citizens were generally not supportive of "pay as you throw," or metered charges, with opposition highest among respondents who were renting and had a low income. It was generally accepted that in any community surveyed, an estimated 10% to 20% of people over reported that they recycled when they didn't. Taking that into account for Broken Arrow, the survey response on recycling was still a strongly positive one.

Ms. Vasquez turned to the implications of the study and solid waste decision making ramifications. As she had mentioned, public engagement was very important and it was crucial for culture change to be possible. A culture change always went hand in hand with the institution of curbside recycling, but it was a deeper issue in Broken Arrow owing to the system already in place. There were questions to be considered regarding whether to have a bag voucher program, the frequency of pick-up, the containers to be used, and financial side or billing. Any changes had to be handled very carefully and concerns of citizens had to be addressed head on and in a proactive way to meet any perceived for real loss of service. Mr. Vasquez pointed out that Broken Arrow's status quo had a lot of strengths upon which a recycling program could be built. If all the bags set out on the second day, as surveyed, were recyclables, the City would be seeing a pretty decent recycling rate of 20% to 30%, on par with the national average. The survey showed that a lot of the bulk items being put out were recyclable and could be diverted from disposal. The majority of people surveyed viewed recycling as a modern amenity, reflecting the evolution of recycling in the United States from a cause to a core service. Again, respondents acknowledged that a service change there might be some cost involved. With regard to the challenges involved there were human and operational ones. The human challenges were, typically, a real or perceived reduction in service with the change.

Ms. Vasquez stated that they had prepared some ideas on the next part of the project: evaluation. She believed there were a lot of resources and opportunities to add curbside recycling in Broken Arrow, should the Council decide to go forward. There were a lot of options because they would be starting from scratch, in large part. They also had a dedicated funding source. She emphasized the need for decisiveness in planning to ensure that each and every aspect was ready for implementation from the get go.

With a view to engaging stakeholders at all junctures of the project, Ms. Vasquez suggested that the City write a clear plan for public involvement, creating a committee of advisors, as well. Additional polling could also be conducted, as part of the plan. She usually recommended three to five things to take place in preparation, including a traditional meeting, a couple of workshops, with some interactive aspect, and then, perhaps, a promotional event. The procurement process included equipment, recycling processing and a complete service proposal from a private vendor. Implementation involved beginning operations/starting collection and the vendor should be required to provide information by collecting data so that the program could be evaluated.

Chairman Thurmond commented that it was surprising to learn that the group that the 65 to 74 age group recycled most, whereas the 18 to 24 age group recycled least. Trustee Parks said that he felt for a long time that the City was lagging behind with respect to recycling, explaining that he and his wife took their recyclable waste to the Metropolitan Environmental Trust (M.e.t.). He thought that Broken Arrow citizens were ready for curbside recycling of some kind, even as a stepping stone to some bigger, future program. He was pleased by the positive survey results showing a high number of citizens supporting and wishing to be involved in a prospective recycling program. Mr. Shapard observed that curbside recycling would make it easier to recycle, enabling citizens to recycle more. On

the other hand, he noted that Broken Arrow citizens were very attached or dependent on the bag system, which did not necessarily lend itself to implementation of a recycling program. It was found in the research that there was a culture that was built up around that; a city bag could be found in their kitchen trashcan, while another trashcan would be in the garage. Some of their practices would have to change and the changes would be met by some resistance on their part, at first. However, as had been observed in other cities, once residents became accustomed to the change they really appreciated the opportunity to dispose of their recyclable waste right outside their houses.

Chairman Thurmond said he thought it was something to support and do in the future. Their challenge was that they had done such an excellent job with trash service and the old adage, "If it's not broken don't fix it," came to mind. However, it was clear that it was important to people to be able to recycle and he, himself, had observed a 60% or more reduction in trash he put out, so the curbside service he paid for had made a big difference. Trustee Eudey commented that he was pleased that a majority of Broken Arrow citizens viewed recycling as important and appeared ready to endorse a curbside program. They had known for a long time that their M.e.t. location was used more than any other. The challenging part would be how to make the program work.

City Manager Michael Spurgeon thanked the Mayor, Authority members and extended his appreciation to Kate Vasquez and Bill Shapard, as well as Lee Zirk and Bill Cade for their stewardship of the project. Mr. Spurgeon stated that he had two recommendations for the Authority's consideration. He believed that the City should continue to collect trash in the way it was currently collected. The culture in place should remain unchanged. Recycling in Broken Arrow had been limited to the M.e.t., with which the City had a great partnership. The M.e.t. did a great job of serving the needs of citizens and the relationship should continue. The current practice and procedure of trash collection presented some challenges, nevertheless. The Council had approved funds from the Capital Improvements budget to purchase route software for garbage truck drivers and use of the software would be implemented some time during the current fiscal year. Secondly, a great challenge was finding refuse collectors who also had a license to drive a truck in an emergency or on call. There were 13 routes and 14 drivers currently, as he understood, and when one or more took time off it became problematical. There were times when the drivers had to double up on their routes or a temporary service had to be engaged. The route software would be of tremendous benefit, no doubt, for substitute drivers but the challenges were ongoing.

Mr. Spurgeon said he concurred with the results of the survey and wished to request the Council's support first, to approve the administration going forward in looking at options for implementing a curbside collection program. He wished to do it with full transparency as Ms. Vasquez and Mr. Shapard described, creating an ad hoc citizens committee. He would ask each Council member to give the name of an individual to serve on the committee, along with a couple of staff members. Anywhere from 8 to 12 citizens, from the Chamber of Commerce, the school district, etc., would be needed to serve on a committee and he believed professional or technical assistance would be needed to help with the process, as well. There would be a series of meetings, including a visit to the recycle center in Tulsa, and then the committee would begin considering recommendations. Sometime early next spring they would arrive at a final recommendation to bring before the Municipal Authority for its consideration. Upon the Authority's approval, a public education program would be instituted. With regard to procurement, he had learned that there were bags available for purchase that would not interfere with the sorting of recyclables. It was an option that would not require a big change in people's habits. They would be aiming at implementation of a curbside collection of recyclables sometime in the fall or by the end of 2017.

Vice-Chairman Carter said he thought Mr. Spurgeon's view was right and he was thinking about candidates to nominate for the ad hoc committee.

Trustee Eudey stated that the key issue Mr. Spurgeon mentioned was correct: they were not going to throw the baby out with the bath water, but were looking at something that dovetailed with the system they had. It would allow citizens to continue with what they had while allowing the City to add more beneficial services, integrating something most citizens desired into a system already in place.

Trustee Lester asked for clarification that after the committee had done its work, the plan would be brought to the community for their review and input. Mr. Spurgeon assured him that that would be the case.

Trustee Parks reiterated that he saw recycling as a priority and he was enthusiastic about the project. He agreed that it would be difficult to change trash collection when they were doing such an excellent job. The question of carts was up to them and they could choose in the future them if they wanted. He himself, had used a large cart for over 20 years with no complaints from the collectors. He did bag items in the cart and he had noticed that half of the neighbors in his subdivision were already using carts. He appreciated too that institution of a curbside recycling program would serve as an example to youth in the community.

Chairman Thurmond stated that three citizens had signed up to speak.

Edward Clingerman, 5709 South Birch Avenue, said that although he was in favor of recycling, he was not in favor of curbside recycling and other options should be considered. He had experience working with a Gallup poll group, and he observed that the way in which a survey question was phrased determined the answer given. He was most concerned about the cost, especially for low-income citizens'. Also, he questioned whether recycling would be putting money back into the system. He appreciated their decision to continue with the good trash service they had, but wished that they would look at vacant city property as possible drop-off points for recyclables into containers. He did like the idea of a citizens' committee being formed and reiterated the need to examine cost and how it would affect people.

Billy Hickman, 5716 South Birch Avenue, stated that he was not opposed to recycling, however he didn't want to avoid the pitfalls of leaping forward just because it was a trendy thing to do. He saw the need to take a look at what kind of recycling they wanted to do, what the costs would be, and how would it be implemented. He recalled that three years before the City had considered making major changes in collection and the people spoke loud and clear at five town hall meetings that they overwhelmingly opposed the proposed changes. The City Council decided not to change the trash pick-up system against the will of the people. He did not trust a telephone survey as reflecting the people's will and their actual thoughts and feelings on the subject would be revealed in time. Although he appreciated that the trash bag system and service would not be changing, he saw changing that as the City's ultimate goal. In time, the City would give up the old system in order to recycle. The bags provided by the City from taxpayer's funds would be eliminated, citizens would be required to purchase their own bags, and carts would become mandatory. Rolling the carts to and from the curb and finding a place for the cart when it was not at the curb would prove problematical for some people. He also foresaw a reduction in the frequency of trash pick-up to one day a week and institution of a policing policy since there would be people who didn't abide by the rules and regulations whom the City see the need to penalize. He was not sure that such changes would be in Broken Arrow's best interest.

Wes Smithwick, President of the Broken Arrow Chamber of Commerce, addressed the Municipal Authority, recalling that as a boy he would pour oil into a ditch behind the house after his father did an oil change on the car. A few years later, Keep America Beautiful ran the famous ad of a Native American seeing him with a tear running down his face as he surveyed the pollution around him. He asked his father why they were polluting the ground and his father answered that he had never thought about it. Later, people who knew better, dug big holes, lined them with plastic, and filled them with trash. Now, they knew better and they had go forward for the sake of their kids and community. Part of the Authority's job was to be leaders of the community. They knew that the vast majority of citizens were either in favor of it or didn't really care. He observed that too often government listened to a very small, but vocal, minority. He applauded the City Manager's approach to maintain the status quo and also move forward in a slightly different direction to make recycling easier. Curbside recycling would mean more recycling and less material sent to the dump to pollute the area from hundreds of years. Mr. Smithwick went on to say that Oklahoma had a negative perception of the issue. Part of his job was to recruit jobs to Broken Arrow and he was always asked to describe the community's sustainability or green program. The issue was becoming more important as they tried to grow their community in a responsible way. He encouraged the Municipal Authority to move in the direction the City Manager had suggested. He thought it was reasonable and many people were happy with the prospect. He thanked the Authority, expressing appreciation for its leadership and confidence that they would do the right thing.

Mr. Spurgeon assured all that any recommendation decided upon with regard to recycling would be voluntary. He had been recycling in different communities for 30 years and it was not his intention to make it mandatory. If a citizen's property were littered with debris everywhere, that was a different story, but it was going to be a voluntary program.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mike Lester, seconded by Scott Eudey.

Move to approve the telephone survey of public opinion regarding curbside collection service

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Scott Eudey, Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Richard Carter, Craig Thurmond

6. General Authority Business

A. 16-987

Consideration, discussion, and possible approval and authorization to execute a Service and Operation Agreement between the Broken Arrow Municipal Authority and the Metropolitan Environmental Trust (M.e.t.) for operation of the Broken Arrow Recycle Center and for services related to Household Hazardous Waste Collection

Mr. Zirk stated that the attached agreement was the annual agreement with the M.e.t. for the years recycle operation and for services regarding Hazardous Household Pollutants (HHPs). The agreement before them was a little different in that it was a single agreement combining both the Recycle Center and the HHP programs. There would be an overall cost increase of approximately \$19,000, reflective of increases meant to reduce subsidies from other cities in operation of their M.e.t. center. He introduced Graham Brannin, from the M.e.t., to speak about the HHP voucher program.

Mr. Brannin stated that the voucher system was an agreement that the Mayor of Tulsa was just about sign with respect to how the system would work through them. How it would work for citizens of Broken Arrow is that they be would be vetted through the M.e.t., and the M.e.t. would then make sure that they were eligible to use the voucher system. If they were eligible, the M.e.t. would set up an appointment, inquiring also about the kind of pollutants they planned to bring. If it were something the M.e.t. handled, they would be welcome to bring the pollutant in at any time, without an appointment. If it were a pollutant

that needed to be disposed of properly at the Tulsa's facility, the M.e.t. would set up the appointment, notifying Tulsa so they would be ready. The idea behind the voucher system was that each voucher would cost \$40 and was assessed to the particular city. It was pre-budgeted, with 240 pre-paid vouchers in the contract. They would keep a tally and report on the status of the voucher numbers. If there were demand for over 240 vouchers, they would give a warning to the City, which could then decide whether it wanted to fund more vouchers. The \$40 would not cover items over 60 lbs. and the person bringing the pollutant in excess of 60 lbs. would have to bear the cost. In such a case, they would inform the person and provide advice on options open to them if they wished to avoid the extra fee.

Trustee Eudey commented that serving as the City's Trustee on the M.e.t., he was aware that Graham and his staff had worked through many difficulties to make the voucher program workable. He thought they had come up with a good program to meet the change in circumstances, as it replaced the biannual hazardous waste drop-off, for the most part, and allowed people to use the permanent facility in Tulsa.

MOTION: A motion was made by Johnnie Parks, seconded by Mike Lester.

Move to approve the agreement for services with the M.e.t. and authorize its execution

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: **5 -** Scott Eudey, Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Richard Carter, Craig Thurmond

7. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:08 p.m.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mike Lester, seconded by Richard Carter.

Move to adjourn

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: **5 -** Scott Eudey, Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Richard Carter, Craig Thurmond

Attest:

Chairman

Secretary