



City of Broken Arrow
Minutes
Broken Arrow Municipal Authority

City Hall
220 S 1st Street
Broken Arrow OK
74012

Chairperson Craig Thurmond
Vice Chair Scott Eudey
Trustee Mike Lester
Trustee Johnnie Parks
Trustee Debra Wimpee

Tuesday, August 1, 2017

Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

Chairman Craig Thurmond called the meeting to order at approximately 8:02 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present: 5 - Debra Wimpee, Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Scott Eudey, Craig Thurmond

3. Consideration of Consent Agenda

Chairman Thurmond asked if there were any items to remove from the Consent Agenda. There were none.

MOTION: A motion was made by Johnnie Parks, seconded by Debra Wimpee.

Move to approve the Consent Agenda

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 3 - Debra Wimpee, Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Scott Eudey, Craig Thurmond

- A. 17-1689 Approval of Broken Arrow Municipal Authority Meeting Minutes of July 18, 2017**
- B. 17-2473 Approval of and authorization to execute Amendment No. 2 to a Professional Consultant Agreement with Holloway, Updike and Bellen, Inc. (HUB) for Design of a 24-inch waterline from the Battle Creek Storage Tank to the distribution system (Project No. WL1609)**
- C. 17-2471 Approval of and authorization to execute a Regional Metropolitan Utility Authority (RMUA) Professional Consultant Agreement for Haikey Creek Grit Building Rehabilitation**
- D. 16-1575 Approval of the Broken Arrow Municipal Authority Claims List for August 01, 2017**

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. 17-2477 Presentation, discussion, and possible acceptance of the Broken Arrow Citizen Recycle Committee Report**

Mr. Lee Zirk, General Services Director, stated in the spring of 2016 City Council authorized a survey to collect the opinions of refuse customers and to serve as a guide in the development and decision making process regarding future refuse and recycling services. He reported in August 2016 the survey was presented to the Broken Arrow Municipal Authority and as a result the City Manager recommended a committee be formed to study refuse and recycling in Broken Arrow. He introduced Mr. Russell Peterson, Chairman of the Recycling Committee, and Ms. Kate Vasquez, Senior Consultant for Gershman, Brickner & Bratton (GBB), who assisted the Committee.

Chairman of the Recycling Committee of Broken Arrow Mr. Russell Peterson expressed his excitement regarding the economic development opportunities discussed in the City Council Meeting that evening. He commended the City and the Chamber and the EDC for the level of cooperation which was shown and said he appreciated their efforts.

Mr. Peterson asked the Committee Members present to stand. He reported the Recycling Committee commenced nine months ago, met twice per month, and had toured the existing facilities in the area, the MET, the Covanta Energy Plant, and the Murph. He stated the Committee educated itself on what was and what was not a recyclable material, and discussed the economic impact of said recyclables. He stated the Committee learned recyclable material was a valuable commodity which would offset the cost of a recycling program. He stated the Committee reached a consensus the City should consider a curbside recycling program, and then researched differing types of recycling programs available to determine what would best fit the needs of Broken Arrow. He explained the Committee had analyzed bags, carts, combinations of the two, and after careful consideration the Committee was prepared with a recommendation for BAMA. He asked that BAMA set up a 4 month pilot project in a designated area (to be determined), utilizing 1 cart for recyclables and 1 cart for garbage and refuse with once a week pickup service and elimination of the free bag program. He explained the economics of this were neutral which would be revealed in the report. He urged that a survey be conducted in the pilot-specific areas to ascertain the citizen's opinion for review and to aid in determination of a final recommendation. He stated the Recycling Committee Report encouraged change, and change was often opposed simply because it was change; however, he did believe this change would be considered progress and he asked BAMA to carefully consider the Recycling Committee recommendations. Mr. Peterson closed with a quote "If you see something wrong in your world or community you can do something or nothing and we've already tried nothing."

Senior Consultant Kate Vasquez expressed her pleasure at being present in Broken Arrow for the BAMA Meeting. She stated she was happy to share the Recycling Committee Report. She explained Gershman, Brickner & Bratton (GBB) had been staffing the Recycling Committee Meeting over the past several months and she had prepared slides to highlight the work of the Committee and its results. She intimated this Recycling Committee was a dedicated, hardworking committee with no preconceived conclusions. She explained GBB worked with many committees and she felt the Recycling Committee was one of the most effective and dedicated committees she had come across. Ms. Vasquez reviewed a slide which listed the presentations and field trips the Committee had participated in to ensure relevant subject matter information understanding. She stated GBB was asked to provide a cost model on one possibility and a variation thereupon. She explained GBB cost modeled a typical 2 cart system, 1 cart for garbage and 1 cart for recycling with once a week pickup (both on same day), and a variation on this whereby the garbage would still be in bags which would require the purchase of fewer carts. She reviewed a slide which displayed the results of the cost model and explained this was not a "rate model" as rates were influenced by factors which were not captured in the cost model. She directed BAMA's attention to the FY16 actual cost, and the two scenario's costs which included a high, low and typical cost. She explained high, low and typical reflected the price of processing recyclables at the material recovery facility. She stated the City of Tulsa presently enjoyed a well negotiated rate for recycling processing and a revenue sharing agreement; this was what was used to calculate the low cost. She stated the high cost was determined using the price quoted a few years ago by the material recovery facility to the City of Broken Arrow for a pilot project and was considered a ceiling price and was high due to the temporary nature of a pilot project and the research involved. She stated the typical rate reflected a hoped for rate if GBB negotiated on behalf

of Broken Arrow with the material recovery facility and was calculated based on \$60 per ton which was what similar facilities charged other cities across the US, versus \$40 per ton which was the rate Tulsa had negotiated.

Ms. Vasquez cautioned these results not be interpreted to mean recycling would “save money” because there were costs the City had which could not be worked into the cost model, most specifically the new GPS equipment which would affect the operating cost per truck per mile. She explained the cost model used lifetime-to-date for the truck cost, as the City kept excellent records which worked into the model easily, but she would expect that number to change as there would be new equipment which would need support and maintenance.

Ms. Vasquez stated recycling performance could vary between scenario 1 and scenario 2. She reiterated scenario 1 was the 2 cart system and scenario 2 was the 1 cart and bag system. She explained in the absence of real field information for comparison the conservative position was to assume the two programs would perform similarly, meaning residents would divert similar amounts of materials and the quality of the materials would be the same. She stated there was only one other city who used a system similar to scenario 2 and it was not a benchmark program; the recycling rate in that city was recorded at 12% which was very low. Ms. Vasquez stated one key influence on cost was the reduction of pickup frequency to once a week. She explained the use of carts for sanitation purposes once a week was safe and clean and the capacity was adequate for material storage, and it also allowed Broken Arrow to use its current fleet without purchasing additional trucks. She explained the introduction of computerized routes would also enable the use of Broken Arrow’s current truck fleet, made the routes more efficient and balanced, and allowed trucks and drivers to operate in the most efficient manner. She stated the elimination of the bag expense was another key influence on the cost. She reported the bag expense in 2016 was \$518,000 and increased yearly due to increased residences and increased bag cost. She stated recyclable revenue sharing was included as a cost influence. She explained revenue sharing was strong in the US and Broken Arrow had easy access to markets. She expected Broken Arrow to be able to negotiate a revenue sharing agreement similar to the City of Tulsa and other client cities of GBB which would match current disposal costs and ideally could improve disposal costs.

She stated Committee recommendations included discontinuation of the free bag distribution for several reasons. She explained beyond the cost savings, not having a cart at the curb would reduce the benefit of a GPS based tracking system as most GPS tracking systems included cart chip reading to determine address points. She stated the opaque bags and general set out allowance would not encourage participation in recycling. She stated once weekly collection was recommended with the addition of single stream recycling and rolling carts. She reported fewer than 10% of cities and counties with more than 100,000 residents used twice weekly collection. She stated best practice showed refuse and recycling should be collected same day to encourage participation. She stated the use of carts for recycling was the best practice within the US to provide adequate capacity for both recyclables and refuse.

Ms. Vasquez stated the Recycling Committee recommended two separate pilot projects with one pilot area for each methodology. She explained both pilots would have once a week same-day collection, and in both there would be no additional bag distribution. She stated GBB was asked to provide possible pilot cost information. She reviewed a slide which displayed the scenario 1 cost (the 2 cart scenario) and the cost of both scenario 1 and scenario 2 combined. She mentioned after the Report had been completed it was discovered that the retrofit cost of \$5,000 per truck was in actuality \$10,000 per truck; therefore, the \$15,000 cost written in the Report for the single pilot program the \$35,000

cost for the double pilot program was now \$30,000 and \$70,000 truck conversion cost. She explained there were costs not seen within the estimate, including possible internal city expenses, perhaps higher fuel costs, perhaps extra costs associated with using onboard truck computer equipment, etc. She asked if there were questions.

Trustee Mike Lester noted the Report said glass would not be included as a recyclable material and asked if this was correct. Ms. Vasquez stated the Committee suggested glass not be accepted in the single stream program as glass caused operational problems at the material recovery facility to include damage to processing equipment and loss of value of recyclable material. She reported glass recycled through the Murph was not recycled into new products such as bottles, etc.; it was used for “beneficial reuse,” for example cover for landfill in place of gravel, etc. She explained if glass was collected separately and brought to a glass specific recycling plant it would be recycled into usable products and the recycling program would be enhanced as the quality of the Murph recycling materials would improve which would help reduce disposal cost and increase revenue sharing. She stated there was an excellent opportunity with the MET, an established well-known and used recycling drop-off center which could collect the glass in its own stream to effect a value from it. She explained currently glass was considered a “loser” as it did not pay; the material recovery facility was required to pay to dispose of it and Broken Arrow would be required to pay to have it processed, but would not receive revenue for it in return.

Chairman Thurmond commented when he visited the Murph, the Murph mentioned it did not want glass. Vice Chair Eudey stated when he worked with the MET, the MET indicated glass was not an income producer when mixed in the single stream. He stated dividing glass into its own stream could yield profit, but in a mixed stream it would not.

Trustee Debra Wimpee asked if an ordinance be required to discourage carts from being stored on the street. Ms. Vasquez stated most localities did have an ordinance requiring cart storage be away from the road, or requiring carts not being visible from the front or side, or indicating allotted hours the carts were allowed curbside, etc. Ms. Vasquez said this was something the City would want to address to prevent carts being left curbside as this was not only unattractive, but could be damaging to the carts as well. Ms. Wimpee asked if extra bags, outside of carts, would be picked up if necessary, and would once a week pickup eliminate jobs. Ms. Vasquez responded there was no reduction in the number of trucks which would indicate no reduction in the number of drivers; work requirement would not lessen or increase, it would simply be allocated differently. Ms. Vasquez, in response to Ms. Wimpee’s first question, stated other cities allowed residents to have more than one cart for a nominal surcharge, some cities allowed extra bags, some did not, and this was something Broken Arrow would have to determine for itself.

Trustee Johnnie Parks stated when he and his wife began recycling themselves several years ago, their trash production decreased by 60% to 65%, which meant one cart for trash should suffice. He stated recycling was on a voluntary basis; therefore, one cart for trash would be an issue for those who did not recycle, especially with once a week pickup. Chairman Thurmond agreed with Mr. Parks and stated he began recycling 10 years ago, paid for a curbside service in Broken Arrow, and he found he produced approximately 60% less refuse as a result. He stated it was possible residents might require an extra recycling cart, but felt refuse production would significantly decrease when recycling began. He said he felt two 96 gallon carts would suffice on most occasions.

Trustee Parks stated other issues would be solved with a changeover to carts, for example workers’ compensation claims. He stated bag pickup was becoming obsolete; most cities used a cart system. He stated this would be a transition, and as it was nice to be able to bring a bag out curbside and be done, the City was spending a half a million dollars a year just on trash bags which were not decomposable. He stated he researched the top 10 cities

in the State of Oklahoma, and Broken Arrow was the only city which did not have trash automation; he felt Broken Arrow might have a system which it liked, but it was behind the times. He stated he approved of the recommendation from the Committee to have two pilot programs, one with a cart and a bag (no bags provided), and one with two carts, followed by surveys to evaluate feedback. He stated Michelle Bergwall with the school system made a suggestion choose a couple of schools to help centralize the areas to test the pilot programs which would ease the distribution of educational materials and would encourage family involvement. He stated he felt moving to once weekly pickup would be a nonissue.

Chairman Thurmond stated he felt the biggest challenge Broken Arrow would face with the change would be the fact that the City had done such a great job for so many years, but he was excited to see the pilot programs implemented and curious to see what the surveys returned. Trustee Parks suggested taking note in the subdivisions of how many residents currently used carts and said in his subdivision it was in excess of 50%. Vice Chair Eudey stated this recommendation was for two pilot programs which would give the City the opportunity to collect data to determine if the change was appropriate; following the pilot programs BAMA could evaluate the data and decide upon the best course of action. Trustee Lester iterated this was a community and a citizen's committee which brought this recommendation before BAMA, he felt this was appropriate and looked forward its implementation.

City Manager Mike Spurgeon asked if the Committee discussed offering different size carts as a part of the pilot. Ms. Vasquez stated the Committee set aside discussing different size carts as the survey last year indicated there was not much interest in different size cart and rate options. She explained the biggest difference between using one size versus another would be the initial capital cost and storage footprint. She stated the Committee had considered 64 gallon carts for this program, but 96 gallon carts could be used. She said any cart smaller than 64 gallons presented challenges. She reported some cities utilized a 32 gallon trash bin and offered larger recycling carts at a lower price, but this caused up to 35% recycling contamination. She recommended utilizing a 64 gallon or a 96 gallon cart for the pilot programs, the same size for each pilot; if Broken Arrow chose to offer different size carts at different costs there would be an associated administration cost. She explained there would be no cost change in servicing different size carts, the cost change would be with the capital cost.

Chairman Thurmond thanked the Recycling Committee for the time, effort and energy spent researching and discussing this project, and the compilation of information into a comprehensive report for BAMA. He thanked Mr. Parks and Vice Chair Eudey for attending the 13 extra meetings. He thanked Ms. Vasquez and GBB for assembling the cost model. He expressed his appreciation to all participants in this project.

Mr. Spurgeon stated should BAMA chose to accept the recommendation the next step would be for administration to review the two options presented for pilots specifically and determine all costs, and schedule a time with BAMA to consider the administration's recommendation to implement one or both of the pilot programs, the implementation plan in terms of public education, and schedule a series of public meetings in the designated pilot program areas. He felt two maybe three meetings should be scheduled for the purpose of educating the pilot program area residents.

MOTION: A motion was made by Johnnie Parks, seconded by Debra Wimpee.

Move to accept the Broken Arrow Citizen Recycle Committee Report

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Debra Wimpee, Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Scott Eudey, Craig Thurmond

Chairman Thurmond thanked the participants. Trustee Parks stated the Broken Arrow Recycling Committee would reconvene following the pilot program to review the collected information. He stated there was nearly 100% participation 100% of the time within the Recycling Committee. Mr. Spurgeon stated whatever BAMA decided the Recycling Committee would continue to be invited to the public meetings for the pilot programs. He stated he felt the Recycling Committee had worked very hard on this project and should continue to be involved. Vice Chair Eudey expressed his gratitude to Ms. Vasquez for her assistance throughout the project.

6. General Authority Business

There was no General Authority Business.

7. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:41 p.m.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mike Lester, seconded by Debra Wimpee.

Move to adjourn.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Debra Wimpee, Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Scott Eudey, Craig Thurmond

Attest

/Craig Thurmond_____
Chairman

/Lisa Blackford_____
Secretary