



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, November 7, 2017

Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

Chairman Craig Thurmond called the meeting to order at approximately 7:32 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present: 4 - Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Scott Eudey, Craig Thurmond
Absent: 1 - Debra Wimpee

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 Mike Lester, seconded by Johnnie Parks.

Move to approve the Consent Agenda

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Scott Eudey, Craig Thurmond

- A. 17-1708** **Approval of Broken Arrow Municipal Authority Meeting Minutes of October 17, 2017**
- B. 17-2822** **Acknowledgement of Submittal of the Broken Arrow/Lynn Lane Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Pretreatment Report to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)**
- C. 17-2823** **Acknowledgement of Submittal of the Regional Metropolitan Utility Authority (RMUA)/Haikey Creek Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Pretreatment Report to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)**
- D. 17-2824** **Award the most advantageous bid to Hach Company for the purchase of eleven (11) units of Hach turbidity meters for the Water Treatment Plant**
- E. 17-2801** **Award the most advantageous bid to Rush Truck Center for the purchase of one (1) 25,500 pound gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) chassis with utility body for the Stormwater Division**
- F. 17-2815** **Award the most advantageous bid to Whitestar Machinery for the purchase of one (1) mini excavator for the Stormwater Division**
- G. 17-2850** **Acceptance of and authorization to execute a Tulsa County Board of County Commissioners Utility Permit for a Sanitary Sewer Installation by boring across Garnett Road for the Cottages at Cedar Ridge located one-quarter mile north of New Orleans Street, west of Garnett Road (Section 19, T18N, R14E)**
- H. 16-1594** **Approval of the Broken Arrow Municipal Authority Claims List for November 07, 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

There were no Public Hearings, Appeals, Presentations, Recognitions, or Awards.

6. General Authority Business

A. 17-2819 Presentation, discussion, and possible action regarding costs related to the Citizens Recycle Committee Pilot Project recommendation

General Services Director Lee Zirk reported in August 2017 the Citizens Recycle Committee presented the Activity Report which included the committee's recommendation to run two separate pilot projects, one with a single cart system for recyclables, and one with a dual cart system for recyclables and trash. He stated the Authority asked staff to obtain detailed pricing and in turn staff worked with Gershman, Brickner & Bratton, Inc. (GBB) to prepare a detailed cost analysis to determine what the pilot projects would cost. He stated Kate Vasquez with GBB was in attendance to review the projected pilot program costs.

Ms. Kate Vasquez stated the Recycling Committee made four recommendations: discontinue free bag distribution, provide once weekly same day curbside garbage and recycling pickup, begin collecting recyclables at the curb using a rolling cart, and conduct a dual pilot project. She stated the dual pilot consisted of two systems, one with dual cart use for garbage and recyclables, and one with single cart use for recyclables and bag use for garbage. Ms. Vasquez reviewed and discussed a Power Point slide which demonstrated the detailed and specific costs that went into pricing the Pilot Projects including GBB's level of effort, detailed pricing on survey work from Shapard Research, appropriate project management and budget controls, specific pricing on routing work from C2Logix, informed estimates from public relation firms, and quoted pricing for recycling processing from American Waste Control. Ms. Vasquez then reviewed an Assumptions slide; she stated each input had a value which was used to calculate cost. She stated the Input/Value for American Waste Control processing was different than previously indicated. She explained originally it had been considered a cost to process recyclables; however, with the revenue sharing involved, it would save \$9 per ton. She stated the truck retrofits were \$10,000 per truck, and cart count included a 2.5% over supply, but this number would vary as discounts were given if carts were purchased by the truckload as opposed to a specific number. She stated all pricing costs presented were collected in earnest with sincerity; however, were not actual proposals. She stated to simplify figures, values were rounded to the nearest \$5,000; however, exact values were available upon request.

Ms. Vasquez stated the Dual Pilot with 1,000 homes in each pilot would cost approximately \$455,000. She stated the pricing for a single 1,000 home pilot, utilizing one collection method, was estimated at \$315,000. She explained the savings was due to less public relations work needed and less capital. She stated GBB had been asked to do a price estimate for a scaled down single pilot with only 500 homes which was estimated at approximately \$160,000. She explained there were significant capital savings when reducing the size of the pilot area; however, the compromise was this would impede learning the actual cost and effort to run the truck work routes, as no truck route included only 500 homes. However, she stated, the information gathered regarding participants' experience would be the same. She stated there were internal costs which were not included in the estimates. She explained these internal costs may or may not impact the overall cost; however, the costs included overtime, fuel, the city's Public Relations officer's labor, possible temporary labor, etc. She reported in GBB's experience, once a service was in place, even when a pilot program concluded, generally municipalities continued to provide the service to the pilot participants until citywide or countywide implementation took place; therefore, a continued operational cost would be incurred until full program implementation.

Ms. Vasquez stated GBB's recommendation was a dual cart single pilot, which was the best practice choice; dual cart service was the nationwide standard level of service. She stated she understood it was expensive to run a pilot project and therefore GBB's second recommendation was for the same, but with a smaller participant group which would reduce cost, namely capital cost. She stated that GBB and the contributing service firms who were

involved expressed hesitancy about piloting a program in a “versus” situation, where one pilot was “winner” and one was “loser.” She stated there were many complications involved in this type of dual pilot and there were extra costs and challenges associated with the losing pilot, including switching to the winning pilot program system, or removal of services until citywide implementation of the chosen method.

Ms. Vasquez stated the next step was to choose a pilot project and choose a public relations firm. She stated GBB had collected estimates from four different public relations firms and recommended Broken Arrow grant all four the opportunity to propose a bid. She stated after Broken Arrow chose a public relations firm, the scope should be finalized and the City could proceed with the chosen pilot.

Chairman Thurmond asked if there were any questions for Ms. Vasquez. Trustee Johnnie Parks stated he had read through the Recycling Committee Pilot Program recommendation several times and he felt something had been lost along the way. He stated Kate Vasquez had done a wonderful job, but it was obvious she felt Broken Arrow should utilize the two cart system as it was the national standard. He stated he understood only about 5% of the nation utilized trash bags for curbside collection and asked Ms. Vasquez to verify. Ms. Vasquez stated bags were being utilized less and less often for collection, residents were often choosing to utilize self-provided carts, and she could find no record of any successful program where garbage was collected in bags and a cart was used for recycling. Trustee Parks stated he agreed, and the question was not how the recycling would be picked up, but how the garbage was to be collected. He stated he had been contacted by several Recycling Committee members who were concerned because the idea had been to follow a dual pilot program to allow data to be compared to determine how residents felt about both programs. He stated he did not want to make any changes to the proposed program without the full support of the Recycling Committee. He stated whatever was done needed to at least go back through the committee to get the committee’s input. He reported the committee had been under the impression the dual pilot program could be conducted until it received the GBB cost projection. He stated Broken Arrow was a close knit community that trusted City Council to make good decisions on behalf of the City. He stated there must be an option which would allow the dual pilots, maybe lower the number for both pilots to 500 homes, or maybe conduct each pilot in separate fiscal years; if not, he felt it needed to go back to the Committee for a final analysis. Trustee Mike Lester asked if there was no option in the cost assessment which allowed for the dual pilot. Trustee Parks stated there was, but the committee was caught off-guard when the recommendation by GBB was a dual cart single pilot program. Trustee Lester asked Ms. Vasquez if GBB made this decision based on cost or standard practice. Ms. Vasquez responded standard practice. Trustee Parks stated he was not belittling Ms. Vasquez, her work was well done, but he felt the committee should have been told in advance that GBB’s recommendation was against the dual pilot program. Ms. Vasquez responded the draft was circulated prior to the presentation, and as she mentioned in the presentation, conducting the pilot program to fewer homes did reduce some cost, and if a dual pilot was conducted with only 500 homes each, the cost was projected to be approximately \$320,000. She stated this compared to the full scale single pilot which was approximately \$315,000.

Vice Chairman Scott Eudey asked for clarification of the cost of a dual pilot utilizing reduced numbers, 500 homes for each pilot, totaling 1,000 homes. Ms. Vasquez replied the cost would be approximately \$320,000. Trustee Parks asked if this included the two cart pilot, and the one cart and bag pilot. Ms. Vasquez responded in the affirmative. Vice Chairman Eudey explained the purpose of the dual pilot was two-fold, to determine which method worked better, and to determine if either worked better than the current practice. He stated he did not discount her opinion, but he could not discount the opinion of the committee either. Trustee Lester agreed and added he felt completely discarding the current practice of trash bag collection was a poor choice which would not be well received. Trustee Parks stated there were members of the committee who were not completely sold on the idea of switching to two carts and he wanted the committee to be on board prior to presenting the idea to the citizens.

Chairman Thurmond stated he agreed with Trustee Parks, and if it was a challenge for the City Manager maybe the program could be rolled over into two budget years to accommodate both pilots. He stated he supported recycling and paid monthly for curbside recycling, but he could see the pros and cons of both pilots and felt each should be tested.

Trustee Parks stated he was pleased with the recommendation to stop distributing free garbage bags as this potentially saved the City \$500,000 per year. Chairman Thurmond agreed. Trustee Parks stated Kate Vasquez and GBB had done an excellent job and he felt either the recommendation of the committee needed to be pursued or the committee needed to be consulted again for further recommendation. City Manager Michael Spurgeon stated \$125,000 had been budgeted for the pilot, so even the scaled down dual pilot at \$320,000 was \$195,000 short. He stated if the Council chose to pursue the scaled down dual pilot he could look at the pay-as-you-go Capital Improvement Program to see if there were any projects deferrable until the next fiscal year to draw funding from. He stated with a \$50 million dollar budget \$195,000 could be found, but this would delay another project as reserves needed to be filled. Trustee Lester stated approval would depend upon what project was being deferred. Mr. Spurgeon stated he would gather this information and present it to Council. Chairman Thurmond stated no vote would be taken as not all Authority Members were in attendance. Trustee Lester stated he agreed with Trustee Parks that the committee needed to be involved in the final decision. Trustee Lester stated he felt the committee should meet once more and review Ms. Vasquez's presentation while the City Manager looked over the budget. He stated maybe it would be beneficial financially to run the pilot programs in two different fiscal years. Mr. Spurgeon stated it would be more beneficial to run the pilot projects concurrently. He explained that it would save time and money, especially when you consider the promotional & educational efforts involved, material acquisition, truck modifications, etc. Vice Chair Eudey stated he agreed with Trustee Parks; the committee should meet to review the GBB presentation while the City Manager determined the financial options, and he also agreed the two pilots should be conducted simultaneously. Ms. Vasquez stated now that the spreadsheets were built changing a few values on the input side was a simple modification, and when she met with the committee different options could be explored for cost impact.

Trustee Parks asked if Committee Chairman Russell Peterson had any comment. Chairman Peterson stated he agreed the Recycling Committee should meet next week to review this and provide further recommendation to the Council in perhaps two weeks. He stated the dual pilot program had been suggested to determine how strongly residents desired to keep utilizing bags for trash pickup while still introducing recycling to the equation. He explained the bag/cart pilot was to be used as a control along with the two cart scenario. He stated he personally did not object to making this a "skinnier" pilot; the committee had never locked in on 1,000 homes for each pilot and the committee certainly wanted to save money for the City, although there did need to be enough participants to collect accurate statistical data. Trustee Lester asked if residents loved bag collection due to free bag distribution or if residents simply preferred bag collection. Committee Chairman Peterson stated the committee was more concerned about negative feedback resulting from too drastic a change from the current method of collection.

Recycle Committee Member Becky Wood mentioned there were committee members who had been researching grants to pay for the carts for the City, inclusive of the pilot programs, which would significantly reduce costs. She stated the committee would be happy to provide that information to the City. Mr. Spurgeon stated PepsiCo offered to help fund recycling, but he needed to discuss this with City Council as allowing a vendor to purchase carts for the City was a policy decision he could not make. He stated the upcoming decisions regarding recycling and trash pickup were some of the most important decisions the City of Broken Arrow had to make. He stated Broken Arrow could not continue to operate picking up trash in the current manner. He explained the operational challenges which currently existed were severe. He stated he loved the bag system as much as everyone else; however, personnel costs, workers compensation costs, and operational challenges were extremely difficult and could not continue. He stated he understood residents did not want any change, but change had to

come. He stated the cart and bag pilot was important; if it failed it would demonstrate to residents why it was impractical and that the City wanted to be accommodating. He stated if it was successful and Broken Arrow chose to move forward with the bag/cart system then the City could say it was unique. He indicated the priority was sustainability in the most practical manner and both pilots should be explored. Vice Chair Eudey stated the entire process began with a survey which indicated the residents desired to implement recycling. He stated it was important to remember that whichever direction the City chose to go following the pilot programs the system was changing and this needed to be done in a way which accommodated the needs of the residents and in a way that would ensure the citizens supported the new program. He stated he felt the only way to accomplish this was to analyze as much data as possible and give as many people as possible, within affordability, the opportunity to experience the process. He stated Council understood what the best practice was; however, Broken Arrow was a unique community and it was important to give the community the opportunity to explore its options. Trustee Parks stated he personally approved of the cart system; he had been using a cart for 20 years and had no troubles moving it to the road and back even though his home was on a steep hill. He stated he certainly was not opposed to the cart system and he felt the issuance of bags equaled \$500,000 wasted annually. He stated he had spoken publicly in favor of a cart system and was ready to vote in favor of it, but that was not the point. He explained the point was to review as much data as possible and this is what the Citizen's Recycle Committee requested, and he felt the committee should be accommodated. Mr. Spurgeon stated a Recycle Committee meeting would be set up as soon as possible to discuss this further, the committee would return to Council with its thoughts, and Council could give staff direction in December. Council agreed.

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

Move to send the Item back to the Recycling Committee

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Scott Eudey, Craig Thurmond

Ms. Vasquez thanked the Council.

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 Johnnie Parks, seconded by Mike Lester.

Move to adjourn

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Johnnie Parks, Mike Lester, Scott Eudey, Craig Thurmond

Attest:

/Craig Thurmond _____
Chairman

/Lisa Blackford _____
Secretary