

Broken Arrow Citizen Recycling Committee

April 10, 2017 Minutes

The regular meeting of the Recycling Committee was held on Monday, April 10, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. in the City Hall Main Conference Room.

Present were:

Committee Members: Russell Peterson (Chairman), Tom Chatterton, Scott Eudey (Alternate), Tom Hahn, E.J. Hardwick, Jim Hoffmeister, Johnnie Parks, Dawn Seing, Jill Spurgeon, Peggy Striegel, Chris Taylor, Becky Wood

Absent were:

Committee Members: Michelle Bergwall, Vicky Randolph

Resource Team: Graham Brannin, Russell Gale, Kate Vasquez, Lee Zirk

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Russell Peterson.

II. Roll Call

Roll call was conducted. Chairman Peterson mentioned that Vicky Randolph resigned due to medical issues.

III. Approval of Minutes, March 27, 2017 (March 13, 2017 Minutes were not ready)

Chairman Peterson stated the next item on the agenda was the approval of the March 27 minutes. He mentioned the March 13 Minutes were not ready.

MOTION: A motion was made by Dawn Seing, seconded by Tom Chatterton.
Move to approve the March 27, 2017 Minutes as published.

Chairman Peterson asked if there were any questions or discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote. All were in favor. **Motion carried unanimously.**

IV. Introduction of Kate Vasquez, Senior Consultant for Gershman, Brickner & Bratton, Inc., Solid Waste Management Consultants

Chairman Peterson introduced Kate Vasquez, Senior Consultant, and stated he was happy she was able to join in person rather than via video conference.

Chairman Peterson referred the Committee's to documents that were sent to everyone regarding one day pickup versus two day pickup. He stated this would be discussed in more detail than it was before. Chairman Peterson reviewed a couple pages of information regarding the frequency, and stated that these pages would end up being an appendix to the report that would be submitted to the City, showing what was discussed and what was come up with. He noted that the pages were in somewhat of an outline form, not in full prose. He stated the current route ran twice weekly trash pickup, which included recyclables, garbage and anything else. The trash service covered the north half of the City on Mondays and Thursdays, and the south half of the City on Tuesdays and Fridays. Holidays were not discussed in the paperwork. He also reviewed the two options for proposed changes to the current schedule:

Option 1: North half of the City on Mondays, south half on Tuesdays, and the recyclables pickup on north half of the City on Thursdays and south half of the City on Fridays. A pro for this option would be the recyclables would be separated from the trash; therefore, less contamination of the recyclables. Dawn Seing disagreed and stated that if the recycling pickup was separated from the trash pickup there would be more contamination in the recycling due to residents putting trash in with the recycling in order to get rid of it since they would no longer have trash pickup twice a week. Others agreed this was a possible con. The point of separate containers for recycling was raised, and Chairman Peterson stated the object of discussion was frequency/schedule of pickup. He stated that Option 1 calls for a separate pickup of trash and recyclables. He stated routes would be exactly the same as they are currently, and the only change would be what type of items would be picked up. The con of this option would be having the public segregate the refuse between recyclables and trash which may be perceived by the residents as negative. The residents may prefer throwing everything away in one bag; as a result, there would be possible contamination if garbage was combined with the recyclables.

Option 2: Chairman Peterson expressed that Option 2 was more or less what had been agreed to in principle. The City would be divided into 4 quadrants with pickups of both trash and recyclables in each quadrant on one day, so there would be once a week service for each home. Trash trucks would start at one end of the route and the recycling trucks would start at the other end so they would not be behind each other possibly getting backlogged; they would work independently. The recycling trucks would be designated as recycling trucks and would not pick up trash. The trash would go in the normal trash pickup trucks. This did not address carts and bags. This was just the frequency of pickup. He said the pros were: most efficient, best practice, previously discussed as being the least or less possibility of contamination of recyclables, because the refuse would be segregated, either in carts or bags, and everything would be picked up in 1 day. There would be some savings because instead of covering half the City in a day and then taking it into Tulsa to the burn plant or to the Murph, only a fourth of the City would be covered in a day, so there would be less mileage driven which would save on gasoline. It would also save on tire usage and there would be less maintenance overall. There would be additional savings in gas, as the trucks do not get good gas mileage.

A member asked what would prevent people from placing garbage in the recycling bags just as could happen with Option 1 if recyclables and trash pickup were on the same day. Dawn Seing responded that contamination was possible, but studies have shown that there was less possible contamination when trash and recycling were picked up on the same day as opposed to picking up trash and recycling on separate days.

Chairman Peterson stated that another con of Option 2 was that any sort of move to a once weekly service would be perceived by the public as a reduction of City services.

A member inquired if the public had the option to have a private company take away their trash. Chairman Peterson responded there were private haulers which currently handle apartment complexes and downtown area businesses. Dawn Seing stated this could be done, but the resident would not get a break on the City water bill if a third party hauler was used. The trash service fee of \$15.50 to the City would still have to be paid monthly, in addition to paying the private hauler. Assistant City Manager, Russell Gale stated he could not recall if an outside service was even allowed. Lee Zirk, General Services Director, responded that all residents of Broken Arrow were required to subscribe to City offered trash when inside the corporate city limits of Broken Arrow, although there was one section in the northeast part of town that was annexed in a few years back that was the exception. The point was made that this does not apply to businesses or apartment complexes. City trash does not pick up at these places; commercial haulers pick up for both.

Chairman Peterson stated the Committee consensus was that Option 2 would be the better option, but this was open for discussion. He said a motion had been made and passed that Option 2 would be the Committee's recommendation; however, it was not set in stone and changes could be made if deemed appropriate.

A committee member wanted to make note that he noticed that his trash service had 2 trucks during his pick-up days, Lee Zirk offered an explanation as to why that happens, basically they all start out separate, but once a truck has completed their area, they move to another area to assist. Typically, there is 1 truck that picks up both sides when fully staffed with 2 people.

Chairman Peterson brought up the next topic: Carts versus Bags. He stated that this topic included outside providers. The current practice was the City provided free bags to the residents, although the bags were not free for the City. He explained he would begin with the high end/more expensive options, and continue on to the least expensive option.

Option 1: Provide two carts, purchased by the City, one for recycling and one for trash. There would be no free bags in this option. All new carts would be obtained eventually, not necessarily all at one time. Trucks would have full automation capability with one person per truck. Half of the fleet would be designated for recycling and the other half would be designated for garbage and trash. He explained this was the most modern procedure. There would be less staff required, which would decrease employee expenses. There would be less Workers Compensation claims due to the automation process and workers would not be physically lifting much at all. He stated that there would be a savings of \$500,000 per year due to the elimination of furnishing bags, which was the

current cost being spent by the City. He remarked that this was optional and the City may continue to issue free bags if desired.

Chairman Peterson stated that the Recycling Committee would bring more than one option to the City -- the recommended option and a back-up option. The City could then present the program to the residents of Broken Arrow gradually, and only when the program had been fully implemented would these numbers be applicable. The cons of this option: This was the most expensive proposal due to the capital expenditure at \$4 million for carts. There would be 34,000 carts which would be needed for trash and 34,000 needed for recycling; 68,000 times roughly \$60 per cart totaling roughly \$4 million. Chairman Peterson stated these figures could be honed down. The new truck fleet needed would be 14 trucks at \$250,000 per truck for the top-of-the-line top loading trucks, totaling \$3,500,000. This would probably be done via long-term financing. The trucks would last approximately 8 to 10 years. This was something that would be further analyzed by the consultant and the City. There would be no free bags issued, which would free up \$500,000 per year and, again, this was optional and up for discussion.

Chairman Peterson stated this might be the most politically challenging option as it involved the most expense and the change of curb practice, given the fact that when it was tried earlier as a possibility there was a lot of blowback from people who did not want to switch to carts. It was noted there were some citizens, especially seniors, which might have difficulty using carts, including the storage of carts either in the garage or outside the garage, transportation of the carts to the curb, etc. Storms could cause issues; for example, transportation of the cart to the road when it was icy, especially with once a week pickup, as it would be more critical to get garbage out to the road. There was also the potential issue that some people may have garbage that does not fit in the cart. With top loader carts, trash could not be picked up unless it was in the cart which could cause problems for residents and workers. Trash would need to be dumped from the cart and excess garbage would then have to be placed in the cart so it could be dumped again, and so on until finished, which would be a lot of extra labor.

Option 2: Chairman Peterson explained that option 2 was an “in-between” option. There would still be two carts. There would be no free bags, but, again, this was negotiable. The existing fleet would be retrofitted with cart flippers. Half the fleet would be designated for recycling, and the other half designated for trash service. Pick up would be once weekly. It would be less expensive because there would be no new high-end truck purchases. The same type of trucks would continue being used, and the City would continue with purchasing a new truck every three years or so as the trucks wore out. The potential savings would be \$500,000 per year due to the elimination of furnishing bags. Cons: It was a \$4 million additional expense for carts, plus the cost of retrofitting which was minimal, even if the entire fleet was retrofitted. It would be approximately \$3,000 per truck, times 14 trucks, which was \$42,000. Trucks would not need to be retrofitted each year, only when a new truck was purchased or a cart flipper wore out. Operational cart flippers could be reused by transferring them from old trucks to new. This option was still a major change from current practice because was it was using carts and not bags. Some residents have issues with cart transportation and storage. There would still be the same number of employees with two people on the back of the

truck. The advantage of this option was people were used to being able to put anything they wanted picked up on the side of the road, and would continue to be able to do so as there would still be employees to continue this service. This would be positive in the eyes of the residents.

Option 3: Chairman Peterson explained Option 3, describing it as a mixture of plans. There would be one cart for recycling only. Free bags would still be issued for trash service. Only one half of the truck fleet would have to be retrofitted; the other half of the fleet would remain garbage pickup trucks for the bag pickup and would not need to be retrofitted. The pro: It was not much different than what was being done currently; it was just adding a cart. The excess bags could still be picked up as was currently done. There would be a \$2 million expenditure for carts because carts would only be issued for recycling, as opposed to recycling and trash. The cost of retrofitting one half of the fleet would be approximately \$20,000, as opposed to \$40,000. Again, some people might have trouble because of the cart. He stated he did not address the contamination situation, how that worked, or how practically it worked in other communities which had done it. A Committee Member voiced another pro of this option was that it would get the residents used to using carts with recyclables and then three years down the road people would be more receptive to using carts for everything.

Option 4: Chairman Peterson discussed option 4, describing it as the least expensive option by a long shot. The City would continue with existing fleet with no changes to the trucks at all. No carts would be issued. Instead, some sort of clear/translucent bag would be issued to only contain recyclable material. Instructions printed on the bag would show what recyclables were acceptable. At a prior meeting examples of potentially acceptable materials were reviewed. The residents would simply be asked to separate their garbage into recyclables and trash. Then when it was placed out, the existing fleet would be able to see what was recycling and what was trash. Half the fleet would pick up just recycling by looking for the clear bags and leaving the black bags for the trash trucks. The additional clear bags would cost approximately \$500,000 per year like the trash bags, but this cost might be offset by not using as many black trash bags since some of the things in the black bags would be shifted to the recycling bags.

Discussion ensued about residents who did not want to recycle at all. Chairman Peterson stated that this was a potential problem, but that there was nothing the City could do about it but to encourage recycling. It was not mandatory, and residents could not be fined by not participating.

Chairman Peterson continued with the cons of Option 4. He said it was not perceived as the modern best practice. Of the top ten cities that were in the hunt for economic development in Oklahoma, none were using this program; they all used carts. Broken Arrow would stick out like a sore thumb in comparison to those cities. However, this would get people used to the idea of recycling, and at least the public would have the opportunity to recycle. A Committee Member brought up the additional con of plastic bags being less efficient since at the recycling center the bag openers were automated and would occasionally miss some materials. Chairman Peterson elaborated on this by adding that upon discussion with the Murph, they were not happy with the bag idea because it would require buying a new bag splitter. They said they would do it, but it certainly was not their preferred option.

Chairman Peterson explained that permutations and combinations of these options could be developed.

Option 5: A third party provided trash and recycling, including the carts. No free bags would be issued by the City. The City would be out of the trash/recycling business. The pros: The City would not have to pay any capital expenditures for carts or trucks. Chairman Peterson said it was his understanding that the Sanitation Department would find alternate uses for their employees. The cons: Any of these could potentially cause a raise in the monthly rate, but with this option it could be a little bit more because it would require a private contractor who may charge more than the City to do it. Another thing to consider was who would handle storm cleanup if the Sanitation Department was eliminated. Outside providers might decide it was not part of their job description. There would be savings due to eliminating the bag expenditure, but there was a risk that if the outside provider could not provide the service for whatever reason (bankruptcy, insurance issues, etc.), then suddenly the City had a major problem. The City would have to find substitute sanitation pickup, as it would no longer have the trucks. This would not be a problem if there was a City Sanitation Department in place. However, it was still a viable option as other cities, such as Tulsa, used it.

Option 6: Chairman Peterson stated this option was similar to Option 5. The City would still provide trash pickup for garbage and a third party would provide recycling pickup. This brings back the issue of trash and recycling getting mixed up and contaminated. The pro would be recycling could be introduced in the City with no change in City trash service. However, with there being less trash to be picked up it could lessen their hours and result in not having enough work to fill their 10 hour days.

A Committee Member stated it sounded like yard waste was a concern, and asked if there could be a separate pickup by City Sanitation only for yard waste. Discussion ensued with the following points: This would keep the City employees working year round. This would keep the dump from filling up so fast. Other cities pick up yard waste, bring it to a plant where it was chipped to mulch and then it was sold back to the community and actually created revenue. People appreciated this and would go out of their way to purchase the mulch. Chairman Peterson stated there was a lot less yard waste than there was years ago because a lot of people have switched to mulching mowers.

Question was asked regarding Option 6 and whether it was the option that Michelle Bergwall recommended, and whether the Committee had any prices for this option. Chairman Peterson responded that it was the option Ms. Bergwall recommended; however, he did not have the prices. He stated that the company that handled Tulsa's trash service and recycling service, New Solutions, requested to make a presentation at the next Recycling Committee Meeting regarding Option 5 and Option 6. Chairman Peterson stated that as he understood it there were issues with the company that handled Tulsa's trash and recycling service; it had been known to miss pickups and had needed prodding to do the job in a timely manner. He added there would be issues no matter who was handling trash and recycling pickup, as there would be in any situation. Discussion ensued again regarding costs. Chairman Peterson stated that the Committee should have an obvious candidate and if the City decided to go with a third party provider, an Request for Proposal (RFP) would be

done. The City would publish the RFP, obtain and analyze bids, discuss them, and ultimately move forward.

A Committee Member said that the decision could be made by the Committee without an RFP about who was going to provide the service; however, the City could still decide to move forward with an RFP. New Solutions wanted to discuss this and share with the Committee the services they provided, their contractual relationship with TARE (Tulsa Authority for the Recovery of Energy), and the potential for contracting without having to follow the competitive bidding requirements that would be required by the City.

A member inquired if the City decided to go the RFP route would the lowest bidder be required to be chosen or could the lowest bidder with the most reliable reputation be accepted. The response was it would be the lowest and best bidder.

A question arose regarding what the citizens of Tulsa paid for their trash service. Response was that the citizens of Tulsa had three cost options, which varied between \$15 a month and \$16 a month for once a week pickup with carts provided for both waste and recycling.

It was reported that Tulsa picked up yard waste and it was delivered to Covanta.

Jill Spurgeon asked what Tulsa Green Waste was, what they did, and who they served. A discussion ensued and it was concluded that Tulsa Green Waste was a reception site for any person who wished to get rid of green waste on their own. They provided this service free for residents of Tulsa and with a fee for anyone outside of Tulsa or a business. The City did not deliver green waste there. Tulsa Green Waste also provided free mulch.

Chairman Peterson asked if anyone knew about the tree trimming firm that did work for PSO, and what they did with their waste. It was discussed that they chipped it themselves and used the chips in various ways, even as landfill cover.

A question arose regarding whether the City's Sanitation Department created revenue for the City. A Committee Member responded it was essentially a breakeven situation or a loss. Another question was asked regarding is there was any savings when the City switched to Covanta rather than using the landfill. The answer was yes, there was a 50% reduction in tipping fees; however, this was not started until January. No specific numbers had been seen regarding what had been saved, but the tipping fees had seen a roughly 50% reduction. It was discussed that money had been saved in tipping costs; however, there was also an increase in costs because it takes longer to get there, with longer wait times to empty the trucks. It was reported that drivers have sat for an hour to an hour and a half waiting to dump their trash load, and in the meantime, trash in Broken Arrow was not getting picked up. As a result, longer hours had to be worked and the City had to hire more workers.

Chairman Peterson stated the Committee would invite the group New Solutions to the next meeting to present its information. This would provide the Committee with a better idea of what to expect and what to look for once it had met with New Solutions.

Ms. Spurgeon asked if it would be worth looking into having the City Sanitation Department do green waste pickup, possibly writing a contract with Tulsa Green Waste for disposal, or possibly purchasing a chipper in order to provide mulch to the parks or for embankments should the City choose to go with a third party for trash/recycling. A discussion took place and Chairman Peterson concluded that this could be a possibility, but until the Committee had a better idea of the numbers involved there could be no decisions made in this regard.

Chairman Peterson turned the floor over to Kate Vasquez.

Kate Vasquez thanked the Committee for having her. She stated she developed a “decision tree” to aid the Committee’s decision making. She talked about how they had been discussing all of these things organically and had spent time trying to organize their thoughts, but there had been a lot of “Well, what about this? Well, what about this?” She said what she put together was a way for them to make these decisions. She wanted them to focus on what would really work. She did not want to make less of their need for money, but their charge was to look at a way to add recycling to the curb. She developed the decision tree in the hopes it would help the Committee focus on what it was to do. She explained another task upon the Committee was to get some cost modeling done. She said she heard the idea put out of having a firm prepare a proposal to just collect recycling. She reported she just bid out Fort Wayne, IN, and it was almost \$3.00 per household for recycling. That was for a city where there was known participation, because residents were already placing recycling by the curb. She expected the bidding to come in higher in Broken Arrow. She said she also expected their best competitor would be someone who had their own Murph; otherwise, they would be beholden to the price that they could get to dispose elsewhere. She said the price she quoted for Fort Wayne was based on a situation where the City had locked in the price after “busting” its other contract.

Ms. Vasquez continued discussing utilization of the decision tree: What was at the curb? What kind of service? Who was going to do the work? If they had to procure something, what were they going to procure? Were they going to have bags or not? If yes or no, what was it going to look like?

She then discussed it step by step: Were they ready to pull the trigger on carts? It would be hard; even if the money fell from the sky, it would still be hard. She wanted them to think about whether they wanted the carts or not. The other task they had from GBB was a 1+1 on cost modeling. They were to put together one cost and one “what if.” For example: run the cost model on the two-cart system, and then add one “what if.” What if grants could be obtained to cover the cost of the carts, or what if people paid for the carts, etc.? They needed to make this fundamental decision before they could go any further: were they going to go through the pain of switching to carts or were they going to go another direction?

Ms. Vasquez said she could not overstate how much she did not recommend solely using carts for recycling. She said their situation with bags was rather unusual, so she had been cross checking their cost with GBB and everyone she met for a year. She was afraid they would spend a lot of money on a recycling cart, and it would evolve into being used as a garbage cart. She was concerned they would not have the success they were hoping for using a bag and cart system. Therefore, they needed to

choose between just using carts or just using bags. Once they decided that, then they could look at who would do the work, so on and so forth.

She reported she had two recommendations: one was her best practice recommendation and one was her secondary recommendation.

Recommendation 1: The best practice recommendation would be the two-cart system. It was the standard. If the City did decide to put it out for bid, it would be easy to put out because it was the type of RFP or bid that companies responded to all the time. There would be standardized equipment; people who moved here from other places would be familiar with it, instead of having to learn something very unique. As far as who would do the work, there was value in having City forces beyond the fact that they pick stuff up. She recommended that they keep the resources that they had and build on them or expand them as needed. She repeated that it would be an easy transition because it was a standard package. She said that initially they could continue to distribute bags; however, far fewer than were currently being distributed. She said they could be distributed with instructions that they were to be used for yard waste, or at the times that they had far too much garbage for the cart. It would be both a compromise and would keep things tidier at the curb. There would be other options for the bags if they chose to switch to the carts; they could charge for the bags, for example a pay as you throw program, or they could just say no more bags. Just because they switched to carts did not mean they had to get rid of the bags. There were always opportunities to compromise with people.

She stated she understood there were a couple of challenges with the switch to carts. The first would be money. She said they could get money. They could get the Recycling Partnership to help with grants to convert to carts. They could finance it. It could be figured out. The second would be the challenge of change, which would be encountered with any change at all.

Recommendation 2: Ms. Vasquez's secondary recommendation was to start with the two-color bag system. She recommended that if they could not pull the trigger and do a full switch to carts, then they should use the bags. It would be more what people were used to, and all the other reasons the Committee had already discussed. As far as who would do the work, again she recommended sticking with City forces, but there also was an opportunity to form a partnership with one or more nonprofit organizations. She gave an example of Eureka Recycling in Minnesota, which was a nonprofit which collected recyclables. She discussed the two options of how many bags would be distributed: keep the same amount of trash bags and add one recycling bag per week, or reduce the number of trash bags and give out one recycling bag per week and see how it went.

Ms. Vasquez concluded her presentation with a recap. She stated that, yes, the carts would be expensive. She stated that if the bag program was chosen, at any time the City could switch to the carts if it was not going well. She stated that if the City tried to contract out the bag collection system it would be very expensive unless there was some type of partnership.

V. General Discussion and Possible Recommendations

Dawn Seing stated she felt that until the Committee had actual numbers from third party collectors, there could not be an assumption it was going to be more expensive. She said she believed the Committee needed to see the numbers to judge whether it would be better to keep it in house or to contract it out. Ms. Vasquez replied that with the use of the carts there would be competitive pricing; however, if the City chose to use bags at the curb with varied amounts of each pickup, without a guaranteed price, the price could escalate. The Committee decided more information was needed before an informed decision could be made in order to pass on their recommendation to the City for evaluation.

A discussion took place regarding putting someone on point to monitor the contract, to contact several different companies about cost, possibly reviewing the prior bids given to Tulsa for its trash/recycling pickup which was public record. A point was made that Broken Arrow was not Tulsa and could not expect the contract bids to be the same; they had different neighborhoods, a different setup, farther distances to the Murph, different volume of pickup, etc. It could be as simple as a per-household price, but maybe not. A suggestion was made to bring in three or four different companies to a Recycling Meeting to review costs. Question arose regarding who to invite, as there were 20 licensed commercial haulers in Tulsa. A Committee Member asked Ms. Vasquez if she could research in the next few days what the best choices were. Ms. Vasquez said she could relay who they use there and their information. Chairman Peterson stated he thought the Committee needed to get a broader idea than just Tulsa's provider for informational purposes, but did not need 20. It was suggested that parameters needed to be defined: a contractor who could take care of both and completely replace the current services and what would it cost.

Councilor Parks spoke up on behalf of the existing Sanitation Department, stating that Broken Arrow had one of the most efficient trash departments in the State. He said, yes, he wanted to see the proposal, but ultimately whatever was decided he could see the Sanitation Department making that transition. He felt they could perform just as efficiently as they were doing now. He was concerned about moving away from the bags because it had been so efficient. He felt the Committee needed to meet with New Solutions, let them present a proposal, and if the City then wanted to go out to bid for a private hauler, it should go through the legal department.

A Committee Member questioned why a private hauler would be brought in when the City had its own team with its own equipment and a proven and efficient routine. It was discussed that there was no argument with this, but hearing New Solutions' presentation would allow the Committee to be more complete in the information provided to the City. Chairman Peterson stated that it needed to be made clear to New Solutions that this was not a bid; this was not a step toward them being hired, this was simply to get an idea of the cost. Chairman Peterson recommended having more than one company come out. Ms. Seing volunteered calling around to arrange for three other commercial haulers to make presentations with a 20 minute cap.

Discussion continued regarding this subject and about how to fill out the proposal with the 1+1 option design.

Russell Gale said he wanted to clarify what New Solutions suggested they would do at the meeting. He stated that they sent him an email which essentially indicated that their pricing model and services were available at the same fee that they charge the City of Tulsa. He read from the email: "This contract was one of four with the City of Tulsa including New Solutions, two contracts that were left by TARE to operate Tulsa's residential waste management system. New Solutions' pricing and services governed by our TARE contracts also were available to other municipalities under the state purchasing statutes." He continued that this was New Solutions' conclusions, not the City attorney's conclusions. He said there could be some concern that if multiple companies were brought in they may be compromising the competitive bidding process that Oklahoma statutes require. He suggested that all New Solutions wanted to do was come in and share with the Committee the services they provided, the fee they charged, and indicate that they would sell it to the City at that price because they had a contract with the City of Tulsa statewide at that fee. He was afraid that if they brought in other services and asked them what they would charge, if the City wanted to look at them, they ultimately would have to have a competitive bidding, or at least a request for proposal process, where it would be a sealed bid and the data would be then independently analyzed. What New Solutions was comparing this to was the same approach with going to Covanta to handle their trash. Covanta had a contract with the City of Tulsa, and other cities of the metropolitan areas got the same fee. Therefore, what New Solutions was saying in the email, he believed, was that they would do it for the same fee, and that this was what they wanted to visit with the Committee about. He felt if the Committee wished to meet with anyone other than New Solutions that they should check with the City Attorney beforehand to ensure they were not compromising anything.

Discussion proceeded about New Solutions, the need for numbers, checking with legal prior to inviting more companies if desired, making certain that the companies knew it was a presentation only -- not an actual bid for the job, the State Law regarding RFPs and pricing proposals, whether companies would give pricing without giving an actual bid, and if they did, would the bids be sealed until the City could review them; Recycling Committee would not have access, which was state law. Ms. Vasquez commented that she would be astonished if someone came in and gave them a price without an RFP to respond to. Various Committee Members disagreed. She continued that she was not telling them to not allow people to come give a presentation if there was not a problem with it legally; she just wanted their expectations to be managed. New Solutions would be willing to discuss their pricing because they currently had a contract and they would basically be saying that they could ride this contract at the same price. This was done in Virginia all the time, cooperative purchasing where it was rideable. Ms. Vasquez said it was not only Virginia, but the entire metropolitan Washington government area.

Ms. Vasquez was asked if she found the competitive pricing model to be the lowest and best pricing alternative. She replied that they were not only competitive; they would get the pricing for free. If she were to run a procurement for them and try to get them the best price it would take 100 or more hours to run even an easy procurement. She explained it costs money to hire someone to run a procurement. A company already under contract showed commitment and stability. They probably had been vetted by the largest government around, whoever had the most resources to get a good

price to begin with; therefore, they were very reliable and a good choice. Whoever negotiated the contract initially would have paid the fees for the consultant, they would pay the fees again to have the contract done the next time, and Broken Arrow could ride it again.

Discussion continued and it was concluded that it would be a good idea to bring in New Solutions for informational purposes only, and then the Committee would make further decisions regarding bringing in additional companies. Chairman Peterson concluded there were essentially three options to consider: extra bag, City doing two carts, or outside provider doing two carts. He stated if that was indeed what was being considered, the Committee and the City could price the first two options and obtain additional information for the third. A Committee Member recommended instructing New Solutions that they would have 10-15 minutes to present, and 10-15 minutes for Q&A afterwards. Chairman Peterson agreed, stating the meeting would be called to order, roll call taken, past minutes voted on, and then New Solutions would present first so they could leave and the Committee could discuss.

Ms. Vasquez stated that when the Committee chose which option it will go with and the “+1 What If,” that she would then provide them with a cost model. She explained that price models should be broken down to the second; the more sophisticated the price model, the more competitive the price could be. She said when she built a model for two carts versus two bags, she would change the seconds per stop and the pounds of recycling and the pounds of garbage based on what they thought would happen if people had a cart versus a bag. She said off-route time had to be considered, as well as many other things. This was why they had to know which one to model. Certain costs could be estimated, such as the cost of carts, including cart maintenance, cart replacement, etc.

Ms. Vasquez stated that if the Committee heard from a third party vendor and were shell shocked, they might not want her to price model that option. It was agreed. Chairman Peterson stated, yes, they needed to gather what information they could in order to narrow the options down to possibly two.

Ms. Vasquez continued that when the Committee meets with New Solutions they should inquire about hidden costs: Who handled customer service, who handled complaints, who provided the customer service representative? Did the City need to provide that? If so, that would be an additional cost that the City would have. How did they handle messes? What was their role in Tulsa? She wanted to be certain these things were discussed. She stated she would provide a list of questions for the Committee to ask. Chairman Peterson added asking about emergency situations and storm clean up.

Ms. Vasquez asked what the current emergency situation process was. The response was that if it was a small storm, generally the in-house crews would handle it. They would give residents a certain amount of time to set the debris out, and then the crews would sweep through and pick it up. On a larger scale, they had to procure help from outside sources to come haul debris away and dispose of it.

Ms. Vasquez reported she just procured a curbside contract, and one side of the contract was emergency help at an hourly rate which did not include disposal of the material. It authorized 100 hours at a time, and the bids were \$150 per hour. A Committee Member mentioned that he remembered a time when after a storm the debris left was 200 feet wide and 34 miles long. Ms. Vasquez commented that Fort Worth had nine emergency sites, none smaller than 20 acres for debris, and now that debris was not burned down until it was gone, it took even longer to dispose of it. Burning was no longer an option for most municipalities, and debris needed to be processed.

City of Tulsa's rates were listed: A 64 gallon cart was \$13.92, a 96 gallon was \$15.42. If they added \$500,000 and provided trash bags still for 34,000 households, that was \$1.20 per month; therefore, at the 64 gallon rate it was competitive to what they were paying now. That was with two 64 gallon carts for pickup. If they went with 96 gallon carts, pickup was \$15.42. This was once a week pickup as opposed to the current twice a week pickup. It was mentioned that 64 gallon carts might not be big enough for once a week pickup; a 6 person household might need two 64 gallon carts for recycling alone. Discussion followed about cart sizes, needs, and options. Residents could have options about what types of carts and sizes they wanted, or they could be issued standard and calls could be made asking for them to be removed or to get additional carts. In Tulsa they had options with different pricing available. Pickup was one day a week in Tulsa with both recycling and garbage pickup on the same day, essentially eliminating the possibility of trash being placed in recycling bin. Note was made that it would be good to get a copy of Tulsa pricing. Discussion continued regarding some cities adding a dollar and change for administrative overhead/staff and by whom was the contract going to be administered. Maybe there was a household hazardous waste program and there was \$0.54 per household per month for that. The fee that users paid was not usually penny for penny the same as what the hauler charged. New Solutions was not charging the home owner the fee; the City was. New Solutions gave a price to the City, the City took that price and then the City calculated the user fee for customers. For example, disposal could also be included in the fee.

It was stated it would be quite useful to have a breakdown of what Broken Arrow's trash service cost the City to pick up the trash, maintenance, cost of bags, etc., for purposes of comparing apples to apples on what the third party hauler was actually going to charge, not just the rate the end consumer paid. Chairman Peterson agreed and added it would be helpful if the breakdown was for the \$15.50 itself, not just the large overall budget numbers that they had seen in the past. Desired categories to be included in the breakdown were personnel, disposal, bags, administration, insurance, capital, maintenance, gasoline, tires, salaries, vehicles, miscellaneous. A Committee Member stated the categories would have subcategories. Operational would include salaries and benefits under one heading, then operational costs under another heading which included gasoline, tires, maintenance, etc. It was agreed they did not need to nitpick the details; they just needed the bigger categories to be inclusive, and the bags to be separated.

It was brought to their attention that on the survey 76% of residents stated they were satisfied or extremely satisfied with the current voucher system. Chairman Peterson stated that the two issues which would cause the City to receive negative feedback were the carts and/or one day a week service; everything else was relatively minor change. If a clear bag was added, no one would get

upset and storm City Hall. If carts were added there could be people who would be displeased, and maybe justifiably so. However, he had spoken with various Tulsa residents and they adjusted to it. They had to make transitions and they got used to it. He reported his brother-in-law pays an extra \$4.00 per month and does not have to bring his cart to the road. They rolled it out and put it back for him for the extra fee. If the City decided to make the change to carts and once a week pickup it needed to be prepared for complaints. He felt that one reason the City created Committees like theirs was to give the City a little bit of cover when they received complaints. Early educational material was also agreed on as playing an important role when implementing the recycling plan so samples were requested again from Ms. Vasquez, who apologized for overlooking that request at a previous meeting.

Ms. Vasquez encouraged the Committee members when they were figuring out what their plan was to think about the fact that their first punch would be cutting pickup to once a week. Following that they would then get into rate changes and carts and such. She stated that less than 10% of cities with 100,000 or more people have twice a week municipal service pickup any longer done by the city. She urged the Committee to remember this was being done not for financial reasons, but for the City to have a more innovative approach, and to let people recycle as much as they could or wanted to. She also encouraged them to make sure they avoided the false assumption that it would function perfectly when they gave people the equipment. It would be a challenge, but this was an improvement for the people who live in Broken Arrow for the tax money that they pay. It would build their sustainability and would make a real impact. What people did with their garbage was one of the most real things people could do to have an impact on the environment every day. When recycling was figured back into the system it had a ripple effect on the entire manufacturing chain. This was how they were going to have to reach people about this: Conservation, reduction of waste, and improvement of the package the residents received.

Chairman Peterson again stated that someone who complained about the carts might not care about recycling or the environment and might not want to recycle at all. Those people were just going to complain because people complain.

It was mentioned that homeowner's associations were going to have an issue with the change because their covenants were going to have to be changed since most covenants would not permit this. There would be costs associated with the change of covenants; they would have to be rewritten, reprinted and redistributed. It would cost around \$6,000 to cover this expense in a 250 house development. Chairman Peterson stated that City Ordinances legally trump all homeowner's associations' ordinances and, therefore, he thought covenants would not necessarily need to be changed.

Councilor Parks suggested it was very important for the Committee to get as much information as possible when it made its presentation because this was a valid point and needed to be addressed. Chairman Peterson agreed and stated that was why the Committee had been formed and why it was important for everyone to speak up, so as many angles as possible could be evaluated.

Discussion continued about communication with HOAs being important, about the educational process and information to be included in it, public presentations in civic clubs and meetings and having answers to most of the questions.

Chairman Peterson stated that even though Broken Arrow was a conservative community he felt that recycling would be welcomed. It was remarked that it might not be welcomed. It was stated that 40% to 60% of all recyclers were not necessarily liberals; everyone was recycling, most people do recycle most of the time. Discussion continued.

VI. Questions from Committee Members

Chairman Peterson asked if there were additional questions from Committee Members. There were none.

VII. Adjourn

Chairman Peterson reported the next meeting is scheduled for 04/24/2017 at 5:30 PM.

MOTION: A motion was made by Tom Chatterton, seconded by Chris Taylor.

Move to adjourn.

Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned.