

# DRAFT

## LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP

### BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the business meeting held April 3, 2018

A meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Board of Supervisors was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Henry on the above date at the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center located at 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Board members present in addition to Mr. Henry were: William B. Hawk, Gary A. Crissman, Robin Lindsey, and Chris Judd. Also, in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager, and Steve Stine, Township Solicitor.

#### **Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Judd led the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the minutes of December 5, 2017. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Henry called for a voice vote, and the Board members voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

#### **Announcements**

Mr. Henry announced prior to this meeting the Board of Supervisors met to receive information from the Township Manager which included scheduling of events, future meetings, and a discussion about several employee personnel matters. Mr. Adam Kosheba, Public Safety Director, was present to discuss an employee personnel matter with the Board.

## Public Comment

Michael Siget, 2094 Fairway Lane, provided the Board members with copies of correspondence that he received in the mail. He noted that he received this letter not once, but twice in the past week concerning recycling bins.

Mr. Siget stated he is not against recycling and agrees with what is in the letter. The recycling collection is on Friday, and they get the wind in his neighborhood and have to dodge recycling bins and the garbage cans throughout the street.

Mr. Siget announced he is an attorney by trade and when he read this letter he thought, "What Ordinance is this?" The letter does list what appears to be an Ordinance, but if that Ordinance is specifically in the Township's Ordinances, he was not able to find it. The closest thing was an Ordinance to the refuse or trash collection, which is not recycling. As you know, the recycling isn't a separate section, so this may be in an Ordinance, and if it is, he would appreciate if someone points it out or ask in the future that the letter indicate the Ordinance that has been violated.

Mr. Siget stated he moved to the Township two years ago, and most people would probably say something similar. When he signed up for trash collection, he was given the recycling bin that Waste Management provides and that is what he has been using for two years. He has to have one of these big monstrosities in the back of the room.

Mr. Siget stated he called Waste Management this past week and it was easy enough, they delivered the recycle bin, and he now has a huge recycling bin with a big huge lid. While driving through the Township on his way to work, he noticed that many people do not have these lids.

Mr. Siget continued if this is an Ordinance, then it is one that he thinks the Township needs to talk to Waste Management about. Any other Municipality that he has ever lived in the weight of the trash collector is the one that supplies the bids. Also, if the Board would like the residents to have lids on the recycling bins, then it is something they need to take up with Waste Management. Again, he took the bin that they provided, and it was just a regular bin that he used for two years, and now he has one of these. Again, it is not to complain about recycling or anything like that; it was more of the contents of this letter that does not give the Ordinance a number so that it could be easily looked it up. Again, as he looked at it, the container must be 36 gallons, have a lid, and two handles and the closest thing he found is the Ordinance on trash or refuse cans, which is not recycling in the Ordinances.

Mr. Siget stated if this is correct, please have someone put the Ordinance citation in Waste Management's letters so that any of us can look it up and see if this is correct and this is something that the Township should be dealing with in the next contract with whomever it gets the contract. If the Board would like everyone to have lids on the recycle containers, then have them give them to all of us.

Mr. Crissman stated that is exactly what the Board of Supervisors is doing this evening.

Mr. Henry added the Board had had discussions about the containers for the last couple of months, so yes, the discussion is currently occurring.

Ms. Lindsey stated that Mr. Siget had mentioned that two years ago when he moved into the Township, he received a recycling container from Waste Management and one from them last night. She questioned if he had received a recyclable container from Waste Management. Mr. Siget answered yes. Ms. Lindsey stated she does not have a recyclable container from Waste Management and it has not been in the Township's contracts at all. And as far as the containers in the back of the room, the Board of Supervisors has not approved anything to have this container. She questioned, "How did you get that container?" Mr. Siget answered he called the 800 number and told Waste Management that he needed a bin with a lid and they dropped it off at his address the other day.

Mr. Siget stated he now has two Waste Management bins and again, if he is not supposed to use that one, then he will not, but the one that he had started with when he called to set up my trash collection and recycling, they dropped off just a regular trash can without a lid.

Mr. Judd stated he received some complaints from people who when the wind blows, you know, and there are certain areas where everyone's recycling when it blows around collects and there are a handful of residents who end up having to clean up everybody else's trash. That was one reason for looking around. He asked Mr. Wolfe if the Ordinance includes information about the recycling containers. Mr. Wolfe explained that he would research the Township's Codified Ordinances, but it is very clear on the Township's website that all cans must be a certain size, weight, and have lids, whether that transposes into the Codified Ordinances or not, he cannot say at this time. He noted that information regarding Solid Waste Recyclables is on the Township's website, but the Ordinance search is more difficult.

Mr. Stine stated he thinks the can size might be outlined in the bidding documents when the trash contract was completed.

Mr. Judd stated the letters went out regarding the lid issue and he would like to clarify the difference between an Ordinance and a lot of professed policy preference. He questioned, "What is the difference?" He stated this happened because there was a problem area.

Mr. Siget stated he appreciates getting the letter and whoever complained, the Township was responsive, and there is no problem with that at all, and it is great. Again, it looks like an Ordinance is being cited.

Mr. Henry explained that there could be a difference between an Ordinance and a policy too.

Mr. Siget questioned if the Township could enforce a policy and fine someone if they do not have a lid on the recyclable container. Mr. Henry explained that no one had been fined for it, to his knowledge.

Mr. Henry referred to the letter noting that it does not specifically reference an Ordinance but seems to be common sense practices at the very least. To his knowledge, nobody has been fined or otherwise punished for it aside from those people who have to pick up their neighbor's trash because it blows around.

Mr. Henry noted that the topic is currently under active discussion and Mr. Siget's timing is perfect.

Mr. Siget stated he is not sure which recycling bin to use now after what Ms. Lindsey mentioned. Ms. Lindsey stated she had owned a home for 39 years and Waste Management has never provided a recycling container. Mr. Siget reported Waste Management told him that it was part of the Township's contract.

Mr. Wolfe stated all containers are currently the responsibility of the property owner or resident and they have never been provided by Waste Management.

Tom Stang, Operations Manager, Waste Management stated he is surprised to hear that Mr. Siget had a cart delivered to his home. He noted that it is not a typical practice and he can only assume that the Waste Management Call Center was trying to appease Mr. Siget by sending him a recycling container with a lid. Throughout the years the Township residents have been responsible for their recycling containers. There may be some Waste Management recycling bins or containers throughout the Township, and that has happened at times when people have moved in and brought the recycling container with them. But it is not their practice to provide a recycling container to Township residents.

Mr. Stang stated he could not answer as to why it is not part of the contract and Waste Management, and the Township is currently in the middle of deciding between awarding a contract that would include carts or not include carts. In the case of the other recycling cart, some people move and bring the recycling bins along, and there have been people who have requested the recycling bins and Waste Management has provided them with a bin or container.

Ms. Lindsey questioned, "How did Waste Management provide containers to some residents of the Township when it was not in the contract?" She questioned, "How does that happen?"

Mr. Stang answered he could not explain why someone would have delivered a cart other than a call center representative heard a customer specifically ask for a lid recycling container and that they thought that that was part of the contract without looking at the contract.

Ms. Lindsey stated she is talking about the recycle container that Mr. Siget received two years ago. Mr. Stang explained that he is not sure why because it is their practice to do so.

Mr. Henry announced the Board would discuss the trash a little later on in the agenda.

Mr. Crissman added he has new neighbors who came from another Municipality and when they discovered that the Township did not have containers before they settled on the house, they decided to bring their containers from the old house with them.

Mr. Judd announced the reason for the letter, whether it is an Ordinance, policy, or just good manners, was only to encourage people to get a container with a lid because there are a handful of residents who suffer greatly when there are windy days. The point of this was to simply to ask people to think about something that is probably not on the top of their to-do list and just understand that when it gets windy their stuff is going to blow around and someone else is going to pick it up, and to please use a lid. Mr. Judd noted he does not want the message to get lost.

Joe Murphy, 5877 Laurel Street, announced he is present as the Chairman of the Lower Paxton Township Historical Commission to remind everyone that the second meeting is coming up this Thursday at 6:00 p.m. here in this room. The Historical Commission will be working on setting up their goals, and when that is complete, they will return to present everything to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Murphy announced he would like to invite the residents of the Township to come and participate. The first meeting was fantastic because the audience helped to design the mission statement and the HC hopes to have the same type of attendance. Secondly, as a resident, he would like to thank the Board for streaming. This morning, he watched the last meeting online and being a person that has Direct TV, it is the first time that he has been able to see the Board members on TV.

Mr. Henry stated that it is very enjoyable to see all the photographs of what was before, where something else is now, that have been popping up on Facebook.

### **Board Member's Comments**

Mr. Crissman reported the Township's Audit Committee met with Zelenkoski and Axelrod the accounts who complete the Township's audits to review the 2017 Audit and there were three issues. Number one, there is a change of staff from Z&A, and they have a new partner that is assigned to the Township's project. However, the old partner will continue so that the transition is smooth until such time, the new partner feels very comfortable, and the Township, in turn, feels comfortable with them. Z&A has identified that there will be a single audit required for the Township's CDBG grant because it is excess of \$750,000, and that is a separate audit so there will be an additional cost that will be approximately \$5,500 to the Township, but again, it's a requirement and not an option.

Mr. Crissman stated thirdly, there was a status report from one of the members of the Z&A team indicating that they will be addressing letters to the various schedules of accountants from outside firms who report information back to Audit Committee as well as, collecting our minutes and agendas because they are required to review all those before they can finalize their audit reports as they move forward.

Mr. Crissman noted the meeting with Z&A was very profitable. The Township has been very fortunate to have excellent financial staff and an excellent accounting firm and the work independently very well and as a team, and as a result, the Township has had very clean audits, and that has been published over the last several years.

Mr. Henry asked Mr. Crissman if the Township's Audit would be posted on the website. Mr. Crissman answered yes it would be when it has been completed.

Mr. Wolfe added there was a public advertisement on the audit and it can be posted on the website.

Ms. Lindsey announced there was a two-alarm fire yesterday at the terraces, so please keep the families that were involved in that in prayer.

Ms. Lindsey mentioned that she attended the Heroes Grove meeting yesterday and that is on the agenda and the Board will discuss this item later.

#### Manager's Report

Mr. Wolfe announced there would be a Chili Cook-off, Car Show, and Family Day at the Friendship Center. This information is on the Township's website. The event is on the front page of the site and will be held on Saturday, April 28th, beginning at 8:00 A.M. until 1:00 PM. Also, the Arbor Day Ceremony in the Township will be held on Tuesday, April 24th starting at 6:00 P.M., it is located at the Heroes Grove facility and a tree in conjunction with a local Girl Scout Troop. the Shade Tree Commission will plant 30

### Old Business

Chairman Henry read the Arbor Day Proclamation noting that the Board of Supervisors and Lower Paxton Township does hereby proclaim April 24, 2018, as Arbor Day in Lower Paxton Township on this third day in April 2018.

Mr. Crissman motioned to approve the Arbor Day Proclamation. Mr. Judd seconded the motion. Mr. Henry called for a voice vote, and the vote was unanimous.

### Action on bids for the collection of solid waste and recyclables

Mr. Henry announced he would turn the meeting over to Vice-Chairman Crissman as he has a conflict of interest in this matter. He recused himself from any discussions.

Mr. Crissman asked the Board members to review the memorandum that has the base bids listed the base bid for two addendum items, one for the base bid and the leaf waste, and one for the base bid and 21 leaf and totes.

Mr. Crissman asked Mr. Stine if all three bids have met the requirements so that the Board may consider all three, or if any need to be eliminated because they have not completed properly, all of the requirements. Mr. Stine explained that all of the bids were responsive to the requests or the invitation to bid and all of them are compliant with all the requirements of the bidding documents.

Mr. Crissman announced he is willing to suggest a procedure for this process that in fact, when the Board members reach a consensus on the three items, they would only have to make one motion for this item. If not, the Board is going to go through a series of three or four motions.

Mr. Crissman stated that if the Board could reach through discussion at least a consensus about remembering two things; number one, that because there are only four Board members involved in the process, if a motion is made or when they get to the motion stage, if they have two votes for and two votes against that, it is not sufficient, and the motion will fail.

Mr. Crissman announced he would like to remind the Board members that the Chairman does have the right and option to make a motion. He asked the Board members for confirmation that they can at least have the discussion and then hopefully reach the stage where they can make one motion. He questioned if anyone objects to the process.

Mr. Judd stated as he understands, the Board has four options as far as, the kind of service and there are three bidders. Mr. Crissman stated there are three items, there is the base bid to consider and the second issue the Board needs to resolve is whether the Township will have 19 leaf waste pickups or 21, which is called option one for consideration. The third item is whether the Board would like to include the totes.

Mr. Crissman explained that if the Board was making a motion, and he had to go through the series of motions, the first motion would be to accept the base bid and that would be the lowest bid, and the lower proposal is from Waste Management. He suggested that if they were going to go through all of the bids and make a motion to approve the low base bid which is Waste Management, then include the 21 leaf waste pickups and the totes. He suggested that the Board discuss each bid and do them one at a time whether endorsing or supporting 19 or 21 leaf waste pickups and then once they reach consensus, move on discuss and discuss the totes to determine if the Board has consensus.

Mr. Crissman noted that it is much easier to make one motion to include whatever it is the Board chooses rather than going through four motions. Mr. Judd, Mr. Hawk, and Ms. Lindsey agreed.

Mr. Crissman explained the Board is obligated to go with the lowest bid, and this motion would be straightforward that our base bid to Waste Management and the amount of 16, 988,655 is the low bid. The award would then go to Waste Management for the base bid, and that one is a given. Therefore, the Board should move on to leaf waste for some discussion with regard to consensus and whether the Township has 19 or 21 leaf waste pickups. The Board should have a discussion, and then he would ask the community if they have any comments they would like to make on that given issue.

Mr. Crissman explained the reason for requesting that community weight is because if there is a consensus here that the number of leaf waste pick-ups is not even going to fly, then there is no point in wasting time to have further discussion. Mr. Judd, Mr. Hawk, and Ms. Lindsey agreed.

Mr. Crissman announced the Township currently has 19 leaf waste pickups and the addendum that the Board had asked to be included was that it be increased from 19 to 21 pickups, and by going to 21, it means that the Township would have leaf waste pick up every other week. Currently, a schedule is put out, and there are periods of time when there is no leaf waste pickup.

Mr. Crissman stated he would support the 21 leaf waste pickups for a couple of reasons. One, it is easier for our constituents to know that it is every other week as opposed to calling the Township or Waste Management, or they put it out thinking it is their week and it's not their week, and it sits out there for a week. Ms. Lindsey, Mr. Judd, and Mr. Hawk agreed.

John Trish, 600 Prince Street, questioned, "What costs are associated with each item that the Board is considering?" Mr. Trish stated he went online and looked at the memorandum and there are four or five charts on there, one has a base bid for 18 something, and the next page has a base bid of 690, and then the next has another addition, then if the Board goes with the totes, there's another addition.

Mr. Crissman referred to the bid documents on display the website noting the cost of the base bid for the trash pickup, leaf waste pickup, and the totes. Mr. Trish stated he understands.

Mr. Judd questioned if Mr. Trish would like to know how much he is going to pay monthly. Mr. Trish answered exactly.

Mr. Judd explained the base collection service is \$18.95 per month. Mr. Trish questioned, "How does that compare to what he is paying now?" Ms. Lindsey noted that the rates are cheaper.

Mr. Judd explained the leaf waste pick up is additional.11 cents per month and the base collection starts at 18.95.

Mr. Crissman stated the third item that has been included for consideration. He noted there is some diversified thinking about the totes and he would allow the Supervisors to speak before commenting.

Ms. Lindsey stated she is not in favor of the totes because she received comments from people and they are saying that they do not have anywhere to store them. Especially, the residents who are part of the Home Owners Association and are not allowed to have the totes outside the house.

Ms. Lindsey announced that she had received three calls from homeowner's association presidents who are saying that a lot of our residents have one car garages and they wouldn't be able to pull their car inside the garage along with the large 96-gallon tote. She noted that some older residents have called her saying that the large totes are going to be too heavy for them. Ms. Lindsey stated that if she had to haul the trash, she thinks the large totes would be too heavy, and there are a lot of older residents that live in the Township. She asked the Board members to consider the older residents.

Mr. Judd stated he has heard from people who oppose the totes for the same reason. He questioned, "What would the benefit be of going to the totes?" Mr. Judd added he doesn't see a financial benefit in going to the totes and would like to hear it before he makes a decision.

Mr. Crissman announced Mr. Stang is present this evening and he would like Mr. Stang to present the pros and cons to the Board because of one issue that was raised about the lids.

Mr. Crissman noted that with lids, if they are provided, then the lids are already there, and there is a consistency. He noted that all three bidders asked for a special meeting and one of the things all three of them asked for was for this type of tote.

Mr. Crissman noted the totes are a move by the industry and he drove around another Municipality to see what they are using and many of them have already made the switch or are in the process of making the switch. He noted that his neighbors liked totes and brought them along when they settled on their house.

Mr. Crissman asked Tom Stang, Waste Management to respond to the Board and the community about the pros and cons and why everyone is moving in this direction. He added there was a question raised that he was unable to answer and that was from a person who happened to live in an older part of the Township where there is no off-street parking, and the cars must be parked on the street. They questioned how Waste Management could pick up the trash in their neighborhood using an automated system as opposed to those areas where they have off-street parking.

Tom Stang, Waste Management, stated the Waste Management contract for service in the Township provides that they are in the Township five days a week. There are three trash routes and three recycle routes. Waste Management has six trucks running through the Township Monday through Friday, and they are traditional rear loading trucks where they load the trash in the back and side loading trucks where they load on the side for the recycling. With the cart system, Waste Management will use automatic equipment and they have figured into the cost of operation is they will run two trash routes and two recycle routes with automated trucks where an arm will come out and grab the cart, pick it and dump it.

Mr. Stang continued Waste Management is well aware of on-street parking and carts that would be placed at the curb or in between cars, or up on the curb, they would have to pull in between and that is why a portion of the route is going to stay with the traditional rear load trucks and the side for trash, and the side load trucks actually will run to rear load trucks, will run a rear load truck for traditional remote truck for trash and the traditional rear load truck for recycling. And they will run the portions of the routes where there is on-street parking that they are not able to get to with automation.

Ms. Lindsey questioned how someone could lift a 96-gallon tote that contains 50 pounds of garbage. Mr. Stang explained traditional rear load trucks where a guy would grab a can and pick it up and dump it. Some flippers are mounted on the back of the hopper. The hopper is the area that stores the trash. When they dump it in, the flippers are hooked to the cart onto the flipper, and the flipper will flip the can. The collection process is a semiautomatic process, but they would still have a driver with a loader on the back of the truck that will go between the parked cars, pull it out to the truck, hook it onto the flipper and the flipper will pick up the cart and dump it.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if employees at Waste Management will lose their jobs because of the automated process. Mr. Stang answered no. He explained there are other places for employees to work and there is plenty of work. In our industry today, it is becoming more and more difficult to find people that want to do what our guys do day in and day out. Waste Management has started to help the people they hire by working with them to get their CDL license so that they can become drivers. The industry is getting very difficult, and part of the automation process eliminates injuries and will leave haulers in a position where they don't have to hire as many people and have such a difficult time keeping people that want to do that in the elements, day in and day out.

Mr. Judd stated the industry needs to do this and ultimately it will save Waste Management labor costs at some point. He noted that is the whole point of moving to automation and there is nothing wrong with that. Mr. Stang stated it is certainly to save labor costs because the cost of that equipment is much more expensive than the cost of the traditional rear loader. The numbers demonstrate that the cost of automation is higher. Mr. Judd stated he was looking for something to tell the people who belong to a homeowner's association and have to handle this change and find space for these totes.

Mr. Judd questioned, "What is the benefit is to the people?" Mr. Stang explained there are pluses and minuses with both sides of it and the residents may be saying as far as the size of it and having a one car garage and fitting it in there is certainly is a concern. The footprints of those carts are bigger than what the footprint might be now for one trash can or one recycling container, but if a resident has three trash cans in their garage, the footprint of a cart is going to be less than what the footprint of three trash cans would be.

Mr. Stang announced Waste Management knows that people have a concern when they see these carts that, but we have seen that when people get these cards and put them into place, there will be some people that will fight it and argue it, but it is going to be a small minority, small group of people that will have a problem with that. People fall in love with the carts and the automated system. It does eliminate a lot of the blowing of the debris and eliminates not just blowing out, but the container is still standing as traffic goes by and after trash cans are emptied. When the Board members see the uniformity of a cart lined street or alleyway, it really does make the community a much cleaner place. Another benefit of switching to the 64-gallon carts is the increase in the volume of recyclables.

Mr. Stang explained that right now in the industry when recycle bins get full on a weekly basis, the other recyclables that end up in the trash container. After implementing a cart program, Waste Management saw a difference of anywhere between two and three pounds of trash per week move from the trash into the recycling.

Mr. Stang noted the Township would see an increase in the recyclables, which is an increase in grant opportunities for the Township. For example, two to three pounds or a two and a half pound average with over 14,000 residents within the Township, that number can add up and make a difference.

Mr. Stang continued as a matter of fact, part of the difference in our price, even though the cart contract is more expensive than the traditional rear load; Waste Management has moved that number into their costs. Waste Management pays \$85 a ton to dispose of trash right now, and if they can move two or two and a half pounds out of the trash stream and into the recycling stream, there is a cost saving on the disposal.

Mr. Hawk asked Mr. Stang if the 64-gallon cart is the smallest cart available. Mr. Stang explained there are carts containers with wheels and lids. He added there are 35-gallon containers.

Mr. Hawk questioned if Waste Management would provide the carts to residents. Mr. Stang explained Waste Management owns the carts and will provide the carts to the Township residents.

Mr. Hawk questioned if he is able to get just one cart. Mr. Stang explained the other option, and it is, and that is part of the contract. If someone is a low volume trash generator, Waste Management offers a bag program that allows people to pay for trash collection based on the number of bags he or she uses. He suggested that Mr. Hawk use the bag program and not have the big 96-gallon trash cart and use a 64 for recycle and just put a bag out every week or every other week.

Mr. Hawk mentioned that he had purchased trash totes with wheels from Lowes and the tote may last for about six months, and then the bottom falls out. The totes have wheels, but they seem to drag them not using the wheels, and then he has to go out and spend \$40 to \$50 bucks to replace the tote. Mr. Stang explained that under the standard program the residents would still be dealing with those issues if you went with the cart contract. Waste Management is responsible for carts and will replace it if it is broken or damaged.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the carts are interchangeable for trash or recycle. Mr. Stang answered no. He explained the Waste Management employees look for the yellow lid and they know that it is for recyclables and the green lid is the trash cart.

Ms. Lindsey commented she had noticed that under the new contract the bag program has gone from \$4 dollars to \$6 dollars. Mr. Stang stated that is correct.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the residents have to pay for the cart if someone drives over the cart. Mr. Stang explained that Waste Management would replace the cart if it is a onetime deal, but if someone breaks the cart more than once, then he or she would probably charge the residents to replace the cart. He noted the cost of that cart probably \$75.

Ms. Lindsey questioned, "What happens if the cart is stolen from someone's property?" Mr. Stang explained Waste Management would replace the cart if it is stolen. He noted that each cart has a number and that number is assigned to the house when the carts are delivered. Typically, when the Municipality has a carting contract, and everyone has carts the carts do not necessarily a walk away as frequently.

Mr. Crissman opened the discussion for public comment.

Mr. Stang noted the breakdown of the costs associated with the carts is about a dollar over the five year period because there are escalators in each year the contract. The additional costs to have to have carts delivered will be \$1.05 per home, per month. Ms. Lindsey added that would be \$20.11 per month for trash and leaf waste pickup and residents were paying \$19.97.

Mr. Stang stated that fee has averaged out and could be off by a few pennies here, but under the standard contract with the extra yard waste two days, over the five year period, Township residents would pay the same price that they are paying right now as an average over the five years. If the Board chose to put the carts in the contract, the residents are going to be paying an average of a \$1.05 per month over what they are paying right now for the next five years.

Michael Siget, 2094 Fairway Lane, announced he is just looking for a point of clarification. Currently, residents get four bags a week and this 96 gallons. He questioned if the number of bags is going down to three bags a week. Basically, a 32-gallon bag multiplied by three is 96 gallons. He questioned if the residents would lose a bag a week now with this deal and pay more.

Mr. Stang explained the 96 gallons that the court would hold is less than what residents currently have under the four bag limit. Currently, with the four bag limit, the specs indicate four 36 gallons, and that is 144 gallons. He noted that when Waste Management converts to the cart contracts, people are able to fit it all in there for the most part and they will pick up an extra bag. The extra bag will not need a tag or anything else, and they will pick that extra bag up as part of the contract and service.

Mr. Wolfe noted the contractor is required to pick up that extra bag and the volume of material does not decrease.

Mr. Stang noted that it might have been mentioned in a previous Board meeting that there are surrounding communities that have converted to the cart programs. He questioned if the Board had done any research in reaching out to the other communities to see how their citizens feel.

Mr. Stang stated every community will have some people that say this is not going to work for them. He has been in this business for 34 years, but there have not always been carts, but the carts have been part of it the last 15 years. Waste Management could go either way and he is happy that they are the low bidder for all the options.

Mr. Crissman announced the Board of Supervisors are trying to assess the information so that they can make the best decision for the Township.

Tim Murphy, 1524 Pine Hollow Road, announced he is speaking as a member of the Shade Tree Commission, and it just occurred to him that he does not know how the mechanical arm works. He questioned if there would be a conflict with overhanging trees. Mr. Stang explained there is not a conflict with overhanging trees because the mechanical arm will come out and pick up and dump, and it will not be any higher than where some overhead issues do come into play. The Waste Management trucks have forks on the front, and the commercial pickup dumpsters have a container that is mounted on the front of that truck, and the arm dumps into that container, and the truck will lift up and dump. The driver has to be looking for not only trees but also overhead wires and things of that sort. He noted that should not be an issue with a manual collection or the dumping.

Mr. Murphy stated he has one more question regarding the per bag option. He questioned, "How does that work?" He questioned if residents are able to opt in or opt out each year? Mr. Wolfe answered yes, the residents would opt in or opt out each year in July, and the contract runs from July to June. He noted that if a resident opts out of the per bag program they will do so for the year, and they can purchase tags from the Township or Waste Management to affix to the can or bag of trash up to 36 gallons.

Mr. Hawk stated he is looking at I'm looking at what appears to be option number three which references the regular collection service and totes.

Mr. Hawk read, "The scope of work for the tote requires the alternate successful bidder to provide all customers with a 96-gallon container and a 64-gallon container." Mr. Hawk stated he could put his neighbor 96. Mr. Stang stated the bag program might be more suitable for Mr. Hawk. Mr. Hawk questioned if he could get the bag program and one 64 gallon container. Mr. Stang explained that one container is for trash and one is for recycling. Mr. Stang explained the containers are not interchangeable.

Ms. Lindsey noted that it is more expensive to use the per bag program. Mr. Stang added most people who use the bag program do not typically put a bag out every week, it is more like every other week or every three weeks.

Mr. Stang continued the cleanliness is a big issue, and the lids will eliminate the recyclables and trash blowing when it is windy. Another plus is the movement of the Townships recycling volumes; the trash volume to the recycling, which helps ultimately for grant monies. The disadvantage to the cart program is that some residents are going to say that the carts are too big and it cost a \$1.05 more per month.

John Trish, 600 Prince Street, stated the recycling is a commodity. The company has the truck in the neighborhood. He questioned, "Why not encourage people to put out as much as they want to put out?" He mentioned that residents should have an option to choose the recycle bin with a lid and put the garbage out in a bag and tie it up. He questioned, "Did the Board think of that option?"

Mr. Trish noted that he is satisfied with the prices. If we're going to pay him,

Mr. Crissman stated he sense is that there is not sufficient support for the tote. Mr. Judd stated Mr. Crissman's sense is probably right.

Mr. Judd stated he does appreciate all the bidders and that they provided all the options that the Board had asked for. He noted that there is not a lot of groundswell support for the totes. He heard from a lot of people who are either intimidated by the size of the tote, cannot find room for the tote, or they have a homeowner's association. The Township has a lot of homeowner's associations and right now it is causing stress, and there is no reason for it. This is the future, and it is probably ultimately inevitable but there is not a lot of support for the program, and he cannot tell people that there is a pressing need for the totes.

Mr. Crissman motioned to award the contract to Waste Management with the 21 leaf waste pickups in the total amount of \$17, 082,705.00. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Crissman called for a roll call vote. Ms. Lindsey voted aye. Mr. Crissman vote aye. Mr. Hawk voted aye. Mr. Judd aye. And th Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to award the contract to Waste Management with 21 leaf waste pickups per year in the amount of \$17, 082,705.00.

Mr. Stang thanked the Board of Supervisors for the opportunity to continue working with the Township.

Mr. Crissman thanked Mr. Stang for his past contributions to the community.

## NEW BUSINESS

### Resolution 18-15; authorizing the submission of a grant application to the PA DCNR for funding to support the Oak Park Greenway Study

Mr. Wolfe reported the PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources grant application would request a total project amount of \$60,000, 50 percent will come from DCNR and 50 percent will come from the Township. This would be an activity that would have to be funded in the 2019 budget. The Oak Park Greenway study would study land acquired by the Township last year for purposes of a Greenway, and the study would basically determine what improvements would be needed along this strip of land that extends from roughly Mateer Ballfields to the north, south to Locust Lane crossing Locust Lane to approximately Community General. The purpose of this grant application is to study the area to determine necessary improvements to actually begin an infrastructure project for a Greenway development along this stretch of stream channel and open space.

Mr. Henry questioned if the Greenway would then be available for the public to bike or walk along if they want to get from point A to point B without having to drive. Mr. Wolfe answered that is correct. He explained that was the Township's purpose in acquiring this property a year ago, what was required was a little bit more than a donation. The Township spent \$20,000 on the purchase of five parcels. He asked Mr. Stine if it was five parcels or seven parcels. Mr. Stine answered five parcels.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Resolution 18-15 authorizing the submission of the grant application to PA DCNR for funding to support the Oak Park Greenway Study. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Henry called for a voice vote, and the vote was unanimous to approve Resolution 18-15.

Resolution 18-16; authorizing the submission of a grant application to the PA DCNR  
for funding to support Heroes Grove, Phase II

Mr. Henry introduced Christine Hunter, H. Edward Black and Associates, Ltd., Vince Pinizzotto, President, Heroes Grove Fund, Inc. and Mr. William Minsker.

Mr. Pinizzotto announced that Phase II is fully funded and they expect to place a roof over the stage area, lighting, enclosing the electrical panel, that is already there today, and making it more secure. Three flag poles have been installed already, and they will have the remaining eight flag poles installed. They are going just to put all eight of the flagpoles in, and as we get donations for them, the appropriate plaques will be installed with them. The other two things in terms of access, they will install a ramp down below where the access road is leading up to the stage so that the people who are using the stage area can roll their equipment up into the stage area rather than toting it the way they are they have to do today. Lastly, they will place a stairway from the upper entrance down to the stage area. Phase two construction will begin in 2019, and the bids will be going out shortly, and then the construction will begin in 2019.

William Minsker, Heroes Fund, Inc. announced that after many years of preparation and hard work by the Heroes Fund, Inc. committee and support from the Board of Supervisors the Dauphin County Heroes Grove facility is really very much being put to use. It has been used and is now being also used for community activities such as art shows, movies, concerts, band competitions, and band concerts. There is an event coming up, which the Board members may have heard about over the Memorial Day weekend. The Rotary Club of Colonial Park is going to start an annual event over the Memorial Day weekend to Salute the Troops.

Mr. Minsker continued this event will be held on May 26th from 10:00 A.M. until 1:00 P.M. Heroes Fund, Inc. plans to have a number of activities over the summer and the focus is always with the idea that this Dauphin County Heroes Grove project and they are trying to focus more on drawing more attention from other communities besides just the immediate local area for the use of this public facility, and it is happening.

Ms. Lindsey added there had been weddings held at the Heroes Grove facility and RJ Harris will be there on the first Saturday of May. This is the third year that RJ Harris has chosen to hold the Support the Troops event at Heroes Grove.

Christine Hunter, H. Edward Black, and Associates, Ltd., noted that Heroes Fund Inc. is happy to see that the use of the facility is growing as more people have become aware of the ability to use it for programs. As Mr. Pinizzotto mentioned Phase II is now fully funded, and the Heroes Fund Inc. is looking ahead to Phase III, and with that, they are planning to submit a grant application to DCNR for Phase III, and they are looking at this project a little more holistically as Brightbill Park improvements. There are some playground renovations that are really needed and upgrades to the playground apparatus within that park, and they would like to pull all that together with the Phase III of Heroes Grove.

Ms. Hunter announced the Heroes Fund, Inc. Phase III proposes to build a welcome building that would have a little concession area and restrooms that are located at the top of Heroes Grove just adjacent to the parking lot of the shopping center on Township property. This would allow easy access for people who are at watching events there to get to that restroom. There have been comments that the restrooms are distant for people at events.

Mr. Wolfe announced the Township's contribution towards this grant application would be \$90,000 and that would be towards the replacement of the play equipment structure that is in Brightbill Park, and this is a planned expenditure by the Township in 2019.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the \$90,000 is a planned expenditure for Township usage because it is part of the park, as opposed to a Dauphin County project. Ms. Hunter answered that is correct.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the \$90,000 match from the Township would help with the grant. Ms. Hunter explained that it would make it a more competitive grant application.

Mr. Crissman questioned if there is a time schedule for when the applications are reviewed and when the grant awards are made.

Mr. Wolfe explained the submission date is next week and the award is a long time away. Ms. Hunter stated the grants are awarded in November or December.

Mr. Henry added in the interim the Phase II project will be getting underway next year. Ms. Hunter agreed, noting that they will begin the process of the design of the project and will return to the Board of Supervisors to approve as we take that design into construction documents.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the total amount for Phase III is \$420,000. Ms. Hunter answered yes. Ms. Lindsey asked, "How much is the grant? Ms. Hunter answered the grant request is for \$200,000, and they will need to apply for additional grant opportunities.

Mr. Henry stated it is very beneficial for the Township to be the host of Dauphin County Heroes Grove and this has certainly been a tremendous amenity to the community. Hopefully, people who are listening will stop out and take a look at Heroes Grove, and it is located in Brightbill Park behind the Friendship Community Center.

Mr. Henry announced Heroes Grove is available for use now and even though it has had good usage it could be used more, and if anyone is looking for a venue, there is a great one right here in the Township. Feel free to get in touch with Lower Paxton Township's Parks and Recreation Department to obtain an application.

Ms. Lindsey made a motion to approve Resolution 2018-16 for the submission of the grant application to the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation Natural Resources for Phase III of Heroes Grove. Mr. Judd seconded the motion. Mr. Henry called for a voice vote, and Resolution 2018-16 was unanimously approved.

Resolution 18-17; authorizing the destruction of specified municipal records

Mr. Wolfe reported the Township has records from 2012 zoning permits and plans which have a five year retention period. The documents are one year out of a five year period and should be destroyed. Additionally, there are administrative, personnel and benefits records between 1999 and 2011 and they also only have a five year retention period.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Resolution 2018-17 authorizing the destruction of the specific vendors. Mr. Hawk seconded the motion. Mr. Henry called for a voice vote, and there was a unanimous vote to approve Resolution 2018-17.

### Request for support from the Township to make Blue Mountain acquisition

Ben Mummert, Central PA Conservancy, announced the Township is very progressive in its implementation of a mandatory dedication and fees in lieu and that is an important instrument empowered by the Municipality's Planning Code for securing the parkland that the growing Municipality needs to meet the demands and to sustain economic development. The Central PA Conservancy is a small nonprofit land trust which is headquartered in Carlisle. The CPC service area includes Dauphin County, and they overlap with Manada Conservancy and the Nature Conservancy, and they work closely with including on this project. I appreciate your pulling up the map in 2001. We made an acquisition of Blue Mountain and Lower Paxton Township. Mr. Mummert referenced the map displayed I have identified in the lower pollute, the lighter blue and the map that was called our Schreckengost acquisition. And we transferred it to state parks is in addition to Boyd Victory Conservation area in 2007. So it's a now contributing to 1025 acres of open space, 12 miles of trail that are accessible to your township residents for cross-country skiing, hiking, running, and mountain biking. For example. The Board of Supervisors decided to postpone their decision until April 10, 2018

### Announcements

#### Improvement Guarantees

Mr. Crissman motioned to approve the Improvement Guarantees. Mr. Judd seconded the motion. Mr. Henry called for a voice vote, and the Board voted unanimously to approve the Improvement Guarantees.

Payment of Bills-Lower Paxton Township & Lower Paxton Township Authority

Ms. Lindsey motioned to pay the bills for Lower Paxton Township and the Lower Paxton Township Authority. Mr. Hawk seconded the motion. Mr. Henry called for a voice vote, and the Board voted unanimously to approve the payment of bills.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Judd seconded the motion. Mr. Henry adjourned the meeting for the Lower Paxton Township at 9:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Shellie R. Smith  
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Chris Judd  
Secretary