

MILFORD CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF MEETING
November 27, 2017

A Meeting of the City of Milford Public Works Committee was held in the Joseph Ronnie Rogers Council Chambers at Milford City Hall, 201 South Walnut Street, Milford, Delaware on Monday, November 27, 2017.

PRESIDING: Chairman Owen Brooks Jr.

IN ATTENDANCE: Committee Members: Councilpersons Lisa Peel and Douglas Morrow

STAFF: City Manager Eric Norenberg and Deputy City Clerk Christine Crouch

Chairman Brooks called the Committee Meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

Public Works Director Mark Whitfield was also in attendance.

Long Term Vision of Refuse Collection Program and Financing

Public Works Director Whitfield brought the Committee up to date on the solid waste collection and recommendations in terms of moving forward. The manner in which it has been handled in the past has been labor intensive with the rear loader truck using a driver and two employees on the back of each, lifting and tossing trash into the back.

In addition, we were only able to do trash collection once a week and recycling every other week due to time constraints.

In terms of improving service without increasing costs, a new automated truck was purchased which has been operating for seven months. Instead of a three-person crew hoisting cans and bags into trucks, a single driver uses a joystick to make a mechanical claw grab and dump standardized cans. As a result, services were increased by adding citywide yard waste and recycling collection once a week.

As a result, there has been an increase in participation and volume in recycling. Because of the additional recycling, the tonnage requests related to normal trash has been reduced.

Mr. Whitfield stated that another automated truck was budgeted for the upcoming budget year. He noted that an automated truck will not work everywhere within a City so while looking at other alternatives and considering future growth, a split body truck was recommended. The semi-automated truck is used for refuse and recycling and is operated by one employee. The fourth truck in the fleet would continue to be a rear loader which is extremely handy for bulk item collection and as a back-up to replace a truck that has to be taken off the road.

He explained that the cost of these trucks are in the \$250,000 range as opposed to the rear loaders that run around \$160,000 which roughly last eight years. In terms of labor, the two rear loaders have required six full-time employees though that is reduced to three full-time employees under this plan. As a result, the cost savings over that eight-year time frame will be approximately \$1 million.

While the vehicle is much more expensive, the result is a savings in manpower and better service for our residents by offering more frequent yard waste and recycling collections. The convenience has already created additional participation by our customers.

Chairman Brooks confirmed the City will have three trucks, one of which will be used as a backup.

Councilman Morrow confirmed the additional overtime being paid to our solid waste employees are calculated into the savings.

Mr. Whitfield also shared that the backup staff on the solid waste trucks actually came from the Street Department. As a result, their labor was not charged to the refuse account though it would have been helped had that been added. Employees

in the Street Department are paid from general fund dollars though in this situation, were working in the Solid Waste Department. In moving forward, he wants to assure the true costs of collection are captured.

Chairman Brooks again expressed concern about the safety of the solid waste employees on the back of the trucks at 5:00 p.m. in dark and rainy conditions. He noted that Tenth Street is a racetrack and drivers were not slowing down even with the presence of the truck and employees.

Mr. Whitfield pointed out that moving to an automated truck will eliminate employees on the back of the truck as is needed on a rear loader. Chairman Brooks pointed out that he has observed the automated truck actually slow speeding vehicles down.

Councilwoman Peel recalled a previous discussion when there were several vacancies in the Solid Waste Department. He confirmed that is still true and the number of employees has been reduced by half.

Mr. Whitfield confirmed that no one will be laid off and several employees will be repositioned as our needs change.

Councilman Mergner arrived at this time.

Recommendation on Purchase of New Refuse Truck

The following memo was included in the packet:

The Public Works Department requests the Public Works Committee consider a recommendation to purchase a new refuse collection truck used by the Solid Waste Division. The truck will be used for the collection of refuse, yard waste and recyclable materials.

The proposed truck is a one-person automated collection vehicle, which allows customer containers to be emptied using a hydraulic arm operated by the vehicle driver, similar to the vehicle purchased earlier this year. The unit will allow for the efficient collection of refuse, yard waste and recyclable materials using a single person.

The proposed change in the type of vehicle has numerous advantages over the present system of using three people (a driver and two collectors) on a rear loading refuse truck. The unit also allows for the safe collection of materials since there is no human contact with the container. The unit eliminates lifting of containers, exposure to dust, needles, and other potential hazardous materials, exposure to weather, traffic hazards, etc. The efficiency will eliminate the need to fill two present vacancies in the Solid Waste Division.

The present unit will replace a 2005 International with a Leach rear load refuse body. The unit has over 18,450 engine hours, 110,334 travel miles and the body is rusted out. A like kind replacement (rear-loader on a tandem axle truck) unit would cost about \$160,000. The proposed automated replacement unit was budgeted at \$227,000 in the 2018 Budget.

Staff recommends the purchase of a G S Product CS9133 CollectStar Auto Side Loader body on a single axle Peterbilt truck through Hunter Truck Sales & Service, Inc. at a price of \$255,865.60. The purchase can be made through the National Joint Powers Alliance Contract (NJPA).

The purchase price of \$255,865.60 is \$28,865.60 over the amount budgeted for the unit. Staff recommends using \$24,450 which was budgeted for downtown containers (the City received a grant to cover this cost) and \$4,415.60 from the container line item to make up the shortfall for the purchase. Because of the favorable quotes on container replacement, staff anticipates a savings within this line item.

The proposed unit was evaluated by the present operators, who took into consideration needed changes from the unit which was purchased earlier this year. Their 6-month experience yielded some recommended changes.

The price of the vehicle is higher than originally budgeted and anticipated due to the need for a cab-over configuration for

the vehicle. The cab-over allows for a tighter truck turning radius, allowing for better maneuverability. Additionally, the cab-over feature allows easier entry/exit for the driver. Due to the multiple times of exiting and entering the truck during the work day, the cab-over not only provides a safer means, but also allows for better time efficiency and less wear and tear on the driver.

Specifications for the truck and refuse body are attached, as well as the requirements for joining the NJPA cooperative purchasing alliance.

Mr. Whitfield recommends the replacement of the refuse truck, and the purchase authorization through the National Joint Purchase Alliance (NJPA) to City Council. Item to be added to the December 11, 2017 meeting.

Councilwoman Peel moved to authorize the matter be placed on the December 11, 2017 City Council agenda, seconded by Councilman Morrow.

Sidewalk Inspection/Improvement Program for 2018

The following memo was included in the packet for Committee review:

The Public Works Department Engineering Division is planning to conduct a sidewalk inspection program beginning in 2018.

Preliminary Inspection

Presently, the Engineering Assistant is conducting an assessment of the present condition of all existing sidewalks within the City. Based on this assessment, a dollar value can be placed on the potential replacement of sidewalks. This will allow staff to evaluate the scope of repairs, both in terms of volume and dollar value, needed to bring sidewalks up to standards as set forth in the Sidewalk Ordinance.

Inspection Program

Staff proposes to begin a formal inspection process in late spring. First priority for inspection will be:

2018:

- 1. The Downtown Development District;*
- 2. Collector streets (Walnut, Marshall, SE Front, Causey, Lakeview, Seabury, Washington, McColley, North, and Church);*
- 3. Streets used for school access (SE Third, SE Fourth, SE Fifth, Bridgeham, NW Fourth, NE Tenth, and Buccaneer)*

2019: Remaining sidewalks not covered in Year 1, in Ward 2

2020: Remaining sidewalks not covered in Year 1, in Ward 3

2021: Remaining sidewalks not covered in Year 1, in Ward 1

2022: Remaining sidewalks not covered in Year 1, in Ward 4

Future Years: Complete inspection in one ward each year; with every ward completed once every four years.

Funding Options

In accordance with the Ordinance, the property owner is responsible for the repair, maintenance and replacement of the sidewalk adjacent to their property. The City may elect to replace the sidewalk along properties where owners fail to complete replacements in a timely manner, and place a lien on the property for the work. This however ties up City funds, potentially for a long period of time, until the property is sold.

There are several funding considerations Council may want to consider in moving forward.

Revolving Loan Fund - Council may elect to set aside reserve funds for maintenance and repair and allow property owners to borrow funds with a 3-5 year repayment schedule at no or low interest. Place lien on property until loan is repaid.

Public Works Projects - On streets identified as needing to be repaved, deteriorated curb will also need to be replaced. In many cases, curb abuts the sidewalk, and the curb replacement will necessitate sidewalk replacement. This work will be completed by the City. Sidewalk repair should not be identified on streets where a public works project is planned within the next five years. Sidewalks not needing to be replaced due to curb work could be identified, and the property owner could elect to piggyback on the public works project to have their sidewalk replaced as part of the project, or elect to replace on their own within one year.

Community Development Block Grants, Community Transportation Funds or other Grants - In areas of low income properties, investigate the possibility of obtaining state or federal monies for assistance.

Sidewalk Replacement Project - The Public Works Department would identify all needed repairs and obtain a price from a contractor to complete all work. Property owner could elect to have City replace the sidewalk under that contract, or complete on their own. Property owners would be billed for the work and would include the City's overhead and project inspection costs.

Next Steps

Complete inventory of sidewalks for extent of repairs needed

Decision on funding options

Budget funds for 2018

Begin formal inspection in July 2018, with replacement by property owners within 90 days of notification.

As proposed, this will create a four-year program and provide a break for residents who may need an annual expenditure to repair sidewalks. In addition, covering the entire town with one inspector in one year is nearly impossible. Breaking it out into wards makes it much more manageable for the residents.

Chairman Brooks confirmed the homeowners will continue to be responsible for their sidewalks because the City does not need that responsibility. He agrees this program is badly needed throughout the City.

Councilwoman Peel reported that a number of residents complain to her about the condition of their sidewalk even though it is their responsibility. She does not think most people understand that the sidewalk conditions are their responsibility.

The Councilwoman feels if walkability, bikeability and safer passages downtown are going to be priorities in our strategic plan, she recommends the City create some sort of campaign to educate them. She does not want the City showing up at someone's house to fix a sidewalk, only to learn later that resident is also being billed.

Mr. Norenberg pointed out there is a notification process required in the Code that would occur before any repairs would begin. They also talked with the media to inform them of several of these projects though he agrees that public education is important.

They also understand that a homeowner may want to do something differently. For example, if the City inspected ten sections of sidewalk and four or five were repaired or replaced, someone may prefer to do their entire sidewalk versus piecemealing the repairs.

The City Manager also pointed out that financing is not something the City wants as a first choice, because of the time it takes to recover. They have not yet identified how to determine low-income criteria for financial assistance, in addition to the percentage, payback period, etc.

Councilwoman Peel has heard multiple complaints through the Community Conversations though it is identified repeatedly as a concern and priority.

Councilman Morrow asked how the City plans to address what has been done in the past and what is being considered now. He agrees the City has wrestled with this for at least twenty years though we never really followed through unless it was a complete street project with curbs and sidewalks repaired at the same time. The last project he recalled was on Southeast Front Street.

The Public Works Director explained that one of the things looked at as part of the capital improvement plan will be prioritizing streets where work is needed. Prior to that resurfacing, he recommends replacing any bad curbing along the street. When the curbing is adjacent to the sidewalk, the City has no recourse but to replace the sidewalk block. If there is a grassy area between the curb and the sidewalk, then the sidewalk does not have to be disturbed. However, a resident with a bad sidewalk against a bad curb, would be the City's responsibility.

He further stated that he does not want to identify sidewalk blocks to be replaced, only to find out three years later the City has to tear up that new sidewalk to replace the curb. As a result, the curbing and sidewalk projects need to be coordinated.

Mr. Norenberg agreed he has heard from a few residents that the City was able to get grant funds from the State or Federal government in the past to do some enhancement programs. In those cases, there were no City dollars used and instead was other government money. For example, there was a decision made at the time by Council that it was important for downtown redevelopment and such funds were accepted and invested. Those property owners received the benefit as a result.

Only outside funding would be eligible for ADA ramps that need to be included at intersections and in particular, where crosswalks are needed. There are a number of intersections where crosswalks cannot be added because the ADA ramps do not meet code. In such situations, CDBG funds could potentially pay for those ramps with the hope of acquiring federal funds through the County to complete the projects.

Councilwoman Peel asked if there is funding available for walkability to encourage residents to use less vehicle transportation; Mr. Norenberg is unaware of funds for that purpose. He is aware of the Safe Routes to School funding which is designed to fix or create a sidewalk where there are gaps children need to walk. They will continue to work with the school district to identify those though in most instances it has been used mainly for infill where sidewalks gaps exist.

Mr. Whitfield announced that one of the areas being considered was the cemetery property particularly after considering the amount of foot traffic on the North Walnut side where there is no sidewalk. That would be an appropriate place for Safe Routes to School.

Councilwoman Peel feels that a crosswalk on Tenth Street over Rehoboth Boulevard to get to the high school should also be considered.

Chairman Brooks prefers the entire Council make this decision.

Mr. Norenberg hopes that Public Works will be able to bring recommendations on capital improvements earlier than the normal budget cycle and address the operational portion in May and June. He prefers discussing the capital improvement planning, including streets and sidewalks, in late winter/early spring.

Councilman Brooks said he has always complained that the City spends millions of dollars and there should more than two nights of budget hearings.

Mr. Norenberg encouraged the Committee Members to get in touch with him should they have any additional questions.

Review Potential Parking Lot Layout for City Hall Parking Lot and City Parking Lot at Northeast Front Street/Denny Row

The Public Works Director then informed the Committee that they have reviewed some of the parking in the downtown areas. In particular, improvements in terms of the number of spaces, as well as the circulation and maneuverability, in and around the parking lots, are being considered. Right now they are looking at City Hall Parking Lot and the City Parking Lot at Northeast Front Street/Denny Row.

Councilman Burk arrived at 6:40 p.m.

Mr. Whitfield then referred to the existing Arena's Parking Lot at Denny Row and NE Front Street. He pointed out some angled parking that is at a 45-degree angle. That angle requires a nineteen-foot drive out though only a ten-foot drive out exists.

There is also a line that separates the two parking spaces that should be perpendicular instead of at a skew. That causes vehicles to park further back in the space than where they should be. That just exacerbates an already bad situation in terms of the drive outs which become very narrow especially when it involves a large SUV or pickup.

A couple different layouts were then reviewed. One was to use ninety-degree spaces. He personally likes that because the number of spaces can be maximized. Changing to ninety-degree spaces will provide 116 spaces in that existing lot. Some minor improvements would be needed at the entryways. Seal coating would also be needed on the entire lot to help preserve it. Presently there is a lot of oxidation on the pavements and a sealant would alleviate the lamination of the pavement as well as cover up all current white lines and allow for restriping.

For what Mr. Whitfield believes will be a fairly low cost, an additional eighteen spaces or so could be added. It would also make it ADA compliant.

If the angled spaces are preferred, 109 spaces can be created. It would entail a ten-foot travel aisle at a thirty-degree parking angle.

The aisles are most suitable in width in terms of the angle. The division line would be perpendicular to the parking aisle and also gain some spaces toward the end which presently contains no parking though there is an extremely wide aisle.

The parking lot at Milford City Hall presently has 43 parking spaces. Some minor modifications to this lot would include relocating the existing entrance to the north and installing a second entrance where a utility pole currently exists but can be removed. The guy wire was no longer needed so the pole is obsolete. The entryway can then be installed and visitor parking spaces placed near the building.

The asphalt should also be resealed.

The reconfiguration would allow another fifteen or so spaces with some minor work.

Mr. Whitfield noted that the parking lots across from DBF, across from Penney Lane, behind the Georgia House and next to the City's Customer Service Department will also need some work.

Councilwoman Peel feels the parking lot by Arena's is a priority adding that she will not even use that lot and chooses to park on the street instead. She is unsure how full the City Hall Parking Lot gets though additional spaces and safer passages should be considered in both lots.

Councilman Mergner agrees that labeling the actual parking lots would help as well. He recommends one sign stating it is a City of Milford Public Parking Lot.

Councilwoman Wilson arrived at 6:50 p.m.

Mr. Norenberg stated that the City will talk with the owner of the Arena's building because they own the first row of spaces and coordinate the effort in terms of striping, sealing and especially the provision of the ADA spaces.

The branding and associated duties are being handled by the City Planner according to Mr. Norenberg. That includes a parking study that is being funded by the Dover-Kent MPO and a collaboration through the USDA Downtown Marketing Plan that will allow some identification signage. He agrees signage is needed in addition to posting regulations regarding snow removal.

Councilman Brooks recommends adjourning this meeting in preparation for the Council Meeting that begins at 7:00 p.m. Due to the time, Councilman moved to recess the Public Works Committee Meeting until after the completion of the City Council meeting, seconded by Councilwoman Peel. Motion carried.

The Meeting was recessed at 6:53 p.m. by Chairman Brooks. The balance of the items on this agenda will be addressed when the Committee Meeting is resumed after the completion of the Council Meeting.

Councilmember Peel moved to reconvene the Public Works Committee meeting, seconded by Chairman Brooks. Motion carried. The Committee Meeting resumed at 7:17 p.m.

Update on Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Public Works Director Whitfield reported a five-year capital improvement plan is currently being developed. He said it will be very different from what has been done in the past.

Mr. Whitfield emphasized this is a plan and not a budget. His goal is to identify every item that will need to be addressed over the next five years, with the estimated cost. He recommends this be created at this point, without any concerns for financing.

He recalled the inventory done this past summer regarding City streets and their conditions. The next step is to review the infrastructure beneath the pavement to prevent having to repave a street when it involves a bad sewer or water line. In addition, should those utilities lines need to be replaced, that enterprise or reserve fund should pay a portion of that street's resurfacing.

As we move forward, signage will be addressed, along with water improvements, sewer and pump station issues.

Mr. Whitfield stressed the need to get these projects listed, with an approximate estimate over the next five years. After that, the next step will be to prioritize and determine the financing. Any items that can be addressed through legislative money or grant funding can then be considered. Any projects that will need a bond issue or enterprise funds can also be considered in terms of rate structures or increases.

A data sheet will be included in this year's budget to identify each project. After that, the projects will be prioritized at budget time. Projects that are not funded will be deferred until such time the funding can be identified.

Councilwoman Wilson pointed out that in the past, Council was asked to identify problem areas in their wards though she is unsure whether or not they would all be considered capital projects. Mr. Whitfield welcomed any input and asked Council to look at infrastructure in terms of buildings, roads, street lighting, electric water, sewer, etc.

Councilman Brooks said that Council used to ride the whole City and itemize each problem that was included in the five-year plan.

International City/County Management Association (ICMA) Local Government Management Fellow Evan Miller, then

echoed Mr. Whitfield's comments that the CIP is a great planning tool. Mr. Miller shares his time with the City of Rehoboth Beach and is also currently working on their CIP.

Mr. Miller agrees this is a great time to focus on an inventory of the infrastructure and equipment needed by all Departments. He then referred to samples he has used in the past. A survey will be provided to the Department Heads who will be given a time frame to return. That document includes a project title, description, justification, estimated cost, estimated time frame and if applicable, any impact on the annual budget.

The draft CIP he completed for the City of Rehoboth is approximately one-hundred pages though he added general information about a CIP, why it is needed, how prepared, the various roles of the department heads, Councilmembers and the City Manager.

He feels this is a great way to provide transparency to residents. It is also a great tool on determining the funding as well.

Mr. Miller then referred to CIP's from Northborough, Massachusetts, State College, Pennsylvania and the five-year three-page Budget Plan for Rehoboth Beach (see Council packet). He agrees this plan can sometimes take several months before the surveys are returned. After that time, a meeting will be held with each Department Head, after which the projects will be reviewed and estimates obtained.

City Manager Norenberg stated that once this information is acquired and added to the CIP, it will be presented as part of the budget for 2018. It will be handled by staff and funneled into a one project that will be overseen by the Finance Department, Public Works Director and Mr. Miller primarily.

Councilmembers Brooks and Wilson both agreed it is a great way to handle.

When asked who prioritizes the projects, Mr. Miller explained it is a combination. It is crucial the City Manager and the Department Heads work together on the document. When he prepared the Departmental survey, he asked for three identifying priorities—essential, deferrable or desirable. The Department Heads do prioritize, which then falls under the City Manager, who then turns it over to City Council for further action. However, priorities are mainly categorized by the Department Heads and the City Manager.

Update on Smart Meter Project

Mr. Whitfield then reported that the City is close to deploying smart meters which should occur late in February or the first part of March. The meters have been received and all data collectors, but two are in place. A number of meters of various sizes have been deployed and are currently being tested to ensure everything is working.

The biggest holdup has been the financial software being able to talk to the software currently used by the meters. Getting that code written to ensure the customer does not see any change in the billing will ensure a seamless process other than a slight blip when their electric meter is pulled and the new one put into place.

The Public Works Director stated that he is aware of other cities that have deployed smart meters and considered an opt-out provision for customers who may have a concern with the radio frequency waves of a smart meter. The reality is the smart meter has less radio frequency waves than a baby monitor, a microwave or cell phone. However, there are residents who have concerns with regard to the radio frequency and the possibility of associated medical issues. Some locations have provided an opt-out provision in which the meters are actually manually read. That customer must then pay for the additional manual service on a monthly basis which is typically in the range of \$25 to \$30.

Mr. Whitfield stated that most cities have not provided that opt-out provision and is what he recommends to the City of Milford. He reiterated there is no more basis for a health concern than a cell phone or other items previously mentioned.

Mr. Norenberg added that this past summer, an informational sheet was included in the utility bill. That generated a few

phone calls and questions to Customer Service. At the same time, an informational page was added to the City's website which is still available and includes factual information prepared by Mr. Miller. Customers with concerns have been referred to this page and related links. Many fears were alleviated as a result.

The City Manager directed our Customer Service staff to refer to him anyone with concerns after they have accessed this information or were provided additional information by that Department. To date, he has not heard from any of our residents.

The topic also came up during one of the Community Conversations. Mr. Norenberg referred that person to our website and provided his business card though he has not heard back from him either. Therefore, he feels this is a nominal issue and does not believe it will go very far as is the case with other utility companies.

If an opt-out program is needed, the Electric Tariff will need to be amended and fees applied.

Councilman Brooks said he will not agree to charging a City Customer just to have our employees go out and read their meter. Mr. Norenberg pointed out the reason for the fee is that a special service is being provided that is not provided to our other customers. He does not recommend that at this point, but if they choose not to use a smart meter, a policy decision would have to be made because it will require a dedicated employee to read the meter.

Councilwoman Peel stated that it sounds to her as though we are complicating this matter unnecessarily. She believes that if the education materials are available, it will not be an issue with our customers.

Mr. Norenberg stated that he wanted Council aware of the possibility.

Update on Southeast Regional Pump Station Project

Davis, Bowen and Friedel Engineer Jason Loar stated that he was asked to provide updates on several projects. The first is the Southeast Regional Pump Station Project that is currently under construction. This project is key to add sewer service to the southeast area of the City and is being funded primarily by those developments, including the hospital.

The project is about 33% complete. The majority of the work left is at the pump station site and involves bigger, heavy duty construction.

It is on schedule and on budget with final completion scheduled in March 2018.

Update on Shawnee Acres Pump Station Project

Mr. Loar reported this is part of the \$4 million USDA Sewer Project that began a few years ago with Fisher Avenue being the first project completed. This project is also critical to the southeast area of the City because it actually goes through the Shawnee Acres Pump Station.

The project funding included a \$2 million grant, \$1.6 million in loans and \$400,000 in City reserves.

It is being designed to accommodate current and future flow for development of the southeast area and is approximately 50% designed. At the Public Works Director request, they are preparing a meeting with local residents to provide them with information and obtain feedback.

Update on NE & NW Front Street Sewer & Water Improvement Project

Mr. Loar proceeded by explaining this includes two projects. The sewer portion is also part of the USDA-funded project and the water portion is being paid from the City's water reserves.

A key issue to this project is that DelDOT plans to repave Front Street over the next couple years. As a result, any utilities

need to be corrected before the repaving begins.

The project is approximately 30% designed. The first priority was to camera the existing sewer lines to determine their condition. The review is almost complete and it has been determined that the majority will only need to be lined. That portion should be fairly quick though a portion of sewer will need to be replaced on the northwest side of Milford closer to the Truitt Avenue Pump Station.

The water project will involve a complete replacement of the lines from Business Route 1 over to Walnut Street. That is being scheduled to start as soon as possible and is presently out to bid.

Adjourn

There being no further business, Councilwoman Peel moved to adjourn the Committee Meeting, seconded by Councilman Morrow. Motion carried.

The Public Works Committee Meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Terri K. Hudson, MMC
City Clerk/Transcriber

Attachments:
Long Term Plan

Solid Waste Operations

Past

	Cost	Number of Employees	Annual Depreciation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Cost Over 8 Years
Wages (\$33,296/employee)	\$33,396	6		\$200,376	\$200,376	\$200,376	\$200,376	\$200,376	\$200,376	\$200,376	\$200,376	
Benefits (\$21,375/person)	\$21,375	6		\$128,250	\$128,250	\$128,250	\$128,250	\$128,250	\$128,250	\$128,250	\$128,250	
Rearload Truck (8yr depr)	\$160,000		\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	
Rearload Truck (8yr depr)	\$160,000		\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	
Rearload Truck (8yr depr)	\$160,000		\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	
Rearload Truck (8yr depr)	\$160,000		\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	
Total Cost				\$408,626	\$408,626	\$408,626	\$408,626	\$408,626	\$408,626	\$408,626	\$408,626	\$3,269,008

Proposed Future

Wages (\$33,296/employee)	\$33,396	3		\$100,188	\$100,188	\$100,188	\$100,188	\$100,188	\$100,188	\$100,188	\$100,188	
Benefits (\$21,375/person)	\$21,375	3		\$64,125	\$64,125	\$64,125	\$64,125	\$64,125	\$64,125	\$64,125	\$64,125	
SideLoader (8yr depr)	\$220,290		\$27,536	\$27,536	\$27,536	\$27,536	\$27,536	\$27,536	\$27,536	\$27,536	\$27,536	
SideLoader (8yr depr)	\$255,866		\$31,983	\$31,983	\$31,983	\$31,983	\$31,983	\$31,983	\$31,983	\$31,983	\$31,983	
Split Body Semi Auto (8yr depr)	\$290,000		\$36,250	\$36,250	\$36,250	\$36,250	\$36,250	\$36,250	\$36,250	\$36,250	\$36,250	
Rearload Truck (8yr depr)	\$160,000		\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	
Total Cost				\$280,082	\$280,082	\$280,082	\$280,082	\$280,082	\$280,082	\$280,082	\$280,082	\$2,240,656
Annual Savings				\$128,544	\$128,544	\$128,544	\$128,544	\$128,544	\$128,544	\$128,544	\$128,544	
												Savings over 8 Years
												\$1,028,352