

BOARD OF TRUSTEES – WASATCH FRONT WASTE AND RECYCLING DISTRICT (WFWRD)
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES

DATE/TIME	LOCATION	ATTENDEES
<p>Monday, October 28, 2024 9:00 a.m.</p> <p>Board Meeting & Public Hearing</p> <p>Monday, November 18, 2024 6:00 p.m.</p>	<p>Public Works Building 604 West 6960 South Midvale, UT 84047</p>	<p><u>Board Members:</u> Anna Barbieri (Chair)-City of Taylorsville, Greg Shelton (Vice Chair)-White City, Sherrie Ohrn-Herriman City, Emily Gray-City of Holladay, Keith Zuspan-Town of Brighton, Laurie Stringham-Salt Lake County (<i>arrived at 9:10 a.m.</i>), Robert Piñon-Emigration Canyon, Mick Sudbury-Magna City</p> <p><u>Participating Electronically:</u> Thom DeSirant-Millcreek City, Patrick Schaeffer-Kearns City (<i>arrived at 9:16 a.m.</i>), Tessa Stitzer-Town of Copperton (<i>arrived after roll call</i>), Brett Hales-Murray City (<i>excused at 10:15 a.m.</i>), Matt Holton-Cottonwood Heights</p> <p><u>Excused:</u> Aaron Dekeyzer-Sandy City</p> <p><u>District & Support Staff:</u> Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel Pam Roberts, General Manager/CEO Helen Kurtz, Finance Director/CFO David Ika, Operations Manager Matt Ferguson, Controller/Treasurer Renee Plant, Administrative Manager Sione Tuione, Residential Recycling Collection & Sustainability Manager Justin Tuft, Residential Refuse & Special Services Collection Manager Shane Norris, Safety & Emergency Preparedness Coordinator James Kelsey, Sustainability Coordinator Lisa Kelly, HR/Payroll Specialist Lori McAllister, Payroll Technician Catarina Garcia, Executive Assistant/Board Clerk</p> <p><u>Public:</u> Patrick Craig-Salt Lake County, Justun Edwards-Herriman, Abby Evans-Salt Lake County</p>

THE WASATCH FRONT WASTE AND RECYCLING DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING AGENDA

To be held Monday, October 28, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. at the District Offices located at 604 West 6960 South, inside the Salt Lake County Public Works Administration Building Training Room. This meeting will also be held electronically via Webex. Public login is:

<https://slco.webex.com/slco/j.php?MTID=mf1664bc9a6c3f66c99ad86d1aa0158bb>

Reasonable accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) for individuals with disabilities may be provided upon receipt of a request within five working days' notice. For assistance, please call V/385-468-6332; TTY 711. Members of the Board may participate electronically.

Call to Order: Anna Barbieri, Board Chair
Roll Call: Catarina Garcia, Board Clerk

1. Consent Items (*Approval Requested*)

- 1.1. October 21, 2024, Special Board Meeting Minutes (Pending)
- 1.2. Lease Agreement with Bingham Creek Park Authority for Container Storage
- 1.3. Interlocal Agreement with Salt Lake County for Waste and Recycling Collections at County Facilities
- 1.4. Adoption of Resolution 4431 Approving Compensation Deferment, GM Serving on the Utah Local Governments Trust Board

2. Meeting Open for Public Comments

(Comments are limited to 3 minutes) Public wishing to submit a comment to the Board of Trustees may do so by submitting their comment to the Board Clerk at cgarcia@wasatchfrontwaste.org before Monday, October 28, 2024, 8:00 a.m. All comments must include the name and address of the individual making the comment. These comments will be read at the meeting as if the individual were present. Public comments can also be made in person or via Webex during this time.

3. Business Items:

- 3.1. 2024, 3rd Quarter Financial Report: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Helen Kurtz, Finance Director (***Motion and Approve***)
- 3.2. Continued Discussions on the Proposed 2025 Budget and Fee Increases Including Follow-up on the Trailer Rental Program: Anna Barbieri, Board Chair (***Information/Direction Requested***)
- 3.3. Tentative Adoption of the Tentative 2025 Budget and Fee Schedule: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Helen Kurtz, Finance Director (***Motion and Approve***)

3.4. Confirm the Date and Time for the Public Hearing to Allow Public Comment on the 2025 Budget and Fee Schedule Currently Scheduled for Monday, November 18th at 6:00 p.m.: Anna Barbieri, Board Chair ***(Information/Direction Requested)***

4. Closed Session *(If Needed)*

The Board of Trustees may temporarily recess the meeting to convene in a closed session to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual, pending or reasonably imminent litigation, and the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property, or other legally applicable reasons as provided by Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205.

5. Other Board Business

This time is set aside to allow Board Members to share and discuss topics.

6. Requested Items for the Next Board Meeting and Public Hearing, Monday, November 18, 2024, at 6:00 p.m.

- Staff Review of the 2025 Tentatively Adopted Budget and Fee Increases
- Public Hearing to Allow Public Comment on the Tentative 2025 Budget and Fee Increases
- Confirm the Date for the 2025 Budget Adoption on Monday, December 16, 2024, at 9:00 a.m. During the Board's Regularly Scheduled Meeting
- General Manager's Report

7. Adjourn

TOPICS/ OBJECTIVES	KEY POINTS/ DECISIONS	ACTION ITEMS WHO – WHAT – BY WHEN	STATUS
Call to Order / Roll Call			
	Board Chair Barbieri called the meeting to order, and Catarina conducted the roll call.		
1. Consent Items (<i>Approval Requested</i>)			
1.1 October 21, 2024, Special Board Meeting Minutes (Pending)	Board Member Ohrn motioned to postpone until November 18, 2024, after a more thorough review.	Motion to Postpone: Board Member Ohrn Second: Board Member Sudbury Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).	Moved to November 18, 2024
1.2 Lease Agreement with Bingham Creek Park Authority for Container Storage	There were no questions or comments on these consent items.	Motion to Approve: Board Member Ohrn Second: Board Member Sudbury Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).	Approved October 28, 2024
1.3 Interlocal Agreement with Salt Lake County for Waste and Recycling Collections at County Facilities			
1.4 Adoption of Resolution 4431 Approving Compensation Deferment, GM Serving on the Utah Local Governments Trust Board			
2. Meeting Open for Public Comments (<i>Comments are limited to 3 minutes.</i>)			
	There were no public comments.		
3. Business Items			
3.1 2024, 3 rd Quarter Financial Report: Pam Roberts, General Manager and Helen Kurtz, Finance Director (<i>Motion and Approve</i>)	<p>Pam began by explaining that WFWRD is required by statute to report quarterly financials and turned the time over to Helen after expressing her gratitude that she joined the team.</p> <p>Helen defined the columns of the report; 3rd Quarter 2024 YTD, Budget 2024, Budget 2024 Less 3rd Quarter 2024, the Percent of Budget, and same time YTD 2023.</p>	Motion to Approve: Board Member Piñon Second: Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).	Approved October 28, 2024

She reported that we are 75% of budget for residential waste collections. Total revenues increased \$355,024 from 2023 to 2024. This was primarily due to increased residential waste collection fees of \$118,153, increased non-residential waste collection fees of \$125,057, increased green curbside fees of \$54,642, and increased interest income of \$36,016.

Total personnel expenses for 2024 increased \$623,844 from 2023 primarily due to increased wages/salaries expense and increased health insurance expense of \$157,152 over 2023. Overtime decreased by \$65,638 compared to 2023. Helen pointed out the 410.96% percent of budget for Supplemental 401(k) which is due to a change in vendors. The vendors are paid from different general ledger account codes.

Total operating expenses increased \$482,761 in 2024 compared to 2023 primarily due to increased maintenance costs and are at 73% of budget. We are doing well there. Maintenance costs include parts and shop labor and are at 84% of budget. Overall, we are doing very well.

Fuel expenses as of September 30, 2024 are \$1.015M versus \$1.052M in 2023. The cost of fuel has decreased slightly from last year. 91% of the fuel purchased is CNG.

Helen showed maintenance costs from 2021-2024. YTD, we have spent \$3.4M. She also showed the 3rd quarter costs of \$1.1M.

YTD. we have recycled 14,392 tons versus 14,671 in 2023.

Board Chair Barbieri asked if the tonnages were from curbside cans only. Pam replied that it also includes front load services for city halls, etc., and that SCRP waste all gets landfilled.

Helen then showed the YTD refuse tons per facility. We have taken 60,738 tons to the Transfer Station, versus 61,346 in 2023.

Recycling costs per ton as of September 30, 2024, have ticked down slightly each month throughout the year so far (from less than \$60.00/per ton in January to \$35.00 in September).

In September we submitted and are expecting \$2,697,715 in certifications. The balance outstanding is larger (\$2,846,331) as citizens can apply for extensions year over year.

There were 36 customers that received refunds totaling \$6,382 in the third quarter. These are primarily due to overpayments.

Capital expenditures are \$4,120,973 for vehicles ordered in prior years. Helen's understanding is that we have ordered four diesel side load trucks for 2024, but they will not be received until 2025. Pam clarified that we paid for the chassis, and it will be the payment for the truck bodies with the arms and packers that we will pay in 2025.

Helen went on to report cash balances which are a little over \$4M in cash. This is due to the capital expenditures from the 2023. We expect the balance to be a little over \$6M by the year end after receipt of outstanding certification balances.

<p>Board Member Ohrn commented that we have seen our maintenance costs constantly increase exponentially and wondered if we have done a comparison on maintenance for our diesel trucks versus CNG trucks.</p> <p>Pam responded that we don't have any apples to apples comparisons because we have not received any side load diesel trucks yet. They will arrive next year and will be in the test group we talked about. Our Asset Manager has said that these are diesel trucks we have never run before. The last information we have is from 2018, the year we replaced the last trucks with CNG. There are other municipalities running diesel trucks such as Draper City and Salt Lake City. We also want to see the emission comparisons.</p> <p>Board Member Ohrn said she is just curious because sometimes we see a more state of the art CNG and maybe the parts are more expensive and cost more in maintenance. She wondered if we are seeing an uptick in maintenance based on the different types of vehicles.</p> <p>Pam replied that there is a large market for CNG. There are busses and other types of transportation that use CNG. Salt Lake County Fleet services the U of U and Salt Lake Community College, which of course are a different type of equipment. There is also the economy to scale.</p> <p>Board Member Ohrn was wondering if it costs more to maintain CNG than diesel. Pam said it is hard to know. We have done some comparisons with Draper's information but not everyone keeps track the way we do. She is proud of our team who analyzes the data so</p>		
--	--	--

	<p>we can be as efficient as possible and cost effective. We will have the true comparisons by second or third quarter of next year. The aging trucks are going out and the new trucks are coming in and we had to add the lubrication system for the arm as an operational expense whereas before it was part of the purchase. The total for the 10 trucks coming in is approximately \$70,000.</p> <p>With no other questions or comments, Board Chair Barbieri thanked Helen for working her magic and moved on to the next business item.</p>		
<p>3.2 Continued Discussions on the Proposed 2025 Budget and Fee Increases Including Follow-up on the Trailer Rental Program: Anna Barbieri, Board Chair <i>(Information/Direction Requested)</i></p>	<p>Board Chair Barbieri explained that this is a discussion that arose at the last meeting.</p> <p>She wanted to cover the budget and follow-up on the trailer rental program. At the last meeting it really stood out that trailers rentals and reservation costs were \$661,000 but we only bring in \$147,000 in revenues leaving a deficit of \$514,972. This discussion is what do we want to do with the trailer program and how does it affect the budget we are about to adopt. She wanted to reach out to the Board to see how they feel about the program, and if their cities use the program.</p> <p>There are only 83 trailer reservations estimated at \$700.00 per trailer rental for the canyons and north county residents.</p> <p>Pam stated that she did a little more digging and had Yael Johnson [Customer Service Manager] pull information per city, which is not in the packet, for which she apologized. The big users are Millcreek City who rented 253 trailers last year, Holladay City rented 230, Taylorsville at 179, and Cottonwood</p>		

Heights at 236. She did not have a breakout of how many were green and how many were bulk on the information pulled more recently.

Board Member Gray asked if last week it was reported that it averaged \$0.50 per household. Pam went back to the purpose that the program rolled out in 1997 as a means for residents to remove their bulky waste. There was an understanding from day one even when rolling it out that there would be a subsidy from the monthly fee. The thought was that it would help reduce illegal dumping. This is the same for the SCRP. They cost money, so the thought was that part of the monthly fee would go towards that and that was okay. The policy decision can be changed by the Board as they are the governing authority.

Pam went on to say that she recognizes that the Board asked her to bring back true costs, but we can only give averages but the more central a rental is such as Millcreek, Holladay, and Taylorsville, it will be “cheaper” than the outlying areas. To capture that is difficult. We can say with 90% confidence that those canyon and north county areas are going to be more expensive. The estimated dollars per rental is \$700.00 to \$800.00 per rental based on location. It reduces the dependency on the monthly fee, so we pulled that out because we are not considering SCRP right now. She is trying to treat that as the policy. Looking at the estimated “subsidy” thereafter would be \$0.43 to \$0.44 per home/per month at the current charges. We have a proposed recommendation to increase that going forward, keeping in mind that it could very well affect the number we rent. She noted that Yael’s numbers are different that what was presented last month. We showed 1,071 rentals but Yael’s information was

1,259. The more we rent the more it takes the subsidy down.

Pam noted that we are not the only government entity that offers this service. It is not uncommon to do this as a government for our municipalities.

- Murray City has a 30-yard bulk trailer rental. Two years ago, they mirrored their program after WFWRD's SCRP for bulky clean up. They surveyed residents a couple times to see if they would want to leave WFWRD and go to city services, and each time it has been "no." Weekly recycling is one reason they wanted to stay, the other reason was for the SCRP for bulky clean up. There is no charge for theirs which is done through their contracted vendor with limited scheduling like ours. Pam confirmed to Board Member Gray that Murray is subsidizing. Their green trailer is \$40.00 per rental which is also being subsidized.
- West Valley City has a 30-yard roll-off no charge, limited availability. They also do curbside once per month for their residents which is done by zone. There can only be so big of a pile, similar to what Sandy City does.
- Thanks to Hazel, who used to work for Draper City, and could provide some data. They have a 20-yard for \$120.00 with a weight limit of 6 tons, so we know that is subsidized. Their 30-yard is \$150.00, weight limit 10 tons. Pam did not realize they also offer a landfill voucher for \$10.00 off the fee. She assumes they go to the Trans-Jordan Landfill.
- Riverton has a 20-yard roll-off for \$240.00 up to 3 tons.

- South Salt Lake City has a 13-yard roll-off and she could not find their rates. Pam reminded everyone that the residents are allowed to take their residential truck or trailer load to the Transfer Station twice a month for no charge. It was an agreement that was made to be able to have the Transfer Station in South Salt Lake off 500 West and 3300 South. She didn't realize that South Salt Lake City just rolled out weekly recycling and increased their fees from \$12.00 per month to \$14.00 per month. This was the result of a resident survey.
- Sandy City has a 30-yard roll-off for \$250.00 and the City pays the tipping fees.

Pam restated that it is not uncommon for governments to do this.

Andy King, Asset Manager, the one who manages the trailer program, looked on line to find a couple examples:

Smaller providers, such as Trash Daddy, have a 15-yard for \$455.00 and a 30-yard for \$790.00

Waste Management, a larger provider, has a 15-yard bulk for \$817.00.

Pam further explained that before and after WFWRD separated from Salt Lake County, there were questions from elected officials if we should do this, and what is the purpose, so it's not uncommon. She noted that there is plenty of business out there. District residents will rent from a private hauler because the purpose of the trailers is not for a contractor to go in and do work at a resident's home and use our trailers. The

agreement residents sign say it is not a contractor doing the work, but their own personal clean-up project. Sometimes they will share with their neighbors.

Pam hoped that gave the information to help discussions on the services. She values the service and is willing to do whatever the Board directs.

Pam clarified to Board Member Gray that we provide an 18-yard trailer.

As the third largest user of the program, Board Chair Barbieri [Taylorsville] cares about it and if we continue with the program, which is what it sounds like most people want to do, do we want have individual cities pay for some of the fees? They get billed separately to make up for some of the fees. She asked the Board for their thoughts.

Board Member Gray stated that she would like to see what that looks like before she makes any decisions.

Board Chair Barbieri asked Pam to explain how the landfill voucher QR code works, the cities now get billed for ones that are being used.

Pam clarified that is not currently happening, WFWRD is paying the full amount. Board Chair Barbieri said eventually it can happen. If we send a trailer to Taylorsville for whatever reason, Taylorsville does pick up a portion of that cost. Pam replied that happens only if it is city-sponsored. For example, Mayor Bush [Kearns] sponsored a trailer for someone who was cleaning up after their sibling passed away. It comes out of the municipal services district funds.

Pam replied yes to Board Member Sudbury, we track usage by city and Magna is the highest. Renee pulled up the information from the District's MIS portal; Jorge Benitez' beautiful work of art that allows information at our fingertips.

Board Member Gray asked the difference between Cottonwood Heights and Cottonwood HTS. Renee replied that it is depends on the reports we receive from the landfill and shows the residents name and address, and that usage has decreased because now we can monitor it. Folks and contractors aren't going in to libraries and grabbing a stack.

Pam added that last year we spent \$92,000 related to vouchers and this year is around \$40,000 because we are controlling it.

Board Member Piñon asked if the intent was for vouchers to be publicly available from the Mayors and Councils, one per household. Pam responded that when they are at the libraries or city halls, they started to be monitored closer and there would be some kind of screening. Before people would go in and grab stacks. We started to curb that with limiting their use. She noted that somebody might go in and grab a stack and may not use them all. It's hard to track how many get distributed but we do track usage.

Board Member Piñon asked if the QR code was smart enough that it won't allow homes to visit multiple times. Pam and Renee replied yes, it is one use only. Renee went on to say that sometimes we will get a phone call, or someone will come in and say its not working and we can see that they have already used one for the calendar year. We will still give them one

if they come in because we don't want them walking away disgruntled.

Board Chair Barbieri commented that one of the best things is that we have seen usage drop appropriately, and no one has complained. It goes to show that when programs are used the way they are meant to be, for the most part people are pretty happy with the program. She feels better about that with Taylorsville being the second largest user. People aren't just taking a stack and using them that way.

Board Member Piñon asked if we can limit how the vouchers are released and if the QR code really is working. Pam replied yes, and eventually we will go paperless. There will be instances where someone may not be technically savvy. Board Member Piñon said he has a stash of vouchers at his house for when the Mayor calls and says someone needs one, he delivers it. He wonders if we need to change our practice from having a pile at the library or city hall to say, "use the QR code". Maybe those in the room are the ones who have the stash for those who don't have computers. Pam believed that was a good thought.

Back on the trailer topic, Board Member Gray believes there are two questions. One is the deficit and how it affects the fee increases. The other question is whether or not to subsidize. In the big scheme of things, half a million dollars is half a million dollars, and it will not fix our fee increase issue. It is less significant when it comes to how it affects the budget overall. Whether or not we should be subsidizing, there are plenty of municipalities that do. Paying an extra \$0.43 or \$0.50 a month for having the option for a trailer rental is worth it. Typically, when you need a trailer, you are

dealing with a lot of other expenses so anything you can do to make that project easier that is probably already more expensive than you think it's going to be.

Board Member Stitzer asked to give a quick reminder that with the Trans-Jordan Landfill vouchers, Copperton has a separate program they use. They were contracted with Trans-Jordan Landfill in conjunction with Rio Tinto. It is an older contract from the 1970's. They do not use WFWRD's voucher program at all. They have an entirely different program they use. She wanted to make sure the Board was aware of that and that is why Copperton is not on the list.

Vice Chair Shelton commented that there is a recommendation for a new price, and he also believes it is a good benefit that it makes us all team players, all of us working together. Some communities do not take advantage of the program as much as others, so it is a wash at the end of the day. He asked if the recommended rates are to keep up with the status quo, or how much does that price into the deficit. He does not mind if it goes up a little bit but thinks we should still help the program out because it is a good benefit for our communities.

Pam replied that it is tough to say because it depends on the number of rentals. We are increasing the bulk rate \$50.00 per trailer. Will it reduce the number of requests? The increase for green is to cover the tipping fee at Diamond Tree which is \$25.00 per load. The other thought is to have the roll-off containers available and the only way to determine true or close to true costs is to look at how many SCRP reservations we have because that is our measure for the hook lift and the roll-off. With just over 7,000 reservations last

year divided by the cost of \$1.1M it comes out to be an average of \$175.00 for each. We won't know a true cost until we roll it out.

Board Member Ohrn stated that she is not a proponent of subsidizing. Herriman does their own clean-up. There were 3,030 vehicles at this spring's clean-up. Herriman residents are paying for that, and they are subsidizing every other resident. If you live in a city that doesn't offer that, the city should cover the gap for WFWRD to provide that service.

Pam asked if the city should be billed for any additional costs. Board Member Ohrn replied that she doesn't know how complex that would be. Pam said it would be very complex. Board Member Ohrn added that we drive ourselves into holes if we don't cover costs.

Pam asked Rachel to share her comment about public good. Rachel hesitates to use the word subsidize. One of the reasons is that we are government, that is the whole point. People look at it as not just paying for an individual trailer rental and other people subsidizing it. Everyone is getting the benefit by paying \$0.40 extra a month as well as not having trash pile up in your neighborhood. Whether you use the trailers or not it depends, that's why people who use the trailers pay a little bit more than those who don't, but everyone is not using them and still getting the benefit.

Board Member Ohrn said this is the same argument we were using for the SCRP. If only a small percentage of our residents actually get it, but all of our cities benefit by not having piles of trash.

Board Member Sudbury asked if the trailer rentals are broken down by city. Pam replied yes, we can pull that information. It would be about \$75,000 more revenues to help offset the costs. \$50.00 for bulk and \$25.00 for green totaling \$75.00.

Vice Chair Shelton believes this is a really good benefit and is significantly cheaper than private entities who provide similar services. We may not be the cheapest but cities around us offer their own subsidy in different ways. It is a team effort, and he likes the proposed prices. He does not find them ridiculous. He would still rent one if he had a project and it is not an unreasonable price.

Board Member Gray talked about charging municipalities differently. Part of what we're doing is combining our efforts together to get economy to scale. If we start breaking things down like that, we could break it down on every level. Part of what we're doing by gathering together is to create an economy to scale in general. It makes more sense to just unify the costs for regular trash pick-up. Maybe Holladay uses the program more, but it costs them less to do their regular trash pick-up. She doesn't know how it all works but it makes sense to her to keep it the same. She imagines it would lower administrative costs by not raising it.

Pam replied that is why we didn't go with the back billing. We want to try to keep things as manageable as possible.

Board Chair Barbieri is grateful we have had this conversation. A half a million dollar deficit is significant. She and the Mayor are meeting with a

couple residents who have seen a \$5.00 increase on this one and they are paying another \$300.00-\$400.00 a year and its hard for them. They have kids or are on a fixed income trying to make it by. She doesn't want to dismiss that we are at a deficit of \$500,000. She appreciates the economy of scale and the fact that we have clean communities. That makes the program worth it. She wants to be really sensitive and knows Magna is really concerned as is Taylorsville and Herriman. These constant "It's only \$4.00, it's only \$0.50" start to add up. She also wants to be cognizant of the fact that our job is to see that WFWRD runs as efficiently as possible. Whatever they vote on makes sense to her. Each comment and argument are very worth the wait of what has been said. She wants to reemphasize why we brought this back to the table. We need to be cognizant of each dollar. Each dollar of every taxpayer is sacred money.

Board Chair Barbieri further commented that she likes the proposed increase. It sends a message if down the road we feel like we want to bill entities separately for the subsidy she is open to that as well. She also understands there is a lot of costs in tracking and billing. The vouchers are pretty easy with the trackable QR code.

Pam replied to Board Member Gray the prices before were \$190.00 for bulk and \$55.00 for green. Those price increases make sense to Board Member Gray.

Pam replied to Board Member Piñon that it was 1,071 total reservations presented last month but the new numbers show there was 1,259 rentals reserved last year. That takes the burden down off the monthly fee if we pull out the reservations. Board Member Piñon

calculated that it costs \$550.00 per rental. Pam said that after reservations it is \$449.00 but there are more rentals not accounted for. Roughly \$0.43 of the monthly fee is going towards the ability to rent and also for clean communities, which she believes is a very good point.

Pam does not want to discount the concern that everyone has raising rates is that she pays for public transportation if she uses it or not. She pays the user fees for school which she did for decades before she had step-children. She respects every Board Member's responsibility as an elected official and representing their residents. She recognizes we are not the only ones coming to the table needing more funds and revenues. We are looking at everything and will adjust anything we can. If we can make some adjustments, she will bring that back later. There have been changes made to the budget based on Board Member concerns. She appreciates the discussion, debate, and dialogue because it helps get us to the decision making.

Board Member Ohrn asked how difficult it is rather than combining the SCRP and trailer reservations to separate them and make trailer reservations by itself. It's actually more SCRP than trailer reservations. Pam replied that we would pull them out.

Pam also noted the north county residents have been annexed into Salt Lake City. It doesn't make sense to have them in our boundaries. It will slightly reduce that cost. She will break it out and report it accordingly.

	<p>Board Member Gray asked if it will reduce overall costs for weekly trash pick-up. Pam responded that we contract with Salt Lake City to provide that curbside service, and our exchange is we provide trailer reservations for the annual clean up. The former unincorporated county had the option to reserve a trailer each year like the canyon residents. We bill the residents in the District and the city bills their own.</p> <p>With no further questions or comments, Board Chair Barbieri moved on to the next business item.</p>		
<p>3.3 Tentative Adoption of the Tentative 2025 Budget and Fee Schedule: Pam Roberts and Helen Kurtz (<i>Motion and Approve</i>)</p>	<p>Pam introduced the tentative budget as “subject to change” because she knows there will be continued discussions, debate, and dialogue. When we proposed the budget, it was a \$5.50 per home per month increase. With Zions’ information, the Board asked staff to bring back a \$6.50 per home per month increase then \$1.50 and \$1.50 to get to \$29.00 per home per month by 2027. We are taking it up one year at a time. To follow Board’s direction, if they want to make any changes now and do the final adoption in December which is her recommendation because there is still discussion that we don’t plan on adopting on November 18th and the public comment stage that we are required to do.</p> <p>Pam explained that we need to publish what our rate is going to be two weeks before that meeting. The second publication is the week prior to that. She hopes we can come to some sort of a consensus today that we can start drafting the publication.</p> <p>We would keep what is proposed for trailer rentals. Pam bumped up the 14-yard roll-off to \$185.00 but can bring it back down to what was shown previously.</p>	<p>Motion to Approve: Board Member Piñon</p> <p>Second: Vice Chair Shelton</p> <p>Votes: Board Chair Barbieri: Aye Vice Chair Shelton: Aye Board Member DeSirant: Aye Board Member Gray: Aye Board Member Hales: Aye Board Member Holton: Aye Board Member Ohrn: Nay Board Member Piñon: Aye Board Member Schaeffer: Aye Board Member Stitzer: Aye Board Member Stringham: Aye Board Member Sudbury: Nay Board Member Zuspan: Aye</p>	<p>Approved October 28, 2024</p>

She believes we can use existing drivers because we are not sure how many rentals we will get.

Board Member Sudbury commented that Magna residents don't recycle every week, maybe every couple of weeks. Some say they don't have very much, and the neighbors are always good about sharing. He asked what the price would be to go every other week.

Pam replied that it is estimated to be about a third, roughly \$1.50 per home per month in "savings" or reduction in fee. This is something we have talked about in a few Board Meetings and her recommendation is if the Board wants to entertain reducing the service, we need to survey residents. It is the residents that have said they want it. When she saw that South Salt Lake City bumped up to weekly and bumped up their fee, she was a little caught off guard. They have been biweekly for decades, so it was the residents saying they wanted it and are willing to pay.

Pam further explained that in 2018 and 2019 we surveyed residents with a \$1.50 fee increase we would need to keep weekly recycling and there was well over two-thirds, 75% District-wide wanted to keep it and willing to pay. Even Kearns and Magna northwest was over two-thirds. Last year's survey was to talk about the increasing costs to provide services. We asked if residents still support weekly recycling with increased costs but did not include a dollar amount. 95% of respondents want to keep it. It will likely drop down to 75% if we include a dollar amount.

Pam replied to Board Member Gray that it is a random sample survey that is done through our website and social media. We generally get 5,000 to 6,000 respondents which is a good sample size for the District at large.

Board Member Ohrn commented if you have 70,000 homes and only a couple thousand respond, is it truly the overall consensus of your residents? We can't force people to take the survey, and you have to know for sure how everyone feels.

Board Member Piñon stated that he sees more full blue bins than black bins in his community, so the level of service is very important to him for a few increase. Pam added that our Quality Assurance Inspectors and Sustainability Coordinator monitor the set-out rate which is in the mid-seventieth percentile of people who put their cans out every week which is quite high.

James Kelsey, Sustainability Coordinator, confirmed the set-out rate is around 70% and the bins average over three-quarters full.

Board Chair Barbieri talked about when she came on board in 2021 everyone was at home, and she doesn't anticipate [online shopping] going down at all. She has retail stores, and her online business keeps increasing. She believes people will continue recycling and it is something we could look at down the road and really see where people want to be. It is a popular program in Taylorsville and residents fill up their blue cans.

Pam replied to Board Member Gray that South Salt Lake City increased \$2.00 per home per month when they moved to weekly recycling.

Because we are voting on the tentative 2025 budget, Board Chair Barbieri believes if there are places WFWRD could be more efficient or cut back, or change the way billing is done, this doesn't mean we have to adopt the budget. We can't change the budget for 2026 because we have recommended incremental increases for 2026 and 2027. It doesn't mean we have to follow through on the 2026 and 2027 budget increases. Perhaps gas prices will go down or we'll find out we are collecting less SCRP tonnage. We can account for whatever the ifs are for 2026 and 2027.

Rachel said by adopting a phased approach knowing that fee increases will go into effect and Pam can account for that automatically. The fee increase process is technically different than the budget process. We can do a fee increase any time of year and there is a procedure for that. Fee increases are what requires us to have a 6:00 p.m. meeting but the budget hearing doesn't. We just combine them. She clarified to Pam that even if we don't raise rates, we still have to have a budget hearing, but it doesn't have to be at 6:00 p.m. A lot of Districts do their budget hearings at their morning meetings if fees are not being raised.

Board Chair Barbieri entertained a motion to adopt the tentative budget and fee schedule.

Pam asked for clarification on the options. Board Chair Barbieri stated that there haven't been any other comments, so she suggested we move forward. Board Member Sudbury stated that he's in favor of anything that may be less. He also commented that it is hard to sit on the water board and see 150 shut offs every week.

Board Member Piñon motioned with a second by Vice Chair Shelton. Board Members Ohrn and Sudbury voted nay, all others agreed, and the motion passed.

Board Member Ohrn commented that since she was elected her role on the Board is only because she is a council member in Herriman. Her 100% job is to her residents. Boards are interesting because you get elected and it's "hey, can you serve on this, can you serve on this" and she doesn't have any idea what they are. It takes time to understand because she is not a garbage or mosquito expert. There are so many things she doesn't know. She comes to the Board Meetings once a month and studies her packets, but she also has a job and many other responsibilities besides her city council responsibilities. 100% relies on this fee and professionalism of WFWRD staff which she respects and knows we try really hard to keep costs down. She has no idea how much a private hauler charges. It is disingenuous for her to pretend like she does and say what is the best route for our citizens to go. Last week she talked about Herriman going out for RFP because her job is to protect the people who elected her. It doesn't mean that WFWRD would do anything to damage our residents, but they have had to make a lot of tough decisions in Herriman. They had to leave UPD and create their own police force. Sometimes it comes to a point when it makes more sense for cities to do their own thing. The process we go through helps her understand that and this fee increase is more than she can swallow right now.

She went on to say that as Board Member Stringham mentioned last week, we talked about bites or nibbles. She has residents the same as Board Member Sudbury does. She recently drove through Millcreek and her guess is there is a lot of people there that don't make a lot of money. There are homes that make crazy amounts of money. There is such a varying degree of people. She spoke to a lady on her way to this meeting about the mosquito abatement board is just a tiny bit, and the library gets more off her taxes than her own city does. There is a list on property taxes and WFRD is not listed on them because we call it a fee but nobody in her city can say no to this. They have to pay so to her it is a tax. That's just the taxes. Then they go to the grocery store. This lady had a \$700.00 increase to her combined car and home insurance. It is layering on people right now and it's just too much. We previously talked about a \$2.75 per home per month increase and a lot of Americans are just trying to get through. They don't have the comfort of saying we are going to make a lot of money to cover the next thing, they are getting by. She can't in good conscience tell her residents we are going to take a big chunk. We can push it out further because they are trying to get by. That is why she has to say no. Not that she believes anything negative about the organization but simply because that is her job and responsibility.

Board Member Holton commented that as he mentioned to Pam, we don't know how this is going to shake out. If this fee increase is to a point where it forces some of the other members or residents of the District to want to leave, the financial impact on those that stay would be much higher. We all look at what our residents find palatable but being conscious of

what else is out there. How other cities might react because at the end of the day our residents will bear a larger burden. He expressed his appreciation to Board Member Ohrn for all that she does to be transparent. All of the Board's first duty is to their residents. Everyone is fully open with each other with what their cities want to do so we can make the best decisions as a whole to keep the District healthy. We will see how this shakes out over time and won't hold any fault because we completely understand if Herriman wants to leave because the fee is too high, it is probably too high.

Board Member Sudbury agrees that WFWRD does an awesome job and is very supportive. The problem is that each city has a whole different outlook. This isn't a big deal to those on the east side, but it is a really big deal to them on the west side. Being the Chair of the water district, they have 150 shut-offs a month. It is a majority of the same people every month and they try to work with them repeatedly, but it is tough for those looking for the next dollar to have a meal. He will recommend Magna also goes out for an RFP.

Board Chair Barbieri appreciates the fact they are going out for RFP because it is wise, especially for new cities. That gives comfort to the residents that they are doing everything they can to make sure their services are covered at the most efficient rate. She appreciates everyone's comments, and it is a reminder that our job is working with municipalities and government entities trying to come together. There are so many different entities trying to make it work. We know that with economy to scale, if one, two, three or four municipalities pull out, the rest of us are paying more. There is some concern that while we don't

contract with WFWRD. Rachel corrected to say that there are no contracts with cities. Board Chair Barbieri went on to say that we don't contract with WFWRD, but we are a part of them, and it is really hard for cities to just walk away from WFWRD and she wants to be sensitive if it comes to that point, it may not be easy but as Board Member Holton said, there is that desire. If we get to the point where we feel like we have to be here, as a Board she is really proud of what everyone has been saying. She feels honored to work with all of them and all their different opinions and concerns about their communities and individual residents. She then asked legal counsel, Rachel Anderson to talk about how the District works.

Rachel added that concerns should be addressed and explained how a city would withdraw and the legal process it takes. Special districts such as WFWRD are made to be independent, legal entities that are justifiable and need to be just as sturdy as a city. There are built-in protections in the law to keep districts sturdy so they cannot be dissolved or imploded quickly. There are a lot of financial reasons that districts need to prove for outside funding reasons that we are reliable government entities that don't just dissolve because people want to leave. A lot of districts rely on getting bonds or lease financing, they are required to have good bond ratings and financial institutions are looking at districts to see if they are reliable. Are they going to have portions up and leave, which would affect the district as a whole. The law specifically protects districts in a way to ensure that doesn't happen. Just as with a city, we wouldn't want a neighborhood to withdraw. The withdrawal statute that a city would have to go through is pretty onerous. The primary route is a petition which requires 51% of

resident signatures and there would be a public hearing. Alternatively, the city and the district could file a resolution to proceed, which is more of a negotiation for a departure-type route.

Board Member Holton added that we need to be as reasonable as possible with other districts. These things can become very political and if there is enough uproar it becomes more than the letter of the law.

Rachel concluded that there is a list of considerations in deciding to approve or deny a withdrawal. It specifically says a district should not approve a withdrawal because it would go in to a breach or default of any other financial or contractual obligations. If we made an agreement to make lease payments on a truck, often when portions of a district leave or split, there is an agreement for those residents to continue paying for a number of years. We can't say no because it is too complicated. If it gets to the point where they feel that way, we need to address that in one way or another. It is not as simple as "we're out", but it is a process.

Board Member Stringham commented that sometimes when you go out for RFP it is not apples to apples. You'll get a private entity that can only do one part of the service and don't do everything WFWRD does. She wants to be very cognizant that when people go out to bid, they are only getting parts of what WFWRD does. If they are not bidding apples to apples, we need to be able to show the equivalent cost of our services. She has seen it many times where municipalities go out to bid it is not apples to apples.

They will get a lower bid which sounds great, but they lose a lot of services they won't be getting with the new contract.

Board Member Ohrn agreed with Board Member Stringham. Hopefully they would be intelligent enough in their city that they would look at all services to understand what their residents want. Is it fluff for most of the residents or are they essential services? The news from Rachel is not new to her, she has had a lot of discussions with their attorney and city staff and understands the processes. She is unsure how Herriman became part of the District in the beginning. They have no documentation that says they agreed to it.

Rachel and Pam clarified that it was back when they were unincorporated [within the District boundaries].

Board Member Ohrn hopes that we look at what is best for the cities. There is a lot of negotiating that took place with SLVESA, and she was not suggesting that it was simple. She thinks it is their right to be able to justify costs. If we look at something that is very disparaging, as a community we should be very loud about that, especially if we are being told by a government entity that they are locked in and can't leave. 51% wouldn't be hard to get from a community if you showed something like that. Her hope and expectation are that we won't be able to say "whoa, we're being price-gouged". She believes we do a good job, and it is her responsibility to understand that.

Board Chair Barbieri commented that she wants to be associated with organizations where people want to be associated. She plans to be here another three years

and has loved how they have all worked together and wants to continue to see that happen so cities like Herriman want to be here and that can be here. She hopes the day doesn't come where we say that essential services are fluff and has appreciated Pam's direction for running a really efficient service.

Board Member Ohrn stated that when we talked about the last salary increase, we needed to do it to keep people here. Pam clarified that benefits are around 27-28% of salaries. There were comments made that people are young and don't appreciate those benefits and just need to get a paycheck. She doesn't know if we can legally offer certain things to certain people but wonders if it would be better to say "okay, instead of paying the extra 30%, we'll give you a 15% pay raise" and save the other portion if they don't appreciate it. She watches kids that work at the city for a while and cash in their URS when they quit because they don't understand the benefits. If they are not understanding the benefits, it is not our job to raise them. These are working adults making those decisions. What would it do to the cost of our benefits package if we offered options? We won't offer you that.

Pam noted that we just signed on with a new health insurance broker and have no premium increases in 2025. This is unbelievable and saved quite a bit as we plugged in a 9% increase. She was hearing 20% from other entities and people out of state and was a little worried. She gave a shout out to Hazel Dunsmore, HR Manager, who has been working with the new broker, Alliant. Their approach is to start early. We will start looking at benefits in the spring and they will help us manage benefits and reduce costs. We are already starting the discussions, and Pam thinks we need to go

back to the drawing board and really look at our compensation package. Are there different ways we can be more creative that we are not having a long-term obligation, and everything keeps going up. She promised there will be more diving in, and her hope is that we won't lose anybody. We have tried to make it an easy decision [for our residents] throughout the decades of doing small increases. Pam apologized that we waited too long [between fee increases], and it wasn't enough. Now we know where we are at and as staff, we will adjust. There is more information in the meeting packet but is not sure where the Board wants to go with information sharing. We are looking at ways to trim and cut.

Board Member Stringham stated that the comment was made about people who have seen their taxes and homeowner's insurance increase. Her property taxes and homeowner's insurance bill come in the same month. Her homeowner's insurance increased \$400.00, and her property taxes increased almost \$350.00 in Kearns. Between the two of them, that is an amount she hadn't counted on. There are also excessive increases for SLVESA [police] and the fire district. Whether it is fees or taxes, they are astronomical. She's a single mom and has to take them out monthly. If she didn't take it out monthly for the year, she wouldn't have it at the end of the year. She increased both amounts she is taking out \$200.00 and never expected it would be almost double. Single-income or fixed-income families struggle when these things are happening. It is important to do the best we can and look at the budgets we have. She also recognizes there are many like her who have to take on extra work over the holidays and an extra job again, go back to three or four jobs shortly, to be able to pay it

all off. It is a hard world that we live in right now and when you're having to do those type of things it is not easy. For those who have two income families or live in more affluent areas, it is a little easier and they don't understand some of the mentality of where we're coming from. She wants everyone to understand that there are those of us with one breadwinner in one house living in an area where the incomes are very low, and these increases are really getting to them. Board Chair Barbieri thanked everyone. Life is messy and paying bills is messy and maintaining all of the services we need can be difficult. She has faith in WFWRD that we can continue at this rate and get the best bang for our buck. WFWRD has always proven themselves and have done well.

Pam then explained that we have the indigent [and hardship] waiver program. If a resident meets the threshold of being indigent, they apply through the Treasurer's office at the county that we reduce the garbage fee by half. It is part of what we adopted in our fee schedule every year so it would be half of the rate for anyone that is truly indigent.

Board Member Holton asked Pam to share information on the indigent waiver as he would love to understand the program a little better so he can make sure it is connected to the people in his community. He doesn't know what the qualifications are and would love to be educated more. Pam agreed to send the information.

Board Member Stitzer echoed what a few people have said and is in between both of the sides. They have seen a lot of the same increases in Copperton. They just saw proposed increases with SLVESA, and UFSA proposed increases, and tax-related increases. The

Pam to send out the information about the indigent and hardship policies and the process through the Treasurer's Office.

<p>difference for them is that they get real numbers from WFWRD and see line-by-line items. We have a great Board that goes through every single item and tries to find those cuts, all the way down to benefits and administrative costs. She thinks that WFWRD out of the majority of the tax increases and increases in general that have been proposed to the Board, has probably done the most fantastic job of being able to cut away at the budget, reduce or remove things from the budget, and there hasn't been a significant increase for quite some time. This is something we may want to think about and learn from going forward (she has been on the Board since 2016) is the fact that when we go years and years and years without increases, at some point we are going to have to have an increase, this is a pretty substantial increase, and doesn't think anybody is excited or happy when they see increases and paying more out, but out of all the increases that have been proposed so far, this is probably the only one that has been the most transparent with the most information. This Board is willing to sit and discuss it for as long as it needs to be discussed to try to find something that works. She believes the biggest issue we have faced so far is trying to figure out anything from the SCRP, the landfill vouchers, the services that are provided, whether or not to go for an RFP, is that fact that all of our communities are very, very, unique. No two are the same and that is something the Board really needs to take into consideration. We have heard from people who live in Kearns, Millcreek, Herriman, Cottonwood Heights and now Copperton, and even down to the SCRP, she was on the Board's side for a long time but that is primarily because they share driveways in Copperton. They don't have the same area as any other municipality, community, cities, or towns. That is something that could benefit us going</p>		
--	--	--

forward if we talk about subsidizing different types of services, which services to provide, and things that need to be the responsibility of a city, town, or municipality and what needs to be paid by WFWRD, what needs to be split, how it needs to be subsidized, and what people are actually paying for. She also echoed Board Member Holton's comment that she would like to know about the indigent program. She doesn't know enough about it to make her residents aware of it. Whenever there are things that they can do to make their lives easier, the Board's life easier, or WFWRD's life easier, that is where she sits at this point. The increase is almost a necessity, and it doesn't look like we'll be able to do much without it if we don't remove services. In order to stay the way we are, she doesn't see any other direction than to increase and appreciates they have been able to see every penny. They ask certain questions on items they have discussed for hours until everybody understands them. She can speak for her council on this and have many conversations about this. She thanked everyone for that.

Board Chair Barbieri thanked Board Member Stitzer and looks forward to all of the Board Members being really involved. They have all been really involved, taking advantage of the information that is provided to the Board every month, and getting their comments and concerns out in the open early in the year and taking time to focus on some of the items that are coming before them regarding fee increases and all the responsibilities of WFWRD.

With no other questions or comments, Board Chair Barbieri moved on to the next business item.

3.4 Confirm the Date and Time for the Public Hearing to Allow Public Comment on the 2025 Budget and Fee Schedule Currently scheduled for Monday, November 18th at 6:00 p.m. Anna Barbieri, Board Chair <i>(Information/Direction Requested)</i>	Board Chair Barbieri entertained a motion to approve the date and time for the Public Hearing to allow public comment on the 2025 budget and fee schedule.	Motion to Confirm: Board Member Gray Second: Board Member Piñon	Approved October 28, 2024
4. Closed Session (If Needed)			
	<i>No closed session was needed.</i>		
5. Other Board Business			
	<i>There was no other Board business.</i>		
6. Requested Items for the Board Meeting & Public Hearing Monday, November 18, 2024, 6:00 p.m.			
	Board Chair Barbieri reviewed items for the next Board Meeting & Public Hearing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Review of the 2025 Tentatively Adopted Budget and Fee Increases • Public Hearing to Allow Public Comment on the Tentative 2025 Budget and Fee Increases • Confirm the Date for the 2025 Budget Adoption on Monday, December 16, 2024, at 9:00 a.m. During the Board’s Regularly Scheduled Meeting • General Manager’s Report 		
7. Adjourn			
	Pam thanked the Board for caring about the organization, our services, her, and our team as much as they do. Everything the Board brings up is out of care and legitimate questions and concerns and she welcomes all of them. She urged the Board to reach out to her if they have questions before a Board Meeting, or any other time. With no further business, Board Chair Barbieri thanked everyone for attending and entertained a motion to adjourn.	Motion to Adjourn: Board Member Sudbury Second: Board Member Gray Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes). <i>Meeting end time: 10:41 a.m.</i>	Approved October 28, 2024