

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

DATE/TIME	LOCATION	ATTENDEES
<p>Monday, July 28, 2025 9:00 a.m.</p> <p>Next Board Meeting Monday, August 25, 2025 9:00 a.m.</p>	<p>Public Works Building 604 West 6960 South Midvale, UT 84047</p>	<p><u>Board Members:</u> Greg Shelton (Chair)-White City, Emily Gray (Vice Chair)-City of Holladay, Diane Turner-Murray City, Matt Holton-Cottonwood Heights, Anna Barbieri-City of Taylorsville, Sherrie Ohrn-Herriman City, Patrick Schaeffer-Kearns City, Robert Piñon- Emigration Canyon, Thom DeSirant-Millcreek City</p> <p><u>Participating Electronically:</u> Laurie Stringham-Salt Lake County, Marci Houseman-Sandy City</p> <p><u>Excused:</u> Mick Sudbury-Magna City, Keith Zuspan-Town of Brighton, Tessa Stitzer-Town of Copperton</p> <p><u>District & Support Staff:</u> Pam Roberts, General Manager Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel Helen Kurtz, Finance Director David Ika, Operations Manager Hazel Dunsmore, Human Resources Manager Renee Plant, Administrative Manager Molly Jeppson, Accountant/Treasurer Andre Perov, GIS Coordinator (<i>Webex</i>) Catarina Garcia, Executive Assistant/Board Clerk</p> <p><u>Public:</u> Abby Evans-Salt Lake County, Patrick Craig-Salt Lake County, Jennifer Kennedy- Murray City, Justun Edwards-Herriman City, Cherie Anderson-Intermountain Regional Landfill, Evan Tyrrell</p>

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

To be held Monday, July 28, 2025 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=m11ce3ad37b62a22e42bfb360484c63de>

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: Greg Shelton, Board Chair
Roll Call: Catarina Garcia, Board Clerk

1. Consent Items (*Approval Requested*)

1.1. June 23, 2025, Board Meeting Minutes

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@wfwrdutah.gov before Sunday, July 27, 2025, 9:00 p.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. 2025 2nd Quarter Financial Report and Cash Projections: Helen Kurtz, Finance Director, and Pam Roberts, General Manager (**Information**)
- 3.2. Moving to Paperless Billing and Plan for Monthly Billing January 1, 2026: Helen Kurtz, Finance Director (**Information/Direction**)
- 3.3. 2024 Fraud Risk Assessment: Helen Kurtz, Finance Director (**Information/Approval**)
- 3.4. Follow-up on Expanding the Seasonal Container Reservation Program (SCRIP) Using Trailer Program Resources: Pam Roberts, General Manager (**Direction Requested**)
- 3.5. West Jordan City Annexation of Unincorporated Oquirrh Highlands, July 1, 2025: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel (**Information/Direction**)

3.6. Letter from Herriman City Requesting Withdrawal: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel
(Information/Direction)

3.6.1. Follow-up on State Statutes Related to Boundary Adjustments

4. Other Board Business: *This time is set aside to allow Board Members to share and discuss topics.*

5. Requested Items for the Next Board Meeting, Monday, August 25, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

- Recommended Policy Amendments to Strengthen Best Practices
- Follow-up on West Jordan Annexation
- Follow-up on Herriman City's Request for Withdrawal
- General Manager's Report
 - Overview of Establishing the WFWRD Organization
 - Strategic Measures of Success
 - Succession Planning

6. Closed Session to Discuss Personnel Matters: *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.*

7. Adjourn

TOPICS/ OBJECTIVES	KEY POINTS/ DECISIONS	ACTION ITEMS WHO – WHAT – BY WHEN	STATUS
Call to Order / Roll Call			
	Board Chair Shelton called the meeting to order, and Catarina conducted the roll call.		
1. Consent Items (<i>Approval Requested</i>)			
1.1 June 23, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes	There were no questions or comments on the minutes.	Motion to Approve: Vice Chair Gray Second: Board Member Desirant Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).	Approved July 28, 2025
2. Meeting Open for Public Comments			
	There were no public comments.		
3. Business Items			
3.1.2025 2nd Quarter Financial Report and Cash Projections: Helen Kurtz, Finance Director, and Pam Roberts, General Manager (<i>Information</i>)	<p>Pam asked to first introduce and welcome Molly Jeppson, Accountant/Treasurer who started with the District on Monday, July 07, 2025. She was thanked and welcomed by the Board.</p> <p>Helen then reported on the 2025 2nd Quarter Financial Report and Cash Projections with the following highlights:</p> <p>Revenues: After the second quarterly billing at the new rate, revenues are \$3.4M more than at the same time in 2024 for residential waste collections and green curbside revenue increased \$136,000 which are increases of 31% and 18% respectively. We are 50% through the budget year and total revenue is 53% of budget, as expected.</p>		

Personnel Expenses: Wages and salaries are up 5.2% over 2024 primarily due to the 4% COLA for 2025 the Board approved. The remaining increase is a combination of employee merit increases on their anniversaries and PTO payouts for separated employees. The good news today is that overtime is down almost \$75,000 due to being nearly fully staffed, compared to the same period in 2024 when we were really struggling.

Operating Expenses: Total operating expenses are \$620,000 lower than the same period in 2024 due to lower tipping fee costs, tonnages, and lower fuel and maintenance caused by commissioning and decommissioning of trucks in 2024. There were also can purchases in June for 2024 and 2025. We purchased fewer cans in 2025 resulting in \$160,000 less.

Capital Expenditures: We budgeted eight CNG trucks, but we ordered eight diesel, which are \$27,000 less per truck. We have placed an order but have yet to receive anything so there are no associated expenditures yet. Truck purchases for 2025 will total \$3.2M, allowing a \$217,000 savings from the budgeted amount.

Pam reminded the Board that we budgeted \$436,600 for CNG trucks and were notified by the vendor that it would be \$450,000 per truck, which was another motivation to purchase diesel trucks, \$50,000 less per truck.

Vice Chair Gray asked about down payments, and Helen replied that we get the trucks in pieces, first the chassis then the body. We do not put a down payment when the order is placed but pay for the pieces upon

receipt. She believes the payments will be divided between this year and next. We received two of the diesel trucks in June that we ordered in 2023. We received the chassis in 2024, just received the bodies in June, and the other two in July. The variance is \$335,680.

Maintenance: Maintenance costs are down \$63,649 from the same time in 2024. There were significant increases from 2023 to 2024 which was related to the increase pricing for parts, shop labor, and receiving new trucks in 2024. There is a cost associated with commissioning new trucks to put into service and decommissioning old trucks. Actual general maintenance has not decreased nor did we have 10 trucks come in.

Fuel Expense History: Fuel expenses are significantly less compared to this time in 2024 due to the price of fuel decreasing for both CNG and diesel of approximately \$142,000. Diesel in 2024 was \$3.13 per gallon and \$2.67 per gallon in 2025. CNG in 2024 was \$2.08 per gallon and \$1.77 in 2025.

Tonnages: All commodity tonnages have decreased slightly compared to the same time in 2024. Tipping fees have decreased as well due to lower tonnages and the price and proximity model that optimizes tipping location. The cumulative reduction in tons and strategic routing resulted in a \$132,000 decrease in tipping fees year-to-date. That number is a bit low as it is actually \$155,000. Average tipping fees paid by WFWRD are \$36.00 per ton for waste, \$38.00 per ton for recycling, and \$17.00 per ton for green. We are looking into the decreased tonnages. It could be lighter loads, we thought it may be somewhat tied to

consumer spending but the initial look did not tie it to that.

Customer Refunds: During the second quarter we had 45 refunds totaling \$21,079. The majority were overpaid accounts, 11 of the 18 were people who paid the quarterly price monthly. This totaled \$9,700 and of course will be fixed when we go to monthly billing. There were six that overpaid online or through Xpress Bill Pay. Eight accounts were being billed for an additional can they did not have.

Cash Balances 2020-2025: We can see with the fee increases we are getting back into a more comfortable cash balance range which is a great thing in Helen's opinion.

Pam took a moment to thank the Board for approving the fee increase. She knows it was tough to implement the 33% fee increase but as they could see, we really needed it.

Preliminary Cash Projections Through 2030: Helen stated that there were some assumptions made. We are assuming we are spending 98% of the budgeted expenses, a 1% increase in revenues, and a 3% increase in operating costs. We don't really know what is going to happen but right now inflation is under 3%. This contemplates the increased costs of going to monthly billing that is netted against what Helen thinks will be reasonably mitigated against those costs.

Pam clarified that it does not include the \$1.50 per home per month increase recommended by Zions for 2026 or 2027. She also noted that regarding truck sales and net proceeds, we are not able to sell the CNG side

	<p>load trucks. Part of the issues relate to the brand, and we still have 21 of those trucks. That revenue is to be determined.</p> <p>Helen went on to say that we do plan to propose to pass on the transaction fee for credit card payments and it includes the increase of interest income based on increased cash flow. We are also doing an e-bill push to encourage customers to enroll in e-bills. She would like to more than double the number of customers on e-bill, which will be reviewed in the next business item. With all the assumptions built in, it appears the next fee increase would have to be in 2028, give people a rest for a couple years. She agreed with Pam that overall, this is good news.</p> <p>Board Chair Shelton thanked Helen for the hard work she put into her report and moved on to the next business item.</p>		
<p>3.2.Moving to Paperless Billing and Plan for Monthly Billing January 1, 2026: Helen Kurtz, Finance Director <i>(Information/Direction)</i></p>	<p>Helen showed the communication plan timeline for Moving to Paperless Billing and Monthly Billing.</p> <p>21% (18,357) of our customers are currently enrolled in e-bill, which she feels is reasonable to say we can double. 36% use autopay, and 12% are enrolled in both.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan started in June with community newsletters and social media posts. • We added the e-billing information to the hold message for customers placed on hold. • We included the information in the welcome packets for new customers from new builds or changes of ownership. We also included information about moving to monthly billing in the welcome packets. 		

- Bill inserts were included with the Q2 and Q3 bills with a QR code. It was brought to our attention in the Pre-Board Meeting that it can be a little cumbersome and it isn't obvious what they need to do so we are changing the QR code to make that process a little easier. We don't want people to give up and not be passionate enough to continue the enrollment.
- As Pam suggested, we will also have a QR code on our new truck wraps for the four new trucks.
- We will be sending emails every two months to people we have an email address for through Xpress Bill Pay advertising e-billing.
- In October we will start advertising monthly billing the Q3 bills that are sent for the September 30th billing and the Q4 bills that are sent in January for the December billing.
- There will be a notice on the front page of our website announcing monthly billing.
- Cart tags will be placed on every can in the month of December explaining monthly billing.
- The first monthly bill will be in February for the January 01, 2026 services and implementation of monthly billing.

Vice Chair Gray asked if we could set the default to e-billing for new customers. Helen replied that Renee discovered there is federal legislation prohibiting a default to e-billing and we cannot do that. Pam mentioned we could also push e-billing on cart tags as well. Helen wants people to be hit over the head with the information.

Board Member Holton asked about the messaging. Helen showed the bill insert, which was also in Spanish, with the bullet points of saving paper, saving

	<p>money, reduce clutter, and a sustainable future. She showed the social media post and community newsletter messages. The truck wrap will combine the theme of all of them.</p> <p>Board Member Holton stated that it might be worth changing the messaging a little to see if there is a higher uptake rate to see if certain messaging is working better than others. For instance, saying “Help us keep fees low – go paperless.” Something very simple to see if there was a higher percentage of people responding to that. So, when we are spending so much money out there, we know what messages are more catchy. Helen agreed that it was a good idea. Renee Plant suggested we change the QR code for each change in messaging as a way to track which messages have the most impact.</p> <p>Board Chair Gray asked if we have noticed a change since the first messaging in June. Helen responded that she ran the numbers in May and there was an increase of 399 enrollments since then.</p> <p>Board Chair Shelton expressed his appreciation for Helen’s hard work on this topic as well and moved on to the next business item.</p>		
<p>3.3.2024 Fraud Risk Assessment: Helen Kurtz, Finance Director (<i>Information/Approval</i>)</p>	<p>Helen reported this annual report is required to be submitted by the State Auditor and presented to an organization’s governing board. The formal explanation is to “help local governments identify, assess, and mitigate the risk of fraud, abuse and non-compliance within an organization”.</p> <p>Helen believes the purpose is awareness and that the State Legislature and State Auditor want to ensure that the top echelon of all the entities are aware of what is</p>	<p>Motion to Approve: Board Member Ohrn Second: Board Member Barbieri</p> <p>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</p>	<p>Approved July 28, 2025</p>

going on in the day-to-day operations when it comes to internal controls.

WFWRD's rating is a low risk with a score of 335 and has been consistent the last few years. The first question "Does the entity have adequate basic separation of duties or mitigating controls as outlined in the attached Basic Separation of Duties Questionnaire?" earned us 200 points and is highly important and something we would pay very close attention to anyway.

WFWRD was able to answer Yes to all 12 questions on the Basic Separation of Duties Questionnaire except question 3 for which we have a Mitigating Control which is allowed. The question is "Are all the people who are able to collect cash or check payments different from all the people who are able to adjust customer accounts? If no customer accounts, check "N/A".

Helen explained that Customer Service Representatives can make some changes to accounts as well as take payments. Our mitigating control is that we have someone who does not touch or take payments, review all the payment documentation for the accounts to ensure everything looks as it should. In the event that it didn't and there was a question of whether something didn't seem right, that person would notify Helen and Pam so they could investigate it. That has not happened since Helen has been on staff. The monthly report is provided to both Helen and Pam.

Again, that allows WFWRD 200 points and the 335 score for low risk.

	<p>Board Chair Shelton thanked Helen for the information and moved on to the next business item. Pam asked the Board to formally accept this Fraud Risk Assessment and they did so.</p>		
<p>3.4. Follow-up on Expanding the Seasonal Container Reservation Program (SCRP) Using Trailer Program Resources: Pam Roberts, General Manager (<i>Direction Requested</i>)</p>	<p>Pam began her report stating that the Seasonal Container Reservation Program (SCRP) is one of our most popular and high-demand programs for bulk cleanup.</p> <p>We rolled out the reservations priority list which seems to have gone smoothly for staff and the residents seem to like it. There was a request to return with more information as the previous proposal was to have the two trailer rental personnel moved over to expand the SCRCP. She recapped the options noting that we are currently delivering 60 containers per day and those FTEs would bump it up 12 containers per day.</p> <p>There had been questions about the costs for going back to the old program and there has been some angst about the monthly fee subsidizing the trailer rentals, it depends how we want to slice that pie because the monthly fee pays for all WFWRD services. The trailer rental receives a small revenue, while not enough to cover the costs. If those resources move over that revenue goes down and the costs would shift.</p> <p>Pam showed the same information she previously presented, noting a new bullet point giving estimates of what it would cost if we were able to hire the required 20 CDL drivers and 6 ground crew. In previous years it was a \$1.9M cost. With today's estimates and costs, it would be an approximate \$3.2M program and we don't know that we could do that due to labor shortages. We would need to bring back the</p>		<p>Staff to return with new pricing options for the trailer program.</p>

Supervisor position that we didn't fill in May after a retirement and purchase two additional light-duty trucks for the ground crew that were sold due to not being used by SCRП ground crew.

There was also information about the cost of trailer rentals which in 2024 was an average of \$400.00 per rental. We raised the fee in 2025 to \$240.00 for bulk and \$80.00 for a green trailer rental.

There were also questions about trailer rentals by city. The top four cities are Millcreek, Holladay, Cottonwood Heights and Taylorsville. Pam noted that the numbers included city requests like code enforcement and if we pull resources away, would we still be able to do that for special cleanup projects? The answer is we would do our best by pulling Supervisors and Managers over since we have the resources dedicated elsewhere.

Pam showed trailer reservations data which is the canyons form of the SCRП. She noted the big jump in Emigration Canyon reservations, and a little jump in Big Cottonwood Canyon reservations. She could attribute Emigration to making sure the containers are only used by residents that really need them and don't get the curbside service. Board Member Piñon added that they are also locked and only residents that are supposed to use them have the combination.

The next question had been about trailer rental availability and could we keep the trailer rentals going and shift the resources when there is availability to the SCRП. Pam stood corrected because she thought rentals would be totally full but there is some availability even in higher rental months.

Pam showed a table broken down by month for 2023 and 2024. January has minimal rentals due to trailers being dedicated to the Christmas tree pickup program. There is low utilization in February and March, which is when we have safety and other training for all equipment operators because it is lower tonnages. In 2023 we suspended the program because there were not enough drivers to cover the side load residential routes. This is an area we first pull drivers from when there are shortages. 2024 gives a clearer picture and number available trailers not used is where we would look to say could we pull some of those over to SCRCP. The answer is we could and in April there were 53 but that is during the month, maybe one to two additional containers per day could move over to SCRCP.

With no questions, Pam moved on to conclusions and recommendations. She noted that it is not feasible to go back to containers delivered in the street. The two big reasons are that we cannot get enough CDL drivers and she was thankful that Board Member Ohrn pointed out it was not just the shortage of staff, it was the piles in the street and illegal dumping. When there were 20 CDL drivers and lots of ground crew we could clean it up but it was not safe at all. Trailer rental and SCRCP exist to reduce illegal dumping in the district. The monthly fee for SCRCP goes towards that and sometimes there's anger from residents that can't get a container, and Pam understands. The monthly fee also subsidizes the trailer rental program.

Pam's thought is that it is similar to many public services. For transportation, she may not get on the bus but she pays for the bus. The idea is reducing the number of cars on the road and wear and tear on the infrastructure. We are paying into the system [trailers]

to help reduce all the piles, mattresses, and whatever else ends up on the side of the road.

She asked if the Board would like to give staff direction to look at the trailers that would be available and how we would logistically move those over to SCRCP, it would be tricky and spur of the moment. We would have to call the residents on the list and tell them they could get a container, understanding it's only one or two per day. Or if we shift resources over it is a guarantee that we could get six more containers every day or 12 per FTE. Going into next year we plan on having available slots to hire more people. We have had 10 allocations for years for the SCRCP and were never able to fill all 10, this is the first year we were able to fill all 10. It may be a sign that next year we bump it up to 12 or 13, it just depends on what we are able to recruit and retain, with emphasis on retaining. It is a program we don't want people to hurry through and we have had some hiccups this year and a couple people had to be let go because they struggled to operate the equipment.

Pam concluded that staff are looking for direction as to what we could bring back to the Board as far as scenarios going forward, totally understanding they want to expand the SCRCP for more availability.

Board Chair Shelton said he wouldn't want to push an initiative where we are taking away from the revenue even though it doesn't cover the costs, it discounts it heavily for keeping those staff busy and working. If there is a scenario that we can get to the customer at the last minute or something along those lines. He asked the Board for their thoughts.

Board Member Turner agreed that it would be really helpful if that is feasible and Board Member Ohrn asked about what kind of logistics nightmare it would be. Her concern is that it would cost us more for staff to try and organize it than the benefit it is providing.

Pam responded that it will be a challenge logistically as it is basically knowing there is an FTE available for maybe an hour and if they could get a container out to Herriman in that timeframe and let the person on the waiting list have that extra container. It would be unpredictable and we may have containers that would sit in a driveway because the FTE is no longer available.

The meeting paused for a moment for technical issues and online participants momentarily lost audio.

Board Chair Shelton stated that another potential scenario would be if we did something more permanent the city would pick up the difference as a fee and rent a specific number of trailers whether we figure out not to take everything away from everyone having the opportunity to rent a trailer, maybe the city could figure out a way to pick up the bill. That way we are not taking away from the revenue, we are also not creating as big of a logistics nightmare.

Pam replied that it could work if we know up front and schedule the trailers and have the funding up front. Board Chair Shelton added that every city could decide if they wanted to participate to boost their SCRP a little bit.

Board Member Barbieri commented on the cost of the trailer program. We are looking at a difference of

\$610,000 revenue and yet Taylorsville only used the trailers 177 times. Whether or not it goes to SCRIP she looks at \$610,000 that could perhaps go back into the budget and expand SCRIP or not and just save the money. There's 177 disappointed people in Taylorsville although she feels like they can get that from the private sector. At \$400.00 per trailer, they may be able to do that. She thinks that Taylorsville City would probably reach out to the private sector as well. They would be disappointed obviously, but on the other hand, \$610,000 is a lot.

Board Member Holton stated that although he doesn't know all the details, he would second that if there are some ways to save costs he would obviously always be in favor of that. He doesn't fully understand the decision we would make and what the associated dollar amount would be but would be interested in looking at that.

Board Member Barbieri commented about actually covering some other overall fees and expenses within WFWRD but she isn't sure if we get rid of the expenses of \$661,000 just in the 2023 costs that it will hurt WFWRD. Pam responded that it wouldn't, the monthly fee pays for all of the services.

Board Member Ohrn talked about spending \$610,000 on the trailer program and not gaining any revenue. The issue for Vice Chair Gray is that everything costs but is the trailer rental a valuable enough service that we provide that it is worth it for our residents? Would they agree that it is worth it for \$2.00 of their fee go towards subsidizing this because even if she doesn't use it, she likes to have the option to use it. Everything we do has a cost to it so it is just about the value of the

service we are providing. Is it worth that to our residents? She feels that Holladay appreciates it and it doesn't seem like the numbers rented are limited by amounts because we are not maxing out of trailer rentals.

Board Member Barbieri added that if you look at the number of people that we service, it is such a small percentage. If we drop the program, she doesn't know how many people would even notice. In Taylorsville they call her to talk about their SCRP and the need to get things cleaned up and she suggests they go to WFWRD and they are not aware they could do that and end up using a private hauler or maybe they call [WFWRD].

Vice Chair Gray asked if Board Member Barbieri was suggesting we transfer the whole program, taking that and expanding SCRP. Board Member Barbieri clarified that she is suggesting we do not provide trailers and she thinks that it is a second decision.

Board Member Holton recalled a discussion about the cost of trailer rentals versus the private sector. Pam responded that it depends on the size of the trailer somebody rents from a private hauler so there are not many 18-yard dumpsters out there, there's either 30-yard or 20-yard. We are less than that as far as the \$240.00 now and she thinks that something comparable to WFWRD from a private hauler that Taylorsville City looked into for code enforcement and couldn't get one from us, it was slightly higher than what we charge.

Pam went on to say that the amount of the monthly fee that goes toward the \$610,000 is \$0.59 per home per

month, \$7.09 per year of the \$312.00 we currently charge. Is it worth it to the residents to pay \$0.59 per home per month for the possibility of renting a trailer at a discount? This is a policy decision.

Board Chair Shelton recommended we pull up the private hauler pricing rather than try to compare specific sizes and get it down to a cost per yard.

Board Member Holton clarified that the original argument he made a year ago was not necessarily to get rid of the program but he wouldn't mind being closer to the private sector fees, possibly consistently a little under and depending on the city there are different levels of need or usage and desire for the program. In his mind, if he gets a call from a resident saying they use the program every year, he would rather they talk about the increased cost. He could explain that the program costs the District \$600,000 and we still want to be under the private sector pricing but a little closer to it to try to help reduce some bleeding a little bit and thinks most people would find that reasonable.

Board Member Barbieri commented on the \$400.00 cost per trailer in 2024 and asked if people would pay the \$380.00. No one had the answers. Pam asked if the demand would go down, possibly. She replied to Board Member Holton that the current cost is \$240.00 for a bulk trailer rental, which was raised from \$190.00.

There were several comments about the number of private haulers in the market.

Pam asked the Board for direction reiterating that disbanding the program would be a policy decision. Keeping it on a limited basis for code enforcement, etc., the trailers are still more cost effective for the canyons so we would need to figure that out. Vice Chair Gray agreed we need to have it for code enforcement and is not comfortable completely eliminating the program.

Board Chair Shelton used the fire department analogy. Just because his property doesn't need wildland fire protection, trucks, or equipment, he still pays for it. It affects the county and all of us and we represent every resident in our district. He understands that they all represent their own constituents in their own cities but when we are here, we are representing every resident of the entire district. He also understands that some residents may not need some of the services and believes it would be a mistake to wipe the slate clean because of the cost. He is all about saving money and not spending it if it is not needed but believes we need to find a creative way to utilize those resources we are already paying for. If we need to raise the rates so it pays more for itself and the revenue is higher it will be less of a bleed on the District and seems like that is the appropriate step to take at this time. This is probably one of those things that could take us forever to nail down and get it right but thinks as long as we all work together, we're all on the same team, and that is probably what we need to do. He loves paying a low amount for a trailer when he needs one and is also okay with paying more because he knows it is cheaper than if he would go through other private haulers.

Board Member Barbieri commented on how phenomenal staff is at gathering the amount of good

data we have and believes this is probably really accurate. She asked if we know the percentage of trailers that are used for code enforcement. Renee could not recall from memory and there are also jail cleanouts, but it is a low percentage.

Board Member Turner commented that she knows her residents would not like it if they did not have the option to rent a trailer. They don't use it that often but it's there when they need it and we need to be providing it.

Vice Chair Gray agreed that Holladay is the same way and that we need to adjust the pricing to stop the bleed understanding that different areas feel different about it.

Board Member Piñon added that as the outsider that is not part of the list, he asked if the Board had a feeling of inequity of how many trailer rentals are happening per resident population. Several Board Members replied no. Taylorsville at 177 of 13,000 is a lot less than Holladay or Cottonwood Heights and the response was that it was not an issue.

Board Chair Shelton went back to his previous comment that we are all on the same team and we need to remember that. If they all start thinking about only their own city's needs, he thinks it's great that sure, White City is paying for one city that is using it more than another, that is fine, we are all on the same team, all in the same district, and he will not be one of those that come in and says that they don't utilize the program and would like to opt out of it. It is a service that is available to them.

Board Member Barbieri appreciated Board Member Piñon asking the excellent question and it is the elephant in the room. She knows that when we raise rates, we all scramble asking how we can save money because our residents are saying, “How dare you raise my rates again?” Then it comes around to not having that conversation but we have a chance here to address putting it off another year or two. She doesn’t have a problem with keeping trailer rentals and believes Taylorsville would either but thinks we need to charge what it is costing us.

Board Member Stringham commented that one of the things that would really help is if this group could define “basic” and “extra” services. One of the things we have always talked about is that we have a set of services but are any of those what we consider extras versus basics? If we all agree that there is a set of basic services that every municipality should have then those are the base services that we pay for everybody no matter what. Then if there are extras or things that are over and above that people would like to add on, that is one way you can define in a service district of what is basic versus extra and do a la carte if that is something we choose to go with, or we can choose that all services that we do are basic services. She is unsure that we have fully defined that but we do basically know that certain services are absolute basic services. We know that everybody loves the dumpster program no matter what form it’s in. If we got rid of it, we would all be in a lot of trouble which has been a given all the way around. We know that when it comes to the Christmas trees and some of those things, a lot of communities like that service but is it an extra or an add on? Is the trailer rental an extra or an add on? Is that something we should just be charging full price

for, and is it something we should just be adding on? That is something that we maybe should look at defining.

When Board Member Holton looks at his city, 2.37% of the entire city is using trailer rentals. 236 rentals are still a decent amount compared to other cities. Millcreek has higher resident rates and Cottonwood Heights is not far behind but still 2.37%. Would his city have a service where 2.37% of the people are using it and 97% of the city is subsidizing it? No, they wouldn't implement something like that, they would start fresh. His thought is that there are still 236 people that use it and it's awesome, but he thinks it is also fair to tell everyone in the city, the other 97% that they are paying what it costs or they are maybe 10% below market rate because we are part of the District and feels like that is more reasonable than 2.37% getting a big, big, big subsidy, especially when we are raising fees.

Board Member Ohrn stated that she focused on the end, 83,842 households, and 1,339 are using it so .02% of people. Exactly what Board Member Holton said, when she looks at that tiny, tiny percentage that used it she would make the fee what it costs because it is not a good business decision. When Pam said it is only \$0.59 per home per month, she deals with that so much in government every time we raise taxes. "It's only this much per house per month.", but then when you combine that to every single thing that happens it becomes a lot of money to people every month. We have to look at ways, it is about the District, it's not just about Herriman, it's about 83,000 homes and only 1,300 people are using it at a \$600,000 expense last year. That doesn't make sense to her.

	<p>Vice Chair Gray added that it sounds to her that we are all kind of coalescent on keeping the program but raising the rates. Board Chair Shelton replied that at the very least, come back with a couple of new pricing options for the trailer program that make it a little more self-sustaining and then we can make that decision and hopefully drive on forward with further details related to SCRIP because obviously we are never done with it, but at least everyone can agree that if we put the tourniquet on and look at the trailer program a bit more, everyone would be willing to keep it on a little bit longer and we can always change our mind later or make another change down the road. That would be the Board's direction.</p>		
<p>3.5. West Jordan City Annexation of Unincorporated Oquirrh Highlands, July 1, 2025: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel <i>(Information/Direction)</i></p>	<p>Pam reported that West Jordan City had been talking about annexing the Oquirrh Highlands area for the past few years. The neighborhood has 485 homes that are in the District's boundaries and she showed a map of the area that is just south of Kearns. The annexation happened July 1st of this year which triggers the state statute, similar to how Murray City and Sandy City are on this Board and have a say with what is going on with services, West Jordan City would now have the same option. Pam turned the time over to Rachel Anderson.</p> <p>Rachel explained that the relevant code section was cited on the slide and as Pam said, it should be familiar to most of the Board which is why we have one member on the Board from every municipality that has even a small portion within our service district. With West Jordan taking over a part of land that is in our service area already, it means they are qualified to have a Board Member but they are not required to. It is a small number of homes and if there isn't anyone who</p>		<p>Pam will report back in August on this topic.</p>

	<p>wants to commit that amount of time they don't have to.</p> <p>Pam added that she talked to Korban Lee who is the City Administrator and used to be at Sandy City, so he is very familiar with annexations and homes in the WDWRD boundaries. He presented the opportunity to their council, and they are considering it. More recently, it sounds like they will be appointing someone. She will keep the Board posted.</p> <p>Rachel also commented that when boundary adjustments happen, it usually doesn't affect the District boundaries whatsoever so if you're in the District, you're in the District. The only exception to that is public safety; fire and police, just by virtue of special language in the code that applies to them only that if an area is annexed into a city that has their own police force and fire department, those are automatically moved to the city but every other type of district, it goes to that fact that we talk about all the time is that we are an independent district and these are the service boundaries and it is unrelated to the cities underneath us. It doesn't affect our boundaries just because cities change their boundaries. It does implicate this for an appointment.</p> <p>Pam will report back in August if the Board will expand to 15 [members].</p>		
<p>3.6.Letter from Herriman City Requesting Withdrawal: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel (<i>Information/Direction</i>)</p>	<p>Pam showed the letter she received through email from Mayor Palmer of Herriman City. It is a request to meet with WFWRD as they have adopted a resolution to withdraw from the District. The kick off meeting is scheduled for August 14th that Rachel and Helen will attend with Pam. She believes that Mayor Palmer will</p>		<p>Pam will report back next month.</p>

	be there as well as Nathan, the City Manager, Todd, their legal counsel, and Board Member Ohrn.		
3.6.1. Follow-up on State Statutes Related to Boundary Adjustments	<p>As Rachel previously mentioned, she had provided a preliminary memo last month and has received pushback already about whether we could use the boundary adjustment option and explored that a bit more. She no longer thinks that it is an option but there is another option in the withdrawal statute that has the same effect. She thinks we are still in the same place with the petition route and potentially another route the District might be able to pursue. There are a ton of policy considerations and we are not ready to say how we are going to proceed because she is still feeling pressure from individuals and stakeholders about being very, very cautious about making changes to districts.</p> <p>Rachel and Board Chair Shelton agreed it would be best to reorganize the meeting topics and end with the closed session.</p>		
4. Other Board Business			
	There was no other Board business.		
5. Requested Items for the Next Board Meeting Monday, August 25, 2025			
	<p>Board Chair Shelton reviewed the items for the next Board Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended Policy Amendments to Strengthen Best Practices • Follow-up on West Jordan Annexation • Follow-up on Herriman City’s Request for Withdrawal • General Manager’s Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overview of Establishing the WFWRD Organization ○ Strategic Measures of Success ○ Succession Planning 		

6. Closed Session Reasons as Provided by Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205: Discuss Personnel Matters

	<p>Board Chair Shelton entertained a motion and approval to open the closed session to discuss personnel matters. Catarina conducted the roll call, Board Member Stringham appeared in person to the meeting, Catarina stopped the recording and was excused.</p>	<p>Motion to Open: Board Member Barbieri Second: Board Member Holton</p> <p>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</p>	<p>Approved July 28, 2025</p>
	<p>Board Chair Shelton entertained a motion and approval to close the closed session.</p>	<p>Motion to Close: Board Member Barbieri Second: Board Member Stringham</p> <p>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</p>	<p>Approved July 28, 2025</p>

7. Adjourn Board of Trustees Meeting

	<p>With no further business, Board Chair Shelton entertained a motion to adjourn.</p>	<p>Motion to Adjourn: Vice Chair Gray Second: Board Member Holton</p> <p>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</p>	<p>Approved July 28, 2025</p> <p><i>Meeting end time: 11:10 a.m.</i></p>
--	---	---	---