

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

DATE/TIME	LOCATION	ATTENDEES
<p>Monday, August 25, 2025 9:00 a.m.</p> <p><b>Next Board Meeting</b> Monday, September 22, 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, Anna Barbieri-City of Taylorsville, Sherrie Ohrn-Herriman City, Robert Piñon-Emigration Canyon, Mick Sudbury-Magna City (<i>excused at 10:28 a.m.</i>), Keith Zuspan-Town of Brighton, Marci Houseman-Sandy City</p> <p><u>Participating Electronically:</u> Laurie Stringham-Salt Lake County, Tessa Stitzer-Town of Copperton</p> <p><u>Excused:</u> Patrick Schaeffer-Kearns City, Matt Holton-Cottonwood Heights, Thom DeSirant-Millcreek City</p> <p><u>District &amp; Support Staff:</u> Pam Roberts, General Manager Evan Tyrrell, Incoming General Manager Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel Helen Kurtz, Finance Director David Ika, Operations Manager Hazel Dunsmore, Human Resources Manager Renee Plant, Administrative Manager Sione Tuione, Residential Recycling Collection &amp; Sustainability Manager Shane Norris, Safety &amp; Emergency Preparedness Coordinator (<i>excused after Item 4.2.</i>) Andre Perov, GIS Coordinator (<i>Webex</i>) Catarina Garcia, Executive Assistant/Board Clerk</p> <p><u>Public:</u> Patrick Craig-Salt Lake County, Jennifer Kennedy-Murray City, Justun Edwards-Herriman City, Cherie Anderson-Intermountain Regional Landfill, Trevor (unknown participant)</p>

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

To be held Monday, August 25, 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. Welcome**

**2. Consent Items (*Approval Requested*)**

2.1. July 28, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes

**3. 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](mailto:cgarcia@wfwrdutah.gov) before Sunday, August 24, 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.*

**4. Business Items:**

- 4.1. Adoption of Resolution 4435, Appointing Evan Tyrrell as the District's General Manager/CEO: Board Chair Shelton, and Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel (*Adoption Requested*)
- 4.2. Evan Tyrrell Oath of Office: Catarina Garcia, Board Clerk
- 4.3. Request Approval of Reclassification of One Equipment Operator Apprentice FTE to an Equipment Operator FTE: Pam Roberts, General Manager (*Approval Requested*)

4.4.Recommended Policy Amendments: Pam Roberts, General Manager (*Direction Requested*)

4.5.Follow-up on West Jordan’s Board Appointment: Pam Roberts (*Direction Requested*)

4.6.Follow-up on Herriman City’s Request for Withdrawal: Pam Roberts and Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel (*Direction Requested*)

4.7.Follow-up on Trailer Rental Program: Pam Roberts, General Manager (*Direction Requested*)

4.8.General Manager’s Report: Pam Roberts, General Manager (*Information*)

- Park City and Summit County Officials Visit With WFWRD
- Overview of Establishing the WFWRD Organization
- Succession Planning
- Strategic Measures of Success

**5. 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.*

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

**7. Requested Items for the Next Board Meeting, September 22, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.**

- 2026 Proposed Budget and Fee Schedule
- General Manager’s Report

**8. Adjourn**

TOPICS/ OBJECTIVES	KEY POINTS/ DECISIONS	ACTION ITEMS WHO – WHAT – BY WHEN	STATUS
<b>Call to Order / Roll Call</b>			
	Board Chair Shelton called the meeting to order, and Catarina conducted the roll call.		
<b>1. Welcome &amp; Introduction – Evan Tyrrell, Incoming General Manager</b>			
	Pam introduced Evan and showed a letter he wrote to employees that accentuates his care and wanting to ensure employees were at ease with him coming on board.		
<b>2. Consent Items (Approval Requested)</b>			
2.1 July 28, 2025 Board Meeting Minutes	There were no questions or comments on the minutes.	<b>Motion to Approve:</b> Board Member Houseman  <b>Second:</b> Board Member Barbieri  <b>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</b>	<b>Approved August 25, 2025</b>
<b>3. Meeting Open for Public Comments</b>			
	There were no public comments.		
<b>4. Business Items</b>			
4.1. Adoption of Resolution 4435, Appointing Evan Tyrrell as the District’s General Manager/CEO: Board Chair Shelton and Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel ( <i>Adoption Requested</i> )	Pam invited Evan to the front to introduce himself. He thanked everyone and expressed his excitement about this opportunity.  Evan explained he is here to absorb and learn from the team and have the opportunity to work with Pam over the next five weeks. He believes it will be an incredible and a really great opportunity for streamlining and succession planning for the organization.	<b>Motion to Adopt:</b> Board Member Stringham  <b>Second:</b> Vice Chair Gray  <b>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</b>	<b>Approved August 25, 2025</b>

	<p>Evan has previously served in similar General Manager capacities with Grand County, Utah, overseeing their solid waste special service district, and also served as the Solid Waste and Fleet Services Section Director for the City of Flagstaff, Arizona. Among many other positions throughout his career, this is definitely a big step forward for him and he is very excited about the opportunity. He thanked the Board for their confidence and willingness to allow him to serve in the General Manager capacity.</p> <p>Board Chair Shelton read the resolution appointing Evan Tyrrell as the District’s General Manager/CEO and it was adopted.</p> <p>In Board Member Holton’s absence and inability to vote, Board Chair Shelton shared his support for Evan’s appointment for the record. Pam noted that Board Member DeSirant also supports Evan’s appointment although he was excused and unable to vote.</p>		
<p>4.2.Evan Tyrrell Oath of Office: Catarina Garcia, Board Clerk</p>	<p>Catarina conducted Evan’s Oath of Office and he was sworn in as the District’s General Manager/CEO which was followed by applause.</p> <p>Board Chair Shelton told Pam she will definitely be missed but is glad we have her for another month. On behalf of the Board, he expressed appreciation to Pam for all her hard efforts, and many, many years of service to the District.</p> <p>Pam thanked him and expressed her appreciation in return for the Board and their support over the years for her and the team. She knows the leadership is in good synergy right now with the energy and the continued planning. There is an orientation for Evan</p>		

	<p>later this afternoon that the management team prepared that will be a really good overview. Everyone wants him to succeed, and fresh eyes are always good.</p> <p>Board Chair Shelton expressed his gratitude for Pam leaving WFWRD in great hands.</p>		
<p>4.3. Request Approval of Reclassification of One Equipment Operator Apprentice FTE to an Equipment Operator FTE: Pam Roberts, General Manager (<i>Approval Requested</i>)</p>	<p>Pam began by explaining that we currently have the allocation and wants it to be clear that we were not increasing any allocations.</p> <p>There are 65 Equipment Operator FTEs, two of which are Apprentices. She reminded the Board that the Apprentice Program was kicked off in 2023 and we reclassified three vacant Equipment Operator positions. We also realized we did not need the Training Coordinator position which was eliminated earlier this year. There are two Apprentice Trainers that we really want to keep to help train new hires and conduct retraining as needed.</p> <p>We currently have one Apprentice position that is filled by Alex Hoppus who will be graduating in the next three months into an Equipment Operator. We leave an Equipment Operator position vacant when there is an Apprentice. We have found that with the salary market adjustments that the Board approved, which was hard because it was part of the needed fee increase, but the additional nearly \$400,000 that came into this year is really paying off. We are able to recruit but retention can still be a difficult because of the complexity of side load trucks. We have had to separate with a couple people. We have come into a few situations with current drivers taking paid time off and medical leave. The operations team including David Ika [Operations Manager] and other Managers would really like to have this seat to be filled.</p>	<p><b>Motion to Approve:</b> Vice Chair Gray</p> <p><b>Second:</b> Board Member Houseman</p> <p><b>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</b></p>	<p><b>Approved August 25, 2025</b></p>

Pam asked Helen to do a brief review of the cost difference. Helen stated that the Apprentice position is currently \$26.06 per hour where Equipment Operator hourly range starts at \$30.70 and capping at \$33.98 pending work-related experience. This amounts to an annual increase of \$12,183 at the bottom of the range or \$20,183 at the top of the range including benefits.

Helen explained that an Apprentice starts at \$26.06 but will move up to the next range in six months. This is a total from \$26.06 to \$30.70 through \$33.98 and really is half of that due to the six-month change anyway.

Pam added that there is no need for a budget adjustment as WFWRD is able to absorb the increased cost for the remainder of the year and will be included in the 2026 budget.

Board Member Houseman commented that she fully supports this request, and it reminded her of podcast she recently listened to from the Sutherland Institute on apprenticeships. It reinforces why this is such a great idea. The host talks about “adopting a career-first mindset with apprenticeships playing an essential role.”

Pam replied that we already have four graduates from the program and are about to have our fifth. It has paid off and the team wants to keep at least one of those spots open.

Board Chair Shelton echoed that apprenticeships are kind of a lost art form these days and are significantly undervalued. It is invaluable and a lot of companies expect a two-week notice from a departing employee, which is not enough time to get someone on board.

	<p>That company will always struggle for the next six months to a year trying to recover that expertise and knowledge. He is highly supportive of this program.</p>		
<p>4.4.Recommended Policy Amendments: Pam Roberts, General Manager (<i>Direction Requested</i>)</p>	<p>Pam worked with Rachel to review the policy manual to shore up any lose ends before she rides off into the sunset. She also worked with Hazel on the HR related sections.</p> <p>Section 2.4.4.1 Board Members: Deleted Metro Townships as each municipality is either a city or town.</p> <p>Section 8.8.: When WFWRD separated from Salt Lake County we replaced “corrective” and “disciplinary action” with “performance correction”.</p> <p>Section 9.1.1.: Removed compensatory (comp) time as it had become very difficult to manage to ensure we had enough people here and not taking additional leave. It became it’s own leave bank that people were accruing rather than overtime. Pam suspended it last year because it was such a nightmare to manage for the front-line ensuring coverage and it was administratively hard to take care of those banks. To reduce liabilities and keep everything easier to manage, Pam is requesting to only keep overtime.</p> <p>Section 9.1.3.: Added the text in blue: At-will employees are eligible for the same benefits as District <b>employees unless a contract is in place stating otherwise. At-will employees</b> may be separated from employment with or without cause.</p> <p>Section 9.1.3.1.: Replaced (1) month salary and health benefits for each (1) year of service with the text in blue: In the case of separation from employment</p>	<p><b>Motion to Approve:</b> Board Member Piñon</p> <p><b>Second:</b> Board Member Ohrn</p> <p><b>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</b></p>	<p><b>Approved August 25, 2025</b></p>

without cause, a severance package will be activated for up to three (3) months upon separation of employment. Any other benefits being granted will be determined by the Board as appropriate. Pam noted that the verbiage is different for the General Manager.

Section 9.2. Workweek: There was nothing defined so for best practices, Pam called out the text in blue: District operations generally run from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. pending the needs of the communities. (emphasis on “generally”)

District business and office hours generally run Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. pending the needs of the communities.

All District employees are required to account for forty (40) hours each workweek in the District’s timekeeping system.

Section 9.4. Overtime: Deleted compensatory time.

Pam replied to Board Member Ohrn that in Section 9.1.3.1., it was one month for every year employed. For example, if Pam was released not for cause, it would have been a six-month severance so it is just shoring it up to say, “any at-will”, which is only Helen besides the appointed General Manager. This is to say they have up to three months. That has basically become the standard around the valley.

Board Member Ohrn was confused about the “up to three months.” If someone works here for three months, do they get three months of severance? Board

	<p>Chair Shelton recommended adding “one month for every year of service, up to three months.”</p> <p>Pam continued with Section 9.4.2.: Holidays: Replaced vacation and sick leave with <b>paid time off (PTO)</b>.</p> <p>She reviewed the clean-up items in Section 15.2., 15.3., 15.4., and 15.6 for records management. Pam noted that Executive Assistant, Catarina, made the majority of changes. Catarina confirmed.</p> <p>Pam sought approval as amended from Board Chair Shelton and the motion passed.</p>		
<p>4.5. Follow-up on West Jordan’s Board Appointment: Pam Roberts (<b><i>Direction Requested</i></b>)</p>	<p>Pam reported she spoke with Corbin Lee, West Jordan’s City Administrator, who said there are quite a few council members that are up for re-election and want to wait until after the first of the year for when they make their board appointments. They will reach out and let us know who they would like to appoint to the Board.</p> <p>She will work with Helen and Evan on the standard procedure for new Board Members. She replied to Board Chair Shelton that yes, it will be an additional seat, taking the Board to 15 members.</p> <p>Rachel replied to Vice Chair Gray that it could change the number needed for a quorum, we just need a majority. It might be the same (9).</p>		
<p>4.6. Follow-up on Herriman City’s Request for Withdrawal: Pam Roberts and Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel (<b><i>Direction Requested</i></b>)</p>	<p>At last month’s Board Meeting, Pam reviewed the letter from Mayor Palmer requesting to withdraw from the District.</p> <p>The letter formally stated their request as well as a meeting. Pam, Rachel, and Helen met with the city</p>		

officials on August 14, 2025. Attendees included Herriman City Mayor, Lorin Palmer, Sherrie Ohrn, Council Member, Nathan Cherpeski, City Manager, Todd Sheeran, City Attorney, and Trevor Ram, Management Analyst.

Pam stated that Rachel did a great job going through the legal process and the state statute that states there needs to be a petition from the residents. We know that is not the case so the bottom line is looking at what we can do. When we looked at any kind of negotiation, if Herriman owes the District money if they actually leave because we purchased all these assets, the liabilities and what happens there, or if the District owes Herriman anything. We don't know because we don't have a foundation of costs per area/city. We have an idea because we keep data.

Pam further explained that what is before the Board is a formal request for direction to proceed and launch an RFP in collaboration with Herriman City Officials. The main thing we need to determine is the scope of work. The Board will need more direction as well in collaboration with Herriman but we need to know if other cities possibly want to leave and include that in the feasibility study.

Pam noted that Herriman is willing to pay for the whole thing just about Herriman but it needs to be a shared cost if it goes beyond that. Pam's request is that we do go beyond that because we need to know the implications of anyone else leaving.

Rachel added that we looked at the statute and there are couple methods for initiating a withdrawal which we also talked about here. One method is citizen

petition which is a difficult process which is not one we are going through. There is an option for the WFWRD Board to pass a resolution stating that we are going to initiate the withdrawal but we are not to that step yet. We have a request from Herriman to do that so we are looking ahead to see what it would take for us to be allowed to approve a withdrawal because the statute has a list of items that must be considered. It says that any of these factors exist, you must say no to the withdrawal. We want to analyze that first because if that is a no, there is no point in pursuing it. We are thinking to get the feasibility study done, in the long list of Section 5.10., we have pre-identified two or three factors that are the most pertinent. There are several we know that don't exist, like bonds, so we are not concerned about that.

Off the top of her head, Rachel said there are things like if a withdrawal would create any sort of peninsula or island where we have to go out past vast areas of non-District territory to get to pieces of our territory. If the withdrawal would materially impact our ability to operate the remaining District in such a way that it would require a significant fee increase and we are allowed to look at the affected cumulative requests which goes into what Pam talked about, what the effect would be if we start getting more requests. It is something the Board can consider although we don't want to go down that path. If we get too many, what is the point, or they can say yes but with certain circumstances, etc.

Rachel stated that the plan is to get the direction from the Board to work with Herriman City to draft an RFP for a feasibility consultant. The idea is that Herriman will pay whatever percentage of the study that relates

specifically to Herriman, then we will pick up the rest if it goes beyond the scope of that. She and Pam struggled over the percentage but then Rachel decided we would pay for the portion that doesn't relate to Herriman and somehow the feasibility consultant can tell us how much time they spent on Herriman versus the other municipalities. That will be worked out in the draft.

Pam commented that the two main components we really had was the definition of "materially impact" and Helen had a great idea for Pam as the General Manager, she always wants to know what our residents think and want. She asked that the RFP includes a resident survey so the Board knows what our Herriman residents want. We take care of all of our residents.

Rachel added that it would be helpful too because the main intent of the statute is trying to push doing a petition. There is a way to do it without a petition and it is nice to still look at what residents are thinking during the analysis.

Board Member Houseman asked if the consultant would issue the survey or if it would come from the management team. Pam replied she thinks it would be best from a third-party and that it would be part of the scope of work.

In the 1980s, when West Valley City was incorporated and were established and went to the County Commission at that time, this was prior to the mayor and council form of government and asked the commissioners to let them out of the District. The

commissioners were serving as the Board of Trustees back then.

Pam doesn't know all the ins and outs and legalities but basically, they let them out. The District was shrunk, leaving Magna and Kearns islands. In this case with Herriman, there will be a peninsula with the southwest unincorporated and we would travel through Herriman to service them. The economies of scale for Copperton increased because we are servicing Herriman. Those are the kind of factors she thinks need to be considered because it is about District boundaries, not county or city boundaries.

Pam went on to say that before she started in 2005, Mayor Snarr approached the county and said they were entertaining the thought of withdrawing the 2,800 homes they annexed within our boundaries. They did a survey, and Board Member Turner said they said "No!". It was a strong no. They like the services and wanted to keep them. It really concerns her and she doesn't understand and would like to know when it was generated. If it was generated for the citizens, which it sounds like it wasn't, or the administration. She thinks a lot more information is really needed. Then they did it again in 2015 just after she was elected and the answer again was no. They really appreciate the service and when she walks her neighborhoods she always finds out they really appreciate the services so they had no interest in changing. Half of Murray has WFWRD and the other half has ACE, [private hauler] and that half is never happy. It is the weirdest thing. They say, "The east side gets this, why don't we?". The city said to get it all together but they would not leave WFWRD so it was pretty interesting.

Board Member Turner replied to Board Member Barbieri that she is not clear why the other half doesn't leave ACE. Board Chair Shelton believes it is the same process to leave as it is to get an extension to the boundaries. Board Member Turner directs the people who ask to talk to the mayor.

Rachel said the feasibility study doesn't say yes or no. It could also say that it could work under certain conditions, it might come up with an option to make it work. We are thinking feasibility study, then by the end of the year or early next year we will have that done and options on the table.

Board Member Ohrn replied to Board Member Turner that the residents have not been surveyed which is being requested in the feasibility study. She reiterated that these decisions are based on what they feel is best for their community. It has no reflection at all on staff or the person sitting in that [General Manager] seat. It is absolutely a logistical, administrative decision and not based on emotions. To Board Member Turner's question, 10 or 15 years ago she probably would have got the same response Board Member Turner described but she no longer gets that. A huge chunk of it has to do with the two issues we have all the time, the rate increase and the SCRP. Those are things that were much different 10 years ago. It has changed the landscape and the way people feel. She and the other council members do get feedback to say that if it is just an administrative decision, it is not. It is based on feedback and she was elected to represent the residents so she too communicates with the residents so it is not the hierarchy of Herriman making the decision. It is through feedback and feeling they have an obligation. Call it what you want, but it is a tax to her. Residents

don't get to decide. If they don't pay for it, it comes back on their taxes. It is her responsibility to ensure those votes are considered sacred and if she can find an area to improve, she was elected to do that.

Board Member Ohrn replied to Board Member Turner that she absolutely believes she has done that. That is why they went through the process. When she was first on the Board they went through this process to go out for RFP to make sure they were getting all this. That was before she knew anything about the garbage business and all the minutia that goes behind all this. It was explained to her that she was involved in the District so she can't do that so at least let her understand what the competition is offering as far as pricing. At the time they were great and in line with what was going on. It made sense to move forward eight years ago and now it is different. WFWRD is very expensive compared to everyone else in the county. She has to look at the residents and ask if it is being fair. They elected her to do that is that is her feelings on that kind of thing. She agrees, 10 years ago the feedback was different. There is definitely somewhat of an elephant in the room, a feeling that she is not a team member, she is not playing with the team because it's one for all and all for one and she understands that mentality but she watches legislation get passed all the time that is one size fits all and it should never be a one size fits all because one size doesn't always fit all or every community. It gets to the point where you feel like it doesn't fit your community. She thinks it is wrong to force the community to stay with something they don't feel like it fits. She knows it is a special service district issue. She guarantees there are a lot of politics going behind what is going on right now because they are trying to

protect, which she totally understands that special districts are trying to protect that sandbox because it is special and there for a reason and is important for certain things but there comes a point where we have to say if a city grows to a certain capacity or changes happen, then do they have the right to look at other options? She believes they should and doesn't think they should be held hostage in these situations. It is tough because the legislation is trying to protect special service districts so they don't just implode because we grow out of them. There has to be a balance there somewhere that allows cities, when it just doesn't work anymore, to leave and make their own path. She thinks the meeting was really good and appreciates staff's time and she agrees with Vice Chair Gray about paying for the RFP. If it is just so Herriman can withdraw it makes sense for them to pay for it but if it gets bigger than that, their city has been contacted by several cities that sit on this Board and she won't mention anyone's name because some of it was confidential. They said they have considered it but have been told they can't and it's going to be important to understand that and it's going to be important to make sure that this continues to function for the people that it makes sense for.

Board Member Ohrn went on to say that she is supportive of the RFP, she thinks it's important and we talked a little bit about are these other cities, Cottonwood Heights, Taylorsville and Magna, the ones because they are more clumped together by the Transfer Station, are they the ones that are carrying everybody else because it is cheaper to service them and it's more expensive to service Herriman? She doesn't know. If it is, should we want to work with Herriman to leave because it's more expensive. These

are the kind of things she thinks are really important to understand so the Board can make different decisions. She thinks there is a clear conflict from every single person who sits on this Board and if there's not, she questions that. She has a conflict because the only reason she sits on this Board is because she is elected as a representative of the citizens of Herriman and because of that, they have a seat on this Board so she can't come here and say that she is only going to make decisions for things she thinks is right for the Board because she has to make decisions that are also right for her residents because that is her job and why she is here. She can't separate the two and say if they leave it's not good for the District and she admits that 100% because the reason she is here is for the citizens of Herriman who trusted her to do a good job. It is a clear conflict but it's the way that Boards are structured so she will readily admit that it is a conflict for her. At the end of the day, her Herriman residents will always win out. They obviously don't want the District to go 100% with the RFP because the problem she has with surveys is how many responses are you going to get? There are 65,000 people who live in Herriman so if you get a few hundred, is that really representative of the way people feel? Do you really clearly indicate what is going on? They can also be very swayed for some, what did you ask and how did you ask it? A lot of times you ask questions because that's the answer you want to get, not that the management team would do that, that is why it is going to be important for them to be involved to make sure the results from the RFP are just factual and we don't need to make decisions from.

Pam replied that is why the third-party would conduct that and it would have to be a valid sample, which they

could determine from the residents that are in the homes that we service. They might have a bigger population but how many are in those homes and what would that valid sample be. That is why we want the people from the outside, the experts, to do this for sure.

Board Member Stringham commented that one of the reasons special districts work so well is because it gives those dual hats that we have to wear when they are on here. We always have to balance if we are doing the best things for our community at the same time are we doing the best things for the whole and does that balance out. Is it balancing out over time, or something we need to re-look at regularly. It's never a bad thing to always be re-looking at our boundaries and what we are doing and how we are doing it and always re-evaluating if we are being the most effective and efficient with what we're doing as a whole entity. We have a mission and vision of what we have to do when we sit on a Board here and we have to balance that with our missions and visions with what we have been elected to do in each of our various roles. That is why special districts work though because you are constantly balancing those two out and making decisions that are always in the best interest of not just the people we serve, but the people all throughout the communities that are served by this Board as well and recognizing a balancing does two things. Basically, what every one of them has to do and she commends Board Member Ohrn because she knows its always good to look at things over time and say what is in the best interest of who we've contracted with and how we're working, or who we're members with and how we're working and find out what is the best way to go. We are in a little bit of dilemma, or predicament,

because special districts run a little bit differently in how they are set up in law so we've got to meet some obligations and some requirements before we can just say yeah go, good luck, we wish you the best, etc. We have to do due diligence as a Board to make sure we meet those obligations and regulations that are laid out by law. Once those are done and met then we can move forward. She loves that we are going through this process because it's never a bad thing to do and it gives us a good chance to re-evaluate and re-look at things and understand how our District runs and how it works. It's always a great dive-in.

Vice Chair Gray stated that she also appreciated what Board Members Ohrn and Stringham said and supported what Pam is suggesting that Herriman cover their cost and we cover the cost if it makes sense to look at the whole process and how we'll be affected if other cities are looking at things. She also thinks that the calls they get are all negative. No one ever calls in and says thank you so much for the amazing trash clean up. She shares the concerns and thinks that is one of the reasons why having a third-party and having Herriman involved so we can make sure that the questions are verified would be really helpful. The institutions that do those things understand sample sizes and data so even though it's not perfect, she thinks that it's good information and agrees that we all want what is best for Herriman and if we come at the end of the day and say it sounds like a great option for them, we will just miss them. She is supportive of WFRD covering the costs of that expanded vision with the study.

Board Member Houseman said she loved the conversation and only added the value of information.

Good governing bodies make good decisions when given comprehensive information to make those decisions. She appreciates the vision to say let's expand the process to ensure we are getting information across all of our entities.

Pam noted that we anticipate the RFP to be drafted and return with a summary for the September Board Meeting. We don't anticipate launching the RFP until we get a consensus between Herriman and the District so we may not have it shored up until sometime in October and can report back as we go.

Board Member Barbieri commented that she thinks it is wise we have this conversation and she thanked the Board Members for their input. It is wise for the District to have the language in the bylaws saying how an entity can leave and join WFWRD. She appreciates staff going through this, it would be pretty bad if we had this as a Board and continued without a way for municipalities to be able to leave. She agrees it is a conflict and competition is a good thing to make us all better. She understands that municipalities are dynamic and constantly changing and we are always trying to balance the needs of the residents and the services we can provide. She will be really interested to see the results.

Board Member Ohrn appreciated Board Member Barbieri's comment about leaving and joining.

Board Chair Shelton added that when he made the comment last month about needing to be team players, it is not about the need to fall in line. That was never the intention, the comment, for example, is his concern for Herriman residents if Herriman leaves because

across the entire District and county, when something like this happens, how many times have they regretted it? Either the switch and bait price change that gets you in at a low price or the service just isn't what was expected. He can step away from White City and look objectively at different situations and see if there is a potential problem. He is not trying to demand that Herriman stays. He appreciates it that is the right action for Herriman. He just wants to make sure that we're looking at the same benefit and Board Member Ohrn admitted it is an apples to oranges comparison based on the quote they received. They didn't quote everything exactly that the District provides, which is fine. That is where his hesitation comes in if he is dragging his feet, it is not because he is trying to control one city's destiny over the other. The District is important, we all get a benefit from being a part of it. He is definitely not trying to hold up the decision and apologized if it ever came across that way.

Board Chair Shelton concluded that the direction is to move forward with the RFP. Board Member Turner asked if we had any idea of the cost. Pam responded that we don't. Helen has reached out to some of her contacts in finance and Pam intends to reach out to a water district in the southwest that does rate studies.

Board Member Zuspan commented on a feasibility study that was done about six years ago that cost \$14,000 and looking at the starting point of what it would cost. Board Member Ohrn guessed that the lion share would be Herriman's burden to bear based on percentage.

Pam accepted the direction to move forward to draft the RFP.

**Staff will draft the RFP and Collaborate with Herrman City. Staff will report back during the September Board Meeting.**

4.7. Follow-up on Trailer Rental Program: Pam Roberts, General Manager (*Direction Requested*)

Pam explained that staff were asked to return with more information. Her slide listed a little background and she noted that this is not the first time that the trailer rental program has come under scrutiny.

When she first started as the Division Director, she was asked to go to the Private Haulers Association and was accused of stealing food off their tables because of our trailer program. She needed time to learn what was going on and come to find out, there was plenty of waste in the valley to be hauled off. The trailer program stayed intact, we increased the fees that started out really low. The Administrative Control Board was launched in 2010 and that is when four big cities came to the table to serve on the Board and have a say in the waste and recycling services they received. There were five county seats at that time. The Administrative Control Board got some pressure from the private haulers again. In 2011, the Board decided to suspend the bulk rental but kept the green. They brought it back two years later for the following reasons:

- The Salt Lake Valley Health Department reported an increase in illegal dumping
- Most municipalities offered a dumpster or trailer program
- Increasing the bulk trailers would increase revenue to offset costs
- Eliminating bulk rentals does not reduce the fixed cost of other trailer uses (leaf bags, Christmas Trees, emergencies, special cleanups). Pam wanted to ensure it was understood that trailers are not just used for the rentals.

Vice Chair Gray asked to clarify that if we got rid of the trailer program, they would still be sitting around when not being used for the above projects and this just allows us to have a revenue stream. Pam agreed, noting that we are not charging the actual cost. She was asked to bring back the fee per ton if we actually charged the cost. At the end of the information, Pam would like to have it labeled as “What are we trying to fix?” and asked everyone to be thinking about that.

Pam showed the following for WFWRD’s 18-yard trailer rentals:

- Estimated average cost per rental for 2024 which was \$400.00, \$22.22 per yard.
- Price Comparisons: Bulk \$240.00 (\$13.33 per yard), raised from \$190.00 last year, Green \$80.00, \$4.44 per yard) raised from \$50.00 last year
- Private Haulers Samples:  
Trash Daddy: 15-yard: \$455.00 (\$30.00 per yard), 30-yard: \$790.00 (\$26.30 per yard)  
Waste Management: 30-yard bulk: \$817.00 (\$27.00 per yard)

We are well below the private haulers and with the comparisons of other municipalities, we know that they have other funding sources, we have one with our fees. We may have other revenues by selling trucks, but the bulk of our revenues are our fees.

- Murray: 20-yard bulk, similar to our SCRP. By reservation, no charge. Green Trailer, 18-yard: \$40.00 (\$2.22 per yard)
- West Valley: 30-yard roll-off: No charge. Many cities have a roll-off delivery they will do at no additional cost but they also might have a private hauler they use to rent. It just depends on the city.

- Draper: 20-yard: \$120.00, weight limit 6 tons. (\$6.00 per yard), 30-yard: \$150.00, weight limit 10 tons. (\$5.00 per yard)

Without reading all the other information, Pam explained that the bottom line is that every city provides a means for residents to dispose of their bulk waste. It is a valid service we provide to help reduce illegal dumping and keep our cities clean.

Board Chair Shelton asked if Murray City just pays for theirs. Board Member Turner replied that they provide trailers as well through public works. Pam noted their 20-yard roll-off container is through ACE and is done by reservation. It is a newer one that came about a few years back and it is a compliment that Murray monitored what WFWRD was doing with our reservations when we had to switch. They piggybacked and adopted what we were doing with online reservations.

With no questions, Pam continued on with rentals by city, which were listed high to low and the canyons and the Town of Brighton reservation rentals were listed separately. It is what they use as SCRIP because trailers can get in tight spots.

Regarding the number of rentals in Millcreek 250, Holladay 230, Cottonwood Heights 236, and Taylorsville 177, Board Member Ohrn asked if other cities offer any other bulk waste clean-up. Vice Chair Gray replied that just this year Holladay did a one-day clean-up and that could be why they are significantly higher than the next group. (Herriman had 38 rentals and does a full week clean-up.) Pam reminded the Board that these are rentals that residents pay extra for

and the SCRCP is at least 60 containers per day with no additional fee.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

- WFWRD charges more per yard than other government entities, which could be because we only have one revenue source and this additional fee.
- WFWRD has one funding source for base fees.
- Both trailer rental and SCRCP provide a needed avenue for residents to dispose of bulky waste, which helps to reduce illegal dumping in our communities and fits our mission.
- Pam and staff recommend we keep both programs. We know from history that it creates issues.
- Options include increasing the rental fee for bulk trailer rentals to reduce the dependency on the monthly fee and shift resources from trailers to SCRCP if that is what the Board desires.

Pam went on to say that coming into this year we budgeted for 10 seasonal CDL drivers that work 40 hours per week for six months, and we budgeted four ground crew. Over the SCRCP evolution, we know that we don't really need ground crew. A driver can tarp the container and haul it off. For next year we would like to shift the funding that we've had for ground crew to the CDL drivers. We don't know if we will be able to get 12 drivers, but we want to at least budget for it. This year we started the season with 10 and are now down to seven. It still remains a challenge to recruit and retain which is why the thought is to shift one FTE from trailers to SCRCP, where it is a sure thing [resource].

Vice Chair Gray asked how much it reduces the cost per yard. Pam responded that it is hard to say because it depends on how many containers we can deliver. Economies of scale, the estimated cost per rental in 2023 was \$406.00 and \$400.00 in 2024 because we rented more.

Vice Chair Gray commented that even if the cost per yard went down 30% by moving that FTE over, maybe at this point instead of increasing price, we reduce the cost by doing that. Pam said that if she understands the problem they are trying to fix, is the angst about the \$600,000 “loss” because we have the rental fee to offset it [rentals] but it is only about \$175,000 per year leaving a remaining cost of \$600,000. Yes, it would reduce or shift costs from trailers, it would definitely still be a cost but it would just shift.

Pam replied to Board Member Ohrn’s comment that correct, there are no savings, it is just a paper shift and thanked her for labeling it. It seems to be a more palatable cost to go over to SCRCP because everybody wants more availability.

Board Chair Shelton said that if you’re spending the money, why not put it somewhere, but at the same time, don’t sacrifice the income that we do get. That’s the balancing game. If we are already spending the money and it’s just sitting there doing nothing versus if we could throw it at SCRCP and it not cost us more, it is probably more palatable because it’s still losing but at least we’re not losing as badly because we are getting a better benefit.

Board Member Barbieri commented on wanting more SCRCP. The only way you will make people in

Taylorsville more happy is to put SCRP back on the street. They won't care about having two extra trailers coming in SCRP because they are not theirs and they don't have it on the street. That is the sad reality.

There were comments about it not being feasible to put it back on the street which would cost \$3.2M versus \$1.6M if we could get 20 CDL drivers.

Pam asked the Board to identify what they want to fix and what is broken. The responses were related to the \$600,000 and raising the trailer rental rate.

Board Member Barbieri added that as we talked about last time, 1% of residents use the trailer rental. She is not going to hear from 1% of the people in Taylorsville and they wont go knocking on each other's doors to say they weren't able to rent a trailer. It is a big expense for 1% of the residents.

Vice Chair Gray asked if we could raise the rate and also move over to SCRP, even though it is somewhat of a shell game, at least we're putting the resources to a program that the larger percentage of the residents use.

Board Member Piñon commented that Emigration still needs trailers which are still better than the private sector. If it needs to go up and still be available, that's alright.

Board Member Ohrn asked what it looks like if we cover our costs and if we are still beating the private sector to cover our costs. Pam said it would be \$400.00 per rental, \$22.22 per yard. Under the two

examples shown earlier, it would still be less, she just doesn't know how many rentals we would get.

Board Member Piñon replied to Board Member Ohrn that he thinks it is fair. At the end of the day, having an option through WFWRD is most valuable and if you need it in the canyon, you're going to pay for it.

Vice Chair Gray said that rather than go up to \$400.00, she wants to look at moving the FTE over then look at the costs. Pam replied that it would be difficult because we would have to go back and give estimates of what has been provided. If we raise the fee she doesn't know if the demand would go down.

Board Member Piñon commented that if rentals go down, there are more available to SCRP. Board Member Zuspan added that they are doing a better job as far as educating our customers and they have an opportunity to put more large things in the front-load containers. They only thing they are missing is the fact that we don't do e-waste. They have the free pass to go to the dump so the impact of the trailer program to them is minimal.

Board Member Houseman said one thought she hadn't heard about the return on the investment and impact on the residents receiving the service, is the holistic impact that it provides even if there are residents that don't take advantage of it, there is still a positive impact on the residents that use it and the experiences they have within their community. It is hard to quantify but it is part of the narrative. Regardless of the decision, the why behind it is critical, and the positive impact.

Board Chair Shelton said that rather than raise rates to the exact costs, he would hate to put that burden on communities that really rely on that a lot. He suggested maybe just going halfway from where we are at so they are still getting a better benefit and it gives us time to absorb and get more data and see where it lands. Ultimately, these trailers allow us to get rid of a lot of bulky goods if someone is not able to get SCRCP that year, there is still a way to do it and they are more likely to use it if they feel like they are getting a deal. \$4.00 per yard cheaper than the competition/private sector, he doesn't know that people will necessarily feel like just utilizing this benefit they already have access to through the District. It at least gives us time to see what happens without just going to the maximum which will help the communities that are still seeing a benefit.

Board Member Piñon commented that they don't get SCRCP and it would be detrimental to the community if the trailer program was eliminated. If it had to increase in price and is still better than the private sector, by all means. SCRCP is free so we are subsidizing.

Pam apologized she didn't have the canyons additional trailer rental information in the presentation. It did include the city requests when the city wants to sponsor a trailer rental for a property clean-up (code enforcement).

Board Chair Shelton talked about considering a lower rate for the canyons residents who don't get SCRCP. Pam explained that they get SCRCP through a "free" trailer reservation. That cleared it up for him.

	<p>On behalf of all Emigration residents, Board Member Piñon expressed their gratitude for all the WFWRD services they receive, even rescheduling a third of their pick up days due to snow. They are the outlier and thanked WFWRD again for keeping them in the program.</p> <p>Pam replied to Vice Chair Gray that we can come back with suggestions on fee in the proposed budget.</p>		
<p>4.8. General Manager’s Report: Pam Roberts, General Manager (<i>Information</i>)</p>	<p>Pam gave a short history of the District. There were 70 employees under Salt Lake County Sanitation Division where she served as the Division Director who transferred to District employment.</p> <p>The four cities at the table wanted to have more say and control of the budget and personnel. The idea of separation started in 2011 and grew from there. She was tasked with working with consultants and the county in efforts to launch the new organization. You can imagine the 70 employees who had been under county employment for many years were a little anxious so they held a competition and contest to name the District and develop the logo.</p> <p>Pam went on to say that the Board committed to not make any changes for at least five years and they stayed true to their word. OPEB [Other Post Employment Benefits] was one of the first things that was changed which was understandable, it was a huge liability.</p> <p>The Mission was established in 2003 and the tagline was added in 2009 “...because not everything fits in the can.” because of the variety of services we provide.</p>		

The goals were set in 2008 and evolved over time. When she first started in 2007 it was clear that not a lot of meetings were held. The first meeting she held with Managers and Supervisors lasted three hours because they had a lot to say. Eventually they got down to an hour. Retreats, the recognition program, safety awards, etc. started in 2008.

The goals are:

- Sustain a High 90th percentile of Customer Satisfaction.  
Champion the understanding that WFWRD would not exist without our customers.
- Achieve a High 80th Percentile of Employee Satisfaction.  
A high level of employee engagement by fostering a positive work environment where employees collaborate, support each other and share a common sense of purpose.
- Environmental and Financial Stewardship and Loss Prevention.  
Leadership designed to inspire employee innovation and empowerment for effective problem solving that improves organizational performance.

Pam is proud of the team that continually looks for ways to improve and absorb costs through efficiencies. Our desired culture of Compassion, Respect and Development was established in 2019 during a Leadership Retreat.

Pam talked about WFWRD University, the vision, the great job Hazel Dunsmore has done, and Catarina is helping to get up and running and more publicized. She also talked about the succession planning the

	<p>management team has been doing and the synergy between the team is just fantastic. She is excited for the team to learn from Evan as she transitions out. He will have fresh eyes and new perspectives. He not only asks good questions, but the right questions. He's ready, and so is the team.</p> <p>Pam showed pictures of Park City and Summit County Officials, Park City Community Foundation, and Recycle Utah who visited with WFWRD exploring possibilities of a new sanitation district in Summit County. It is always a compliment when somebody asks "How you do this? What is working for you?". Helen, David, Pam, and James met with them and they asked a lot of great questions and took a tour and saw the CNG island.</p> <p>She wanted to tout that what we're doing is working and she is so proud.</p>		
<b>5. Closed Session</b>			
	There was no closed session.		
<b>6. Other Board Business</b>			
	<p>Board Member Barbieri gave a shout out to Renee! She had received a message from a resident about a SCRP container and reached out to Renee to ask her if she could check on it before she called the resident back. Renee gets the resident on the phone right then and took care of it on the spot. The container was delivered before Anna could call him back.</p> <p>Board Member Barbieri said to Renee:</p> <p>"I am so grateful to you Renee, the resident was very grateful as well. Renee, you are a superstar because they repeated again and again how grateful they were</p>		

	because you called, and I am too. Thank you. I know this happens all the time.”		
<b>7. Requested Items for the Next Board Meeting, Monday, September 22, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.</b>			
	Board Chair Shelton reviewed the items for the next Board Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2026 Proposed Budget and Fee Schedule</li> <li>• General Manager’s Report</li> <li>• Follow up the Feasibility Study RFP</li> </ul>		
<b>8. Adjourn Board of Trustees Meeting</b>			
	With no further business, Board Chair Shelton entertained a motion to adjourn.	<b>Motion to Adjourn:</b> Vice Chair Gray <b>Second:</b> Board Member Houseman  <b>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</b>	<b>Approved August 25, 2025</b>  <i>Meeting end time: 10:48 a.m.</i>