

ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL BOARD – WASATCH FRONT WASTE AND RECYCLING DISTRICT
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES

DATE/TIME	LOCATION	ATTENDEES
September 22 , 2014 9:00 a.m. <hr/> Next Board Meeting October 27, 2014 9:00 a.m.	604 W 6960 S Training Room	<u>Board Members:</u> Sabrina Peterson, Dama Barbour, Jim Brass, Scott Bracken, Coralee Moser, Aimee Winder-Newton, Sam Granato, Patrick Leary, Jim Bradley <u>District Staff:</u> Pam Roberts, Lorna Vogt, Bill Hobbs, Gavin Anderson, Gaylyn Larsen, Whitney Mecham, Craig Adams, Stuart Palmer <u>Public:</u> Leslie Reburg, Keri Nakamura, Stephen Thomasma, Jeanne Dickey
AGENDA		

1. **Consent Items: (Approval Requested)**
 - 1.1. July 21, 2014 Board Meeting Minutes
2. **Meeting Open for Public Comments** (Comments are limited to 3 minutes)
3. **Informational Items**
 - 3.1 Monthly Loss Report
 - 3.2 Healthcare Benefits Survey Report, Gaylyn Larsen, Human Resource Manager
4. **Business Items**
 - 4.1 Request to delay implementation of policy 15.1 Service Charges Effecting Big Cottonwood Canyon Residents, Board Member Leary & Pam Roberts. (**Approval Requested**)
 - 4.2 First Look 2015 Budget – Pam Roberts and Stuart Palmer (**Direction Requested on the Following**)
 - Area Cleanup Schedule
 - Merit Increase Based Upon market Included in Next Proposal
 - Capital Purchase: 1 Additional Side Load Truck for Green and Growth
 - 1 additional FTE; Equipment Operator effective July 1, 2015 for Green and Growth
 - Cancellation of the 2015 ACB previously approved fee increase of \$2.00 per month
 - 4.3 Request for Board Members to serve on an Investment Committee, Pam Roberts (**Approval Requested**)
 - 4.4 Follow-up on 2200 West Residents, Interlocal with Salt Lake City for Exchange of Services, Pam Roberts (**Approval of Direction Requested**)
 - 4.5 Confirm or Reschedule November meeting for November 17th, 2014.
5. **Requested items for the Next Board Meeting on Monday, September 22, 2014**
 - 3rd Quarter Financial Report
 - 2014 Projected Revenues/Expenditures vs 2014 Budgeted
 - 2015 Requested Budget

- Policy for Mid-Year Budget Review, Gavin Anderson
- Set Public Hearing date in December for 2015 Budget

TOPICS/ OBJECTIVES	KEY POINTS/ DECISIONS	ACTION ITEMS WHO – WHAT – BY WHEN	STATUS
1.Consent Items (Approval Requested)			
1.1 July 21, 2014 Board Meeting Minutes	Board Member Bracken stated that on Page 15 “community council” should be changed to “city council”.	Motion to approve with changes: Board Member Brass, seconded by Board Member Newton Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present)	Approved September 22, 2014
2. Meeting Open for Public Comments (Comments are limited to 3 minutes)			
Big Cottonwood Canyon Residents	<p>Steve Thomasma, resident of Bountiful (1817 S. 1150 E), owns a cabin in Big Cottonwood Canyon on East Camp Tuttle Road, 12368 East Camp Tuttle Road. The cabin is on Forest Service property so he does not actually own the property since it is part of the Summer Home Association. He has no access in the winter due to a lease owned by Solitude which leases it in the winter for the Nordic Center. This means the roads leading to the cabin are part of the lease so they cannot be plowed, as well as the water being turned off during the winter months which turns out to be more than 6 months of the year due to the long winters. This limited access also includes the area of Lady of the Lake, since that road cannot be plowed either. This year he has noticed cans at Camp Tuttle and a few big cans halfway up the canyon, but those cans near the road to Donut Falls disappear in the winter. He feels there is not adequate year round service to warrant a full yearly service fee which is fine because the cabins are inaccessible anyways. There is no reason to have service up there and he doesn't want to have to pay for services that aren't available or used.</p> <p>Jeanne Dickey, another Big Cottonwood Canyon cabin owner, agreed with Steve's statements and stated that even during the summer months when she uses her cabin, she hauls her trash back down to the city to dispose of it at her home where she already pays the year round fee.</p> <p>Board Chair Petersen thanked the residents for voicing their concerns and values their input as citizens, invited</p>		

them to stay for further discussion and directed them to Pam Roberts or Lorna Vogt for further questions or updates.

3. Informational Items

3.1 Monthly Loss Report

Lorna Vogt presented the Monthly Loss Report to track our expenses for our insurance provider and internally for loss control measures. We are in line with what we estimated for this year so this is just an update. It shows the number of claims we have had and the amount we have paid out. These do not include open claims. Please direct workers compensation questions to Gaylyn Larsen, our Human Resources Manager. Later on this year we will get a report back from our providers detailing our costs for next year.

Board Member Bracken asked what the total budgeted amount for the small claims payout was.

Stuart Palmer answered that \$27,000 was budgeted based on a 10 year history. Payouts will be covered under deductibles.

Board Member Moser asked if there was a reason for the increase in workers comp claims this summer.

Gaylyn Larsen responded that the increase was due to the injuries from the temps working in our area cleanup program over the summer months.

Board Member Bradley stated that he didn't see a comparison in the Monthly Loss Report to last year. What was last year's loss year to date?

Lorna responded that we weren't tracking it this same way last year but we could go back and get the numbers.

Board Member Bradley asked if we are looking at 10% ahead of last year. What are we doing to hold that down? Lorna responded this is dealt with entirely through training and disciplinary notices. We had a couple big

3.2 Healthcare Benefits Survey Report, Gaylyn Larsen, Human Resource Manager

claims last year that don't show up here. These losses are more work related such as hitting mailboxes, tree branches, and bumping into things we shouldn't be bumping into.

Gaylyn Larsen stated that last year Board Member Snelgrove asked us to compare our benefits with the private sector. She presented Benchmark Comparisons by Government vs Private Sector by First West Benefit Solutions and then added our own organization into a 3rd column to compare as well.

First West Benefit Solutions surveyed statewide. They sent out 2300 surveys and got back under 300 completed surveys. The survey pool was represented by 81 % private companies and 19% public sector/governmental. A down arrow shows the majority of the public or private sector respondents that were below the benchmark and an upwards arrow shows they were above the overall benchmark. The most differences are in Section 3 Retirement. The reason for those differences are due to the pension plan that the government sector provides when the private sector provides a 401(k) plan. As a majority, most private sector employers are not matching 401(k)'s currently. 401 (k)'s are also available to public sector employees, and the majority of public sector employers do not match the contributions due to the large percentage that they are putting into the pensions.

Pam asked what percentage WFWRD puts into an employee's 401(k).

Gaylyn responded 1%.

She stated that the government and WFWRD are also below benchmark in the immediate vesting schedule for retirement plans due to the 4 year vesting period set by the state legislature. The private sector usually has a step plan where you earn a percentage each year.

Board Member Bradley asked if our vesting period is good or bad.

Gaylyn responded that it probably is bad when compared to the private sector, especially since the millennials entering the workforce move around a lot more, it would be a great recruiting and retention tool if we could have something less than 4 years but that would take legislative action.

Board Member Bracken asked if short term public employees realize any of the contributions.

Gaylyn answered no, that is correct. They try to compensate for that by allowing you to work for different public sector entities and they all go towards that 4 year vesting period.

Board Member Brass stated that not all private sector's vest right away or with a step plan and most smaller businesses do not match employee's 401(k)'s.

Gaylyn stated that there are only 2 places on this survey where we as WFWRD exceed the study. One is medical insurance since we have no waiting period for new employees to qualify for health insurance. The other area we exceed in is the Dental max, where the benchmark is \$1,201-\$1500 and ours is \$2,000.

Board Member Barbour asked if we have a probationary period for our new employees but insurance becomes immediate.

Board Chair Petersen responded that it is 6 months and yes, insurance becomes immediate.

Board Member Bracken asked for clarification about the "statement" versus the "benchmark".

Gaylyn clarified that the statement is the benchmark.

Overall, Gaylyn reported that we are equivalent with what is going on in the private sector. Since we came

from a shoot-off from the county, our benefit package is much better than if we had started from scratch.

Board Member Bradley asked if this means that our retirement plan is sufficient and we are not looking to make any changes.

Gaylyn responded yes.

Board Member Bradley stated that after the 4 year wait, the plan is very high in benefits. He stated that one thing we have to watch in public policy is to make sure that people save for the future and any way we can do that is a good thing. Usually if people have the chance to withdraw from a 401(k) they do it, which will result in a population that has retired but does not have the means to live appropriately. Due to this problem, that is why he thinks that when the Board decided to opt out of social security it was a mistake.

Gaylyn responded that we went with ICMA in lieu of social security because employees cannot take loans from their account. She stated that UPD put social security money into the state retirement 401(k) so that money is available for loans. Our employee's money is not available for loans.

Board Member Bracken asked about having no HRIS.

Gaylyn responded that the Caselle program we have and the HIPPA information we have in there makes it so employees cannot access their own paystubs due to security levels.

Board Member Bracken asked if that means it's a provider software issue.

Gaylyn said that it is.

Board Member Moser stated that Herriman city just recently realized they have the ability to let employees

	<p>print pay stubs using Caselle as well so that may be a function to look into. She then mentioned that the software they use may actually be Polaris.</p>		
--	---	--	--

4. Business Items

4.1 Request to delay implementation of policy 15.1. Service Charges Effecting Big Cottonwood Canyon Residents, Board Member Leary & Pam Roberts (Approval Requested)

Board Member Leary stated that since the July ACB meeting the township offices have heard concerns from residents of Big Cottonwood Canyon. In the larger context of local issues, the unincorporated areas of Salt Lake County are going through a long conversation about what their future looks like. Anything we do that appears to be raising fees, while in this case the level of service is not commensurate with the fee, sends a bad signal to the residents of the unincorporated areas at this point in time. He would like to either have a conversation about delaying this policy and/or if there is an appetite to revisit this notion. He appreciates that the board is attempting to clean up policy but he thinks it would be wise to delay the implementation of this policy at this time.

Pam stated that with the new transparency of billing we have had more contact with our residents than ever before. Although the topic is not popular, Pam sees the open conversation as a good thing so that we have the ability to explore the details of the homes located in Big Cottonwood Canyon more closely, such as which areas are inaccessible in the winter. She would like to gather more information to bring back to the board so that we can do what is fair and equitable for the residents pertaining to fees and service level.

Board Member Moser agrees that areas in the canyon that are not being serviced year round should not be required to pay the full yearly fee. Is it possible to identify which properties should have a reduction and which ones receive year round service in the next 3 months?

--

--

Pam responded that we can do our best to identify this. We also have to look into HOAs and private lanes which might require something specific in the resolution. We will explore it and bring back more information in October or November but we will be focused on bringing forward the budget at that time as well so it might not give us enough time to fully explore what we need.

Board Member Bradley stated that it is important to differentiate fees such as property taxes versus charging a user fee. If they aren't using the service, they shouldn't have to pay. He thinks we should delay the implementation.

The board decided to delay to October's agenda.

Board Member Bracken agreed that if they are not receiving full services, they shouldn't have to pay the full service.

Pam stated that they receive container and compacter service at \$88.50 a year per household.

Board Member Barbour asked for clarification on what information is being requested. Who is receiving service and who is not receiving service? It needs to be clarified who should pay the full fee, in lieu of service. When we set this policy we were looking at areas, but now we need to go back and look at addresses.

Pam said that initially we thought there were 321 properties that were receiving the 88.50 reduction that would be effected by this policy. We basically need to verify who is receiving what level of service.

Board Member Leary stated that we adopted a blanket policy and now we need to go back and look at specific addresses.

Board Member Moser responded that when the board

	<p>made this decision we thought some of those areas had year round access but now with further information we know that they do not.</p> <p>Gavin Anderson addressed the board and stated that he thought there were 2 issues concerning the canyon properties. One issue was to suspend the fees for home owners due to a seasonal service cutoff, which is what we have been discussing. The other issue was we were going to eliminate the break that was built into the fees for secondary homes defined in the tax code. He wanted to make sure the council (Board) was addressing both of those issues. We never made a decision on the secondary homes because it was tied up in this issue as well.</p> <p>Pam stated that originally we had brought back policy statements that addressed both issues.</p> <p>Gavin stated that the problem with the secondary homes is they can be located anywhere in the valley. He recommends that the board revisit both issues.</p>	<p>Motion to postpone for further discussion: Board Member Brass, seconded by Board Member Granato. Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present)</p>	
<p>4.2 First Look 2015 Budget – Pam Roberts and Stuart Palmer (Direction Requested on the Following)</p>	<p>Pam asked Stuart to put together a base budget to present some of the things that we already know, such as health insurance cost increases as well as a need for a new truck and receive direction from the Board.</p> <p>Stuart presented the 2015 First Look Budget with a column comparing the 2014 budget numbers.</p> <p>REVENUES: Residential waste collections (fees) show an increase of \$180,275 due to a 1% growth of new homes and it has been projected that we will have a loss of fewer 2nd cans.</p> <p>Pam asked if 1000 cans come back this last year. Stuart clarified that we did have 1,000 second black cans returned this year, so we estimate 500 coming back next year due to people returning their 2nd can in exchange for a green can.</p>		

Green curbside (cart/fees) revenue will be decreased for 2015 by \$140,176. This last year we didn't receive as many green can subscriptions as we had anticipated. We are currently at 1600 subscriptions and estimate bringing that up to 2500 in 2015.

Nonresidential collections revenue will decrease by \$28,333. This mostly has to do with city/county collections and accounts adjustment.

We estimate a 2.5% tonnage increase in recyclables and a steady price/ton, resulting in an \$11,125 increase in recycling revenue.

Neighborhood trailer rental revenue is estimated to decrease by \$27,785 to reflect trends of customers utilizing green trailers 60/40 compared to bulk trailers.

Sale of assets (trucks) is set by our schedule so it shouldn't vary too much from this past year.

Interest from our PTIF account with the state will stay at \$75,000 for each year.

The "other" section reflects our change in the use of the company purchase card which qualified us for an increased rebate. This past month we received a \$33,000 rebate check from the bank for using the commercial card. The second part of the increase is due to certification, charging the residents who don't pay on time a \$20 certification fee.

Overall, we see a slight increase in revenues for 2015.

Board Chair Petersen asked when customers are charged the certification fee.

Stuart responded that we certify customers in September and send the information to the Treasurer's Office. The actual charge is in November on the property tax notice.

EXPENDITURES - PERSONNEL EXPENSES:

Stuart asked the board to notice that the 1st Look Budget reflects a 12% health care increase for 2015.

Wages/salaries expenses are estimated to decrease by \$902 which does not reflect an increase of FTEs. We took out the reclassification of dollars and cents that the county used to include.

Board Member Bradley asked if we will not be having

any budget increases for wages and salaries?
Stuart responded that we will be asking for a new driver and merit increase but those numbers are not included in this budget because we are asking for the Board's direction.

We are reducing admin costs for temporary labor. In May 2014, we stated we would reduce admin costs to accommodate the request for a new FTE. We are also adjusting the days in our area cleanup which will reduce temporary labor costs.

The retirement pension cost will be increasing due to the rate increase by URS that we pay for the entire year. Health insurance costs reflect a projected 12% health care increase.

Gaylyn Larsen stated that we came up with that 12% increase by looking at what the cities got in July, which was quite high, one city was 34% originally. We put in 12% as a place holder until she receives the rate in October.

Retirees Insurance expenses will increase due to more retirees within the district.

Workers comp insurance claims expenses will increase due to a 1-5% estimated increase cost from our insurance and will add \$20,000 in claims. We are trying to get a feel but we still don't have hard numbers yet. Pam stated that the Trust started managing our claims for us and asked Stuart if that is included in this piece of the budget.

Stuart responded that it is included.

Unemployment expenses will increase \$14,750 to reflect trends due to paying unemployment for our seasonal area cleanup employees.

Increase in other post-employment benefits costs by \$51,000 reflecting the Actuarial study from January 2014.

Board Member Bradley asked if we are going to increase salary and benefits, won't the social security and alternate (ICMA) costs go up instead of the listed decrease of \$10,716?

Stuart responded that is correct. This is just a placeholder for what is reflected in this budget now.

Board Member Bradley asked about the \$28,115 increase in retirement pension.
Gaylyn stated that when URS lost money in the 2008 market crash, they tacked on a 1.25% increase each year through 2014 to recover that money. This 1.25% is the last installment for us and since we are a January budget and not a July budget, we have to include that now. Next year it will be a zero increase in July.
Board Member Bradley asked what the difference is between retirees insurance and post-employment benefits and if we are still offering post-employment benefits since a lot of people are not doing so anymore. Stuart responded that we are still offering the benefits, rolled over from the County's practices.
Pam noted that employees hired after January 1, 2013 are not eligible for the post-employment benefits. We followed the same policy that Salt Lake County implemented.

OPERATIONS

Stuart stated that there is an estimated \$44,747 decrease in fuel costs going into 2015 due to using more CNG fuel, although we are increasing mileage.
Truck maintenance is broken up into different categories but the total increased expense will be \$185,583 due to a \$2.50 per hour shop increase.
Board Member Bradley asked if that increase is unilateral.
Board Member Leary stated that it seems that they have legitimate reasons for another fee increase and we should hear it from them.
Pam stated that we met with Fleet and they are experiencing increased health insurance costs and the increased URS component. We have looked at the market to confirm that county fleet is competitive and she is happy to report that they are still below the market rate.
Board Chair Petersen asked if we could have Fleet come in to the next meeting and give us more information about the fee increases.
Pam confirmed that we could have fleet come in next

month and also recommended inviting Sarah Brenna the new Administrative Services Department Director. Board Member Barbour asked what the actual hourly rate is for fleet. Stuart stated that they went up to \$90 last year and it will be going up to \$92.50 for 2015 which is still more affordable than the other market options available. Board Member Leary stated that it might be worthwhile to have next month's meeting at the new fleet services building. Pam stated that we will schedule. Lorna noted that they are going to be implementing a new software program that will help accommodate us even better. Pam stated that John Webster, the Fleet Director recently retired so we will be able to meet their new Director Greg Nuzman. Board Member Bradley asked about the increased maintenance costs involving 2 factors, the increased shop rate and the replacement schedule requiring maintenance. Stuart mentioned that the maintenance costs will increase because we will be driving more miles due to growth in the valley. Board Chair Petersen asked if we are seeing increased maintenance fees because we are postponing the selling of our trucks. Stuart assured them that we have not experienced that yet. We are only shifting the schedule 3-4 months. Disposal fees overall will increase \$194,000 for three reasons: there is a Health Department fee increase of \$0.35 per ton effective July 1, 2014 (we did not know this would happen until this last July), 3% increase in MSW tonnage, and an increase in debagging of leaves. Every year we pay a temp service to debag the leaves but this year the landfill would like to debag. We have not received a cost back from the County yet for the debagging. Last April and May we mentioned the cart replacement bubble. There will be an increase in cart replacement costs due to aging of the carts and a growth increase. IT services anticipated about the same costs going

forward.
Building rental is increasing \$13,000 because we will be increasing our office space by taking 5 offices when Fleet moves out of the first floor office space.
Attorney costs are estimated at a decrease of \$5,000. We will be going out to bid soon for a new attorney services contract.
The “other” line item is decreasing in costs due to shifting the costs to disposal for debuggging the leaf bags. Depreciation costs will decrease by \$650,000 due to buying 4 fewer trucks this year and going from a 3 year to a 4 year depreciation schedule.
For the 2015 budget first look, overall we are estimating net gain of \$619,710. More details will be coming next month.
For 2015 Capital Expenditures we are asking for 1 new side load truck. We plan on spending \$4.4 million on our truck replacement schedule next year.
The 2015 net cash flow with capital purchases will be - \$1,965,350.
Board Member Bradley asked if the capital expenditures built into the expenditures was represented in the previous totals.
Stuart responded that yes they were included.
Board Member Bradley asked if the decreased cash flow for personnel of \$6 million reflects any compensation adjustments. Stuart replied that it does not. This is just a base budget.

Stuart presented the cash impact scenarios. Back in the April meeting, agenda item 3.4 of that board packet, we showed that the cash flow projection including the 2013 actual cash balance, the new trucks we plan on buying in 2015 and 2017 and any increased cart replacement plus any reducing of the cart fund in the reserve funds. We said at that time that by 2018 we will be in good shape by \$1.4 million. We are now saying if we stay where we are now with the adopted budget and add in the 2014 projections and 2015 first look budget and add the 12% medical insurance increase, these new numbers as option 2 is what we project before we look at a fee increase.

Board Member Bracken asked why the cash for carts will become zero beginning in 2018. Is that because we are moving those purchases into general operations? Stuart responded that is correct.

Board Member Barbour asked about if we were looking at another fee increase at this point last year, what changed.
The big change was the delay in the equipment replacement schedule being changed from 3 to 4 years.

Board Member Bradley asked about the best practices being set at 5%, which is the statutory minimum, but best practices are around 10-15%. The county carries 10-15%.

Pam responded that the UASD has clarified that with an enterprise fund within an organization there is no statutory minimum so the board can establish whatever minimum you would like. We carried over the previous standard from the Sanitation Division practice of 5%.

Board Member Brass is concerned about the undesignated cash, the cash burn from 19 to 20. We are spending \$3.4 million more than we are making. The trend concerns him for the future. His experience with deferring the maintenance schedule is that it cost Murray city in the long run because they had to replace a lot of vehicles all at once.

Pam wanted to note that there is a 1% revenue increase and a 3% inflationary cost that is equated into the projections. Stuart stated that is a conservative approach to the budget.

Pam is asking for direction on what schedule the board would like, rotating versus static, as well as the service level pertaining to the container to home ratio that was raised this past year.
Lorna apologized for any confusion generated in the last

4.2.1 AREA CLEANUP SCHEDULE

meeting on the operational end. She stated that we increased the ratio of container to home from 1:5 to 1:6. This is an average across the district. It equates to about 30 feet more between containers. We have directed the supervisors in the field to use their discretion when dealing with residents and the placement of containers this year. We don't have all the final tonnage numbers currently for this year but we are very close. The demand is measured by tonnage, comparing 2013 and 2014.

Board Member Bracken asked if the gross number we collected changed much.

Lorna responded that it is very similar than last year. It is impossible to predict what areas will be cleaning out their homes each year, so the best way to track is by tonnage.

We also measure capacity by tracking how many containers we have empty at the end of the day which are labeled as empty/partial containers. Some areas had 30 empty containers within 700 homes. The average across the district is about 12 per day.

We learned this year that the routing was not as smooth as it should have been. Bill Hobbs, the program's manager, has collected a paper copy map from the supervisors for each area with problems circled which will be analyzed to help with next year's program. We also have to add a full day to adjust for the growth of new homes.

Board Member Newton asked if we do a static versus a rotational schedule we are really only saving \$50,000 and the other \$450,000 is from the ratio.

Lorna responded that the service days are made up of the lease rate for the trucks, fuel and maintenance, and the temporary labor. All those things go into making up that \$400,000. We are looking for direction on the schedule. If we rotate, the goal is to give everyone a spring and a fall at some point in the schedule since those are the most requested times. If we did a 4 year rotation, some areas will have an 18 month period between clean ups. We are trying to figure out a smooth schedule that will reduce that 18 month period.

Herriman also does a supplemental cleanup on the opposite season that we do ours for their residents. Board Member Moser stated that they fund that 2nd cleanup themselves. The tricky part is the timing for their budgeting so she requested that Herriman always receives the WFWRD area cleanup sometime in May-June 30th or flip and do the fall, as long as it's always the same or else they may have to pay for 2 cleanups in a budget cycle.

Board Member Barbour stated that Taylorsville is entertaining the idea of providing another supplemental area cleanup as well because it is so popular.

Board Chair Petersen shared that the Holladay city council's preference is a static but if we do a rotational they just want it to be around the same time every year.

Board Member Bracken stated that Cottonwood Heights usually gets stuck in the middle due to the location.

Board Member Granato stated that the county council met on this topic and it was unanimously decided to continue on a rotating schedule.

Board Chair Petersen asked what the savings would be if we changed to a static schedule.

Pam responded it would be between \$15,000-45,000.

Board Chair Petersen had complaints from residents when their cleanup was at a much different time this year than previous years. Several council members want it fixed but if we rotate just make sure it is consistent with no more than a year in between years.

Board Member Newton mentioned maybe put Holladay on a static base in July and everyone else could rotate around that.

Pam stated that we would like to bring back the best

rotational options to be evaluated by the board.

Board Member Bracken stated that if we stretch out the schedule over more years, the change each year will be less noticeable.

Board Member Newton said that sending out the announcements/reminders earlier also seems to help. Pam mentioned that maybe including the next year's month could also be helpful as well.

Board Member Leary stated that we just need to rotate on the shortest window as possible, accommodating all the interests of the areas.

Board Member Moser confirmed that Herriman's concerns are their yearly budget and that they want to stay fair to all municipalities.

Board Member Brass stated that he preferred rotating.

Board Member Bracken prefers rotating.

Pam asked if it would be acceptable to bring back concepts next month and we won't finalize the schedule until November or even January, especially since we are currently trying to fill our GIS Coordinator position again.

The board also decided to stick with the 1:6 container ratio.

Gaylyn Larsen stated that this is a request for direction on merit increases for our employees.

Board Member Moser asked if there are any statistics of average merit increase percentages around the valley.

Gaylyn responded that the 3% was pretty consistent in the private sector. Most counties gave a merit last year.

Board Chair Petersen gave direction to stick with a rotating schedule but make sure to take into consideration the Herriman and Taylorsville budgets.

4.2.2 MERIT INCREASE

Salt Lake County gave a 2.5% merit plus and an additional 2% in their 401(k)'s. We did not add anything into the 401ks last year and did a 3% merit increase last year. On the national level the average is 3%.

Board Member Bradley asked if we are looking into doing a cost of living increase as well.

Gaylyn stated we had not looked into a COLA for the 2015 budget.

Board Member Bradley asked what percentage of the employees are merit.

Pam responded that we have 78 merit employees.

Gaylyn responded that about 2% of the merit employees are not eligible for a merit increase due to not meeting performance expectations.

Board Member Bradley would like us to look into COLA and merit increases.

Board Member Newton asked if we can compare what other waste providers are doing. Gaylyn stated that their information is not public because they are private companies. We have had a few new drivers coming over from the private companies because they want shorter shifts. So we know that our benefit package is valuable. The Tier 2 is also hurting us because it doesn't offer what the Tier 1 offers to other employees.

Board Chair Petersen asked if the board had any concerns about these next two items. There were no concerns so she directed that we bring back more information at the October meeting.

4.2.3.Capital Purchase of 1 Side Load Truck

Board Member Bradley said it is premature to cancel this fee at this time and we should discuss it at the next meeting. All board members agreed.

Board Chair Petersen directed Gaylyn to bring back more information to the next meeting.

<p>4.2.4. 1 Additional FTE, Equipment Operator effective July 1, 2015 for Green and Growth</p> <p>4.2.5. Cancellation of the 2015 ACB previously approved fee increase of \$2.00 per month</p>			
<p>4.3 Request for Board Members to serve on an Investment Committee, Pam Roberts (Approval Requested)</p>	<p>Pam reported that Stuart explored investment options with Zions Bank. Under the Utah Money Management Act agencies are allowed to invest funds into the market. We are asking for a couple members to sit with us and the bank to look into our investment options. Through our discussion with Zions, if we invest \$10 million, we will earn \$100,000 additional annual yield.</p> <p>Board Member Bradley stated that this would be better than what we are doing now.</p>	<p>No board members volunteered to sit on the committee. Direction was given to move forward on making the investments.</p>	
<p>4.4 Follow-up on 2200 West Residents, Interlocal with Salt Lake City for Exchange of Services, Pam Roberts</p>	<p>Pam needs direction and approval in developing an interlocal agreement with Salt lake City for exchange of services. Salt Lake City provides the curbside service on 2200 West for the homes in that unincorporated area. We are trying to formalize what has been happening for decades. Salt Lake City provides the curbside service for the homes on 2200 west even though we bill them and they use our cans (12-15 city homes, 17 homes that are unincorporated). In exchange for that service, the district provides service for homes on the boundary of Canyon Rim and Salt Lake City who have Salt Lake City cans but we provide the service. Salt Lake City provides the area cleanup for both of those locations. Going forward Pam is proposing that WFWRD provide the area cleanup service on 2200 West through the trailer reservation program. This would prevent and deter illegal dumping on 2200 West. The city is behind this exchange as well.</p>	<p>Motion: Board member Granato, seconded by Board Member Moser Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present)</p>	<p>Approved September 22, 2014</p>

4.5 Confirm or Reschedule November meeting for November 17th, 2014	<p>Due to Thanksgiving we would like to move the meeting from November 24th to the 17th for the approval of the Tentative budget.</p> <p>The board decided that the Public Hearing for the Adoption of the Budget will be held on December 8th @ 6:00 p.m. and then no meeting until January.</p>	No motion needed. All members in favor.	
5. Requested Items for Next Meeting on Monday, October 27, 2014			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd Quarter Financial Report • 2014 Projected Revenues/Expenditures vs 2014 Budgeted • 2015 Requested Budget • Policy for Mid-Year Budget Review, Gavin Anderson • Set Public Hearing date in December for 2015 Budget 		
ADJOURN		<p>Motion: Board Member Granato, seconded by Board Member Barbour</p> <p>Vote: All in favor (of Board Members present)</p>	