

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

DATE/TIME	LOCATION	ATTENDEES
<p>Monday, January 27, 2025 9:00 a.m.</p> <p>Next Board Meeting Monday, February 24, 2025 9:00 a.m.</p>	<p>Public Works Building 604 West 6960 South Midvale, UT 84047</p>	<p><u>Board Members:</u> Anna Barbieri (Chair)-City of Taylorsville, Greg Shelton (Vice Chair)-White City, Sherrie Ohrn-Herriman City, Keith Zuspan-Town of Brighton, Robert Piñon-Emigration Canyon, Mick Sudbury-Magna City, Emily Gray-City of Holladay, Diane Turner-Murray City</p> <p><u>Participating Electronically:</u> Thom DeSirant-Millcreek City (<i>arrived after roll call</i>), Tessa Stitzer-Town of Copperton (<i>arrived after roll call</i>), Patrick Schaeffer-Kearns City (<i>arrived at 9:22 a.m.</i>), Laurie Stringham-Salt Lake County (<i>arrived after roll call</i>)</p> <p><u>Excused:</u> Matt Holton-Cottonwood Heights, Marci Houseman-Sandy City</p> <p><u>District & Support Staff:</u> Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel Pam Roberts, General Manager/CEO Helen Kurtz, Finance Director/CFO David Ika, Operations Manager Renee Plant, Administrative Manager Catarina Garcia, Executive Assistant/Board Clerk</p> <p><u>Public:</u> Abby Evans-Salt Lake County, Patrick Craig-Salt Lake County, Justin Edwards-Herriman City, John Taylor-Taylorsville City, Unidentified Caller (435) 5**-**59 (9:28 a.m.-9:46 a.m.)</p>

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

To be held Monday, January 27, 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: Anna Barbieri, Board Chair
Roll Call: Catarina Garcia, Board Clerk

Welcome New Board Members: Marci Houseman, Sandy City Council, and welcome back Diane Turner, Murray City Council

- Oath of Office: Catarina Garcia, Board Clerk

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

- 1.1. December 16, 2024, 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@wasatchfrontwaste.org before Sunday, January 26, 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. Formal Transition of Board Vice Chair Greg Shelton to Board Chair: Board Chair Barbieri (*Motion & Approve*)
- 3.2. Formal Transition of Board Member Emily Gray to the 2025 Board Vice Chair: Board Chair Barbieri (*Motion & Approve*)
- 3.3. Conflict of Interest and Financial Disclosure Requirements: Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel (*Compliance Request*)

3.4. General Managers Report: Pam Roberts, General Manager (***Informational/Direction/Approval***)

- Human Resource Updates, 2024 Truck Sales, Request Direction or Approval on SCRP Reservations, Billing Frequency, 2025 Customer Satisfaction Survey Concepts

3.5. 2024 4th Quarter Financial Report: Helen Kurtz, Finance Director (***Informational/Direction***)

3.6. Requested Amendments to the Private Road Policy: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel (***Approval Requested***)

3.7. Follow-up on the Apple Awards: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Hazel Dunsmore, Human Resources Manager (***Direction/Approval***)

4. Closed Session (*If Needed*)

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

5. Other Board Business

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

6. Requested Items for the Next Board Meeting Monday, February 24, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

- General Manager's Report:
 - 2023 and 2024 Program Cost Comparisons
 - SCRP Reservations Follow-up
 - Billing Frequency Follow-Up
- Open and Public Meetings Act Annual Training
- Human Resources Policies Annual Review
- 2025 Customer Satisfaction Survey Review

7. Adjourn

TOPICS/ OBJECTIVES	KEY POINTS/ DECISIONS	ACTION ITEMS WHO – WHAT – BY WHEN	STATUS
Call to Order / Roll Call			
	Board Chair Barbieri called the meeting to order, and Catarina conducted the roll call.		
Welcome New Board Members	<p>Board Chair Barbieri welcomed Marci Houseman, Sandy City Council, who was excused from the meeting, and Pam noted that Board Member Houseman has already taken her Oath of Office.</p> <p>Board Chair Barbieri welcomed back Diane Turner, Murray City Council, and Catarina conducted Council Member Turner’s Oath of Office.</p>		
1. Consent Items (<i>Approval Requested</i>)			
1.1 December 16, 2024, Board Meeting Minutes	There were no questions or comments on the minutes.	<p>Motion to Approve: Board Member Ohrn</p> <p>Second: Board Member Zuspan</p> <p>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</p>	Approved January 27, 2025
2. Meeting Open for Public Comments			
	<p>Catarina shared a public comment from L. Iasella of 1398 East 8730 South.</p> <p>L. spoke with General Manager Pam Roberts on December 23, 2024, and expressed her disapproval of raising the fees for services 33% in 2025 without restoring the once-a-year container delivery services for bulk waste pick-up. She wants the old program back.</p> <p>There were no other public comments.</p>		

3. Business Items			
3.1. Formal Transition of Board Vice Chair Greg Shelton to Board Chair: Board Chair Barbieri (<i>Motion & Approve</i>)	Board Chair Barbieri entertained a motion to approve, which was done by Board Member Gray and a second by Board Member Ohrn.	Motion to Adopt: Board Member Gray Second: Board Member Ohrn Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).	Approved January 27, 2025
3.2. Formal Transition of Board Member Emily Gray to the 2025 Board Vice Chair: Board Chair Barbieri (<i>Motion & Approve</i>)	Board Chair Shelton entertained a motion to approve, which was done by Board Member Barbieri and a second by Board Member Piñon.	Motion to Adopt: Board Chair Barbieri Second: Board Member Piñon	Approved January 27, 2025
3.3. Conflict of Interest and Financial Disclosure Requirements: Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel (<i>Compliance Request</i>)	<p>Rachel Anderson introduced the new legislation that requires all elected and appointed government officials, boards, city councils, county commissions and councils throughout the state to complete a detailed list of questions related to conflicts of interest and financial disclosures. It is similar to what state legislators are already required to do and the requirement has been expanded across the state for all government officials.</p> <p>Rachel explained that it must be completed annually no sooner than January 1st and no later than January 31st. The District is required to have it on their website for the entire year and send the link to the Lieutenant Governor's office. The law states that the District must impose a \$100.00 fine for Board Members who violate the requirements. One nuance with laws is that appointed members should already be doing this for their cities and we can use that form if they are already doing it for their city.</p>		

	<p>Rachel is unsure if cities realize this is a new law but a lot of the city forms that have already been completed do not meet the standards of this new law. Rachel created this form that cross references to another code section which is extremely detailed for state legislators. She went through each question and added the applicable ones. She understands it can be uncomfortable or awkward to answer questions about spouses, but that is the law.</p> <p>Rachel stated she would stay after the meeting if anyone has questions about completing the form.</p>		
<p>3.4.General Managers Report: Pam Roberts, General Manager <i>(Informational/Direction/Approval)</i></p>	<p>Pam began by stating that the District is in good shape, and she wanted to provide updates and review some initiatives.</p> <p>The first page of her report shows all of the tonnages we collected through several avenues to remove waste for residents and from our communities. Pam stated that we are well worth our girth, we collected 148,000 tons of all different shapes, sizes, and colors of waste and recycling.</p> <p>Pam noted that she previously reached out to all Board Members to review some of these items to expedite today's meeting.</p> <p>Personnel: Staff are always looking for cost saving measures and have recently reduced our workforce due to budgetary restraints and the ability to absorb workloads from three positions. It is never easy to go through a Reduction in Force (RIF). This is the first in District history, we are hoping it will be the last, but we never know what the future may hold.</p> <p>As Pam mentioned, there were three positions identified. One was the Quality Assurance Inspector</p>		

(QAI) position that was vacated when Trace Sondrup retired last year. When talking with James Kelsey [Sustainability Coordinator] and Kevin Ungerer [Quality Assurance Inspector], who are the remaining staff that head up the Sustainability Group, they believe they can absorb that increased workload and want to do their best to help save money.

The other two positions were staffed and included the Equipment Operator Apprentice Training Coordinator position that was added in April 2023. Hindsight being 20/20, once things were up and operating there wasn't a lot of workload there. What remains will be absorbed by Management, Supervisors, and our Safety Coordinator. Pam further stated that we were able to reduce the HR/Payroll Specialist position that was added in June 2021. Hazel [HR Manager] and Lori McAllister, Payroll Technician, will absorb some of the workload from that position.

The costs savings will be just over \$320,000 annually including benefits and will help offset a large portion of the \$372,000 Equipment Operator salary market adjustments approved by the Board in August 2024. WFWRD moved from 101 FTE to 99 with these changes.

As Pam previously mentioned, staff would like to keep the Quality Assurance Inspector FTE and look to see if we need to reclassify it if we move to more frequent billing in the future. We may need another Customer Service Representative, or other position to help with billing and receipting but we would come before the

	<p>Board to discuss options before we ever make that change.</p> <p>2024 Truck Sales: Pam explained that we did not recoup acceptable money for the five side load trucks at auction with what is now JJ Kane Auctions. We received a total of \$5,600. She is expecting a letter from JJ Kane with their offering then she will bring it to the Board in February to discuss it in a closed session if needed.</p> <p>2025 Truck Purchases (<i>Direction Requested</i>): Pam reported that the purchase price of trucks increased more than what was budgeted for eight CNG side load trucks at just over \$436,000 each. The price increased just over \$23,000 per truck so the big question is if we want to stay with CNG or go all diesel for the eight trucks which would save approximately \$400,000. Diesel trucks are each \$50,000 cheaper than CNG. We haven't tested the diesel trucks yet. We had four arrive at the end of last year, but they have not been tested yet. We can't find any data that says which fuel type is cleaner and are requesting direction from the Board. To have some cost savings is very appealing and the question is what the future price of fuel will be. There is data showing the price of CNG increasing and diesel decreasing. We have not been able to test a diesel truck for MPGs, but we do know that CNG gets less than two miles per gallon.</p> <p>Pam responded to Board Member Zuspan that CNG gets less than two miles per gallon, and we do not know for sure about diesel. The last data we had showed two miles per gallon for diesel.</p> <p>Pam replied to Vice Chair Gray that she believes CNG is 1.89 miles per gallon.</p>	<p>Motion to Approve: Board Member Stringham</p> <p>Second: Board Member Ohrn</p> <p>Votes: Board Chair Shelton: Aye Vice Chair Gray: Aye Board Member Barbieri: Aye Board Member DeSirant: Aye Board Member Ohrn: Aye Board Member Piñon: Aye Board Member Schaeffer: Aye Board Member Stitzer: Nay Board Member Stringham: Aye Board Member Sudbury: Aye Board Member Turner: Aye Board Member Zuspan: Aye</p>	<p>Approved January 27, 2025</p>
--	--	---	---

Pam replied to Board Member Ohrn that we do not know what the advertised diesel miles per gallon are. We have some information from Salt Lake City and Draper City. Draper said they are averaging three miles per gallon, but we do not know for sure about the accuracy. We do know that we keep a lot better data than many of the other entities, which is why we wanted to test the four diesel trucks first. We will not be able to test them before we need to place an order.

Board Member Barbieri noted that we usually get a much higher rate back on the gas-powered trucks which served us well, whereas CNG trucks don't resell for as much and are much more difficult to unload because of the infrastructure.

Board Member Stringham recommended that we move to all diesel truck purchases this time around. Looking at the environment and what is going on in the government right now and the cost of CNG. There is also the recyclability we can get for them after the fact. Her research indicates that buying CNG right now does not make sense in our current environment, and we should save that money.

Pam responded to Board Member Turner that it is so hard to know what the environmental impact is, which is why we wanted to test four trucks. It is hard to get the emissions data. Our plan was to test that ourselves. The DEF (Diesel Efficiency Fuel Systems) have become more cleaner which was the purpose of that regulation to make sure the diesel emissions were cleaner when they off gas. You can find information that will tell you both which is what is so hard and why we wanted to test the trucks.

Board Member Ohrn reminded everyone that the Board asked for that data a while back, but we could never find any. That was the biggest driver in changing and there is nothing that can confirm it and there has been so much regulation on diesel. She seconded Board Member Stringham's opinion because we don't know, and it is never a problem to have diversity in the fleet. If something changes and we are not able to get CNG, we are just stuck. It makes sense to her to have that diversity and save a big chunk of money. All the DEF data is to try to take care of the problem, and it is mandated.

Board Member Barbieri commented that maintenance costs less on diesel trucks and they resell for a lot more.

Board Member Stringham clarified that maintenance is much less on a diesel and there are more people who can actually work on them, so the cost of maintenance is much less, and parts are cheaper and easier to get. The most important thing is that diesel trucks are more recyclable when they are no longer usable. CNG trucks are not and that is the one aspect we do not look at when we look at these vehicles. Batteries for electric trucks are not recyclable, they do not break down, there isn't a place to tear them apart and recycle the parts and pieces. They just sit in a big pile somewhere and we haven't gotten to a point where we can do something with them. When we start talking about what is recyclable and what we can break down, diesel trucks are still way more recyclable than a CNG truck. There are some dichotomies in the industry when we talk about recyclability and clean air. It might be green in one aspect but way less green in another. This needs

to be taken into consideration and is where she struggles sometimes.

Vice Chair Gray asked why we moved to all CNG in the first place. Pam replied that it was a lot cheaper per gallon and with the DEF coming on-line it took some time to do that. It was a Board directive to switch to CNG. Pam has heard in government that we don't go back and look, we don't go back and change things, but we might need to, especially with the savings. She said she was always on the fence because she wanted to have proof and always uses data to manage. There will be four diesels arriving hopefully next month and if we were to do all eight, we would have a total of 12 diesel with the remaining [44] trucks CNG.

Board Member Stringham believes this will give us a better understanding between the two and she does not think adding eight more diesel will make a huge difference to where we are at right now and will give us better understanding of the vehicles and give us a bigger number to measure. She believes for the cost and environment we are in right now, it is the way to go. She made a motion to make the next eight truck purchases diesel trucks. Board Member Ohrn seconded, Board Member Stitzer opposed.

With no further comments, Pam continued on with
2025 Initiatives:

Exploration of Increased Billing Frequency
(Direction Requested): As Pam previously mentioned, we want to hold on to the QAI FTE and it is a matter of going back to look if we can do something different to improve cash flow, understanding that if we increase billing from quarterly to monthly or bi-

monthly it is an increased cost. Helen and Matt compiled some dollars and cents. Pam showed a list of pros and cons and invited Helen to report on them.

Helen reported there would be increased security with improved cash flow throughout the year to have enough cash on hand for emergencies, capital purchases, and paying regular bills without concern. This is a really big driving force for Helen. We currently bill quarterly so we get a lot of money coming in after the quarterly billing then it tapers off, of course we are still spending money every month. She does not want to get into a position where the cash balance crosses with expenditures, and we have to make a decision on what we can and cannot pay for that month. It hasn't happened, although it was close this last year.

Helen went on to report other pros are keeping higher dollars in accounts to earn more interest, increasing cash receipting for current year with fewer amounts in accounts receivable and collecting faster. It will also allow us to find problems and errors faster, refunds will be lower, and we can catch changes of ownership sooner to reconcile accounts and receive payments by sellers. The significant fee increase for someone paying quarterly will feel like a large increase whereas the \$6.50 monthly increase for customers who don't budget on a monthly basis and save it up and pay it, are going to feel that more. From a customer service perspective, she believes it is a better situation.

The cons are increased workloads for billing because it will be more frequent and also for cash receipts because a lot of payments will be coming in more frequently. A lot of them are electronic and just need

to be uploaded and posted. We have to do some research which will take some time. The increased workload will have to be accommodated. As Pam mentioned for that purpose, there is the possibility of adding or reclassifying the vacant [QAI] FTE to help out. We will try very hard not to add another person or have to use that money. She really believes we can do it, but it could be difficult, and we are not exactly sure if it will really be a possibility, but she thinks we can do it.

Helen showed a table illustrating increased costs for switching from quarterly to monthly or bi-monthly billing. She noted that the bi-monthly billing costs were calculated incorrectly and showed the corrected numbers off to the right in a corrections column.

For one quarter of billing, we have revenue of \$6.6M. If we change to monthly, we would collect \$4.4M early, and \$2.2M earlier if we went to bi-monthly billing. This translates into more interest at 4%. The Public Treasurer's Investment Fund (PTIF) is currently at 4.67% but it has been down month over month the last year. There will be increased printing and postage costs which will be \$92K for monthly and \$60K for bi-monthly. There are also increased transaction fees for credit card payments which will amount to \$90,592 and \$4,300 for a monthly billing, and for bi-monthly it would be \$22,648, and \$2,901 for the lockbox check payments. We also have walk-in and call-in payments which are all on a percentage basis so the dollar amounts will not be affected.

Helen further reported that we added an amount for turnover and training costs. There will be training required but she does not know what that will look like

yet. Matt calculated an amount that would be one time, not quarterly. The quarterly increased cost for monthly billing would be \$213,791. For bi-monthly billing it would be \$73,103. The net increased cash inflows would be \$4,235,675 for monthly and \$2,149,000 for bi-monthly.

Board Member Ohrn asked if we added the anticipated salary into the costs. Helen replied that it was not calculated into the numbers, but it could be a part of the training and turnover costs. She did not add a new person to the costs because she thinks we can do it without adding a new person.

Board Member Sudbury asked about delinquent notices for people not paying their bill. Helen replied that we have a pretty high payment rate. There are approximately 13% that were late, which will be shown later in the certification amounts.

Board Member Barbieri asked if we would give any incentive for people to pay online. Helen responded that we do not currently have an incentive, or cash discount to pay online but it is actually one of her plans is to do a push to get people to pay online and get e-bills which will mitigate the increased printing and postage costs.

Helen replied to Vice Chair Gray's question that online payments are approximately 75% of residents. There are people who use their bank bill pay which are also processed through the Xpress Bill Pay online payment portal.

Pam added that for today we are asking for direction to continue with the exploration then we can return with more information. This is something we would like to roll out sooner than later, the reality may be that it will be 2026. The reason why bi-monthly is included is because Mt. Olympus Improvement District, the sewer provider for Millcreek and many other cities, used to be quarterly and they went to bi-monthly billing for the exact reasons that are listed on the slide. More cash flow, a higher amount of year end cash versus what will be in AR. We want to talk to Steve Rohwer there to find out for sure how they did it, the benefits, etc. Our billing system is built for monthly billing, and we reprogrammed it to bill quarterly. We can't help but wonder if monthly billing will smooth out a lot of the issues we have with our database.

Board Member Barbieri believes staff should move forward with the exploration and shoot for monthly billing and if there is any way we can encourage people to do online processing and get rid of their paper bill.

Board Member Zuspan asked if there are other electronic communications we can use with Xpress Bill Pay's payment portal. Helen replied that we do have a plan to inform customers several different ways many times. It will be on social media, we will send emails to those for which we have email addresses, and we will put notices on the bills and possibly bill inserts, so it will actually be read. Helen does not believe it will affect Xpress Bill Pay's billing but will personally call them and discuss it.

	<p>Board Member Turner would like to know what other companies are doing. In Murray they work with more than one vendor. Pam said that haulers bill the city who then bills the residents and that monthly billing coordinates with the utilities.</p> <p>Helen added that Sandy City bills monthly for their outsourced waste collection services. She believes most other services are billing monthly, which is more common than a quarterly bill.</p> <p>Board Member Ohrn shared that in Herriman and she believes in most cities, utilities are billed monthly.</p> <p>Board Chair Shelton requested to see the data for current quarterly billing in addition to the cost increases. He thinks it is a good idea to look at incentives for online billing, especially if it will save us money.</p> <p>The Board directed staff to move forward with gathering more information.</p> <p>With no other comments or questions, Pam moved on to the next initiative of doing a Customer Satisfaction Survey (<i>Direction Requested</i>).</p> <p>She noted we haven't done one for a while and the question comes up with having another fee increase in 2026-2027, if we should ask our residents about the frequency of billing, ask about switching to bi-weekly recycling to reduce costs and prolong the next fee increase and give an estimated dollar amount to save. Scraping the SCRP to reduce costs would save an estimated \$1.20 per home per month. We have talked about leaves, Christmas trees, etc., the thought is</p>	<p>Staff to move forward with gathering additional information and report at the next Board Meeting.</p>	
--	---	---	--

understanding that if we take something away or make changes in the integrated waste collection system, the tonnages are not just going to go away. For residential collections we did almost 139,000 tons last year. If we change it to bi-weekly, where would that extra go? Probably in the garbage can. If we did away with 6,000 tons of bulk waste from SCRP, where will that go? Pam asked the Board for direction to proceed to develop a survey. We will use older surveys and add in some of the questions if the Board is comfortable with that.

Vice Chair Gray believes it is a great idea, and it helps people understand how much a particular service adds to their bill, and she also likes the idea of asking them about billing frequency.

Board Member Turner agreed that adding some statistics is helpful, and Board Chair Shelton commented on the importance of involving the public and being as transparent as possible. We have to understand that sometimes they don't understand the whole picture, so we have to make the best decision for them. It is still good to involve them and take the temperature of the communities.

Board Member Ohrn also agreed that is the hard part of the question. Reducing costs is great but there is a bigger picture, and it is so difficult to do that in an online survey. There are hard arguments on both sides of bi-weekly recycling. Most residents don't realize all the boxes are sitting somewhere in a warehouse and they don't understand the history of shipping it all to China and how it started in the first place, and how far behind the US is with any kind of recycling. Those kind of things are realities and sometimes we do things

that are “feel good”, people feel good that they are recycling but don’t understand what is happening with the recycling industry. You can’t communicate that in an online survey so that is the difficult part about getting information back from residents. It’s much bigger than what is communicated in a one sentence survey.

In response to the public comment Catarina read earlier, Vice Chair Gray believes we have all received that comment ad nauseam and doesn’t know if there is a way to put in an education piece. When she talks to people she tries to explain the background, but they don’t like it but at least it makes sense. She wonders if there is a way to include that or if it is not the right venue. She understands people are frustrated and thinks we all share it, we all would love to have the old [SCRP] program back.

Catarina asked if we could ask the online unidentified caller their name for the minutes. Renee sent the caller a message asking their identity. Although the caller was not muted, there was no response, and they left the meeting.

Pam continued that it is possible to put intros for SCRП and recycling and we will try to shorten the number of questions.

Board Chair Shelton asked if we have the ability to label the outside of our bills with something like “special notice enclosed” for special announcements. Helen responded that it may be possible with our current vendor, and there was an additional charge for that when it was done in Sandy City.

With nothing else, Pam stated that staff will proceed and return next month with a draft.

The last initiative Pam revisited was **Limiting Repeat SCRP Reservations and Expand Services to More Residents** (*Direction/Approval Requested*) and asked Renee to provide the update to the Board.

Renee showed 2022 to 2023 repeat reservation data, the same information from 2023 to 2024, and the change from prior year. Most of the communities had an increase in repeat reservations. It indicates residents are better understanding how the process works. The residents may find it more equitable to alternate years. She explained that there are some residents in neighborhoods who are the designated “host” that do this for their communities.

Board Chair Shelton gave his area as an example and stated that there could be a possibility for shared homes to just change who is the host and then place special instructions with their neighbors as he is one of the people who rents for the whole neighborhood. He talked about the reservation being made by one person but having the container placed at a different address.

Vice Chair Gray stated that she has received several requests to not have reservations open at midnight. Renee replied that Customer Service was inundated when the reservations opened at 8:00 a.m. and our very committed Customer Service Manager would be up at midnight to answer questions which helps spread some of that. Some communities were sold out in three minutes.

Board Member DeSirant commented that some of his residents do not support limiting repeat reservations because there is typically one person in a neighborhood with a deep driveway who will request a container that the rest of the neighborhood uses.

Board Member Stitzer commented that Copperton has a very small population so now that we have figured out how to make reservations and where Copperton is concerned, they are not lumped in to the larger cities where it is filling out before they have an option. She is heavily against limiting repeat reservations because their population is small enough that they can definitely handle it, and they have shared driveway situations as well as a lot of renting situations. To echo Board Member DeSirant's comment, she has heard from her community that they are not in favor of limiting that and that they have certain people who will rent a container and share with neighbors that may have an additional driveway. She offered this as something to consider when making the decision because there are communities who are a little bit more unique.

Board Member Ohrn asked if they have 100% who want a container to get one, or if they have a waitlist in Copperton. Renee replied that they would have a waitlist.

Board Member Stitzer added that before last year they had a lot of conversations about how certain areas were lumped in to other larger areas. Previously when the reservations were made, they were part of Herriman and there were two different parts of Herriman on that same list so there were quite a few Copperton residents who were waiting until midnight

and were automatically told they were on a waitlist. She previously brought this concern to the Board and also spoke with Pam separately to come up with something that works a little better to match their situation. Last year it ended up working really, really well, but with the small population there will be a lot of repeats. It is not a big enough area where every single person in Copperton would do that. She believes that Copperton on their own ever sells out.

Board Member Ohrn agreed with Board Member Stitzer that one size never fits all, she does not believe we are saying that we won't allow repeats, it is 100% to say prioritize people who didn't get a chance the previous year. If everyone in Copperton is getting a chance, it really wouldn't affect them if we do that.

Board Member Stitzer replied that it makes sense in a way because there are people that do secure those and are usually the same people. She has not seen the exact names of people who have reserved containers over the last several years, which would be interesting to see how many repeats they actually have. She knows they have certain individuals that do end up getting them each year and they share with some of the neighbors especially because they have property management rentals and a lot of those are incredibly hard to get in touch with to get the approval prior to the reservation window.

Board Member Barbieri asked Renee if it is possible to send out the notices based on the city. Renee responded that yes. If the Board decided to say perhaps if a community is a certain size or smaller, they remain on the same type of reservation system we currently have, that could be done. An opting out

option. Renee said we can determine what the breaking point is. Copperton could stay with the current system and those in the larger areas is where we would focus more on a priority level.

Board Member Stitzer felt that was the best approach when we have had several of these different conversations. All in all, whenever we have talked about the program, they have always fit a different scenario and she believes that each community is awesome and unique in their own ways and if we can make it work for the other communities and other smaller cities that don't have this issue, it would be a win/win.

Renee replied to Board Chair Shelton that we would not need a different software to accomplish this, and he recommended that communities should decide if they want to opt out of limiting the repeat reservations.

Vice Chair Gray recommended each Board Member go back to their councils and ask them.

Renee commented that we have prior year's data now, so we are able to do that. We came up with a system internally which she called the "early bird special" for those that are on the prior year's cancellation list that didn't get a container, it would be an "early bird special".

To answer Board Member DeSirant, Pam said that it is not based on the size of the municipality because Millcreek is the largest of our cities.

	<p>Renee stated that we would need to know who wanted to opt out because we will begin the background processes pretty quickly to get ready. She agreed with Board Chair Shelton that the next Board Meeting would be soon enough. He asked the Board to take this back to their community councils and bring back their decisions next month or email Renee as soon as possible.</p> <p>Vice Chair Gray expressed her appreciation for how adaptable staff have been in this process. Board Chair Shelton added that their community [White City] greatly appreciates this for those who don't have trucks and can't get out to the dump, and it is an amazing program.</p> <p>With no further discussions, Board Chair Shelton moved on to the next business item.</p>	<p>Board Members to report their community's preference at the next Board Meeting or notify Renee in advance.</p>	
<p>3.5.2024 4th Quarter Financial Report: Helen Kurtz, Finance Director <i>(Informational/Direction)</i></p>	<p>Helen began her financial report for the quarter ending December 31, 2024 which is also the end of our fiscal year-end. She noted that not everything is in yet, so they are not final numbers. She reported the following highlights:</p> <p>Revenues: While total revenues are 90.47% of budget for 2024, if you take out the \$3,388,000 that we expect to use for fund reserves, we actually posted 101.49% of budgeted revenues so we are doing pretty well for the budget for the year.</p> <p>Personnel Expenses: There are still journal entries to be done for FY 2024 such as the payroll accrual, compensated absences, pensions, and OPEB. We changed from Mission Square to URS during the year for 401(k) accounts and changed g/l account codes as well causing Supplemental 401(k) to appear overspent</p>		

by 616% and the Social Security and ICMA line to appear underspent. 92% of personnel expenses have been spent and there have been vacancies throughout the entire year.

Operating Expenses: Helen reiterated these numbers are not final for the fiscal year. All year-end entries are not yet posted. We are at 94% of expenses for the year. Fuel is underspent by \$322,000 because of a price change, maintenance is overspent by \$262,000 which is not terribly unexpected considering the current state of the economy. Overall, we are underspent on operating expenses, which is a great thing. For capital expenses we had budgeted \$6M which included carry-over from prior years, and we spent \$4,303,767 in 2024.

Capital Expenditures: We made some CNG fuel island concrete improvements totaling \$182,000, spent \$4.1M on trucks that were ordered in 2023 but not received or paid for in 2024, for a combined total of \$4.3M in expenditures. We have four diesel trucks that were for 2024 which were not received and will be paid for in 2025. Pam added the caveat that we did pay for the chassis, and we will pay for the bodies in 2025.

Cash Balances: Helen's graph showed an unfortunate plunging line in 2024. The reason for the dip in the summertime is because of the capital expenditures from 2023. We discussed in prior Board Meetings that we predicted \$6M in cash at the end of December 2024, and we are at \$5.9M. We were pretty close. The reason for the jump in September is due to the \$2M in certifications that we collected.

Fuel Expenses: As previously discussed, we spent less money on fuel than was budgeted and less money than 2023. The price of fuel decreased. In 2023, diesel fuel went from an average of \$3.80 per gallon to \$3.13 per gallon, and CNG went from an average of \$2.32 per gallon to \$2.08 per gallon. 92% of fuel purchases were for CNG. This is why it was under budget because we actually purchased more fuel but paid less than 2023 because of the price differences.

Maintenance Expenses: Helen's graph shows the jump that we talked about from 2023 to 2024 and the fact that we are over budget in 2024. The bottom block on her graph is expenditures in the fourth quarter of 2024.

Recycle Tons: These have been decreasing primarily based on the actual weight of the recycling materials have decreased because of all the cardboard. Helen's slide also showed that contamination rates were 22.96% in 2024 which is 2.49% less than 2023 (25.45%). In 2021 it was 37.25%, and 26.05% in 2022.

Vendor Recycling Costs: Helen's graph showed 2024 costs falling right in the middle of the other years. This is calculated with the commodities-based costs. Pam said she wants to bring back a pricing index next month with just the percentage and type of materials that are in the blue can. She can give a rough estimate of the pricing because it fluctuates. Cardboard is just over 50% of what it is in the blue can.

Board Member Ohrn asked how many people actually break down their boxes. Pam responded, "not enough". Board Member Ohrn said that we talk about

how full the cans are and thinks some of that is because they are not compacted. Pam said that a lot of people don't know what "break down" means, so we are saying to take the tape off and fold it. The Sustainability Team of Kevin Ungerer, QAI, and James Kelsey, Sustainability Coordinator, constantly try to educate people on this topic. Our drivers ask if we could please tell residents to break down the boxes.

Refuse Tons: Helen reported that we are pretty close to last year, about 350 tons over, and her graph showed tons per facility; South Valley Transfer Station (80,077 tons), and the next highest is the Salt Lake Valley Landfill (31,229 tons), then the Trans-Jordan Landfill (16,095 tons) which is the most expensive place to dump.

Certifications: Helen added a table showing the number of parcels that are associated with each year. The original amount we certified for 2024 was \$2,697,714. The outstanding balance for that certification was \$364,556 which includes 1,814 parcels. For 2024 we originally sent 13,588 parcels, which is a 13% amount that is left outstanding. The data went back to 2016 with just one parcel owing which carried through 2017 and 2018. Helen explained that customers can request an extension from the County to pay their property taxes and it can be granted year after year.

Customer Refunds for the 4th Quarter of 2024: Helen reported there were 46 refunds totaling \$9,384. Most of those are refunds on closed accounts and there was one person who accidentally paid us their mortgage amount (\$1,716).

	<p>Pam gave a shout out to Helen at the end of her presentation and thanked her for adding more data to give the number of parcels that are actually refunded and for the historical information on certifications.</p> <p>With no further questions, the Board moved on to the next business item.</p>		
<p>3.6.Requested Amendments to the Private Road Policy: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel (<i>Approval Requested</i>)</p>	<p>Pam reminded the Board we are revisiting the policy staff brought to them in December regarding private roads. As a recap, we talked about adding the definition of a property unit that will also be in the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP).</p> <p>Pam explained that there is a process for new builds where residents request our services online and we automatically flag anything that is on a private road or in an HOA. In the past, we would automatically decline the request because we have that clause that states if a private hauler is available, we would not provide the service. That automatically threw us out in cases of a tear down and rebuild or we may want to service on a private lane, which was the parcel in Holladay City now called Holladay Court where there was one single-family home they tore down and put up four new single-family homes.</p> <p>Pam stated the only thing we changed from December was to really fine tune Section 10.1.3. to ensure the language is agreeable to the Board, and that the District will not accept requests to provide service on private roads or for excepted properties if a private hauler is already providing the services. There would only be an exception if the private hauler discontinues the service and the HOA or the property unit owner wants to have us service them.</p>	<p>Motion to Adopt: Vice Chair Gray Second: Board Member Barbieri</p> <p>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</p>	<p>Approved January 27, 2025</p>

Board Chair Shelton asked if a private community is already being serviced by a private hauler and they want to come over to us, if that would be okay. Pam said that she guesses it would, but she would want to be a little leery. Rachel said that it does not require that we take on those cases. The way it was drafted previously was that we wouldn't consider at all if a private hauler was "available". Now we want to say that even if there is one available, there might still be cases where we take it. It certainly is not a mandate that we take it in those cases.

Board Chair Shelton was curious because it reads like if they were refusing to provide service to that resident, but what if that resident says they are terrible and do not meet their expectations. Rachel replied that if it still doesn't work for the District, we can also still say no, but we are not mandated to provide services.

Pam stated that if someone on a private road wanted to fire their private hauler because they charge too much, and we are cheaper. Rachel added that they have to talk to us before they make any decisions because it is not going to be an automatic "yes".

Board Chair Shelton clarified that this allows us to step in and evaluate at that point. Pam said that we are not bound to provide them services.

Board Member Zuspan asked if the properties on Holladay Court are single cans or front load dumpsters. Pam answered that they all have side load cans, and they need to bring them out to 3900 South just as the previous property owner did, along with many other homes on 3900 South. This helped our efficiencies and economies of scale.

	<p>Board Member Ohrn commented on how we are solving a problem but still doesn't bind us in any way. It allows us the opportunity if it makes sense for the District.</p> <p>Rachel stated that the other point is that we are not going out to solicit or compete with private business. If there is already a private hauler providing services, we are not even going there.</p> <p>With no other comments, Board Chair Shelton sought a motion to approve.</p>		
<p>3.7.Follow-up on the Apple Awards: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Hazel Dunsmore, Human Resources Manager <i>(Direction/Approval)</i></p>	<p>Pam began by noting that Hazel had to step out of the meeting to work with a new driver this morning.</p> <p>Pam recapped that we shifted from two separate banks of sick leave and vacation to one Paid Time Off (PTO) leave accruals for employees to take time off for vacation or if they need to take time to be sick, doctor appointments, etc. There is one bank which the Board approved in December, and it has rolled out.</p> <p>She explained the Apple-A-Day Award has been part of our Employee Recognition Program and in the past anyone who had no use of sick leave could roll over up to 32 hours of sick leave into their vacation. Since we don't have sick leave banks, the thought was that maybe we could put some dollars and cents into the award while understanding budget constraints. Now we will base the awards on unscheduled leave or "call-ins". Call-ins are what hurt us the most, especially with our front-line equipment operators. We can't plan for that, we try, but it is understandable that it can create quite a headache. Initially we put dollar amounts that were pretty high but now offering</p>		

thoughts to not go that high while still making it an incentive.

Pam went on to say that we were asked to return with data to show the Board the historical trends that have happened and if we had \$1,000 for the gold apple meaning no call-ins, but this is based on minimal use of sick leave or no use of sick leave. Historically, the gold apple is no use of sick leave, and the red apple is minimal use of sick leave meaning less than 32 hours.

Pam showed a chart that shows the history noting that data was not available for 2017, 2018 or 2019. In 2014 there were 23 gold apples and 12 red apples. Over time, that has decreased which is pretty interesting to see.

She wanted the Board to understand that this would remain part of our Employee Recognition Program and if it were tied to dollars and cents, it would be the Board-approved dollar amount. This would be in addition to the over \$100,000 that we expend on Safety, Outstanding Employee, Team Appreciation, etc. Pam recommended that we do not implement the originally proposed \$1,000.00 for gold apples. We could have 50 employees that don't call-in in a year, which could be \$50,000.

The red apple is three or less call-ins per year. If we start a little lower and with inflation, we could raise that, but if we start high, she would never want to have to decrease that over time. This is a test as we have never had this kind of criteria for a dollar amount, it has always been sick leave hours that rolled over to vacation hours.

Pam further explained that some options could be to reduce the \$1,000.00 to \$800.00 for gold apples and from \$500.00 to \$450.00 for red apples, or \$700.00 for gold and \$400.00 for red. She stated that this is up for discussion and direction.

Vice Chair Gray asked if we had a sense if employees would prefer hours or cash. Pam replied that they would prefer cash.

Board Member Ohrn asked what the cost is associated with hours. Pam said that it would depend on the employee's salary.

Helen added that the average Equipment Operator salary is \$30.00 per hour plus variable benefits.

Board Member Turner asked what the expense would be. Pam replied that it would be increased overtime, depending on the season. May through September are the heavy tonnage months and that is when we see an increase in overtime. We have \$500,000 budgeted for overtime in 2025. We have tried to pull that out to see what is associated with that data. David Ika, Operations Manager, has run some reports. She is unsure if he can give dollars and cents for overtime when people call-in.

David said that we also have to consider vacancies which come out of our relief crew who work a five-day workweek if they come in on their day off. He does not have the data available today but can produce it. Board Member Turner said that would be helpful, so we have an understanding how much we are saving and make sure we are doing the right thing.

Helen said that she has some information and apologized that it was not final in time for the meeting packet. Based on Matt Ferguson [Controller] and David's information they compiled on overtime, in 2024 we spent \$348,145. In 2023 it was \$455,000, which is why our overtime budget is \$500,000 because we have history where there was a lot in a year. Of the \$348,145, she believes the driver overtime would have been \$288,960 of that. At that time David thought 100% would have been attributed to call-ins. People calling in and having to call somebody back who was off that day and having to pay them overtime. The average cost per overtime hour is \$64.70. If we say that \$288,960 was due to call-ins and we did do \$1,000.00 [for a gold apple] and everyone in WFWRD got \$1,000.00, that would be \$90,000 which would have net saved us \$188,000 for 2024.

Helen replied to Pam that she assumed it was for call-ins and drivers working on the fifth day. David confirmed that it was for call-ins and vacancies. Helen said that even if it was half, we would still save a significant amount of money.

Board Member Turner said that it sounds like a good investment to her. Board Chair Shelton commented that as long as the net benefit is that we are saving money, if money is more incentive to show up. Board Member Ohrn commented that the difficulty is that if giving them additional money really makes them not call-in, how do we determine if that is the key factor whether they call-in or not? In 2014 there we 23 [gold apples] and two in 2024. What is causing a trend in that? Sometimes we use dollars to fix a problem, and she wondered how much COVID was factored into the numbers. She is not suggesting it is a bad idea but

thinks we incentivize people with money and money is not a fix-all but it is not an incentive for long-term. We have to figure out why there is a so-called change in philosophy because obviously there is a big trend in it.

Pam stated that the use of sick leave is the hard part of it, and she doesn't know, it would take a lot of digging to find out how many were call-ins, or if they scheduled sick time off for doctor appointments. That is the historical piece. We are changing the criteria to calling in. It is an obligation if we put money to it, we are making a promise, which is why she is a little leery about the \$1,000.00. It is a good frame to say that we are paying people to show up.

Board Member Barbieri agreed with Pam that there is value in starting lower.

Board Member Zuspan stated that the varied amounts are a great idea but, in his head, he was thinking about a sub sandwich punch card. For the first year you don't call in you X dollars, and you fill your punch card is where the increased dollar amount really kicks in. They can project if they can fill their punch card up, they will get the larger dollar. It is a chance to change behavior because part of that is not having two different levels, they don't need a red or gold, they have a punch card. They get to the end of the punch card, they get the big dollars. It is trying to drive people to fill their punch card. He said that those were just some simple thoughts.

Vice Chair Gray commented that for younger employees, that may be too far out. Board Member Barbieri said that two months might be too far out.

Pam stated that she likes the idea of having the award because we have always had something to reward people for coming to work and not using sick leave or using very little. Now it will be don't call-in, but then again if it is high enough, are they going to show up to work sick? That is the balancing act that we have to do. Is \$500.00 enough for a gold and \$300.00 for a red?

Board Member Barbieri looked at the overall cost for 2024 which would have been \$6,000, it is worth adjusting and going with the lower amount and see if it is working. She thinks it is a conversation among the drivers that it is a pain in the neck if they call-in at the last minute. There might be building comradery or a sense of commitment to their fellow employees.

Board Chair Shelton asked what the call-in deadline is, where it is not a call-in, but schedule timed off. Pam replied that we would have to define that. She will work with David, but in her mind, it would be at least a day.

Board Member Sudbury expressed that he has mixed emotions and asked if there is any other way we could do this without taking money out of their pocket. He commented on the letters the Board received about staff's pay. To him it may be an incentive to call-out because you are taking away his money.

Pam replied that there is no money attached to it right now, and he said that he meant their hours. Board Member Ohrn asked if he wanted to keep the compensation they were getting previously [rolling over hours].

Board Member Piñon stated that he believes it is an accountability conversation and how the team works together. He would keep it at \$1,000.00 and \$500.00 because they will do the math, and if it's too low, what? If it is a true incentive and will save us money as calculated in terms of if everyone made it and operations run smoother, keep it at \$1,000.00.

Board Chair Shelton commented that they are still getting paid PTO if they have it, and this is just an extra bonus. Board Member Piñon added that if it is the day before, you can schedule a doctor appointment, but all things considered, we are talking about accountability.

Vice Chair Gray wondered if it would make a bigger difference because now, they have all their time off in one pool because you can only use sick time for sick and vacation time for vacation and it's oh well, use it or lose it sick time. Now that it is all in one pool if she was going to call-in a sick day and it won't affect her vacation, that would have a greater impact on her decision making. Pam said that was the main reason for switching [to PTO].

Board Chair Shelton commented about starting it out too low and you can't put the rabbit back in the box. Vice Chair Gray believed that \$500.00 for gold was too low and Board Member Turner agreed that it should be \$700.00 or \$800.00.

Vice Chair Gray said for the organization, the difference between \$700.00 and \$800.00 is not a lot but may be to the individual. She motioned for \$800.00 for gold and \$450.00 for red which was seconded by Board Member Turner.

	Pam thanked the Board noting that it will be appreciated. Board Chair Shelton concluded that it is good to reward our employees, and this will help reward good behavior and shift the focus to that. Board Member Turner reiterated that it is a good investment.		
4. Closed Session (if needed)			
	<i>No closed session was needed.</i>		
5. Other Board Business			
	<p>Board Member Ohrn updated the Board that at Herriman’s Council Meeting last week they gave direction to move forward with an RFP for collection services. The wording in the agenda was to “exit WFWRD” and the answer was no. They are moving forward to ensure that they are staying financially responsible to their community. They are fully aware that it will take a vote from the Board as well as negotiations on any kind of financing, you can’t just leave because there are a lot of things involved such as trucks, staff, etc.</p> <p>There was no other Board business.</p>		
5. Requested Items for the Board Meeting Monday, February 24, 2025, 9:00 a.m.			
	<p>Board Chair Shelton reviewed the items for the next Board Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Manager’s Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2023 and 2024 Program Cost Comparisons - SCRP Reservations - Billing Frequency - Apple Awards • Open and Public Meetings Act Annual Training • Human Resources Policies Annual Review • 2025 Customer Satisfaction Survey Review 		

6. Adjourn			
	<p>Board Chair Shelton reminded Board Members to turn in their Conflict of Interest Forms.</p> <p>With no further business, Board Chair Shelton entertained a motion to adjourn.</p>	<p>Motion to Adjourn: Board Member Zuspan</p> <p>Second: Board Member Ohrn</p> <p>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</p>	<p>Approved January 27, 2025</p> <p><i>Meeting end time: 10:39 a.m.</i></p>