

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

DATE/TIME	LOCATION	ATTENDEES
<p>Monday, March 24, 2025 9:00 a.m.</p> <p><b>Next Board Meeting</b> Monday, April 28, 2025 9:00 a.m.</p>	<p>Public Works Building 604 West 6960 South Midvale, UT 84047</p>	<p><u>Board Members:</u>  Greg Shelton (Chair)-White City, Emily Gray (Vice Chair)-City of Holladay, Anna Barbieri-City of Taylorsville, Sherrie Ohrm-Herriman City, Keith Zuspan-Town of Brighton, Robert Piñon-Emigration Canyon, Diane Turner-Murray City, Matt Holton-Cottonwood Heights (<i>arrived at 9:10 a.m.</i>), Marci Houseman-Sandy City</p> <p><u>Participating Electronically:</u> Thom DeSirant-Millcreek City (<i>arrived at 9:17 a.m.</i>), Patrick Schaeffer-Kearns City (<i>arrived at 9:19 a.m.</i>), Laurie Stringham-Salt Lake County</p> <p><u>Excused:</u> Tessa Stitzer-Town of Copperton, Mick Sudbury-Magna City</p> <p><u>District &amp; Support Staff:</u>  Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel  Pam Roberts, General Manager/CEO  Helen Kurtz, Finance Director/CFO  Matt Ferguson, Controller/Treasurer  David Ika, Operations Manager  Hazel Dunsmore, Human Resources Manager  Renee Plant, Administrative Manager  Justin Tuft, Residential Refuse &amp; Special Services Collection Manager (<i>Webex</i>)  Andre Perov, GIS Coordinator (<i>arrived at 9:15 a.m. Webex</i>)  Catarina Garcia, Executive Assistant/Board Clerk</p> <p><u>Public:</u> Christopher Bell-Salt Lake County, Abby Evans-Salt Lake County (<i>9:16 a.m.-9:34 a.m.</i>), Patrick Craig-Salt Lake County, Jennifer Kennedy-Murray City, Justun Edwards-Herriman City</p>

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

To be held Monday, March 24, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. at the District Offices located at 604 West 6960 South, inside the Salt Lake County Public Works Administration Building Training Room. This meeting will also be held electronically via Webex. Public login is:

<https://slco.webex.com/slco/j.php?MTID=m11ce3ad37b62a22e42bfb360484c63de>

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

**Call to Order:** Greg Shelton, Board Chair  
**Roll Call:** Catarina Garcia, Board Clerk

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

- 1.1. February 24, 2025, Board of Trustees 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](mailto:cgarcia@wasatchfrontwaste.org) before Sunday, March 23, 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. General Manager's Report: Pam Roberts, General Manager (***Informational/Direction***)

- Continuous Improvement: Optimizing the Equipment Operator Apprentice Program, 2025 Employee Satisfaction Survey Summary, Management Team Leadership Retreat, 2025 Customer Satisfaction Survey Preliminary Results, March 11, 2025, Solid Waste of North America (SWANA) Event Briefing

3.2. Request to Move to Monthly Billing Starting in 2026: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Helen Kurtz, Finance Director (***Direction/Approval Requested***)

**4. Other Board Business**

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

**5. Requested Items for the Next Board Meeting Monday, April 28 2025, at 9:00 a.m.**

- 2025 1st Quarter Financial Report
- Report on URS Audit
- General Manager's Report
- Release of Properties from Tax Sale Request from the Salt Lake County Property Tax Committee
- Place Holder: Request Reclassification of Vacant FTE Allocation to a Driver FTE
- Monthly Billing Update

**6. Closed Session *Reasons as Provided by Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205***

**Open:** Motion and Approve for Closed Session to Discuss Personnel Matters.

**Close:** Motion and Approve

**7. Adjourn Regular Board of Trustees Meeting**

TOPICS/ OBJECTIVES	KEY POINTS/ DECISIONS	ACTION ITEMS WHO – WHAT – BY WHEN	STATUS
<b>Call to Order / Roll Call</b>			
	<p>Board Chair Shelton called the meeting to order, and Catarina conducted the roll call.</p> <p>Having attended last month’s meeting online, Board Chair Shelton reminded everyone that it is very difficult for online participants to hear conversations when multiple people are talking. He requested they speak one at a time, state their name and community, and ensure everyone online has the opportunity to speak.</p>		
<b>1. Consent Items (<i>Approval Requested</i>)</b>			
1.1 February 24, 2025, Board Meeting Minutes	There were no questions or comments on the minutes.	<p><b>Motion to Approve:</b> Board Member Barbieri</p> <p><b>Second:</b> Vice Chair Gray</p> <p><b>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</b></p>	<b>Approved March 24, 2025</b>
<b>2. Meeting Open for Public Comments</b>			
	<i>There were no public comments.</i>		
<b>3. Business Items</b>			
3.1.General Manager’s Report: Pam Roberts, General Manager <b>(Informational/Direction)</b>	<p>Pam began her report with Continuous Improvement, noting that we are always trying to find ways to improve, streamline processes, and absorb increased costs.</p> <p>The first item is Optimizing the Equipment Operator Apprentice Program. As a refresher, we were struggling to recruit and retain CDL drivers for a number of years. Staff recommended the program which is specifically to get candidates their CDL and</p>		

train them to operate a residential waste collection truck. The only qualifications for an Apprentice are that they be 18 or older, have a valid driver's license, and be able to pass the DOT physical. The Board approved the program which began in 2023.

There were five FTEs needed that included one Training Coordinator, two Apprentices, and two Trainers. We reclassified five vacant driver positions to make this happen. We hired two apprentices; Lori Turek and Jesus Becerril, and two Trainers were promoted from within; Daniel Burgener and Melinda Mahoney. Lori and Jesus graduated last year, and we have two Apprentices approaching completion this year.

We also work to utilize the program as a Career Path to advance internal employees who wish to gain a CDL and become an Equipment Operator. An example is the Container Specialists who are out delivering and repairing cans. This allows a formal training program where they can advance their career with WFWRD.

The Trainers are with their Apprentices for a full year of training. The reason we started it out that way is because our requirements for an Equipment Operator are that they have a year of truck driving experience and six months with CDL. We have found that we can shorten that training time with the apprentices because it is so intense being in the side load truck with a Trainer and is the best training we can provide.

Pam went on to say that the Board may recall the recent reduction in force. We discovered the Training Coordinator position was not needed, which she discussed with them in February. In doing that, we saved \$120,000 going forward. To recap, going into the 2024 budget season, we requested a driver FTE to

backfill the Training Coordinator position to ensure we had enough drivers. The costs are mainly associated with labor, which between the two Trainer's and Driver's wages at roughly \$8,000 per year per Trainer, and the two Apprentices, which are roughly \$80,000 each. This totals \$176,000. After evaluation, shortening the timeframe, we will save money in the long run. The amount will depend on the Apprentices coming in and their choices of health insurance benefits.

We are anticipating beginning this right away. Arturo Diaz and Juan Rios will be graduating and Alex Hoppus from the Container Specialist Team will fill one of those positions. The vision is to use the other Trainer to train some of the new hires. We are seeing that some of the issues are that they don't have the sanitation side load experience, and two will need more intense training from the available Trainer.

Pam expressed her respect for direction and approval should the Board choose.

Board Member Ohrn recalled that we began the program due to driver recruitment challenges and building has drastically declined in Herriman and wondered if we are doing the program and is it still needed. It does cost us, for example, four FTEs versus two. She asked if they are doing routes. Pam replied yes, they are fulfilling a route. The Trainer and Apprentice are doing roughly half a route to begin, then the Apprentice moves into the driver's seat, and they are completing the route. Four FTEs are completing one full route and eventually two of them are doing two routes.

Pam further explained that we have to ask ourselves if the program is needed, and currently she believes it is.

She will come back to the Board in the future if there is need for adjustments. We are still having trouble recruiting CDL drivers.

Board Member Ohrn talked about doing a career path for internal employees, it incentivizes loyalty but always being cognizant of the cost of the program.

Board Chair Shelton commented that this is more or less a way to see if we can get away without having a Training Coordinator and we can optionally add another week or two of training for new drivers.

Pam agreed that it is the vision, and there are Lead Equipment Operators who have done new hire training in the past, but they are trying to run their route while training. If the Apprentice positions are not needed in the future, the Trainer positions will be. They are equivalent to a Lead Equipment Operator, but their sole responsibility is to train new hires and Apprentices, which helps with retention. We have a newer hire that has already had two incidents. They are costly but we can manage them in-house without filing a claim. If that continues, we will have to let that person go unfortunately. The idea is that the Trainer could work with that person who is a good soul, wants to be here, and is very loyal. We want to keep him.

Pam replied to Board Member Barbieri's question that it is a pay increase for the Trainer, a promotional opportunity, which is another reason this program was appealing. We could offer two more promotional opportunities. It is an allocated cost.

Board Member Barbieri clarified that the program has been cut back. Pam agreed, noting that we trimmed it \$120,000. We are looking to reduce it even more by shortening the window for Apprentices. Could it be

\$40,000 versus \$80,000, then they move into a full-time position? We need to wait and see. She also agreed with Board Member Barbieri that the training is really paying off and we really want to keep the program.

With no further questions or comments, Pam continued on with Strategic Measures of Success related to Employee Satisfaction and the survey Hazel conducted in January.

Hazel reported that we had 91 employees and received 56 responses, which is 61% of employees (36 written surveys and 20 online). She sat in the meeting room with a lock box which turned out to be really good for interacting with the drivers. She was trying to stay out of the way, but they would actually sit down and have long conversations with her. This gave her a good sense of what is going wrong and things they are concerned about.

She explained that the results were overwhelmingly positive. 88% of the respondents are aware of and understand our Mission. There were also sections for comments. Two questions had 50/50 responses, so we never got into the negative. The answers were strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree. We never went below 50% in the comments that were made. She compiled the comments into categories of compliments, suggested improvements, and concerns. The management team is currently working on the suggested improvements and concerns, and Hazel believes it was a very positive process, especially taking into consideration that we had just gone through a Reduction in Force (RIF), and the switch to PTO. We expected it to be a little down from past surveys.

Pam explained we try to get into the 80<sup>th</sup> percentile with employee satisfaction. It was the timing of the survey right after switching to PTO and the RIF. 61% of our employees felt secure in their job at the time of the survey. To be above 50% is a win considering the situation. We would absolutely like to do better than the 73% overall satisfaction and we are striving to do that.

She reported that the management team had their retreat with Pam Gardiol [leadership consultant] in March and had a follow-up meeting last week. We understand that we are the core of the organization and have to work together as a team which will ripple out. If we are not communicating as a team, holding ourselves and each other accountable, and not being consistent in the messages we communicate with each other, we can have a negative ripple effect. The idea is that we have got to be a cohesive unit moving forward. There have been some staff changes, so it is about coming together and defining our standards.

Board Member Barbieri said that it says a lot that Hazel has been here two years and employees feel comfortable enough that they can come in, sit down, and chat with her. It says a lot and creates the feeling of security, a place to be heard. She appreciates that WFWRD has gone through some real changes with PTO, RIF, and COVID and employees know they can come in and reach out to Hazel.

Board Member Houseman commented that the “79% understand how their work directly contributes to our success.”, is a win as well. To have employees understand not just what their job role/description is, but to understand how it connects to the greater success, the outcomes the organization is accomplishing, is significant. You don’t often have an

employee answer that they know their role, but then to be able to convey “this is how my role affects the overall organization” is significant.

Board Member Houseman also commented on the management leadership retreat, and the connectivity of the greater organization is something to highlight and celebrate. She thanked staff.

Pam returned the thank you noting that there are some successes, or “huzzah’s” as Pam Gardiol calls them, that we can celebrate. We also know we have work to do. Pam added that through some of the feedback from staff, we created the Operational Effectiveness Committee (OEC), which has 10 drivers that meet regularly and is facilitated by Renee. They began meeting weekly and it was a forum to express their thoughts and concerns. Through COVID and everything else we didn’t have the forum for people to gather and just talk. Getting back into the swing now that we have staff that are here to help support the process, the first meeting was three hours, which is not surprising.

Pam recalled that when WFWRD started having management team meetings, they were also three to four hours. Just trying to get everybody to “form, storm, and norm”.

As Pam previously mentioned the Management Team Leadership Retreat, she reviewed our Mission, Vision, and Culture of Compassion, Respect, and Development, which is the core of what we want to focus on as a team. If we are not cohesive, communicating, and holding each other accountable, our core will not be strong.

The next item in her report was the 2025 Customer

Satisfaction Survey Preliminary Results. Pam explained that our goal is to sustain a 90<sup>th</sup> percentile customer satisfaction rating and thanked Renee for spearheading the survey process.

Renee showed a table of responses by city which illustrated a correspondence of homes in the District. We had about half of what we would normally expect from Kearns compared to the number of homes we service there, and Sandy and Copperton have a slightly higher percentage of respondents.

Renee reviewed question seven “How many people live in your household?”. The “one” and “two” people per household equal 47% of respondents. 52% have three or more people per household. This makes her feel good about the responses we got related to the different subsets of how many people are in their home.

Renee reported that although we are not quite where we want to be, our goal is 90%, we were at an overall 86% satisfaction. The service-specific statistics are good considering the SCRP, which is the majority of the comments in the survey.

Board Member Barbieri commented that the “98% [satisfaction for] website payment options” is huge, and Renee added that so many more people are able to go in and self-serve which is so much more efficient.

Board Member Houseman talked about her experience in education and looking at performance and proficiency with students. One of the things they look at are the “bubble kids”, the students that are so close to proficiency. She asked Renee what she thought it would take to move the 10% and 7% of neutral, that are sitting on the bubble, they’re not dissatisfied. What

would it take to move them from neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, to satisfied? We are so close to that proficiency mark that we want, and they're not dissatisfied. What is getting in the way of moving them to say they are actually satisfied?

Renee replied that she believes a lot of it is the Seasonal Container Reservation Program. That seems to be the tipping point. She is very excited about this year to try the new prioritization process and seeing if they feel it is more equitable. She stated it has been a lot quieter up front [in Customer Service].

Vice Chair Gray agreed that it is the area where we hear the most complaints.

Renee continued on to review SCRP Stats, highlighting that 90% said that no one unauthorized used their container. This is huge for her and tells her that it is working as planned. That was one of the big reasons we changed, besides the fact that we couldn't find enough drivers, environmental concerns with containers leaking onto the streets. They allow folks that they've authorized to use it because it is now on their property, and 74% said they shared their container with neighbors or family.

Vice Chair Gray stated that she is not saying we should shoot for the 90% and thinks that the numbers in the mid-70's are pretty good considering 76% said it is easy or very easy to reserve a container. There are barriers with timing, some we try to address and some we can't. Considering those things she believes the numbers, especially with a 78% overall satisfaction with reservation services. She is under the impression they are not the people who would do anything to go back to the old system and are still wanting that. To even get that close to 80% is more reflective of people

really wanting the old system rather than this system not being a functional, working thing. She believes this will change as people become more used to this system.

Pam noted that historically, when the Area Clean-Up was out on the street, we rarely went above 80% satisfaction, and Board Member Ohrn added that there was definitely more unauthorized use.

Board Chair Shelton talked about the times at the end of his street when you would see people pulling in with trailers and dumping construction materials and getting out as fast as they could. The current system has definitely helped in their area [White City].

Renee continued with her report stating that she was not surprised that only 43% of respondents were aware that WFWRD operates solely on fees. We are not a taxed-based organization, and this shows we have more education to do.

When residents were asked about what services they would be willing to give up to save in monthly costs, 60% would definitely not give up the SCRP to save \$1.40 per home per month. 47% said they would be willing to move to bi-weekly recycling to save \$1.50 per home per month while 53% said they would not.

While looking at the statistics, Board Member Holton wanted to point out that this is something we have talked about a lot. Is 53% truly reflective of the people that live in our cities and districts? For instance, he knows that if he wasn't on the council, the chances that his wife would have filled out this survey are zero. He talked about the age of his children and said there is no chance. He believes that if we were to every truly decide, we would have to put some money forward to

truly try to reach every individual because the people who need the weekly pickup are the ones who can't fill out the survey, they are not paying attention, they are just trying to survive. His neighbors growing up that raised seven kids needed that weekly pickup, but filling out the survey today, they could go for monthly pickup because they just don't need it. Everyone is at a different stage, and we shouldn't just look at this data and go with it.

Vice Chair Gray seconded his comment and added that this is a random survey, and our data isn't really organized in a structure so roughly a 60% response rate, and roughly half of that so really there is a little over a fourth of residents saying yes or no. We don't have enough comprehensive data to make a massive change like that. It is worth continuing to look at, but she believes we need to make sure our data is more reflective.

Renee commented that when we did the recycling-specific survey a couple years ago it was overwhelming a yes [95%] to keep weekly recycling.

Board Chair Shelton stated that one thing we could look at because he knows people that have multiple recycling cans but maybe we could pull that number and determine what that looks like percentage-wise of our total customers. That may give us a little education. If someone has two [recycling] cans, they will obviously not be willing to go to bi-weekly recycling.

Board Member Holton commented on the people that also have two garbage cans, and the recycling would just go into the garbage cans.

Pam added that WFWRD previously offered a second recycling can at no charge when we were receiving revenues. When that changed, we started charging a \$3.00 per can additional fee. We saw a small decrease in second recycling cans. Then it was raised to \$5.00 per additional can three to four years ago and we saw more coming back. It does make a difference if we are going to charge a fee or not.

Board Member Ohrn commented that there are some other nuances we could look at. She has previously asked how full the cans are. Some are full because boxes aren't broken down and you could fit three times as much if the boxes were broken down. That could be used as training in reducing costs just by educating the public. There are families that really want weekly recycling so we have to look at applying for an additional can if they are in that situation who are only using it once per month but paying for weekly pickup. We don't have to look at a one-size-fits-all, we could look at some options for people and solve some problems by looking at some different variables for people there. Not changing the driver routes because that costs money but saying that homes with seven kids need weekly pickup, if not they need two cans, just trying to look at things differently. She believes there are things we can look at like training people to break down their boxes would really help because there is a cost associated with picking up a five-pound can versus one that is 50 pounds. Pam referred to it as the "set out rate", and how full they are.

The last item in Renee's report was billing frequency and associated costs. 74% of respondents were neutral or supportive of moving from quarterly to monthly billing, but when asked about a \$0.64 cost increase, 70% said no.

With no further comments or discussions, Pam moved into the Solid Waste Association of North America (SWANA) Event. She was asked in February to give the keynote address by Preston Lee with Wasatch Integrated in Layton. She pondered what to talk about then received a flyer saying that the topic would be “Minority Leadership and the Challenges of the Waste Industry”.

Pam’s address focused on March’s Women’s History Month, with March 8<sup>th</sup> being International Women’s Day. She always remembers this as it is one of her Shero’s birthdays – her phenomenal sister.

Pam went on to explain that women make up just over half of the population, yet in the waste and recycling industry we are only 17% of the workforce. This was a study done by the National Waste & Recycling Association back in 2022. This was an increase from the 2020 census that showed women were 15% of the workforce. When Pam first started there was one female driver, and two other women in administration and customer service. Now we have seven women CDL drivers, which is 11% of our drivers (65 total drivers), and 14 women in leadership, administration and customer service. Women are currently 21% of our workforce, proudly exceeding the nationwide industry standards. Pam showed staff pictures of customer service, equipment operators, and administration. She pointed out Melinda Mahoney, one of our Apprentice Trainers, and Rhonda Kitchen who was the first female National Waste & Recycling Association Driver of the Year in 2017.

Pam concluded that we always strive to have an all-inclusive work environment and thanked Board Chair Shelton for his compliment of WFWRD’s great accomplishments.

	With no questions or comments, Board Chair Shelton proceeded with the next business item.		
3.2. Request to Move to Monthly Billing Starting in 2026: Pam Roberts, General Manager, and Helen Kurtz, Finance Director ( <i>Direction/Approval Requested</i> )	<p>Pam began by stating that Helen has done a great analysis of the information and recapped that staff have been evaluating whether we should move to monthly billing versus quarterly billing which we have been doing since 2015.</p> <p>She explained that when we first left Salt Lake County in 2013, we did not have a billing system. The fee had always been on the property tax notice as a separate fee. When we left, we were given the task of billing, and the Board had the decision to choose the billing frequency; monthly, quarterly, or annually. It had been annual. Upon separation we realized that we wouldn't be able to bill annually. We did it the first two years, 2013 and 2014, so we had time to develop our customer database and a billing system because we did not have a billing system. We told residents they could let it go on the property tax notice or pay it in full and we wouldn't charge any fees if it went delinquent on their property tax notice. In 2015 we rolled out quarterly billing.</p> <p>When we first surveyed residents regarding monthly and annually, annual took the most weight but we knew we couldn't do that because of expenditures. We knew there would be an extra cost to bill monthly, so we rolled out quarterly billing.</p> <p>Since that time, we have looked at cash flows and Helen dove into the analysis. Before the question with the dollar amount, 18% of respondents were very supportive, 15% were somewhat supportive, and neutral was the highest percentage of 43%. 7% were somewhat unsupportive and 17% were not supportive at all.</p>	<b>Staff to prepare additional information and report back at the April Board Meeting.</b>	

Pam pointed out that the only thing we did not include is that the increase costs alone would not trigger a fee increase. It was a yes or no question, no neutral. 30% of respondents said yes, and 70% said no. For business practices and cash flow, we still would like to propose this to the Board and have a discussion and debate.

Pam turned the time over to Helen to review the benefits.

Helen explained that the primary benefit for her purposes is the increased, more frequent cash flow. As previously discussed, we do not want to be in a position where we have to make decisions on what to pay and not pay. In the event of an emergency, we need to ensure we have enough cash on hand to handle those situations. The next benefit is to keep higher dollars in accounts earlier to earn more interest. We also feel that payment amounts would be easier for our residents to manage; \$26.00 per month, versus \$78.00 per quarter. Monthly billing and payments would align with other utilities our residents manage. We would be able to catch changes of ownership sooner to reconcile accounts and receive payments by seller or title companies which would result in lower refunds. We would be able to correct billing discrepancies and adjust sooner for increased customer service, and they would also be lower dollar amounts. There would be increased cash receipting for the current year with fewer amounts in accounts receivable for the following year. The WFWRD billing and receipting database in Caselle is designed for monthly billing and we forced it to do quarterly billing. There are still manual processes in place to make that work, and it has worked, but her feeling is that we could drop those manual processes and increase billing frequencies by using the system as it was intended to be used.

Helen showed a graph of bank balances versus cash expenditures. The blue line was the cash balance from the beginning of 2023 through 2024. The orange line was the cash outlays or expenditures for that same time period. In 2023, the gap between the lines was very comfortable and was that way for several years prior. When we get into 2024, we had over \$3M in capital expenditures in May and \$1.5M in August. They were payments for trucks that were ordered in prior years, but due to all the delays, we did not receive them until this year. Paying for them all at once drew down our cash balance. Fortunately, the lines did not cross, but there was the potential they could have. She would like to prevent that by increasing cash flow and having cash on hand. She responded to Pam that yes, having the lines cross would be a very bad thing.

Vice Chair Gray asked if the reason why we were comfortable previously is because we ordered trucks in previous years and got them all at once in 2024, but we were setting aside that money for those purchases.

Pam responded yes and no. We also had increased operational and personnel expenses which took down the fund balance. The cash is related to trucks. The fund balance and the increased costs there – that rollover of under expenditures previously really decreased as well. It is two different “pots” of money.

Helen added that it was an inevitable decrease in closing of the two lines [on the graph] and happened a little faster because of the truck purchases. That is why we had to do the \$6.50 per month, such a large fee increase in 2025. Those lines were going to merge anyway.

Pam stated that staff knew raising the fee this year will broaden the gap that we like, however, there is still some concern. We ordered the eight Board-approved diesel replacement trucks. Purchasing diesel [versus CNG] will save \$400,000 of purchase price but we will not see them until 2026. Pam believes this year's cash inlay and outlay looks pretty good based on the information Helen and Matt compiled. We are currently projecting a \$6.9M cash balance for year end.

Board Member Piñon asked what the [graph] lines will do with the recent adjustment in fees, and if the cash balance line will level or kick up any. Helen replied yes, she believes it will level and slope up a bit. The cash flow projection includes the fee increase and is projected to be over \$6M annually.

Pam replied to Board Member Holton that we service just over 86,000 homes. He would love staff's help in better explaining why \$0.64 per home per month is a justifiable increase. If we didn't bill monthly but needed more revenue, that same fee is over \$700,000 we would put into the District (save). Most of the increase is due to the cost of payment processing.

Helen responded that yes, it is payment processing because we would be adding eight billing cycles to go to monthly billing. The combination of payment processing and printing and postage costs are where most of the costs are. Regarding justification, Helen stated that we do have some ideas. She anticipates we will implement ideas to mitigate the costs. We do not believe that we will have to add [\$0.64 per home per month] into a fee increase because we are going to hopefully be able to draw down some of the costs and not experience it year over year. We are currently asking for the Board to approve WFWRD to go to

monthly billing starting in January of 2026. We will begin with work on cost mitigation efforts on an on-going basis.

Helen replied to Vice Chair Gray that some of the cost mitigation efforts include that approximately 25,000 of our 86,000 customers are currently on e-bill and she would like to do a campaign to encourage customers to go to e-bill. She believes some customers do not know that we have it or haven't thought about it. That would decrease the printing and postage costs. We also have our online payment transactions and one of the things we will do anyway is to go out to bid to see if we can lower the cost of those items. We may not have to switch vendors depending on what they come back with. Although it may be a little touchy topic, she would like to propose a transaction fee for credit card payments which would cut out a lot of that cost.

Board Member Holton commented that we could do an ACH (Automated Clearing House) with "no-fee", and a credit card with a "fee". Both Vice Chair Gray and Pam agreed.

Vice Chair Gray believes all the numbers seem they could bear a little fruit to lower the \$0.64 per home per month significantly. Helen agreed. Board Member Holton commented that it would be a significant reduction.

Board Member Barbieri stated that people are getting used to processing fees, and many cities have gone to that. Vice Chair Gray commented that it is just as easy to set up ACH as it is for credit cards. Helen believes it is important for people to have a no fee option.

Board Member Holton added that he would like to go to monthly billing and \$660,000 is a lot of money and

asked if there was a scenario where we would not need to pose an additional fee and find savings elsewhere. He would be much more supportive because we just did a fee increase.

Board Chair Shelton and Vice Chair Gray both responded that it is not a fee increase, it is just explaining what the costs would be for going to monthly billing. Whether or not it gets passed on to the customers is not part of the discussion. Board Member Holton said that it reads "...a \$0.64 per home per month cost to the District...", and Vice Chair Gray agreed that the statement is misleading. Board Chair Shelton added that the survey had several leading points like that, and we have to be very careful about that as consumers and customers tend to read into those.

Board Member Holton asked why if it is just a cost to the District, we would even pose that to the residents as a whole. There are a lot of costs to the District we do not pose to customers. Board Member Barbieri replied it is because we are transparent. Board Chair Shelton reiterated the importance of being careful how we present that to the customer, and this was intended to say that we are raising rates \$0.64 per home per month if we do this.

Board Chair Ohrn talked about how we just asked if residents understood that we are fee-based, and if we increase costs, we increase fees. That's simply how it is at the end of the day, it will increase their costs. Board Chair Shelton replied yes, it would increase fees, but not immediately, it would be down the road. Board Chair Ohrn likened it to kicking the can down the road.

Board Chair Ohrn stated that the increased cost is \$660,000 and we are all aware she opposed the 2025 rate increase, she still believes we have to be focusing on bringing down costs, not increasing them. Everything she sees is convenience-based, which she understands 100%, it makes things go more efficiently, even for residents, but it is a lot of money, over half a million dollars, and it is not a one-time thing, it is every year. We talked about reducing postage then our processing fees will go up, then we'll still charge those back to the customer. We are going to reduce that cost by charging them a fee somewhere else. There is still a cost associated with changing this. It doesn't matter how we say we change the topic, it is still a topic. That is the hardest thing for her and before she approves something like \$660,000, she would want to say here are the things we are going to do to make sure it is not \$660,000 or we are just going to explore those. It is a huge chunk.

Board Chair Ohrn went on to say that one thing the District has that our competitors don't have is that there is no risk in collecting money. The reason people don't understand that we are fee-based is because they think it is on their taxes because it used to always be on that bill. You never thought about paying it, it just came with your tax bill, so they assume that. We always do certifications and almost never do we not get that collected. We don't have to worry about having to hire people to go after late payments and collections, we don't have that concern and that worry. This is another thing that is really built in for security for the District. Yes, we might have to bill for three months, and we might have to go a few months to get certified and get the revenue, but we get it. A lot of private haulers do not have that security and advantage. Those kind of things are super concerning to her, it just feels like it is the wrong direction to go

spending an extra \$660,000 because no matter what we do, people are going to pay for the change. The sixty-four cents? People are going to pay for it whether through processing fees or on their rates a few years down the road.

Board Member Barbieri agreed that \$660,000 is a lot of money and believes that she is hearing that the biggest contributor to that is the postage and printing. Helen replied that it is postage and printing, and the transaction fees would increase because fees are charged on a transaction by transaction basis. Board Member Barbieri said that a lot of times those are charged on a percentage whether it's \$20.00 or \$70.00 [purchase], it could be the same whether it is monthly or every three months.

Board Chair Shelton said the thirty-cent transaction fee will come in eight more times a year and that is where the processing fees come in.

Board Member Barbieri shared a story of her family talking about paying by check, and that she believes it is going to go away. Part of WFWRD's goals are sustainability and recycling, she was surprised that only 25,000 residents don't receive a paper bill without any encouragement to do it. She thinks that if we didn't have to pay postage and printing, we could get that down to a little more reasonable cost to do monthly billing and even out the gains and losses. We are already printing, if it is going out in the mail, let's add a big disclaimer that if they want to save and be responsible for recycling and saving the earth, go online, and list how much it will be for an ACH and credit card. Down the road we need to be early adopters of pushing people away from getting a paper bill.

Board Member Holton added that everything else is monthly and doesn't know why we wouldn't want to but if we increase fees, would we as a Board say we could reduce costs by \$660,000 to bill quarterly, we could add it to the list of savings, plus we have RIFd some positions, lets add it to the pile of things we can save money on. If we put ourselves in that position he might say yeah, monthly's great but I could save \$660,000 to go quarterly, he doesn't know. As a consumer he wants monthly [billing] but views it differently as a Board Member.

Pam said that hindsight being 20/20, she wishes we would have started with monthly billing, especially over the years having the cash and fund balance change dramatically. Would we have been able to see that? We used to have \$14M in cash and when we moved to quarterly, \$4M went over into A/R and it didn't hit. Suddenly we had \$10M in cash and it stayed there, and now we are down to \$6M. Having additional funds at the end of each year versus in A/R helps to run our business. Her interest in looking at this is really sustainability of the District and ensuring we have cash flow.

Vice Chair Gray stated that as Board Chair Ohrn said, money is going to come in whether it is monthly or quarterly. She is trying to figure out how big a difference in cash flow it will make. It is coming in regardless.

Pam said that we can bring back more information next month, and Board Member Ohrn recommended a bigger graph of eight plus years that will show a story. This is just a tiny snapshot. A graph that was more reflective of the history.

Board Member Stringham mentioned that when we do the cash flow analysis, we really need to see the monthly breakdown so we know when our lowest and highest months are, where we have concerns about what is and what is not coming and have a sense of what that cycle of expenses are for us because there will be higher and lower months depending on what is going on and what is happening. It is key to understand what the lowest month is, and it is helpful in this graph to see what that closing point is. For her, she would rather see what our lowest point is projected to be. Not so much a line graph, she wants to see the numbers so we can actually gauge how much cash we want to have on hand and what is our policy and make sure we are abiding by that policy and are meeting what needs to be an emergency cash flow balance on account. We need to make sure we are comfortable with the policy of what is our cash on hand at all times for emergencies and make sure we are also comfortable specifically with the number of what we have in cash on hand each year. She knows entities who are special districts that are comfortable by what is required cash on hand for emergencies and that is their minimum balance. WFWRD has always had a greater balance because we have money in the bank for trucks and things like that but that should actually be showing up in a line item specifically for those so that we know that is already called for and spoken for, so we truly know what the balance actually is. We need to replace trucks and those type of things and what is truly emergency cash on hand.

Board Member Stringham offered to work with staff to develop a format for next month's report. She has an idea of what she would like to see and would love to give that to WFWRD specifically so she can gage this just a little bit better.

Board Chair Shelton stated that he would like to see a projection with a dotted line showing what last year looked like if we were on this system, and what next year would look like.

Board Member Ohrn loved Board Member Stringham's idea because that would take away "is this because of the trucks?", remove what was already allocated for cash. Pam clarified that Board Member Ohrn was asking for the fund balance.

Board Member Turner stated that she is curious about the process of charging transaction fees. She thinks that would really be a good idea and help mitigate costs and it makes sense to her. She thinks that would be really helpful. She knows her citizens and she would like to have something they could plan on. When they raised taxes, that was the feedback they received. We understand we have to pay this stuff but don't want to get hit with everything right at once. They would prefer to be able to plan on it and budget for it.

Board Member Houseman added that she is really enjoying the conversation, especially being a newer Board Member. She recommended that staff add the value of proactive approach. We have already been talking about it a little bit. What would it look like to have an education campaign about the efficiency we are pursuing. I know that we introduced it with the survey, she really thinks we need a proactive approach to hear the things WFRD is doing to find efficiencies, to reduce our costs, and then if we want to go as far as clarifying the intent of the question on the survey, or if we even want to. She is a big proponent of, before she even gets ready to get behind any kind of increase, proactively communicating all of the efforts we have made historically and what we have on

the horizon, what we will do to look for efficiencies and putting it into a public-friendly narrative rather than the language we are accustomed to, which she is still learning. Before she feels we are even in a place to vote on the fee, what are we doing to proactively reduce costs. The purpose for collecting survey responses, what is our proactive approach, what is our advocacy as to why this is even being considered, a little bit of education and storytelling. She feels it is appropriate approach.

Board Member Ohrn thanked Helen for including the 10-year average PTIF interest rate (2.97%). It has been through two different political parties and COVID, so it is pretty good. She believes the 4% PTIF interest Helen used should be adjusted to a more conservative number which will make our savings a little bit less with a one percent change.

Board Member Holton asked how much we spend on postage annually. Helen replied that \$92,000 would be the quarterly increase. We project the cost to be \$138,912 per quarter on monthly billing. Board Member Holton asked if new residents have to opt-in to e-bill, versus a paper bill, and if we could give someone brand new the only option to e-bill and phase out paper bills. He has had other organizations say they are no longer doing paper statements, and could we pick an age demographic out of love and compassion, over X year, we just let them continue on with this because he would never even wish the e-bill process on his grandfather which would be very, very difficult for him to navigate. Could we then say by X date, FYI, we are going to e-bill only and please make sure that your payments and email are set up and give them a leeway to try to phase this out so the half a million dollars per year is no longer a cost, and also so we can figure out how to bring down the costs for

monthly billing. Not have additional costs but still do monthly billing which is what is best for the District, we may have to make some of those decisions about what is best for the Board as we transition to a more current use of technology. We have the due diligence on behalf of our residents to look at those things and make those decisions.

Board Member Piñon expressed his gratitude for the conversations and being sensitive to taxes/fees. He asked to return to the graph and stated that something that is missing is a line for income. That would demonstrate the expenditures have been higher than what we are collecting. Showing that will then justify why the blue line [bank balances] has dipped so much.

Vice Chair Gray expressed her appreciation for Board Member Holton's comment about phasing out paper bills and that it makes a lot of sense. The other thing is that when people are opting-in for e-bills, if their first option is the ACH, which is not associated with a fee, then they don't feel like one way or the other they are having to pay this. If they choose to use their credit card, they could hopefully see that we are not trying to increase their costs.

Board Chair Shelton asked if we know what e-billing currently costs, and Helen replied that she does not have that information handy. He commented that outsourcing to a billing company will be more expensive than doing it in-house. Helen added that we use Xpress Bill Pay and she will gather the information.

Vice Chair Gray said that Helen mentioned one option is to go out for bid for billing services and shop for options, which would be part of this process.

	<p>Board Chair Shelton concluded that we have more work to do, which is fine, but we don't want to make decisions without all the information. He recommended the topic be tabled for the April Board Meeting and moved on to the next business item.</p>		
<b>4. Other Board Business</b>			
	<p>Board Member Piñon expressed a huge thank you again for WFWRD's support on the gates and locks on dumpsters in Emigration Canyon. It has been night and day without unsolicited trash that has been showing up over the years. You could now walk barefoot through the enclosures and there was a lot of coordination with WFWRD staff making repairs to the gates. He thanked staff very much and Pam thanked him as well for his partnership because it takes a team to make things happen.</p> <p>Board Member Ohrn replied to Pam that it is too early to talk about their RFP, and that each community is just different, and we all have different needs, even with SCRP and opting out of priority reservations [Murray City and the Town of Copperton]. The WFWRD management team does a good job coming up with ideas like with recycling.</p> <p>Board Member Piñon asked to give one more shout out related to last week's storm. Wednesday morning there was ice in the entire canyon, and they were able to use the WFWRD website with the ribbon at the top to learn about a move in service days to Friday. Pam thanked him and gave a big shout out to Yael Johnson, Customer Service Manager, who navigates the website and posting updates.</p> <p>There was no other Board business.</p>		
<b>5. Requested Items for the Board Meeting Monday, April 28, 2025, 9:00 a.m.</b>			
	<p>Board Chair Shelton reviewed the items for the next Board Meeting:</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2025 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Financial Report</li> <li>• Report on URS Audit</li> <li>• General Manager's Report</li> <li>• Release of Properties from Tax Sale Request from the Salt Lake County Property Tax Committee</li> <li>• Place Holder: Request Reclassification of Vacant FTE Allocation to a Driver FTE</li> <li>• Request to Move to Monthly Billing Follow-Up</li> </ul>		
<b>6. Closed Session Reasons as Provided by Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205</b>			
	<p>Board Chair Shelton entertained a motion and approval to open the closed session to discuss a personnel matter. Catarina conducted the roll call, stopped the recording, and was excused.</p> <p>Board Chair Shelton entertained a motion and approval to close the closed session.</p>	<p><b>Motion to Open:</b> Board Member Piñon <b>Second:</b> Board Member Holton</p> <p><b>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</b></p> <p><b>Motion to Adjourn:</b> Board Member Barbieri <b>Second:</b> Board Member Ohrn</p> <p><b>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</b></p>	<p><b>Approved March 24, 2025</b></p> <p><b>Approved March 24, 2025</b></p>
<b>7. Adjourn Board of Trustees Meeting</b>			
	With no further business, Board Chair Shelton entertained a motion to adjourn.	<p><b>Motion to Adjourn:</b> Board Member Barberi <b>Second:</b> Board Member Ohrn</p> <p><b>Vote: All in favor (no opposing or abstaining votes).</b></p>	<p><b>Approved March 24, 2025</b></p> <p><i>Meeting end time: 10:57 a.m.</i></p>