

WASATCH FRONT WASTE AND RECYCLING DISTRICT (WFRD)
BOARD OF TRUSTEES | REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

Held Monday, March 23, 2026, at 5:00pm at the District Offices located at 604 West 6960 South, inside the Salt Lake County Public Works Administration Building Training Room. The meeting was also held electronically via Webex.

Emily Gray, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:00pm and Catarina Garcia, Board Clerk, conducted the Roll Call.

Board Members: Anna Barbieri-City of Taylorsville, Emily Gray-City of Holladay, Greg Shelton-White City, Lyndsay Longtin-Kearns City, Mick Sudbury-Magna City, Clark Bullen-Murray City, Nick Griffith-Emigration Canyon, Zach Jacob-West Jordan City, Matt Holton-Cottonwood Heights (*arrived at 5:18pm, departed at 6:31pm*)

Participating Electronically: Laurie Stringham-Salt Lake County, Tessa Stitzer-Town of Copperton, Keith Zuspan-Town of Brighton, Marci Houseman-Sandy City

Excused: Jared Henderson-Herriman City, Nicole Handy-Millcreek City

District & Support Staff: Evan Tyrrell-General Manager, Helen Kurtz-Finance Director, David Ika-Operations Manager, Hazel Dunsmore-Human Resources Manager, Renee Plant-Administrative Manager, Yael Johnson-Customer Solutions Manager, Catarina Garcia-Executive Assistant/Board Clerk, Rachel Anderson-Legal Counsel

Webex: Sione Tuione-Collection Manager

Public: Patrick Craig-Salt Lake County, Abby Evans-Salt Lake County, Terry George-Magna City, Christopher Bell-Salt Lake County, Zach Hamblin-*unknown*

1. Meeting Open for Public Comments

Catarina read a public comment submitted to the County Council via email on March 17, 2026 by Lorin Twede, 8155 Westbury Drive, Magna, Utah, and forwarded to Catarina by Abby Evans, County Council Senior Advisor on March 19, 2026.

“The semiannual container program has historically been a highly effective and appreciated service. When multiple containers were placed throughout neighborhoods, residents had ample opportunity to dispose of unwanted items, and the containers were consistently well utilized. The changes implemented during the COVID period appear to have reduced the program’s accessibility without a clear ongoing need. The previous model did not present significant safety concerns and was widely beneficial to the community. The current approach, which often relies on placing a container at a private residence, can limit participation. In many cases, the container reaches capacity quickly, preventing other residents from having the same opportunity to use the service. Given the program’s past success, I respectfully request that you consider returning to the previous model or expanding access so that it better serves all county residents. This service was both efficient and highly valued, and restoring it would be greatly appreciated by the community.”

There were no further public comments.

2. Board of Trustees Business

2.1 Follow-up on Scheduling a Board of Trustees and Leadership Staff Retreat

Evan informed Board Chair Gray that the overwhelming availability was May 28, 2026 from 1:00pm-5:00pm, however, there were also discussions about postponing the regular meeting on April 27, 2026 and holding the retreat during that time. The goal is 100% Board Member attendance to discuss goals, initiatives, challenges, resident concerns, and how we move forward to ensure we are providing the best service at the best possible rates and meeting customer service demands.

Board Chair Gray directed staff to send out a final poll requesting availability Monday, April 27, 2026 from 8:00am-12:00pm and/or Thursday, May 28, 2026 from 1:00pm-5:00pm.

3. Consent Items

3.1 March 2, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes

There were no questions or comments on the minutes.

Board Member Sudbury motioned/Board Member Griffith seconded to approve the March 2, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Business Items:

4.1 General Manager Report

Evan began with updates on the payment processing vendor transition from Xpress Bill Pay to Point & Pay. Helen responded to Board Chair Gray that residents currently on auto-pay must sign up for auto-pay with the new vendor because they cannot transfer over payment information. Evan noted that WFWRD is forecasting a significant savings with the transition to the new vendor. Staff are also exploring moving from a full-size paper bill to a postcard bill with an annual savings of \$192,000 in printing and mailing costs. Savings for 2026 are projected at \$128,000.

In response to Board Member Sudbury's question last month about possible savings for not providing collection services on WFWRD's four premium holidays, Evan reported that Helen calculated the fully-burdened impact for the half-time hours for 2025 were \$31,480. We would want to survey drivers as most prefer to work the holiday and not work the subsequent Saturday. Given the relatively limited impact, Evan does not see a need to make the shift that could negatively impact morale and offset the gains. Board Chair Gray stated the Board wants drivers to feel happy and supported.

Evan then reported on the shared costs with several county departments for the maintenance and lease of the Mahogany Radio Tower on the county's west side mountain that helps with communications with our CB radios in our trucks. The equipment there is beyond end of life and uses obsolete technology. The tower has gone down twice and is currently down, parts are difficult to find. The total estimated upgrades are \$650,000, WFWRD's share would be roughly \$115,000. This also requires the replacement of fleet radios from analog to digital projected at roughly \$300,000 which combined, is the cost of a single side load truck, roughly \$415,000. Details are being worked through, a budget amendment is not necessary for these essential capital upgrades,

and, although alternative options have not been identified at this time, the team is looking at prospective alternate options.

Evan also talked about the number of new Board Members and scheduling a virtual meeting to review WFWRD's history, organizational structure, budgets, etc., hopefully in the next month or two.

Evan continued with updates to the 2026 Priorities, Goals, and Initiatives (PGIs) that included qualitative and quantitative benefits, and one-time and ongoing benefits. The Board agreed with staff's recommendation to forego the purchase of leaf bags for the seasonal leaf bag program for an ongoing annual savings of \$25,000. There are 1,400 rolls from 2025 that will be available for pickup at the District's offices in 2026.

Overall, total one-time savings for 2026 are currently calculated at \$500,000 with ongoing (annual) savings in 2027 and forward of \$193,000. Cumulative cost savings for 2026 are forecasted at \$1.7M, with ongoing (annual) savings in 2027 and forward of \$1.4M. Evan closed by stating that more cost savings are anticipated to be identified throughout the year and that PGI updates would be brought back to the Board on a regular basis (e.g., quarterly).

Board Chair Gray stated that she really liked how the information was organized to highlight all of the efforts, appreciated the structure, and that it was significant and impressive. She asked Evan to pass on the Board's appreciation to everyone who helped work on it.

4.2 Prospective Central Bulk Loading and Public Drop-Off Dates and Locations for the 2026 Seasonal Container Reservation Program (SCRP)

Evan reported that WFWRD intends to ramp up the SCRCP capacity from 60 containers per day to a minimum of 72 containers per day for this year's season. He asked the team to over-hire two seasonal positions (14 total) for SCRCP based on four FTE vacancies we have not backfilled. There will be no budgetary impact.

He talked about the table of Prospective Central Bulk Loading and Public Drop-Off Dates and Locations, and initial logistics.

The Board was in favor of staff's request to move forward with the Central Bulk Loading and Public Drop-Off initiatives. Board Chair Gray stated that she liked seeing these new, fresh ideas and the way that staff is looking at being innovative and cost aware.

4.3 2026 Capital Replacement Update and Consideration for the Purchase of a Rear Load Refuse Truck

Evan reviewed Helen's updates to the 2026 Planned Capital Purchases slide that showed a projected savings with lower-than-budgeted light-duty replacement costs combined with \$1.8M in deferred savings for reducing the amount of new side load trucks from eight to four, and proposal for adding a new rear load truck for \$352,000. It would not require a budget amendment, rather the use of cost savings. He responded to Board Chair Gray that we are unsure of the resale value of a rear load truck, but it will be better than what we are seeing for the resale of a CNG side load

trucks. Even if the rear load truck is ordered this year, it is unlikely we would not receive it until early next year.

Regarding the public comment at the beginning of the meeting, Board Member Barbieri asked if we could put the containers back on the street and allow and pick up the overflow with a rear loader and skidster. Evan replied that first and foremost we are addressing how we can maximize our capacity in the service areas. Second is efficiencies. In 2025 we hauled over 7,400 containers that were less than one ton per container on average [which have a four-ton capacity] and is inherently inefficient.

Board Member Holton commented about the steep driveways and streets in Cottonwood Heights which would be more reason to create a drop off option. Board Chair Gray recalled that the reason we have not gone back to containers in the street is due to costs and attaining seasonal drivers. Board Member Shelton stated it would double the cost of the current program. Evan talked about the huge reliance on seasonal CDL drivers and that the street clean-up utilized seasonal grounds crews which positions were reallocated to additional seasonal CDL drivers or eliminated this year. There is still a lot to evaluate and there may not be a one-size-fits-all model.

Board Member Barbieri motioned/Board Member Holton seconded to approve the purchase of one new rear load truck. Motion passed unanimously.

4.4 Customer Solutions Program Presentation

Renee Plant, Administrative Manager, introduced Yael Johnson, Customer Solutions & Communications Technology Manager, to the Board, noting that she has been managing the front office for 12 years and the WFWRD website for the past few years. Yael constantly blows Renee away looking for cost savings, ways to improve customer interactions, and always thinking ahead.

Yael thanked the Board for their time and allowing her to present on her role as the Customer Solutions & Communications Technology Manager, the Customer Solutions Team, Technology Management, Communications, and Key Responsibilities. She talked about the communication channels managed by the Customer Solutions team that include phone calls, emails, live chats, and walk-ins.

This item was continued after the Public Hearing.

5. Public Hearing on the Proposed 2026 Mid-Year Fee Schedule [6:00pm]

5.1 Open the Public Hearing for the Proposed 2026 Mid-Year Fee Schedule

Board Member Shelton motioned/Board Member Sudbury seconded to open the Public Hearing for the Proposed 2026 Mid-Year Fee Schedule. All Board Members in attendance voted Yes/Aye.

5.2 Public Comment:

There were no public comments on the Proposed 2026 Mid-Year Fee Schedule.

5.3 Close the Public Hearing

Board Member Shelton motioned/Board Member Stringham seconded to close the Public Hearing for the Proposed 2026 Mid-Year Fee Schedule. All Board Members in attendance voted Yes/Aye.

5.4 Consider the Adoption of Resolution 4445, a Resolution Adopting the 2026 Mid-Year Fee Schedule

Board Member Bullen motioned/Board Member Sudbury seconded to adopt Resolution 4445 2026 Mid-Year Fee Schedule. All Board Members in attendance voted Yes/Aye.

Evan pointed out that the formerly proposed transaction fees as part of the mid-year fee schedule were removed and that they would likely be revisited as part of the future 2027 budget and fee schedule.

Yael continued her presentation from agenda item 4.4. Customer Solutions Program. She reviewed the Gateway for Resident Services where the Customer Solutions team connects residents with District services and field operations when needed, and How Issue Requests Move Through the Office. Handling even simple requests requires a structured process to ensure accurate documentation, consistency, and proper routing.

Yael reviewed Daily Alignment Practices and talked about the team's daily huddle which is a key component of ensuring timely responses and strong alignment between office and field operations, and the Impact of the Customer Solutions Office and key responsibilities.

Yael stated she is very proud of the team and how they enjoy talking to customers, how amazing it is to see the team grow and finding new ways of doing things. They are always open and willing to change. She expressed her appreciation to the Board for the opportunity to show off her team.

Board Chair Gray expressed the Board's appreciation to Yael and the Customer Solutions team, who are the forward-facing people that our customers interact with. We have all had bad customer experiences, and good customer service experiences make a big difference for everyone and really affect how people feel about the organization.

5.5 Overview of New Residential Cost and Service Comparison throughout the Tri-County Combined Salt Lake Metropolitan Area

Evan introduced the new fee and service comparison that Renee Plant, Administrative Manager, has worked very hard to develop. What we have been seeing for quite some time is that it is impossible to compare one city to another based on the types and frequency of services provided, and those that are provided through user fees or subsidized through general funds are different in every circumstance. He explained WFWRD was designed to provide services unlike any other service provider. Everything is managed holistically by WFWRD without ever receiving a penny from property or tax monies, all services are included with and funded entirely from the base service rate. Our services eliminate any need from our partner cities to allocate resources or time

in managing billing, new builds, property ownership changes, customer service, etc.

Renee explained the information layout, shapes and color legends, and methodologies.

Evan replied to Board Member Sudbury that 100% of the recycling that WFWRD collects is delivered to recycling facilities and recovered to the maximum extent that is practical. Any contamination (items that do not belong in the bin) gets pulled and sent to the landfill. There were brief discussions about recycling commodity market fluctuations and volatility.

Evan replied to Board Member Sudbury that staff is planning to explore bi-weekly recycling as part of this year's line of service financial assessment. It may be a decision based on each city, including the potential rate reduction.

Board Member Jacob recommended assigning a weight or score to every service to enable the ability to score them head-to-head.

Evan replied to Board Member Barbieri that the bi-weekly recycling shown on the chart for other cities is determined by the city or by contract, not by individual. WFWRD could potentially offer that each city determines their own level of service. We are also beginning to track the set-out rate (the percentage of recycle cans placed at the curb) by service area.

Board Member Gray stated that she is glad we are evaluating each of our services.

Renee replied to Board Member Bullen that the city most comparable to WFWRD is likely Salt Lake City but it shows how we are comparing apples to pineapples. Board Member Holton commented on policy making; every community decides what is most important to them which is different for everyone.

Evan noted Salt Lake City's rate includes mandatory green waste but they do not offer landfill vouchers or separate leaf bag collections, for example. He replied to Board Member Sudbury that we are moving towards transitioning to on-line vouchers but still offer paper vouchers upon request. Online vouchers will help us understand the requested and redeemed vouchers by area.

Renee further explained data related to base services and additional services, and Evan added that it was nearly impossible to determine what services in other cities were being subsidized or offset with general funds. He talked about Trans-Jordan member cities who receive 35-37% discounted tipping rates, those that receive limited discounted tipping rates (0% at Trans-Jordan, 14% at the Salt Lake Valley Landfill, 9% at the Salt Lake Valley Transfer Station), and other discounted rates.

Board Member Gray commented that it is very helpful to see the information organized this way and appreciated Board Member Jacob's recommendation about weighing the value of each service. She expressed her gratitude to Renee for the amount of work she put into this report.

Several Board Members requested a copy of the report. Evan noted that one of our partner cities recently did a comparison of WFWRD services and costs to West Valley City and the results were very favorable towards WFWRD.

Board Member Sudbury added that through research, they have found they can go out and get cheaper service but then have to pay for the billing. The service provider bills the city and the city has to bill the customers, which all comes with a cost.

Evan said that staff will continue to provide more information, update the PGIs, and track all the savings. A lot of this was spearheaded prior to his tenure and staff will continue to be creative to find areas to save costs, keep rates where they are, maximize our services, and remain open to considering varying tiers of services and possible future adjustments.

Board Member Sudbury agreed with Board Member Holton's comment that each city's needs are totally different. Board Member Gray commented that these are the type of long-term things that need to be discussed at the retreat, the areas in which each Board Member feels we need to review and reevaluate.

Evan reiterated that you cannot compare the cost or the rate of the service to other providers. There are so many other things to consider. He and Renee will put the information in a shareable format to distribute to the Board.

6. Closed Session (If Needed)

No closed session was needed.

7. Other Board Business

There was no other Board business.

8. Items for Subsequent Board Meetings

- Monday, April 27, 2026 Regular Meeting
 - General Manager Report
 - 1st Quarter 2026 Financial Report
 - Utah Association of Special Districts (UASD) Presentation
 - Regional Bulky Waste Program Comparison
 - Boundary Adjustment for the Northern Salt Lake County Service Area Annexed by Salt Lake City
 - District CDL Driver Drug and Alcohol Testing Policy
 - Overview of University of Utah Recycling Survey
 - Waste Diversion and Recycling Contamination Presentation

9. Adjournment

Board Member Jacob motioned/Board Member Shelton seconded to adjourn. Motion passed unanimously.