

WASATCH FRONT WASTE AND RECYCLING DISTRICT (WFWRD)
BOARD OF TRUSTEES & WFWRD LEADERSHIP TEAM RETREAT MINUTES

Held Monday, April 27, 2026, at 8:00am in the Multipurpose Room at Millcreek City Hall located at 1330 E Chambers Avenue. This meeting was also held electronically via Webex.

Emily Gray, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:21am and Catarina Garcia, Board Clerk, conducted the Roll Call.

Board Members: Anna Barbieri-City of Taylorsville, Clark Bullen-Murray City, Emily Gray-City of Holladay (*excused at 11:30am*), Keith Zuspan-Town of Brighton, Laurie Stringham-Salt Lake County, Lyndsay Longtin-Kearns City, Matt Holton-Cottonwood Heights, Nick Griffith-Emigration Canyon, Nicole Handy-Millcreek City, Terry George-Magna City, Tessa Stitzer-Town of Copperton

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

Webex: Sione Tuione-Collection Manager, Justin Tuft, Collection Manager

Public: Stan Lockhart-WFWRD Lobbyist, Justun Edwards-Herriman City, Lise Brunhart-Town of Brighton, LeGrand Bitter-UASD, Heather Anderson-UASD

Participating Electronically: n/a

Excused/Absent: Jared Henderson-Herriman City, Greg Shelton-White City, Zach Jacob-West Jordan City, Marci Houseman-Sandy City

1. Meeting Open for Public Comments

There were no public comments.

2. Board of Trustees Business

2.1 Welcome New Board Member: Terry George, Magna City

Board Chair Gray introduced Terry George and Catarina conducted his Oath of Office.

2.2 Adoption of Resolution 4446, a Resolution Expressing Appreciation to Former Board Member Mick Sudbury for their Years of Service as a WFWRD Board of Trustee Member

Board Member Barbieri motioned/Board Member Holton seconded to Adopt Resolution 4446. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Board of Trustees and WFWRD Leadership Team Retreat

3.1 Welcome – Purpose and Goals of Retreat

Board Chair Gray welcomed everybody and invited Hazel to begin the next item.

3.2 Ice Breaker Activity

Hazel Dunsmore, Human Resources Manager, led the group in a laughing yoga activity, and Renee Plant, Administrative Manager, asked everyone to share one thing they were looking forward to this year, personally or professionally.

3.3 Utah Association of Special Districts (UASD) Presentation

Due to a scheduling conflict, this item followed item 3.5.

LeGrand Bitter, UASD Executive Director, began with a story about receiving a call from a citizen in northern Utah County asking how they can create a district. It was regarding services from a private water district that does not hold open meetings. They can't get copies of minutes. They can't listen in, they have NO input on the pricing. They want to actually create a district in order that they might have the state statute to protect them allowing them to go and attend these meetings, have input on the costs, to actually be elected to a board and have feedback.

He talked about a legislative audit and their feedback on some things that boards can do, their performance criteria, and working for a very large district where some people were very happy with the service and others that were not for whatever reason. They created some committees that were focused on certain areas such as budget, finance, government operations, or citizen groups. They were involved, an ad hoc committee where there might be a board member or two and some staff but inviting citizens as well to come in and give feedback that helped them in improving their performance and educating key people.

LeGrand shared a story about Ben Franklin creating the first district in the east, and districts being created in situations where a city or a county is either unable or unwilling to buy the service the citizens want and achieving economies of scale. He talked about historic burn barrels, landfills, and dumps that pushed waste over the field and lit it on fire, an eternal burn. The EPA passed solid waste rules in the seventies that cities would have complete responsibility for eternal care of that facility and remediation. By that date, in Davis County and Morgan County there were 15 cities and counties that joined into a district in order to avoid all these little entities having liability for everything that's going on. They had one facility and all worked together because they wanted to achieve economies of scale.

He went on to explain that Board Members have a responsibility to represent the interest of the District, whether they were appointed or elected, and the fiduciary responsibility to represent the best interest in the District. Sometimes that's challenging when they have responsibilities with respect to their city and the citizens they represent, but collectively when they come together, it's representing the best interest of all the citizens.

Board Member Griffith commented that he thinks it's very easy for districts to be a punching bag for private interest and is a central threat to special districts. It is something that is not going away anytime soon and it is a concern to him, not what districts do, but rather what people think districts do and that perception, and how we address it.

LeGrand agreed that districts can become a punching bag, everything mentioned earlier with respect to private industry and their ability to subsidize and doing a variety of different things and not comparing apples with apples are critical as well as competition. It is important to make sure there's understanding and transparency. Communications are important and involving committees

with key citizens. He recommended considering some resources of professional help we might have access to and that they have access to some help from California, Oregon, and Florida. By virtue of districts being members of the Utah Association of Special Districts, they are automatically a member of the NSDA, which gives them representation in Washington DC. UASD can talk about some of the things we're experiencing and ask for feedback on experiences they have had on how they effectively communicated and overcome some of these problems, particularly in competition with private industry. LeGrand thinks they can come up with some ideas and things where other states have experienced that might be helpful to WFWRD.

Heather Anderson, UASD Director of Legislative Affairs, added that the Washington County Water Conservancy District has an incredible model that they've been utilizing for over a decade where they regularly invite all of the law makers to come to the district and have a lunch and provide information and answer questions and will give tours of the facilities whenever asked. There's constant communication, not only between the board members and the Washington County Water Conservancy District, but also their state representative because they'll have a board member from each individual city and they'll invite all of the county councils, mayors and city councils, whoever can attend and because they hold them so regularly, eventually most of them do show up. That's just a great way to keep everyone in the loop of knowing what you're doing.

Board Member Holton commented on LeGrand's statement that Board Members need to look after the best interest of the District and we've had a debate about that over the last year or so. With what the legislature did this last session in regard to this specific district alone, changed that that dynamic a little more. We're talking collectively right now about what the good things are and the good things we are doing but we also have to acknowledge the elephant in the room, which is each community has different needs and the fact that under impending state law, if his community doesn't feel like their needs are being met, they have the ability to leave the District without approval of this forum. During this retreat, it's important that we all figure out what we like collectively, but it's true that the needs of Emigration Canyon and its residents are going to be clearly different than the needs or desires of Herriman of what those elected officials believe. Maybe it's a one on one with Evan, he encouraged each Board Member to be blatantly honest and say, "I don't feel like this is being met for my community." because if we all come together and agree on 90%, and that 10% matters the most to your community, they may want to leave. We need to at least address what those things are so that we don't have people that splinter off because if some of those communities do, it then makes it very expensive. Dependent on how many residents, proximity to the District, fuel, etc., but that's something that he doesn't think they should shy away from. They should be 100% forward and honest so that we can address these things because if we don't do that today, we're going to be caught off guards six months from now. The dynamic has changed a little bit.

LeGrand replied that it is an interesting tug and pull because they do represent their cities and have needs, yet they do have the fiduciary responsibility of someone who serves on the Board. That doesn't eliminate the fact that the city council is an independent political subdivision that has needs, and it doesn't illuminate the fact that our fiduciary responsibility of someone appointed to represent another political subdivision. There's a tug and pull, not a separation of them. It's an interesting dynamic to work through.

Board Member Barbieri stated that she has heard it said sometimes we get on boards we just

become bobbleheads. It has happened to her a couple of times and they pay the price for that. She is not afraid to hear any of the conflicts that they have with their city. It's really healthy to find out what Emigration [Canyon] needs, she is not offended by anything. She's not offended by the fact that Magna, just opening up the city, their needs are going to be very different and if there's any way that we can meet the special needs of individual cities, let's try and do that because it keeps the Board and this organization healthy. Board Member Stitzer added that it strengthens our relationships. Board Member Barbieri agreed, but it weakens the Board if we are bobbleheads. We need to know so that we can strengthen the organization.

LeGrand responded that yes, it is hard to solve the problem if you aren't aware of the problem. He put a point of emphasis on what Heather said and the importance of communicating with legislators and other representatives couldn't be overstated.

There were no further comments.

3.4 WFWRD Organizational Background: Administrative, Financial, and Operational Programs and Services

This item was not discussed and the Board moved on to item 3.6 2026 Plans and Initiatives.

3.5 Brainstorming Discussion

Emily Gray, Board Chair, led the discussion and made notes on flipcharts:

- What does WFWRD do well:
 - Board Member Holton: Reliable.
 - Board Member Griffith: Wide coverage area.
 - Communication. Board Member Longtin appreciated always getting updates and mailers for when the SCRP was happening. The communication has been great.
 - Board Member Stitzer: App and website development. Board Member Barbieri asked if there was an app. Board Chair Gray replied yes, and it is so cool. She can enter items to find out if they can be recycled. Board Member Stitzer added that it will give you service dates, recyclable items, and SCRP information. Board Member Holton commented we better cross off "communication" and Board Chair Gray said that could be a gap. It was noted that the app could be found on the website.
 - Board Member Handy: Team and staff that care. She has been impressed to see that as a newer Board Member. They take real pride in their work.
 - Board Member Barbieri: WFWRD can think outside the box and be creative with services where most companies can't.
 - Board Member Bullen: Good value, a lot of services for the price. He showed his council the spreadsheet of services and they were surprised how much WFWRD does for the fee. He noted that only one third of Murray is on WFWRD services. The other portions of Murray feel

like they need to talk to their Public Works and up their game so they are comparable to WFWRD.

Board Member Griffith said his community finds value in the trailer program. Board Member Stitzer commented that it goes with the basic service that Board Member Griffith described (below) and value because a lot of times the perception is that they want all of that at the same cost. Communication, basic service, and value are right in the middle. She believes the Board understands it but is unsure of the best method to get residents to understand it.

- Public and City Perceptions, areas we might be misunderstood or invisible, not acknowledged or seen for what we are doing:

- Unaware of the app.
- Board Member Holton: Too expensive, or they want a different type of service. Some may want recycling every other week, or wish glass was included, or curbside bulky pick up. What we do and plan on doing is reliable, just other options about wanting to do it differently.

Board Member Bullen commented about [them] wanting those things at the same cost, and Board Member Barbieri provided an example, “I don’t want to pay for recycling.”

Board Member Griffith talked about waste removal as a basic function, it is not a premium service and something that people feel they should not pay a lot for. As an example, Board Member Griffith stated, “I should be able to put my trash at the curb and it goes away because I am a citizen of the United States of America.”

- Board Member Bullen: At the Utah League of Cities and Towns he heard someone say in passing that special districts are unnecessary in Utah with the options and competition in the open market. He had never heard something like that before and believes it may be a misperception why we support special districts like WFWRD.
- Gaps: Board Chair Gray asked about identifying the gaps between what we are doing well and what the perceptions are. Is it a services gap – we need to change our services, or a communications gap – we need to let our residents know about what our app is?
 - App being unknown: Board Member Handy believes there is a communication piece. Catarina does a great job at reaching out to their PIO and communications team and for the most part we are relying on the cities to share it. She received the email about the payment process, so who are we missing? That is an issue that cities have as well and they are always talking about how they are reaching people.

Board Chair Gray commented about how often Board Members would really be checking the city’s website and following them on social media if they weren’t involved in city government.

Because only one third of Murray is with WFWRD, Board Member Bullen stated that they can't just say what WFWRD is doing because it just confuses people. New changes are hard to message out. Board Chair Gray believes that is important for WFWRD to keep in mind because if we are really relying on the cities, we need to look at other avenues to ensure the information is getting out.

- Board Member Holton: Telling our story, a subset of communication. He gave huge props to Evan [Tyrrell] for coming in and turning over every stone and looking at every single way that we can make improvements. We had this discussion earlier this year [telling our story] and Board Member Holton put that gap on Board Members. He believes it is their job to tell the story to their colleagues and residents. He said that for his turn in the Cottonwood Heights newsletter, he talked about the District how over this next year, we're going to do everything we can to be as competitive as we can, because on these community forums, the people that take over are talking about is too expensive, the more negative side, but if we don't tell the story about how we're rolling up our sleeves and really trying to make a difference, that will help residents be a little more patient and let things unfold and improve. If we don't say that though, they're just going to be ticked. He reiterated putting that gap on them as Board Members. They have to do that.

Board Member Stitzer talked about how they always take a specific amount of time on the agenda in their monthly meetings for their liaison to explain what has happened, any new changes, any big upcoming things like the app or SCRP or postcards that are going out. They post the newsletters to all the different areas people look in their town and, on their website, so that the information is actually going up in time.

To echo Board Member Holton's comment, Board Chair Gray reiterated the importance of Board Members communicating with their cities/towns.

- Value versus expense: When people say it's too expensive, Board Chair Gray asked what they were comparing it to.

Board Member Stringham commented that the very active private market is actually making that statement. They are asking for the opportunity to present to local cities and towns believing they can do it cheaper, getting in the ear of local leaders and parties. She has heard several places that they tell [residents] they don't need local government services, they can do it cheaper. People don't understand what actually happens. Historically when the private industry comes in, they underbid every single time. They underbid for a period of time and then they jump it up and you end up paying more long-term because they can't sustain it. Their costs are the same and they take it out in other ways where they have cost savings, and your services actually go down. It's really interesting to actually look and compare a private industry to local. There's a lot who believe it's cheaper to go to a private industry, but in actuality you lose services. It's a balance of do you want local control for your cities? Do you want to be able to have a say or do you want to go to private industry and have zero say in your services? They can change it on a whim and your contracts are year to year. The Board has a say in all those things because they have a say in the budget versus a private industry where you're just signing a contract and hoping they don't screw you in the end.

Board Member Stringham believes that people don't understand the difference between those two things. She has worked with special districts for many, many years and has seen it cycle through. You see people leave and come back.

Board Member Barbieri commented that [competitors] are at every chamber meeting and she is a free market person, having her own business. She understands when government gets involved in business it is not always the best way route to go. The fear is that there really isn't a lot of competition out there, and if we jump ship and leave this one, whether we're government sponsored, government bureaucracy, whatever you want to call it, we are the competition to the private market. If we leave, that leaves just them. One thing she has said over and over to the people in Taylorsville is that they have a voice at the table, and with our competitors, we're not going to have a voice at the table, and [they] have made it abundantly clear. Sometimes [they] don't know who she is at meetings, they just think she's with Taylorsville, and they made it very clear "I'm coming after your business, what can we do?". She believes that today is really important because she wants to see competition in the market for garbage collection, and she *likes* the way WFWRD runs. She *likes* the services and thinks it's a good deal, and so does Taylorsville.

Board Chair Gray summarized it is in some ways a communication gap because people are focusing on money and the private sector, but what we're really seeing is we're offering competition which is what they're really wanting and we're also offering a voice at the table so that their representatives can be involved in making those decisions on pricing and on services so that they can then have a voice.

Board Member Holton commented that Sandy City uses Waste Management. Part of it obviously uses WFWRD and you'll get people that will post and compare Sandy and Cottonwood Heights who are very, very common on many different levels. They will say that it's just cheaper. Having been on the Board for a couple of years, he has been able to use a bunch of different approaches and see what works. The one that is getting most people to just stay calm and calm down and trust the process is when he is just blunt with them. In his article he said over this next year, we're going to look at XXX over the last year we've done XXX. If after a year from now, we are not more competitive with the marketplace, then we're going to have a problem. Herriman was on the call and Board Member Holton explained he had a conversation with Mayor Palmer and told him the best thing would be for Herriman is for the District to actually be pretty healthy because it then keeps competition in the marketplace which then helps those that have gone to the private market. Instead of trying to explain the local control argument, which worked with some, some are just too nuanced. Is it a dollar amount? It is that simple, and we have got to be more competitive, but in that, the only way that we're going to be able to pull this off (he thanked Board Member Barbieri for her comments and for mentioning all of those great things about WFWRD) is we have to all band together and give it our best shot that over this next year we are going to create a better District that is more competitive, more responsive to our residents, which then they're not going to want to leave. But if we just say we do this and they don't do this, we do the tree pickup and they don't do that. The majority of people, you've lost them, it's done, and they're just upset that it's too expensive.

Board Member Griffith commented about the communication having to show residents that they have the access, the seat at the table, and a voice in what those decisions are or all they're going to hear is somebody say, "I can do it for you cheaper."

Board Member Bullen suggested considering a short video that highlighted some of the great things that WFWRD does and also told the story of why it's important to have a special district. Combined, we are like a really, really big city with a lot of purchasing power, but individually, we can't really have necessarily the same effect. Any marketing piece they could read to people, something quick and easy, to explain what we're talking about and why it's important to have us in the marketplace.

- Vocal private market, communication, Board Members have a say in services and pricing.
- Competitive pricing/services: When Board Member Holton first came on the Board, competitiveness was not discussed, it was "look at all the great things we do." That clearly hasn't worked for some communities. Evan frankly is the one that did this as we're going to have to be more competitive. He loved it when he shared at his council meeting recently the fact that you can pay for a pickup of a fridge or a washer. You would be surprised how many people were so excited about that. He shared an experience when he called a junk removal company before this was offered and it was super expensive to pick up a single fridge. People reached out and said, "How do I do this? This is super cool!". It's a great advantage and those are real tangible things, but we have to communicate that.
- Ownership – change the language we use. Board Member Stringham commented that one of the things people don't understand is that they are owners. Special districts are made up of the boundary and every person that lives in the boundary owns a piece of the special district, and that really is what it comes down to. We're not a bunch of cities that are members of the district. We are a boundary and we are representatives of those boundaries that live in that district, which is why you have some cities where they're only partially part of that. The beauty of special districts is they were started as those services and had to start that district. Maybe we have to stop calling them residents and we need to call them special district owners or investors or whatever they are, but we need to talk about who they are really differently and maybe that's the language we need to change because technically they're owners of this district.

Rachel's concern is that in any form of government, not just this one, residents don't have ownership in that when they leave, they get some sort of equity payout. That's been of contention recently, so she really wanted to make that clear because we don't believe that that's the case.

Board Member Stringham understood and reiterated that they're in the boundary. They've chosen to do this. Which gives them that kind of say.

Board Member Griffith commented to consider the broader perspective too, we are one of many different special districts and we all face many of the same challenges and it would be really important to consider what those other special districts are doing. How they are managing districts. A lot of Board Members have roles in those in those other districts too.

Keep in mind, we're not doing this alone. There's a lot of other organizations that are going to face the same pressures. How can we capitalize on each other?

- Cost – council meetings, council visits, media, PR contract, ambassadors/citizen schools. Board Chair Gray talked about budget seasons, new members on the council, and being members of UFA and UPD. They do presentations about their offerings and why their service is beneficial to their community. Evan has been doing an excellent job of going around to cities and doing the same thing, but she wondered if that is something that we need to do more regularly or have on our regular rotation right before budget season before we're having to make these kind of decisions.

She went on to talk about UFA's fire school which was very compelling to make their case. When she was appointed to WFWRD's Board, it was helpful for her to go to the recycling plant and maybe that's something that we need to offer to our councils is to invite not just members of the Board, but members of the city councils, to see the different services that we are providing and give them a more in-depth experience.

Board Member Stitzer mentioned multimedia so that in WFWRD's absence, they have something else that can be shared whether it's on WFWRD's website, on the app, whether it's on all of their websites, but having that in conjunction, in addition, because she was unsure if Evan has the time to attend every meeting every month to make sure that that's done in person and they have an incredibly small population. Some of those people are listening to the recording or seeing the minutes rather than being there in person.

Board Member Holton commented on how people take information different ways and Board Member Stitzer talked about using the MSD, so when they do the bulletins, people were at least getting the information secondary to Facebook or Instagram or just doing it on their own.

Board Chair Gray recapped that in addition to what Evan is already doing by attending the council meetings for all of our different municipalities, also inviting councils to visit WFWRD in some capacity to see what we're offering and see the different services that are provided, and then also with media.

Board Member Griffith believed that it would be worth exploring at least the cost benefit versus the cost or benefit of hiring some expertise to look at the case and to figure out the best way to fill those gaps, to communicate those gaps to people. Maybe there are professionals here that can influence media campaigns. He thinks it would be worth seeing what it would cost to hire that expertise.

Board Member Stringham feels that we also need ambassadors, maybe a trash and recycling citizen school where they come and learn and they become ambassadors for the communities. An idea of a sitting in a school where we can bring in anybody from the team, not just the leaders. Board Chair Gray liked having people come in and are experiencing what we're involved in.

Board Member Stitzer loved the ideas but we also have something that keeps coming up on things that the residents don't like and that's cost. So anytime we have more involvement, more studies, more times that people can come out and see recycling, we also have to consider the amount of time and money that's being put into it. And we have to make sure that we have a good explanation of where that's coming from, how it's being used, because when they see fee increases, those are going to be the first things they want eliminated.

Board Member Holton commented that is why the most powerful thing is for Board Members to actually speak because they are the ones who have been selected as a source to represent for information. They all get calls. "What's happening with taxes? What's happening with this? What's happening with the police? I saw a fire here, what's happening?". That happens everywhere. Board Members are already built into the structure to be able to communicate, we have to tell the story.

Board Member Stitzer stated that if they can get that information first and make sure that that is super transparent and explained ahead of time, these types of things are very easy to move forward with. She wanted to ensure it was noted that that's going to be the number one. People are going to ask because they already aren't aware, so they're in the dark, and the very first thing they're going to think of is money, costs, especially if right now they aren't understanding all of the benefit, they're not going to. If we say, "But we have this and this and this going", they're going to automatically assume those things are tied to their fees. Finding a way to separate those and adequately communicate them before we do those types of things is going to be really important.

Board Chair Gray commented about making sure that we're trying to reach out, we're trying to increase our communication, also not hoping that Evan has eight arms and trying to be a one man show and running everything. She was not saying that he doesn't have an amazing team but she knows and talked with Evan and they are all operating at 110% these days with all of these new initiatives that we have going on. We need to be conscious of that because we don't want to burn anybody out.

Vice-Chair Zuspan said that a lot of the cities that that are using other services, that they actually offset part of the public costs that the public doesn't see, "I'm going to pay this, you're going to pay that." because the city contributed X funds from the general fund in order to keep the cost low. We do a comparison looking at the display number but you don't know the back end of that number. Board Chair Gray agreed it is really difficult to make a direct comparison because of that.

Heather Anderson commented that Taylorsville did an excellent job at a board meeting recently and talked about their staffer who actually did a comparison and did a fantastic job of showing that part of their property taxes are paying for [this], which is why it's less expensive for the homeowner when in reality it's not. She feels water has the same issue with the State of Utah being compared to other states because states like Nevada will use water, clean it up and put it back into the system, and therefore it looks like they're using a different number than Utah does because we don't put the amount of water that we're sending down the Jordan River that's clean back into our numbers, and so they're not comparing apples to apples and it looks bad, so that really is a communication that Taylorsville City did.

The specific board meeting where their staffer explained it was really helpful. Even if other cities don't do a direct comparison, even being able to take numbers like what Taylorsville did and using that when they are talking to their city councils, would go a long way.

It was obvious to Board Chair Gray there's a lot more that we need to communicate. Internally we're doing a lot to make sure that we're offering the best service at a competitive price and then externally it looks like what we're trying to do is make sure that as Board Member Holton said that we're telling our story and as Board Member Barbieri said, our story is pretty great. We offer a lot of services and we need to dial in and making sure that our services are the best, and that we're making our story easy to tell so that people want to stay with the District because what we provide is so great. It's about connecting those dots.

Evan expressed his appreciation for all of the open, candid feedback which is exactly what we wanted [as part of this retreat]. To hear what's good, what's bad, and what's the misperception. He explained he has been focusing on telling our story when communicating or presenting to the various councils that we are a sole enterprise fund and emphasizing to them that we don't ask for any of their resources. There's no contract management, they're not having to deal with the billing, new account changes, [delinquent payment]collections, etc. That comparison and part of the story is critically important. UFA and UPD are asking for money from that city's purse, their general funds. Everything that we do is entirely funded from the fees that we collect which are limited by nature of our design. There are other services that we're providing beyond basic trash and recycle collection that are above and beyond what a typical waste collection provider would provide. Understanding what those are and are there different funding mechanisms, is there a different model possibly for that? He was not suggesting that there is, but that part of the story and understanding that everything we're doing including the leaf bag program, including managing our website, including our billing, etc., is all funded from user fees, there's no other monies coming into the system.

The meeting returned to agenda item 3.3 Utah Association of Special Districts (UASD) Presentation.

3.6 2026 Plans and Initiatives

Board Chair Gray invited the Board to attend one the following breakout sessions:

- **BREAKOUT GROUP #1:** Evan Tyrrell, General Manager, and Helen Kurtz, Finance Director
 - Ongoing Cost Savings and Rate Retention Initiatives
 - Line-of-Service Financial Assessment by Geographic Service Area
- **BREAKOUT GROUP #2:** Renee Plant, Administrative Manager
 - Customer Relations, Satisfaction, and Partnership Building
 - Education, Outreach, and Information Dissemination across Service Areas
- **BREAKOUT GROUP #3:** David Ika, Operations Manager, and Hazel Dunsmore, HR Manager
 - Service Models and Geographic Service Areas: Needs, Wants, Challenges, and Opportunities
 - Uniformity in a Diverse Service Landscape

When the groups reconvened, each group spokesperson gave highlights from their session.

BREAKOUT GROUP #1: Board Member Holton reported on cost saving measures related to postcard billing. It costs \$600,000 annually to send bills to each home, but moving to the postcard in 2026, we will save a \$112,000. In 2027 we will save \$200,000 simply by switching to a different method of mailing.

They talked about some of the bylaws and other things that we're going to need to address as a Board on allowing us to go after some different multi-family homes and businesses to try to get more people in the District to gain economies of scale to keep costs down, which he thinks is the goal of everyone in this room.

Board Member Barbieri added considering some contests to get people to sign up for paperless billing. Board Member Holton said \$400,000 is a substantial amount of money annually trying to get more people to go paperless would save us a ton of money.

BREAKOUT GROUP #2: Board Member Handy reported they talked about communication and making sure that they are communicating with their councils and residents in the District. They revisited the idea of how we educate and get our councils and possibly some ride alongs or something that could be fun to do but that doesn't take too many resources away.

They talked specifically about how to reach residents about the new payment system and how residents do have to reset up their automatic banking. Ensuring that the communication includes a grace period. There will be growing pains with that but making sure that the communication is that federally we couldn't just automatically transfer over payment information and we're saving residents money because this will ultimately be beneficial.

The major ask is that all Board Members make sure they are connected with their current PIO or whoever is sharing information. They also talked a lot about the video ideas, some social media pieces beyond what James [Kelsey] is already doing, to expand how we communicate more what our services are. Then they looked briefly at the 2025 Satisfaction Survey, which overall sounds very positive and that has been used to make some of these changes moving forward. It was nice to see that communication.

Board Chair Gray added that Renee had a lot of good ideas about engaging their entire councils so that the Board Members were not the only ambassadors, and that they get all of their councils on board, which she was really excited about.

BREAKOUT GROUP #3: Board Member Stitzer reported their group talked about the different services that some of our communities are receiving versus others and the fact that it doesn't necessarily work as a one-size-fits-all type scenario. The smaller communities in the group brought up paying the fee every month and this is what everybody's receiving. However, there's certain communities that are not receiving a glass pickup, green waste pickup, and the dumpster program [i.e., Seasonal Container Reservation Program (SCRPP)] is not necessarily serving as well as it could be. They spent a lot of time addressing some of those issues as a lot of the smaller communities don't necessarily get as much of that time to really discuss how important those issues are to them.

They talked about whether or not recycling every other week is something that would benefit the

communities as a whole, and how that would be perceived by the community. They also talked about whether or not that could offset different services being better provided to some of the areas that are further away or require different machinery to be able to pick up like Brighton for example, is front load only or Copperton being way on the west bench or very limited access on the street in Emigration. The ability to get the opinion of the Board Member for the community that serves here and then being able to discuss that with their respective councils, get the information from the residents on what their priorities are, whether it's recycling, green waste, glass collection, and being able to articulate how those savings can benefit them rather than them just saying "Well, this is what I'm paying a month, so why are we cutting services?", making sure that they understand it's not a cut in service, it's just balancing that so that we can provide the best service all the way around.

There were no further comments.

3.7 WFWRD Serviceability – Limitations, Evolving Landscapes, and Adaptation and Expansion Opportunities

Evan began with WFWRD's creation, the evolving and changing landscape in Salt Lake County, limitations of servicing up to a four plex, and due to these limitations, the District's economies of scale have been hindered and service costs for residential customers, meeting the definition of a property unit, are not able to be offset by servicing high-density, larger volume generating properties and we've had to actually defer services.

He noted that Renee has worked a lot on our private road agreements but recalls that we've actually had to give away services up to a thousand plus various units and he talked about how we seek to evolve and grow. He asked if we should research and identify servicing other properties and adapting our resolutions and opening our boundaries to all residential properties.

Board Member Griffith asked why we haven't done this from the beginning. Board Chair Gray replied that the short answer is Salt Lake County has largely been single family residents, and that mix of additions has been gradually changing over the years.

Evan added that the District was created before all the areas within our service areas were incorporated. We were using the economies of scale model to provide services throughout the county where they didn't have municipalities or other incorporated areas. That model remains the same, he believes the state, and Salt Lake County, into their larger metro areas are sensitive to private sector services. Board Member Griffith understood it was not a principle reason at the beginning.

Rachel noted that as a district, even though we are 100% independent at this point in time, we are limited to what our creation documents gave to us. A district is created by a city or county that held the power and obligation to provide those services before and it more or less divested itself of those powers and gave it to us and anything that it didn't give to us it retained for itself. We can't expand our services beyond what was stated in the documents. The documents limit us in terms of our primary responsibility, but it doesn't stop there. It does say we can do all these other things if entities request service so we're not completely barred, it would just not be our primary obligation model. We can do all of those under more of like a contract basis with those entities. No, we're not going against the foundational principles.

Evan showed a map that plotted all the front load service locations throughout the valley from downtown Salt Lake City to Draper and explained the legend. There are a lot of opportunities to enhance our economies of scale, our efficiencies, and maximize those higher volume generating facilities to offset our costs to other businesses.

He mentioned his work in various other special districts and read from Resolution 5100 Section 4. "Services may be provided to planned unit developments, condominiums, commercial and industrial properties upon request ... services may also be provided to facilities owned and operated by municipalities located within or outside the District, at the request of the municipal governing body." Evan encouraged everyone to review at least the highlighted sections in the resolutions.

Board Chair Gray clarified that the ask was not deciding about each of these different categories but deciding if we want to research the cost effectiveness of those avenues and really see what it would look like to expand our charter.

Evan asked what areas we should focus on researching, and what is the best strategic path forward.

Board Member Stringham stated that we need to research all of them so that we have all of the data to make the best decision possible for the District. Vice-Chair Zuspan talked about routes that pass by particular map dots and areas we can target additional businesses in those areas. Board Member Barbieri asked if we start going after or were perceived as going after some of these commercial spots, does that mean our residents feel like they are subsidizing the pickup of commercial entities? She was thinking about a little HOA community in Taylorsville that has wide streets. When they planned it, they were told to widen the streets. WFWRD can easily go in and pick up the trash, it would be awesome. However, they are only paying \$19.00 a month. If we go in and say you're now with WFWRD, then they get the calls saying, "How dare you do that? I'm now paying \$26.00 when I was only paying \$19.00.", but they're part of Taylorsville where they were getting the advantages from some of the other stuff.

Board Chair Gray did not disagree with her, which is why we need to do the research. She was not saying that they were all on board with all of this, we just need the data so that we can look at those kind of situations that they all have in their communities.

Lise Brunhart asked who does the research then compiles the data. Evan responded that we have budgeted for and are developing an RFP. We fell a little behind based on other priorities and needs. It will be a line of service financial assessment to understand the true cost of providing various services by geographics. We will look at the cost savings or rate adjustments for going every other week recycling versus weekly recycling, we want to expand our green waste collection services, etc. It will be predominantly a third-party financial assessment from a consultant.

Evan then showed the Holladay Hills Concept Plan where we've been asked to provide service on the eastern portion of the development. Towards the north portion, there are combined multi-family apartments being developed there as well other mixed used developments.

If we can't provide all the services, we actually give that service away and lose that business, that revenue, and that efficiency and economies of the scale. This is another reason we can readily demonstrate why we need to adjust and have more flexibility, “serviceability”.

Evan talked about the resolutions stating we can provide collection, transportation, and processing. In essence, WFWRD has the scope and the ability to develop or operate its own transfer station, develop and operate its own materials recovery facility for recycling, or develop and operate our own composting facility. There are a lot of opportunities not necessarily looked at nor pursued in the past, so we're looking at what strategic initiatives we should look at and prioritize.

Board Member Barbieri said go, go, go. Let's look at all of it. Board Chair Gray asked Evan if he got the direction he needed. He was looking for direction a bit more focused and mentioned possibilities of increasing efficiencies in our front load collection services. Evan replied to Board Member Stringham that side load trucks are more expensive than front load trucks because of the [grabber] arms and technologies, \$50,000 more at most. New side load trucks are approximately \$420,000 and the commercial front load trucks are probably \$380,000 – \$390,000. He talked about the operations and capabilities of each type of truck.

Board Member Griffith commented on the budgeted RFP, having a consultant looking at financial implications, how they are communicated, and what the economics are.

3.8 BREAK

Board Chair Gray chose to forego this scheduled break and asked participants to excuse themselves as needed. She noted that she had to be excused at 11:30am and that Vice-Chair Zuspan would take over for her.

3.9 Bulky Waste Program Design and Service Maximization

Evan explained that Renee has put together in the past the cost of service comparison across various cities and the second exercise she's done is put together a comparison of how those cities manage funds, limit and/or restrict their bulky waste programs, the means and methods of providing those services, how often they're provided, what's accepted and what's not accepted, etc. We found WFWRD is currently, as far as we know, the only organization providing bulky waste removal via a container service as part of its base services. Unless others charge a fee for a container or box, those bulky waste programs are predominantly almost entirely a curbside based program or a central container program. The idea is to learn and glean from this comparison and hopefully any adjustments to our program moving forward we take the best examples, criteria, etc., for our program.

Renee showed the spreadsheet with data that when compared, was looking at what was included within [their] base rates. High level observations of what she has included within all these cities is that it's obvious WFWRD absorbs most of the risk and cost that other bulky waste programs do not. If someone puts a mattress, tires, or construction debris in their container, we pay for it. Other cities would essentially charge residents, fine them if they were breaking rules, or they just didn't pick it up so they didn't have to absorb that cost.

She talked about how we have made the reservation process a lot simpler and encouraged everyone to take the time and review all the comparisons.

Board Member Holton asked how [they] execute their curbside bulky waste programs. Evan responded that they have different equipment that goes out on the streets, in some cases a dump truck, but oftentimes it is a rear load truck that is loaded manually or with a piece of hydraulically operated equipment. Renee added there are size restrictions, even for green waste, there's it can only be like four or five foot width. In Salt Lake City if a customer does have a mattress, it is set aside and another truck comes to haul it away. Consistently we saw that construction material wasn't allowed and the new guidelines that we have for our SCRP are pretty consistent with other cities.

Board Member Holton found that interesting because if somebody puts materials that you don't want to take, you still need the bin back with our current structure. You need that physical bin because someone else has a reservation versus if someone's putting materials on a curb, we don't pick it up and gives that flexibility so someone's not holding onto a bin for a year or something.

Evan summarized some of the things that Renee already mentioned that different cities and service areas accept different volumes of items, different types of items, etc., and then vice versa, they won't accept certain types of items or items over a certain volume of material. Where the material is placed curbside in Sandy City is three feet from the curb. Our SCRP in essence, is still, in most cases, being used as a larger trash container, people still have bagged trash in there. There are so many mattresses and a variety of other items that are going in there. What we have preliminarily talked about is having a more structured program that would look at maybe a curbside model, but it wouldn't fit every city, or every service area, and wouldn't be a one-size-fits-all so what is really the best path forward and next steps.

Evan further explained that our approach this year was to ramp up our capacity to better meet service demand, which is exactly what we've been doing. This is also predicated that late last year the Board provided direction to suspend the trailer rental fee-based program along with the fee-based container program which was outside of the SCRP season. This year we budgeted for 12 seasonal drivers plus two permanent drivers with a goal of servicing no less than 72 containers per day. Historically, we've averaged about 60 containers per day. The goal has been historically to provide 10% of all households serviced by the District. In 2025 it was about 9% of total households serviced, so this year we've certainly ramped that up significantly.

Evan showed the 2026 Holladay-Murray SCRP Service Area Zones and Dates, Post Card Mail Dates, Website Reservations Open Dates, and the Early Bird and General Access dates. Each of the zones get a postcard that's mailed on a specific date and those zones are tied to specific collection days that are grouped by proximity to maximize efficiency and to maximize the serviceability and hauling. He talked about how we are allowing up to 75 container reservations per day for the online requirements specific to the valley communities, not necessarily the canyons. We've optimized the programs to open at 8:00am as opposed to midnight. We're leaving this open and are working out some kinks and continuing to maximize and optimize the online reservation process.

Evan also showed the performance year-to-date and that we have exceeded the 72 containers per day; averaging over 76 containers per day. He talked about recruitment and retention for our seasonal drivers, and first and foremost, we have expanded our services compared to past years. Thus far we are servicing 25% more than we have done in the past and have started some interim bulk loading to reduce travel time, fuel time, driver time, etc. We have been able to fit 12 and up to 14 individual containers into one truck load that's then subsequently going to a transfer facility.

David is working on some really great ongoing metrics we can track, and tons per load has increased substantially. Our cost per ton is actually going down, and it will actually help us in some cases when we're going to Trans-Jordan, who has a minimum one ton charge and when we have less than a ton, we get dinged for the whole amount. We are actually doing quite well this year thus far and program started April 6th.

Evan talked about central bulk loading sites, logistics, maximizing our throughput, serviceability, tonnages, WFWRD staffed public drop off events, looking at some advertising, and allocating up to 30 residential loads per hour. This year we are really trying to supplement the additional communities that require or have asked for on a lot of occasions additional services for their bulk waste. He noted that we were calling residents in Cottonwood Heights because there were still reservations that were not filled up. Again, the whole intent was to maximize our services this year to better meet the needs and working to supplement offerings.

Board Member Barbieri stated that it was impressive WFWRD could put this all together in the last six months. Other Board Members agreed and gave kudos.

Evan replied to Board Member Griffith that the SCRP containers are 14-yards and in 2025 the average tons per container was .79, much less than the actual capacity. He talked about the trailer program, shifting of resources, services for the canyons who have more trees, fire mitigation needs, a lot of enhancements, flexibility, and some late adjustments to really hopefully maximize our services. Clearly it is not a one-size-fits-all.

Evan responded to Board Member Stitzer that yes, these dates and information are all planned and they can start sharing it publicly with their councils and residents. He talked about the Specialty Curbside Collection Services (SCCS) program using online templates where requests can be by commodity type, quantity, service area, etc., providing this year-round for tires, mattresses, appliances with freon, and regular appliances like hot water heaters, washers, dryers, stove top ranges, etc. All these materials will be ultimately recycled to the maximum extent possible and we are working on those contracts. We are also looking to add more items to the collection services for next year. We've done some research, have heard concerns from staff, and we are going to require that mattresses be bagged.

He went on to say that is all of what we're doing this year, which Board Member Barbieri already mentioned, is a lot in the period of time, we've made a lot of adjustments, a lot of enhancements, and new services that we're quite excited to bring forward. As Renee mentioned in the comparison document, the non-container based programs do not accept a variety of materials that we are currently accepting in the SCRP; mostly construction debris, but also heavy material, rocks, dirt, asphalt shingles, kitchen remodels, granite countertops are all things that aren't really acceptable from a curbside perspective.

This is where there are some gaps and opportunities to provide possibly in the future a reinstatement of the fee-based container service if we go to a curbside model. We would not be able to accept those items curbside.

Evan reviewed 2026-2027 Bulky Waste Plans, Initiatives, and Considerations that included a year-round program eliminating our need to rely on seasonal drivers, eliminate the need to lease the ten plus hook lift trucks from the county, which would cost us additional money and it would also reduce that corresponding mileage, fuel, and repair and maintenance. He mentioned the Board-approved a new rear load truck in 2026, one additional will be proposed in 2027, and, in relation to the concept of transitioning to a curbside bulky waste program, the need to garner support from our partner cities, a large scale educational outreach campaign, serviceability impacts, the capital cost of setting up this type of program, the cost savings of eliminating SCRP in the valley, the cost of a curbside program, staffing, reducing travel time, and maximizing our tonnage and serviceability.

Evan stated that the direction that the Board decides that we want to move forward of course taking into consideration some of the more unique service areas and challenging areas, but if we can provide bulky waste service two or more times a year, the landfill voucher program may no longer be needed. We used to be a department in the county that has a landfill and transfer station still tied to the county. But we have no ownership of the county landfill or the transfer station. The question is, would the landfill voucher program continue to be necessary and/or appropriate for WFWRD to offer that in addition to the bulky waste program.

Board Chair Gray recalled having the Board going back to their councils and take the temperature on how supportive different communities would be of this kind of approach. She was wondering the different feedback that people have seen either like officially in their council or just anecdotally, like, is this a program that you think people in your communities would be supportive of? Evan has done a fantastic job of going over the benefits of that program, but it is a big change.

Board Member Stitzer stated that their community council in general is in favor of this because of the concerns she brought up in the past with shared driveways. When you put those trailers in our driveways, it's not just one resident liable for what goes in and the driveway itself. There are two residents that are now having a garbage trailer in their driveway. It puts it back onto the road that everybody's been asking for, and they kind of need that where there at, so there's been a good response to this where they are. The voucher program would be completely moot because they [Town of Copperton] have their own agreement with the Trans-Jordan Landfill.

Board Chair Gray reported for Holladay, people were supportive at looking at it and seeing as far as their city management was concerned, a separate question she wanted to get to later dealt with issues like stormwater but that there were some concerns. The overall response was support.

Board Member Barbieri said that they have some of their administration feels like you get people leaving things out that you can't take then we have to involve code enforcement but she thinks that can be resolved if we can get some people on board with the whole idea of things just being dumped in the road. Her question is if we took the SCRP containers off of the street because it was just too dangerous and people were driving by and dumping everything on the street.

We put it in the individual driveway so that we could eliminate those huge bulky dumpsters or people dumping things. She asked what the difference is between just putting the SCRP containers back on the street where people want them and they were happy with them? If we are allowing bulky waste on the street, why can't we have a SCRP container on the street?

Board Chair Gray stated that it sounds like what Evan has proposed would have to do with decreased costs and Board Member Barbieri said that if you're going to allow both, why don't you just put the trailers back on the street?

Evan replied that this concept is based on cost and efficiency but also maximizing our ability to meet service needs. With the containers and our reliance on seasonal workers and drivers to individually haul those, we are bound by the limitations of properties that can get a container. With a curbside bulky program that's being hauled and packed and maximized the tonnage with a rear load truck, we can offer every single property along the streets. There would be no need to have people rush to the container in the street and put all of their junk around it, which created a ton of work for front-line staff to do that. They would get picked up on their curb with restrictions. Different size of pile, where to place it, where not to place it, and there are concerns with damaging mailboxes and in-ground utilities. This is maximizing efficiencies and our abilities to collect it. By going back to containers on the street is continuing with the problem that we've always had is not being able to meet the service needs for the bulky waste.

Board Member Barbieri pushed back a little bit because we didn't have complaints about SCRP until we moved it off of the street. It was meeting people's needs when it was just put in the neighborhoods randomly and people filled them up and we carried them away. She was completely sympathetic to the fact that people would just come and dump by the trailers as well. People are going to go wait a minute, you told us we couldn't put SCRP on the street because it was a liability, but now we can just dump the stuff on the street, and that's not a lot of liability? She understood all of the answers.

Board Member Holton seconded her comment because he never heard a complaint when they were just placed on the street. Administratively a different issue, but from residents. Board Member Stitzer added that the only complaint they did get when it was on the streets was there's two on this street and one on this street. The smallest of complaints, but they didn't get the same type of complaints they get now. She agreed because it is difficult to continue to go back to your community and say we're doing this because of this and then suddenly, we're telling you just kidding, now we're doing that. It's hard for them to understand. When we were talking earlier about the different services their receiving and then you're trying to talk about every other week recycling because we're saving money and they're going but wait, you're cutting services. It kind of goes hand-in-hand with that, just being able to explain it to them.

Board Member Handy talked about being prepared for it to be on the street where before we weren't and Board Chair Gray commented that [curbside bulky collection] is a significant cost savings, and to go back to the old SCRP model that we all love, is not even just more expensive, it's cost prohibitive. This feels closer to that, so it's less that this is a good system and more that we have a real messaging communication problem in implementing this. We're going to really work on and make sure that we have good messaging and address those concerns hopefully quickly.

Board Member Handy brought it up and didn't hear one way or the other, very neutral, they are not as excited about it in her community. She remembered when they were around more and so it will feel like an expansion of services. Board Chair Gray said maybe that's a good way to frame it is an expansion because if you get a couple of dumpsters in your neighborhood, every single person gets their stuff picked up and you don't have to walk it down the street to the dumpster. That could be a good framing marketing approach.

Board Member Stitzer echoed Evan's comment that it allows everybody to be able to participate. A concern was brought up earlier of how do we police it as a city or town? That's another concern that kind of goes along with communication, but also, you're just going to have people that do that regardless. It would have to fall into code enforcement.

Board Member George stated he will bring it up to their council and Board Member Longtin said she had kind of the same feedback, they definitely want monthly bulky. Board Chair Gray commented on storm drain concerns and water issues. Her parents live in Sandy and they have this type of program there and truly it's like, "You'll pry it out of our cold dead hands.", they love it. She asked what other communities are doing, the proposals to address these concerns.

Evan said that it's another partnership opportunity to work with MSD and some of our other partner cities that have their own code compliance departments. It would be a huge education and outreach initiative. Sandy City has really helpful diagrams on their website and we would basically be taking the best of the best out of there, forming this program. Bringing back to the Board more information. We're actually focused right now on this year's SCRP season, but we're thinking about everything else on the side where we need to do additional analysis but it's a partnership opportunity with various cities and the MSD in some cases as well.

Board Member Stitzer commented that it's just as important as the entire process because it's going to be put into the city's hands to be taking care of both of those and those are both really big concerns. Stormwater and code enforcement all lands on them and they want to know what's going on. Board Chair Gray imagined some of the complaints will go to customer service, but even then, customer service would then route that back to the city. Their code enforcement officers are already run ragged, especially in the summer. Board Member Stitzer added that especially when you're working with all the municipalities that are functioning under code enforcement with the Municipal Service District because it's not a large office of code enforcement to manage that many municipalities, especially if you're doing it twice a year or for several days out of a month, prioritize what code enforcement you want done at that point.

Evan said we can support that. Right now, we actually send letters and as historical practice for residents that call in and complain that their neighbor's not taking their cans in. There's a lot of other possible enforcement actions that we could support. Board Chair Gray asked if WFWRD could take that on instead of putting it onto the cities, that was a big ask. Evan agreed it's a big ask on the District and she said it's also a big ask on the cities to take that on. Board Member Stitzer agreed because you're asking paid employees that we're already paying to take care of enforcement.

To Evan that's the piece that probably requires a lot more looking into because it's a big potential. It really depends. Even this SCRP season we're dealing with enforcement just eating the costs.

We are pulling propane tanks from SCRP containers, pulling mattresses, buckets of paints and chemicals. If these were at the curb for a bulk waste curbside program, we would see it and wouldn't collect it. We'd have to really structure this in a way that by zone, your pickup week is this week, do not place anything on the curb more than 72 hours in advance, so they're not leaving stuff year round. Then our drivers that are in all these neighborhoods on a weekly basis, we will rely on their eyes and ears and having them to report back to our operations and our customer service team if there's noncompliance so we need a concerted, collaborative effort that was in addition to getting support from partner cities and in some cases code compliance departments.

Board Member Stitzer said maybe just going through different bullet points with certain areas that have smaller, more narrow roads when it comes to things like Unified Fire, because those emergency services are usually the ones that have the most to say, whenever you want to try to use the street for anything because she is one of the people who have been on this Board for a long time, even when we were putting them in the road, one of the only other kickbacks they have is from UFA because of the narrow streets and creating obstacles in case of an urgency and maybe working with them maybe just to find out what their recommendation is.

There were comments about bulky waste placement, state roads, the curbside program Evan oversaw in Arizona, very few property damages, and the format in which we are going to educate and present this great plan.

3.10 Programmatic Adaptation Considerations and Opportunities

Evan talked about the concept of going from weekly to every other week curbside recycle collection and the discussion had centered around the line of service financial assessment that we are still planning to solicit this year and have our financial consultant provide some analysis as part of that. It would not be a resident-by-resident decision. It would likely be something we would ask each respective city to decide on which level of service they would like so ideally Board Members would poll their residents and a city council would decide which level of service will be provided for that. When he was in Arizona, the City of Tucson went from weekly to every other week recycling and when he asked them about the impact of the program, they said they actually did start receiving lower recycling volumes and tonnages. There could be that unforeseen negative consequence of having less materials getting recycled as a whole.

The second topic was related to the curbside green waste program. How it looks to continue to adapt and what opportunities we have. Evan talked about a consistent increase in new customers but that seems to be dialing down, maximum saturation of program participation, increased revenues, tonnages, the possibility that WFWRD can start its own compost program, how we continue to grow, have it stay as a subscription based or to have it automatically included in certain cities that have a higher need. That would be something that the city council would have to vote on. He wanted to see what our possibilities are of adjusting these programs.

Evan went on to talk about Herriman and Southwest subscribers and continuing to offer the service in those areas probably doesn't make sense operationally or from a cost perspective. Board Member Stitzer commented on her second black can, the costs, and it only being used for grass clippings and green waste because they don't have the opportunity to get a green waste can.

Board Member Holton talked about neighbors that had green waste bins who then got rid of it and got a second garbage bin because it is cheaper to put in the landfill. There were discussions about the costs and the duration of the current program.

Evan reported that Momentum is starting up curbside glass collections in Kearns and Magna and explained the administrative overhead costs and billing. He asked if there were any recommendations or direction on further pursuit of the green waste program growing it or keeping it as is and replied to Board Member Holton that we would come back to the Board with how much people's bills may decrease to going to biweekly recycling, which will be evaluated as part of the planned financial line-of-service study.

3.11 Looking Forward – 2027 and Beyond, Break Outs and Discussion

Based upon time constraints, Vice-Chair Zuspan asked the Board Members to discuss these items with their councils and add them to the May Board Meeting agenda.

3.12 Recap and Closing Statements

Vice-Chair Zuspan commented that this retreat has been an opportunity because at our normal meetings we try to pack in as much stuff and discuss as many things as we can. This provides a clean flow of ideas and specifically when we look around the room, everybody's demographics are completely different and each government services are provided in somewhat different manners. He asked the Board to reach out if they have questions, desires, or more information that we want to throw out for the next meeting.

He thanked the Board and the entire WFWRD staff.

4. Items for Subsequent Board Meetings

- Monday, May 18, 2026 Regular Meeting
 - General Manager Report
 - 1st Quarter 2026 Financial Report
 - 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
 - Authorization to Withdraw Properties from the 2026 May Tax Sale
 - National Waste and Recycling Worker's Day, Thursday, June 18th

5. Adjournment

Board Member Holton motioned/Board Member Stringham seconded to adjourn. Motion passed unanimously.