WASATCH FRONT WASTE AND RECYCLING DISTRICT (WFWRD)

BOARD OF TRUSTEES REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Held Monday, September 28, 2026, at 9:10am at the District Offices located at 604 West 6960 South, inside the Salt Lake County Public Works Administration Building Training Room. This meeting was also held electronically via Microsoft Teams.

Emily Gray, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00am and Hazel Dunsmore, Human Resources Manager, conducted the Roll Call.

Board Members: Anna Barbieri-City of Taylorsville, Emily Gray-City of Holladay, Greg Shelton-White City *(departed at 11:00am)*, Lise Brunhart-Town of Brighton, Lyndsay Longtin-Kearns City, Matt Holton-Cottonwood Heights *(departed at 11:00am)*, Nick Griffith-Emigration Canyon, Nicole Handy-Millcreek City *(departed at 11:10am)*, Zach Jacob-City of West Jordan

Participating Electronically: Clark Bullen-Murray City, Jared Henderson-Herriman City, Laurie Stringham-Salt Lake County, Marci Houseman-Sandy City *(arrived at 9:22am/departed at 10:30am)*, Tessa Stitzer-Town of Copperton

Excused/Absent: Terry George-Magna City

Public: Trevor Ram-Herriman City, Gina Chamness-City of Holladay, Patrick Craig-Salt Lake County

District & Support Staff: Evan Tyrrell-General Manager, Helen Kurtz-Finance Director, Hazel Dunsmore-Human Resources Manager, David Ika-Operations Manager, Renee Plant-Administrative Manager, Molly Jeppson-Accountant II/Treasurer, Rachel Anderson-Legal Counsel

District & Support Staff Participating Electronically: Andre Perov-GIS Coordinator, Justin Tuft-Collections Manager, Sione Tuione-Collections Manager, Yael Johnson-Customer Solutions Manager, Shane Norris-Safety & Emergency Preparedness, Andy King-Asset/Fleet Manager

1. **Meeting Open for Public Comments**
   There were no public comments.

2. **Consent Items (*Approval Requested*)**
   2.1 August 24, 2026 Board of Trustees Regular Meeting Minutes
   2.2 Approval of Additional Two-Year Credit Request from Customer 137003.01 for $110.00
   2.3 Approval of Additional Two-Year Credit Request from Customer 162431.02 & 162432.01 for $906.00

   Board Member Brunhart motioned/Board Member Griffith seconded to adopt the August 24, 2026 meeting minutes and approval of additional two-year credit requests. Motion passed unanimously.

3. **Business Items:**
   3.1 General Manager Report

   Evan Tyrrell, General Manager, gave updates on second can audits, the second verification process, retrieval of additional cans not being billed, and noted that the recycle processing MRF RFP has been solicited and submissions are due October 28th. The leaf bag program begins October 15th and runs through November and the WFWRD website has been updated that we are no longer utilizing Bywater Park as requested by Cottonwood Heights City and the Parks Department. We have identified UFA Station 110 off of Ft. Union Boulevard as a new location and have signed a temporary

use agreement with UFA. A Herriman Transition Planning group has been kicked off and staff will work to support transition tasks. Quotes were requested for retail side load truck appraisals and an award will likely be issued this week. SCRP continued averaging 85 container deliveries per day and containers will be moved into storage today. More information will follow on that program next month as well. We had an annual Workers Compensation Audit by the Utah Local Governments Trust where they audit our actual payroll amounts and WFWRD is receiving a credit in the amount of $19,682.35, which is positive news. Last month we talked about re-routing and collection day updates to smoothly distribute all the routes per day which we will report on next month. Reminder that we will change southwest unincorporated and Copperton to a Tuesday service day effective December 1st. It does not appear we will be awarded the West Jordan services contract, there is not any official correspondence but on the procurement website, there was a notice of intent to award to another service provider. We are requesting one-year extensions on a variety of contracts with Salt Lake County and will work to collectively update those in future years. Last week we held a staff appreciation picnic at Taylorsville's Vista Park and Evan thanked Vice-Chair Barbieri for attending and sharing positive and encouraging remarks.

Vice-Chair Barbieri commented that it was fun and there was a great vibe there. Staff appreciated the time and were so kind and it seems like they really get along. She appreciates that, and commended staff on a job well done.

Evan went on to report that he would be leaving this afternoon to attend an Environmental Health and Safety conference but would still be monitoring emails and working remotely. He concluded that November 4-6 is the UASD Convention with Wednesday afternoon being the Board Member Training which also completes the Open and Public Meetings Act training requirement. While the early bird pricing has ended, WFWRD can still register Board Members. Each board term requires State Auditors Board Member Training and there are still a few Board Members that need to complete that. There is an online training option as well.

There were no questions or comments.

3.2 Curbside Bulky Waste Program Proposal Overview

The program draft contains Key Goals and Program Highlights, How the Curbside Bulky Waste Program Would Work, and Curbside Bulky Waste Program Service Standards. The team believes it would be a large step forward in sustaining a program that would be more efficient and more cost-effective. The current SCRP program does not appear to be a sustainable model moving forward for a variety of reasons, including recruiting and retaining seasonal drivers.

Vice-Chair Barbieri asked if the main concern about the current program is just the CDLs. Evan replied that is one of the primary items. Historically we've struggled to meet community demands, averaging less than 10% of all households District-wide throughout our service area for years. With the exception of the Canyon communities for which we have a separate plan as part of that, we will provide every resident in the valley twice annual service for curbside bulky waste pickup, therefore quadrupling or multiplying by 10 times the amount of service provided under the current SCRP model. With the SCRP program as it is currently designed, delivering individual containers to each household in their driveway, once removed we directly haul the container to a dumping facility.

The number of miles and amount of windshield time is very inefficient compared to what a curbside model would be.

Renee Plant, Administrative Manager, stated that the biggest goal of this program is to meet more demand. And as we know, the SCRP program is our most popular program. Staff met with some other neighboring cities here locally and staff from Flagstaff and Scottsdale, Arizona and did a lot of research about how they run their programs and what makes them successful. She talked about the structured neighborhood collection model and the difference between seasonal and temporary workers.

Board Member Holton commented that one of the points that was brought up that residents do not like is stormwater runoff, and people collecting and taking some items or whatever is in the pile and moving it along, issues with that.

Evan replied that is one item we are trying to address and the pile specifications. In Sandy City, for example, the materials are placed past the curb in the streets. Some cities or other programs have material placement that will not go past the curb. WFWRD is trying to create specifications where the materials are placed before the curb in the park strip, or if there is an immediate sidewalk, it would be past the sidewalk, but basically not in the street.

Board Member Holton commented that he wanted to be responsible and was one of those who "flipped my strip" with desert plants and you could put nothing there and asked how that would work.

Evan replied that those are some of the idiosyncrasies staff will have to work through, the driveway could be an option. Every community and neighborhood is different in certain capacities. The street is an area to where we are trying to avoid that stormwater pollution concern first and foremost, but secondly is impeding traffic or creating safety concerns, but also there are some communities with a lot of cars parked on the street and these are things that staff would bring back. Evan then talked about specifications and creating diagrams of different options.

Board Member Holton asked about dropping off at another location. He hauls it to his local park and there is a spot there where he can put his stuff. Evan talked about all the different scenarios, routing, open dumping, addressing those issues, receiving feedback, and Renee talked about backfilling a Quality Assurance Inspector (QAI) position specific for this program.

Board Member Brunhart asked how that inspector would work up in the canyons with the trailer program. Renee responded that the trailer program would be separate and what we previously had where residents could get one free trailer rental a year in lieu of the curbside program.

Board Member Griffith asked if there was some type of low-tech solution that could be laid out by customers that catches stormwater runoff? Evan replied that he knows certain cities have their own stormwater pollution prevention plans and that is something we could ask for when we send out for review. How this would support compliance or what the concerns are from their Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

Board Member Holton asked how [waste] is collected if it is in a park strip. When we are on people's property and making sure that we are not damaging their park strips or anything. Evan showed a picture that shows the model that we would be looking at. We would use rear load trucks where we would load materials by use of grapple loaders. He talked about how it would work, the grounds crew laborers, and pile specifications. There were comments about not reinventing the wheel, it has all been dealt with before, and other cities that have bulky curbside waste collections.

Evan went on to say that based on District modeling, which was developed in consultation with multiple municipalities with existing curbside bulky waste programs, the District anticipates collecting bulky waste from 2,250 households per week, which includes three crews running simultaneously each week on a 4-10s schedule. This coverage, with an estimated 50% set-out rate, includes 4,500 parcels per week (1,500 per crew). He talked about coverage in the event that one or more crews fall behind on weekly schedules and explained this is somewhat of a similar program that he oversaw with the City of Flagstaff.

Vice-Chair Barbieri asked what the percentage of homes in an average city use the service every six months or once a year. Evan replied that that is our average set-out rate, and we are assuming 50% of households would set something out each service opportunity, and vetted this with Flagstaff, Scottsdale, and Sandy City. Renee commented that when the program first rolls out, it will likely be more than 50% of households.

Board Chair Gray commented that one of the reasons she really loves this program is because it is an opportunity for everybody compared to the 10% that we are able to serve with SCRP, even though we are serving so many more with SCRP than we have been. There is also a massive cost savings for us because we are serving so many more people at a much more efficient cost and saving a lot of money. Board Member Holton stated that he wants to make this happen.

Evan talked about rainfall, snowfall, fire mitigation, and highlighted the QAI position. WFWRD currently has one QAI that is supporting recyclable contamination, recycling audits, hauling our central glass containers, etc., but we would want to bring in a second QAI who would be dedicated towards this program, and Evan reviewed the responsibilities of that position. He also reviewed training and responsibilities for the crews and drivers.

Evan explained the main objectives of a curbside bulky waste program are to support fire mitigation efforts and help residents get rid of unwanted, bulky materials that cannot fit in a regular trash can. They are not designed to offset the cost of a resident remodeling their home, and we are also looking at materials from a perspective that would help to avoid making messes or hazards in the streets or avoiding damaging nearby property. He talked about material set-out timeframes, pile specifications, and accepted and unaccepted/prohibited materials.

Vice-Chair Barbieri asked how much of the unaccepted/prohibited materials are being put in SCRP containers. Evan replied that we have seen it all, including a lot of paint this year. Renee added there is a lot of furniture and garage clean-outs.

Board Chair Gray commented that it seems like this new plan is going to focus on specific bulky waste, but that we have options for really all of these other unaccepted materials in our other programs as well, especially if we reinstate the container rental program.

Evan reviewed the Additional Information section that included:

- Canyon communities, including Big Cottonwood Canyon, Brighton, and Emigration Canyon, would be offered one free container service per household per year in lieu of curbside bulky waste collection service
- The CBWP would be supplemented by the Specialty Curbside Collection Services (SCCS) Program
- Reinstatement of a Roll-Off Container Rental Program: Year-round container rental service offered to all District households under a fee-based full cost recovery model

- Upon implementation of a curbside bulky waste program, the District will suspend the Landfill Voucher Program with a direct estimated savings of $40,000 per year, which does not include administrative costs
    - Evan replied to Board Member Brunhart and Board Member Handy that that calculates to 2,500 residents redeeming landfill vouchers. WFWRD supplemented SCRP with central bulky waste drop offs and found out that many people did not have the means and methods or did not want to self-haul.

Capital Requirements included:

- Adding two additional rear load trucks to the District's fleet to ensure there are spares in the event of a breakdown
- Three grapple loaders
- Three trailers to haul the grapple loaders

Evan pointed out that the administrative costs of $622,000 is the internal team of managers, technical support, GIS, and Data Analyst that spend a huge amount of time doing tedious administrative work under our current SCRP process with reservations, vetting addresses, cancellations, and wait lists. A curbside model would alleviate that in a significant way, and it would free up these technical staff members and managers to focus on higher level strategic priorities and move forward with more initiatives from a cost savings perspective. Into next year, we are looking at projected savings off the bottom line of $682,000. But taking off that administrative savings, it is roughly a quarter million dollars, but also significantly increasing the amount of service we are able to provide.

Evan replied to Board Member Griffith that the $682,000 projected savings is the fully-burdened personnel cost minus the savings of operational cost reductions. It basically shows as a profit and loss; we do not show nor do we get revenue separate for this program, it is based on our base user fee. The adjusted cost of personnel for a proposed curbside program goes from $512,000 to $635,000, but if you look at the cost reductions from an operational perspective, fleet maintenance is projected to go down from $319,000 to $150,000. The $400,000 represents reduced staff time allocated to the program, rather than an equivalent reduction in payroll, and fuel goes down almost $100,000 because we are not driving every container individually to a disposal facility. Comparing 2025 actual costs, 2026 projected cost and what the curbside would look like, we are projecting that there would be a savings next year of $682,000 with all things considered.

Renee added that when looking at the staff that are directly involved in the administrative process costs, we looked at how many hours per day during the season they are doing SCRP work, and if we move forward with the proposed program, we will not have to manage reservations, clean the data, handle cancellations, phone calls, etc.

Board Member Handy commented on the communication piece and educating residents on this noting that we already send a postcard. It was mentioned instead of saying call and reserve on this day, you are now sending out something saying it is time. Renee confirmed that there is not an additional cost.

Renee replied to Vice-Chair Barbieri that we have not finished the route planning yet and are still talking about the logistics with the crews that would be working the areas. We are hoping to get everything picked up within four days each week.

Evan concluded that staff are hoping that the Board will support continuing to move forward. The idea would be then to send this off to all of our cities and their administrative staff to solicit feedback, comments, work to resolve those, and bring a refined, hopefully final plan back next month and get the formal approval to move forward with this for implementation next year. The other option would be to hold off another year and continue with SCRP next year, but we just cannot guarantee the same success as this year. Evan is planning to send this out to the City Administrator or Manager and copy each Board Member so they can share it accordingly and solicit feedback.

Board Chair Gray stated that the vibe she is getting is that the Board is generally supportive. There are logistical concerns to work through that we need to obviously coordinate with their city's management. Board Member Holton agreed that was accurate, and they all know when it is open to their colleagues, they will get 10 more things shared with them about why this would or would not work, as long as WFWRD is prepared for that feedback.

Vice-Chair Barbieri commented that she would be interested to know if staff thought about rolling it out to one city or entity as a trial and then come back and reassess and asked if anyone is interested in that or if most cities want to move forward with this.

Several Board Members stated they wanted to move forward. Board Chair Gray commented that as Board Member Jacob mentioned, it is not like we are reinventing the wheel, it has been done in many places. In Holladay in terms of the feedback she has received from people on their Council, there are logistical concerns.

In response to Vice-Chair Barbieri's question, Evan said that is something we could certainly consider, however, if we are going to roll-out a curbside program, it will have to be pretty much all or nothing. To continue with seasonal SCRP and seasonal CDL drivers would not be effective. He talked about the logistics of a pilot program and capital investments.

Board Member Shelton added that just from the preliminary data that staff provided, it would almost be irresponsible of us to not just move forward because of how much money is in the proposed savings. And because we have got so much information from so many other communities that are already doing this he does not see why doing a small sample group would ultimately make sense.

White City has always been one of the higher-utilized cities for SCRP, people are dying to have [curbside bulky waste pickup] already.

Vice-Chair Barbieri commented that she thinks it bodes well and she threw out the trial idea. As she looks at Flagstaff, Arizona, and that Evan managed that, there we go. Board Member Shelton stated that there is probably still a lot to be nailed down but there is no reason not to just pursue this very aggressively. Board Chair Gray believes the biggest case could be resident education and that will probably take a year or two as they get used to the program as with all things. The feedback that she sees is not even just overwhelmingly positive, but more like 'please do not ever get rid of this under any circumstances.'

Board Member Handy commented that maybe one of the questions for the cities is to ask is if they do an informational meeting similar to this for their code enforcement because she knows there will be quite a bit of anxiety when we encourage residents to put waste on their curb, especially if it does not fit and what that would be. Hearing that we have a code compliance [employee] and making sure that they know that might be helpful to make that part of the feedback.

Evan replied that depending on the direction from the Board, his intent would be to have a very robust council reporting campaign in November and December 2026, and January 2027. He will send it to each city's respective Board Member and City Manager, and they can forward as appropriate. He talked about compliance with stormwater pollution prevention controls and understanding what each kind of SWPPP or MS-4 permit each city has, non-conforming piles, and special district's purview of managing predominantly residential household waste and recycling. Board Members may be able to identify and give special districts [WFWRD] enforcement mechanisms for which we could actually have some teeth to for those that do have violations with this program or any other program that's tied to sanitary services, for example. The Board could potentially develop, in essence, enforcement mechanisms that the organization could actually have to support things like this as well.

Board Chair Gray stated that that is something that we should at least think about and believes we have general direction on where we want to go with SCRP by reaching out to the cities and then as we look at specifics on how we want to deal with some of those other issues and can plan that for future meetings.

Rachel clarified that we cannot do anything punitive or under police powers. First is that any sort of enforcement that we would have to be more tied to actual costs and remediating issues, but we can look into that in depth at how our powers go. She wanted to make it clear that it is not just completely expansive.

There were comments about rejecting piles, health enforcement issues, fines being considered criminal penalties and under the purview of criminal law, our fees would have to be more related to actual costs, and resident education being critical to the whole success.

Board Chair Gray reiterated that this is a service that our residents really care about and believes it has the potential to dramatically increase satisfaction, although there is going to be a learning curve and a lot of consternation initially, but is optimistic that this will ultimately be a huge benefit to our communities.

Vice-Chair Barbieri made it clear that Taylorsville residents are going to love this. The administration is grappling with ensuring we do it correctly and educate our residents and that it does not turn into some problems, but we can troubleshoot.

Board Members expressed general support for continued development of the proposed program. Staff would solicit feedback from other District community leaders and return with a refined proposal for formal Board consideration.

3.3 Preliminary Proposed 2027 Fee Schedule

Evan Tyrrell, General Manager, stated that first and foremost, there are no proposed changes to WFWRD's base service fee and he talked about a shift to ensure that we are looking at services from a full cost recovery perspective. He then began reviewing the Preliminary Proposed 2027 Fee Schedule.

Board Chair Gray paused and asked the Board if they had any concerns with any of the information Evan had reviewed to that point, noting that the base fee is not changing.

Board Member Brunhart commented that she is concerned about possible rate changes for Big Cottonwood Canyon residents as the fee schedule shows that it is open for discussion. After talking

to Evan over the weekend, she spoke with some folks and they are not happy about any increases, which she understands. It seemed okay to her personally, but several other folks that she knows who are influential in the canyons said there would be a lot of pushback with that, and maybe if there was an across the board increase of some kind, it might be different. She knows WFWRD covers costs especially with the loss of Herriman and she asked if there was a different way we could approach that such as a fuel surcharge. $8.00 does not seem like that much to her.

Board Member Shelton asked if WFWRD's charter or bylaws say that we charge the same rate regardless of where in the valley a particular can is. Evan responded that this is historic pricing he believes was developed because of the front load container service that is provided. His thoughts are to bring more information to the next Board Meeting as this is flagged for discussion about having equivalent service rates. WFWRD does not offer seasonal resident rates in the valley. People start asking for that, it will create a lot of discord, so maybe it is just elimination of the seasonal rates for seasonal residents. He talked about the long travel time incurred, the number of trucks and trips per week, paying a separate vendor for the central compactor, what the ski resorts pay, and canyon residents receiving the same level of service as valley residents.

Board Chair Gray recommended that for the purposes of today, moving the topic to next month so the Board can continue to discuss it.

Board Member Stringham commented that this is something that has been talked about before and there was some pushback on changing it because there were some seasonal residents versus others. The problem and the discussion that happened back then, is that we do not know that those seasonal residents aren't using it year round, especially if they are renting it out as an Airbnb because they put it all in the same bin. There is no way for us to truly know if they are actually doing that or not.

Board Chair Gray believed that that makes a lot of sense and wants to ensure we bring that up when we discuss it at the next meeting, because it is an incredibly important point when we are looking at the costs.

Board Member Stringham reiterated that there isn't seasonal pricing for everyone else and we do have in our charter that we charge the same and that we are all members of the same organization so those are some things we really ought to consider when we are looking at it.

Evan concluded by reviewing the last items on the second page of the 2027 Proposed Fee Schedule.

3.4 Preliminary 2027 Operating and Capital Budget

Evan Tyrrell, General Manager, reviewed the WFWRD Services Overview pointing out the proposed changes, Recent Activities and Updates, 2026 New Costs Savings as of mid-July of $1M, $450,000 of ongoing annual saving, combined with ongoing cost savings from 2025, total cost savings in 2026 are currently forecasted at $2.3M, the Zions Public Finance Recommend 2025 Rate Options which were implemented in 2025, but we managed to avoid for 2026 and 2027 recommended changes to the WFWRD Organizational Chart, 2027 Preliminary Budget Highlights, Proposed Staffing Adjustments, Scenarios, and Cost Impacts Post-Herriman Withdrawal.

Board Chair Gray requested to move forward to Item 3.6 while there was still a quorum present.

Continued:

Evan continued with 2027 Preliminary Operating Budget Highlights that included continuing to purchase diesel (as opposed to CNG) heavy duty truck replacements and fuel cost volatility.

Helen Kurtz, Finance Director, reported on Budget 2026, Estimated 2026, Proposed 2027 Without the Herriman Withdrawal, Withdrawal Reductions, and Proposed Post-Withdrawal 2027 for Revenue Projections, Personnel Expenses, Operating Expenses, Revenue Projections, Personnel Expenses, and Operating Expenses for the Proposed Curbside Bulky & Container Rental Programs, and 2027 Preliminary Proposed Capital Purchases.

Board Chair Gray thanked the Board Members who were able to stay in the meeting as they covered some really important issues for making changes as we look in to 2027.

3.5 Consideration and Approval of Curbside Bulky Waste Program Capital Purchases in an Approximate Amount of $1,200,000 Utilizing 2026 Capital Budget Cost Savings

Board Chair Gray stated that it sounds like they are all on board with moving ahead with the bulky waste program and we just need to work out specifics for individual municipalities. Therefore, the Board needs to approve $1.2M for this budget in order to procure some capital equipment in time so we can start that program.

Evan added that the main item staff would like to move forward with at this time based on lead times are the two rear load trucks valuing $700,000 [total]. The other items can wait as they have less of a lead time.

The total capital is approximately $1.15M but if staff can get approval to move forward with the $700,000 using 2026 cost savings, it would be very helpful for us in this program.

Board Member Handy motioned/Vice-Chair Barbieri seconded to approve Curbside Bulky Waste Program Capital Purchases in an amended amount of $700,000 for the two rear-load trucks. Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting then returned to Item 3.4.

3.6 Consideration and Possible Adoption of Resolution No. 4449 Approving a Revised Interlocal Agreement Detailing the Terms of Withdrawal of Herriman City from WFWRD

Board Chair Gray explained that the Board needs to adopt a Revised Interlocal Agreement Detailing the Terms of Withdrawal of Herriman City from WFWRD noting the only difference is that Herriman needed a withdrawal date at the end of November instead the end of October.

Rachel commented that Herriman approved this version. Before they ever approved the original resolution, they came back and asked for an extra month. We also took the opportunity to address a couple of other items. We changed some of the deadlines in line as certain transition items need to be done since we have a longer time until the transition happens. We wanted to make sure that we keep any trucks that we are giving them as long as possible, since we will need them for longer rather than having it be so tied to the date the agreement is signed and more tied to when the transition is happening. We also made a clarification in the section about the appraisals of the trucks. She and Evan chose to include an explanation of when the trucks are dated in terms of age because there were some terms about trucks between certain years would go into different categories. We realized it would be

helpful to have a defined term of how to date how old a truck is, and Herriman approved all those changes.

Rachel replied to Board Member Griffith that when both parties sign the agreement, we are under contract.

Board Member Griffith motioned/Board Member Holton seconded to Adopt Resolution No. 4449 Approving a Revised Interlocal Agreement Detailing the Terms of Withdrawal of Herriman City from WFWRD. Motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call Vote

Anna Barbieri: Aye	Lise Brunhart: Aye	Zach Jacob: Aye
Clark Bullen: Aye	Lyndsay Longtin: Aye	Marci Houseman: Absent
Emily Gray: Aye	Matt Holton: Aye	Terry George: Absent
Greg Shelton: Aye	Nick Griffith: Aye	
Jared Henderson: Aye	Nicole Handy: Aye	
Laurie Stringham: Aye	Tessa Stitzer: Aye	

The meeting then moved back to item 3.5.

4. **Closed Session**
   No closed session was needed.

5. **Other Board Business**

   Board Member Stringham thanked the staff for everything that they've put together. It has been a lot of work to pull the numbers, looking at all the options and abilities to become more efficient and effective. She gave staff kudos because the savings we are seeing this year have been amazing. Several Board Members agreed. There was no other Board business.

6. **Items for Subsequent Board Meetings**
   - General Manager Report
   - 3rd Quarter 2026 Financial Report
   - Updated 2027 Considerations for Collection Day by Service Area Modifications
   - 2026 Seasonal Container Reservation Program (SCRP) Results Presentation
   - Tentative 2027 Budget and Fee Schedule
   - Confirm the Public Hearing Date and Time for the 2027 Budget and Fee Schedule: Monday, November 16, 2026 6:00pm
   - WFWRD Customer Account Management and Billing Overview Presentation
   - Open and Public Meetings Act Training
   - [ON HOLD] Boundary Adjustment for the Northern Salt Lake County Service Area Annexed by Salt Lake City
   - [ON HOLD] Looking Forward – 2027 and Beyond: District Land, Buildings, and Offices

7. **Adjournment**

   Board Member Brunhart motioned/Board Member Griffith seconded to adjourn. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting end time: 11:15am