WASATCH FRONT WASTE AND RECYCLING DISTRICT (WFWRD)

BOARD OF TRUSTEES | REGULAR MEETING MINUTES – *PENDING BOARD APPROVAL*

Held Monday, March 2, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. at the District Offices located at 604 West 6960 South, inside the Salt Lake County Public Works Administration Building Training Room. This meeting was also held electronically via Webex.

Call to Order: Emily Gray, Board Chair
Roll Call: Catarina Garcia, Board Clerk

Board Members: Anna Barbieri-City of Taylorsville, Emily Gray-City of Holladay, Greg Shelton-White City, Keith Zuspan-Town of Brighton, Lyndsay Longtin-Kearns City, Marci Houseman-Sandy City *(arrived at 9:09am)*, Mick Sudbury-Magna City *(excused at 10:35am)*, Nick Griffith-Emigration Canyon, Nicole Handy-Millcreek City, Zach Jacob-West Jordan City

Participating Electronically: Jared Henderson-Herriman City, Laurie Stringham-Salt Lake County, Clark Bullen-Murray City, Tessa Stitzer-Town of Copperton *(arrived at 9:19am)*

Absent: Matt Holton-Cottonwood Heights

District & Support Staff: Evan Tyrrell-General Manager, Helen Kurtz-Finance Director, David Ika-Operations Manager, Hazel Dunsmore-Human Resources Manager, Renee Plant-Administrative Manager, Sione Tuione-Collection Manager, Catarina Garcia-Executive Assistant/Board Clerk, Rachel Anderson-Legal Counsel
Webex: Andre Perov-GIS Coordinator, Yael Johnson-Customer Solutions Manager, Shane Norris-Safety and Emergency Preparedness Coordinator, Justin Tuft-Collection Manager, Andy King-Asset Manager, James Kelsey-Sustainability Coordinator

Public: Patrick Craig-Salt Lake County, Abby Evans-Salt Lake County, Robert Piñon-Emigration Canyon

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

2. **Board of Trustees Business**
   2.1 Welcome New Board Members: Lyndsay Longtin, Kearns City, and Nick Griffith, Emigration Canyon

   Catarina performed the Oath of Office for Lyndsay Longtin. Former Board Member Piñon introduced Nick Griffith, and Catarina conducted his Oath of Office. Board Chair Gray thanked Board Member Longtin and Board Member Griffith for their willingness to serve.

   2.2 Adoption of Resolution 4442, a Resolution Expressing Appreciation to Former Board Member Patrick Schaeffer for his Years of Service as a WFWRD Board of Trustees Member

   Board Chair Gray noted that former Board Member Patrick Schaeffer was not in attendance and did not read the resolution.

   2.3 Adoption of Resolution 4443, a Resolution Expressing Appreciation to Former Board Member Robert Piñon for his Years of Service as a WFWRD Board of Trustees Member

Board Chair Gray read the resolution for former Board Member Piñon who was in attendance.

Board Member Griffith motioned/Board Member Sudbury seconded to approve Resolutions 4442 and 4443. Motion passed unanimously.

2.4 Adoption of Resolution 4444, a Resolution Expressing Appreciation to Retired WFWRD Employee Ryan Dyer for 25 Years of Service

Evan introduced Ryan, who was in attendance, and David Ika, Operations Manager, gave a brief history of his career and work related to implementing the Area Cleanup program. Ryan also helped in implementing weekly curbside recycling. Ryan hired David in 2007 when recycling was subscription-based and has left the District with a lot of institutional knowledge. David thanked Ryan for his service and expressed his appreciation for him.

Board Chair Gray was glad to hear all the contributions Ryan made, expressed that the Board was grateful for him, and they were sad to see him go but are excited for the next step in his life.

Vice-Chair Zuspan motioned/Board Member Shelton seconded to approve Resolution 4444. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Consent Items *(Approval Requested)*

3.1 January 26, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes

There were no questions or comments on the minutes.

Board Member Barbieri motioned/Board Member Handy seconded to approve the minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Business Items:

4.1 General Manager's Report - 2025 Metrics and Accomplishments: Evan Tyrrell, General Manager

Evan gave an overview of WFWRD services noting that the District is a fee-for-service enterprise fund and does not receive monies from general funds such as property tax and sales tax. Everything is funded by user service fees. In the coming months, presentations will be made to the Board to better describe and educate on various District programs and services and the amount of work that is required. He reviewed 2025 tonnages for curbside refuse, recycling, special services, trailers, green waste, SCRP, trees, leaves, and glass.

Evan showed a map of WFWRD Service Areas and reported on the number of homes serviced, collection days and go-back days to maximize efficiencies, and disposition facilities. Another slide showed the number of homes (86,495) and the nearly 200,000 curbside cans serviced per city/service area throughout the District's entire service area. The next slides showed the 2025 Curbside Tons Collected by Service Area, Material Type, Disposition Facility, and Tipping Cost Comparisons to Other Companies/Agencies/Service Areas.

WFWRD has developed a new service cost comparison throughout the Salt Lake metropolitan area, including Salt Lake County, Utah County, and Davis County. Due to the varying types of services offered, costs comparisons are often ‘apples to oranges’ and are not directly comparable (e.g., biweekly versus weekly recycle collection). WFWRD has learned that several cities utilize general fund sources to provide ancillary services whereas WFWRD operates as a single enterprise fund with limited revenue sources and overall serviceability.

Evan showed January through December Tonnage Comparisons and Landfill Vouchers, Customer Solutions Calls and Interactions, a high-level summary of unaudited 2025 Preliminary Revenues & Expenses, and several quantifiable cost-savings measures in 2025 while retaining all lines of service; total quantifiable cost savings due to various District initiatives in 2025 totaled $1.82M, several of which will be ongoing savings in 2026 and beyond. He will plan to update the Board every other month on the Priorities, Goals, and Initiatives (PGIs) that track efficiency and cost savings throughout the calendar year and will identify on-going versus one-time costs savings.

Board Member Stringham asked if it made sense to keep the CNG vehicles and fix them over time instead of trying to sell them at a point if the resale value doesn't make sense. If it makes more sense not to sell them off at a certain point but just to keep fixing them and keeping them since they don't have a high resale value.

Evan replied that these are also things we are looking at with our data analysis and visualization, looking at what's typically referred to as the “TCO”, Total Cost of Ownership. We know that the older the trucks get, the more expensive and the more frequent repairs are needed. We do have several trucks that are at auction currently and yes, the bids we are getting on them are pennies to the dollars for what we paid originally. If we hold trucks and they just sit when they are not being utilized on a regular basis, then they have more issues with all the interesting and fun things that are part of the technologies of the trucks. These are things that we are actively evaluating and we will likely bring back a later time with the District’s fleet team.

David Ika added that when we are not utilizing trucks, there is a cost just getting them going again which comes at a higher cost per mile.

Board Chair Gray asked Evan if there were any last things he wanted to add before we move on because she did not want to rush through some of the other items and they were behind schedule. He replied that he could be brief on the next two slides that showed the volatility of the processing fees for recycling that changes on a monthly basis, and the latest green waste and recycling can guides to better educate what is and is not acceptable.

4.2 Review and Approval of Proposed Interim Policy Manual Updates: Evan Tyrrell, General Manager

Board Chair Gray explained that most of the updates were cleaning up language and turned the time over to Evan to review the substance changes.

As mentioned, Evan confirmed that a lot of the items were basic cleanups. They have added definitions for what comprises a full-time employee and made some adjustments to ensure that we are able to pivot with changes in state code or budget proposals, the most recent compression matrix, and clarifying exempt positions versus non-exempt positions and related timekeeping requirements. There were no questions or comments.

Evan went on to review more cleanup items related to workweeks, adult designee, holiday pay, paid time off (PTO), and pro-rated accruals.

Board Member Sudbury asked if it is overtime for operations when we provide service on holidays. Evan replied yes, in some cases. He talked about premium holidays, noting we do not perform collections on Christmas, Thanksgiving, and New Year's day. Board Member Sudbury would prefer the time off over the pay and asked what the overtime cost savings would be to move services back a day.

Board Chair Gray agreed that is definitely something that we should look into and Evan stated that while we do not have that number in the immediate, we can certainly look into that.

Evan clarified that Rachel Anderson, the District's legal counsel, reviewed all of the changes and proposed a cleanup of the military leave section to reference USERRA (Uniformed Services Employment and Re-employment Rights Act). He then reviewed updates to Abatement or Refund of Charged Service Fees that added specificity.

Regarding the strikeout on 16.4.3. Back Billing: "The District ~~Administrator~~ may bill the amounts owed or negotiate payment plans for amounts owed in their discretion.", Rachel replied to Board Member Griffith that it was a technical error because we do not have a District Administrator.

The last item Evan reviewed were updates to the landfill voucher program and confirmed to Board Chair Gray that it was just to get our policy in line with current practices.

Board Member Houseman asked for clarification of the strikeout of Section 4.2.1.3 ~~As part of the Public open meeting, the Board shall state the General Manager's annual compensation, and, at the Board's discretion, sign a letter stating such compensation that will be filed in the General Manager's personnel file.~~

Evan apologized for skipping over that item and Rachel explained that we have never had a well-defined policy regarding reviewing the General Manager, which is one thing the former General Manager added before their departure. It was Evan's first year and we felt he did not need a performance review after a few months in 2025. The policy had not been followed yet and announcing the pay in the meeting felt a little unorthodox and it was decided to pull that back. The amount is public information but in the interest of not being awkward in a public meeting. It is not about trying to hide the information, it felt more typical for the Board to discuss in a closed session and we did not feel the need to have it announced in an open session.

Rachel clarified to Board Member Houseman that it was another cleanup of getting the policy in line with current practices. She talked briefly about past practices that never included announcing the pay in an open session and it may have gone a little too far in trying to correct the issue. We are not proposing to forego the General Manager's annual performance review process as part of this Policy Manual update.

Board Member Shelton motioned/Board Member Sudbury seconded to approve the proposed interim policy manual updates. Motion passed unanimously.

4.3 2026 Seasonal Container Reservation Program (SCRP) Planning Overview and 2027 Considerations: Evan Tyrrell, General Manager, Renee Plant, Administrative Manager, and David Ika, Operations Manager

Evan explained that staff would now review the program, historic challenges, improvements, recruitment and retention efforts, planning, and the "all hands on deck" approach for 2026.

Renee gave an overview of the program including the Operating Period, Reservation Process, and Funding, SCRP Goals, Historical Challenges, Opportunities, the Tiered Process, Key Takeaways from Last Year, and a new online zone map where residents can enter their address to find postcard dates, service dates, and zone information specifically for their address. She asked the Board to refer residents to our website if they get any questions and gave a demonstration of the map on the website.

David reported on Resource Allocation & Metrics that include a total of 14 drivers (2 full-time and 12 seasonal) to go from 62 containers per day in 2025 to 72 containers per day in 2026, projected to result in at least 1,183 more containers to be serviced during the 2026 SCRP season.

Evan replied to Board Member Barbieri that the additional cost of adding 10 containers per day would be largely related to the disposal fees, materials hauled, and fuel consumption.

In response to Board Member Jacob's question about the typical number of residents on the waitlist, Renee went to the Appendix that showed the 2025 EOY SCRP by City Detail. She clarified that similar to last year, those on the waitlist that did not get fulfilled will be given Early Bird Access this year. She also showed a slide of repeat reservations historically, depicting that the tiered process works, repeat reservations dropped, and made it more equitable to residents.

Board Member Barbieri stated how proud she was that Taylorsville went from 34% in 2024 to 11% in 2025 and is hopeful it will eliminate the complaints from residents stating they can never get a dumpster. She was also impressed with the large reductions in other cities.

David continued on with Additional 2026 SCRP Information that included staff have strategized Seasonal CDL Driver recruitment and retention. Hazel confirmed there were currently 15 applications, seven are returning from previous years. She explained that some drivers do not make it through the entire season and talked about the end of season incentive that will replace the SCRP monthly recognition meetings. Renee added that the incentive is cost-neutral. Instead of smaller monthly awards, they can earn up to $600.00 if they stay the entire season.

Evan talked about the update to the job posting title, recruitment and retention, and introduced Sione Tuione who manages SCRP. He then showed a slide of the 2026 SCRP Service Area Dates and spoke about Acceptable & Prohibited Materials, the updated SCRP agreement, noting that other bulky waste programs do not accept a variety of materials being accepted via SCRP.

2027 Considerations included evaluating a curbside bulky waste model that would eliminate the need for containers and individual deliveries to/from the landfill/transfer station, utilizing rear load trucks and loading equipment that could maximizing the average tons per load and could have reduced the number of hauls in 2025 from 7,457 to 655 if rear load trucks were used to haul the maximum tonnage payloads (i.e., the average tons per SCRP container haul in 2025 was 0.78 and a rear load truck can haul a maximum payload of 9 tons). Evan reviewed the estimated cost savings and estimated equipment costs to convert to a curbside bulky waste program in 2027, and the concept of alternative central bulk loading of individual SCRP containers for 2026.

Board Chair Gray summarized that we are looking at 1) in 2026, identifying central locations in each of their areas to bulk load SCRP containers, 2) next year, talking with municipalities to gage their support of curbside bulky waste services, and 3) a possible alternative to areas that do not want to engage in a curbside program.

There were discussions about tonnages, equipment, the proposed process, logistics, and safety. Evan added that ultimately what we're trying to do is maximize how much we can service and maximize in meeting the service demand.

Board Member Shelton stated that he loves this idea and loves where it's going. He talked about the large volunteer base in White City and coordinating through their community council.

There were continued discussions about the options, logistics, group site pickups, and curbside pickups. Evan mentioned Salt Lake City's "call to haul" program, shared his experience with the City of Flagstaff bulky waste program, and how certain metropolitan areas have implemented a more robust planning and reservation process for curbside bulky waste service in Phoenix and Tucson, and the work Renee has done with a comprehensive comparison of similar areas of how these programs are managed, funded, limited, accepted or not accepted materials, etc., that will be brought back to the Board as we evaluate this throughout the year.

Board Member Houseman offered to be a partner in this because Sandy City has been doing this and it is the most beloved service to their residents. When they had a mayor who tried to take it away and go to containers, it did not go well and they fought to keep it and are grateful they did. There are things like working with the Department of Water Quality, where there were certain conditions they had to put in place to be in compliance. She stated that they are happy to help staff think through the options and that it's something that helps Sandy City. Their residents tell them over and over again it is a way that helps them feel that the community gathers together, cleans up their yards, and helps one another. They had to do a lot of education and communication and modeling and going back and educating again, but their residents have been so incredibly responsive. They've made those needed adjustments and it's just fantastic. She asked staff to please let them help. They've done so much of the heavy lifting in terms of what it looks like to ensure we are not endangering our stormwater.

Board Chair Gray interjected that she knows we are really excited about this, but we obviously need a lot more information. We need a lot of information from our cities but it sounds like an incredible option that's especially an incredible financial option, and we have a good year to look at planning and get feedback. She agreed with Board Member Shelton that a sub-committee is a fantastic idea when we get to that point.

4.4 Overview of New Residential Cost and Service Comparison throughout the Tri-County Combined Salt Lake Metropolitan Area: Evan Tyrrell, General Manager, and Renee Plant, Administrative Manager

In the interest and respect of everyone's time, Board Chair Gray moved this business item to a future meeting.

4.5 Proposed Tentative Mid-Year Fee Schedule Updates: Evan Tyrrell, General Manager, and Helen Kurtz, Finance Director

Evan clarified that we are not imposing or increasing our base fees and noted that if approved, the fee schedule would become effective April 1, 2026. Highlights included revisiting additional can fees in 2027, new residential-only Specialty Curbside Collection services for tire, mattress, and appliance pickups.

Board Member Houseman asked to clarify the proposed changes that would take effect in April which is outside of our normal process are really just related to opt-in type services and we are not changing any fees only because we've had this operational efficiency which is fantastic and wanted to make sure we're not increasing fees.

Board Chair Gray confirmed yes, these are only opt-in options. None of our standard fees are changing at all. Evan added that the intent is to fill a community gap and provide an additional community service that we feel will be desirable once residents are aware of it, but of course, a public entity solid waste district is to help to keep our communities clean, sightly and safe, and to provide those avenues and resources to clean up additional materials outside of SCRP.

Board Chair Gray reminded everyone about the March 23rd regular Board meeting at 5:00 pm with a Public Hearing at 6:00 pm to hear comments on the Seasonal Container Reservation Program (SCRP) Prohibited Materials Assessment Fees.

Evan explained the SCRP Prohibited Materials Assessment Fees are to disincentivize residents from putting prohibited materials in the containers and offset additional costs to the District for those items. [Tires, Freon-Containing Appliances, Hazardous or Toxic Materials, Other Prohibited Materials, Commercial, Contractor, or Industrial Generated Waste]

Helen recapped discussions from the February Board Meeting regarding the credit card transaction fee. She talked about absorbing the $1.50 per transaction fee for people who pay online with an ACH with their checking account and adding a $3.00 convenience fee for phone payments.

Board Chair Gray recalled that we wanted to make sure that there were non-fee options available, which we've done.

Regarding the $3.00 convenience fee for phone payments, Board Member Shelton commented on having the ability to override that because of the system either not working or special case scenarios. Helen responded that the $3.00 convenience will cover all transaction fees; our customers would not be charged an additional $1.50 for paying with a credit or debit card.

Board Member Barbieri recommended delaying these charges until 2027 as she believes that our residents have been hit over the head with the [January 2025] fee increase, monthly bill payments, then see the ACH and credit card changes, she thinks we're done with fees. She was the one that proposed we start collecting the fees based on credit card charges but thinks we're at a place where we can allow people to call in and pay for transactions and perhaps helping those people walk through getting online. She thinks a lot of the audience that calls in could be older people that may not be savvy enough or they don't want to or they're not trusting enough to give a credit card over the phone, but they don't.

To be clear, Board Chair Gray asked Board Member Barbieri if she would prefer to postpone the adoption of these [payment transaction] fees until next year, to which she replied yes, she doesn't want any more residents calling and complaining about the fees.

Board Member Shelton commented that he is okay with that especially if we continue the education piece that this will start to go into effect, but that we're giving you grace period to adjust your spending behavior to adjust to avoid the fee.

Rachel noted that we could do the adoption at the public hearing rather than waiting to do the hearing, saying that it is approved and will be effective as of a certain date, would be legal. Board Member Barbieri replied that if we make it public now, they will get phone calls.

Board Member Houseman mentioned the narrative, depending on what action was taken, how important it will be to communicate how intentional we've been in improving our operational efficiencies which is how we've been able to have this savings. Some form of what we've been doing to increase efficiencies and this is something we can absorb for a short amount of time because of these efficiencies but not in an ongoing manner.

The Board agreed to support Board Member Barbieri's recommendation to delay the payment transaction fees.

Board Member Stringham added that we do need to have a protocol, something written on when and why we waive fees so it's consistent and would pass an audit. That will be vital that it's part of our policy. When is it appropriate to waive a fee like that when is it not? She wants to make sure we cover that base so that we are clean and clear if there was ever an audit of why we're waiving certain fees and not others.

4.6 Scheduling a Public Hearing for Mid-Year Fee Schedule Updates: Emily Gray, Board Chair

Vice-Chair Zuspan motioned/Board Member Longtin seconded to approve Rescheduling the March 23, 2026 Regular Meeting to Commence at 5:00 pm and Scheduling a Public Hearing for Mid-Year Fee Schedule Updates for March 23, 2026 to Commence at 6:00 pm. Motion passed unanimously.

4.7 Discussion and Direction in the Development of an Interlocal Agreement with Herriman City to Address their Withdrawal Request: Emily Gray, Board Chair, and Rachel Anderson, Legal Counsel

Rachel reported we had a great meeting with Herriman City on February 19th with the WFWRD Admin Team, Board Chair, and Vice-Chair and today we are seeking direction and approval just to proceed in a certain direction. We're not asking for any formal approval of specific terms per se, but that we have the direction to continue with this approach. Namely, what that would include and why we are seeking direction is we talked with them about creating an expedited withdrawal process for them and part of that would include foregoing doing a feasibility study, which would be both a cost savings and a time savings. Helen has prepared a lot of financial information that we can use as we have these conversations and we think we could get through the process more quickly if we go that route. We've talked about Herriman keeping the cans that they already have there. There was some back and forth about what made sense there and what would it cost for us to remove the cans and do you want to keep the cans and that's kind of where she believed we settled is they keep the cans and we might talk later about things like the branding. Those are nitpicky details which we can discuss later. We talked with them about coordinating the timing of the withdrawals so we expressed the ability to do it as quickly as possible in a matter of a couple of months. They expressed that in fact they might need it a little bit longer than that in order to get a new hauler up and running so we will work through that together and choose the exact best time for everyone because obviously the transition needs to be seamless. Luckily, this sort of transition wouldn't be too difficult on our side, it would just be a matter of not sending trucks one week, just all of a sudden we stop servicing them especially if they're keeping the cans, but we will coordinate that and then also thinking about coordinating around billing cycles and making sure that we do what makes most sense for Helen's team in terms of when were people billed and when does it make sense to transition to make that as efficient as possible. There will definitely be a few more details worked out, but that's the rough discussion that we had and if we have Board approval to proceed in this general direction, we can start working with Herriman's team, namely herself and their attorney, we can work on what we were thinking of doing an interlocal agreement to set in stone what our expectations are and the process and that way we both have assurances that will proceed as we agree, so even if we're not ready to start the actual withdrawal because they might need a little bit of time to get the new service up and running, we at least have the framework agreed to proceed under that.

Board Member Stringham commented that she would like to see that we send a letter with their last bill that is coming because not everybody pays attention and we want to make sure that they know we've enjoyed serving them, we've been grateful to be able to provide good service to them and we wish the City of Herriman and all the residents good luck with the new service.

Rachel responded that it is a good point that she didn't mention previously, they discussed that there will definitely be a large need for a major communications effort here. She thinks largely that it will take place on Herriman's side. They'll be communicating with their residents, but that's not a bad idea for us to include that as well.

Board Member Shelton mentioned one other detail is whether we have any delinquent accounts in Herriman, how it affects our ability to collect those remaining accounts if they are technically out of the District.

Rachel assumed we can still certify any delinquent accounts and there are a lot of little details once they start writing the document. There will be things they didn't consider and are the kind of things that we'll need to work through. She reiterated that we are not asking approval of any of the details and anything that comes up through further negotiations would be brought forward to the Board and the Herriman Council to formally approve. As long as we have this general idea of expediting [the withdrawal process], foregoing the feasibility study, letting them have the cans, etc., it's a good starting point for us to continue these discussions.

Board Member Houseman asked Rachel if the impact to the rest of the District is cost neutral and if the framework she is building with them will not result in other cities absorbing costs.

Rachel replied that we've done a lot of framework and financial analysis, and we are not anticipating a fee increase [to the remainder of the District]. In terms of other costs, she believes it's impossible to have someone leave and not have some adjustments that will need to be made and we will manage those. It has been decided that we can do this without having a fee increase.

Rachel answered Board Member Barbieri's question that there is no anticipation that the new service provider would take our equipment or employees, nor honor our obligation for their retirement or pension.

Board Member Barbieri wanted to make sure that cities feel comfortable when they feel this no longer serves the needs of their residents, they need to be able to make an exit. On the other hand, we need to be able to protect the rest of the District, and wanted to make sure everything is equitable, in writing, and a process that's fair to all cities, all residents, and WFWRD.

Rachel and Board Chair Gray commented that they thought Board Member Barbieri was expressing how we all feel and expressing that really well.

As far as increased costs to Board Member Houseman's question, Board Chair Gray stated that obviously we lose economies of scale with Herriman leaving, but with Helen's analysis, we are confident that we can absorb those costs. It's because of that and because we want to make sure that the District remains strong and we know that Evan has a lot of ideas, some of which he shared today which we can see some big cost savings that we're excited about. But we also want to make sure that we are listening to the needs of all the different cities and for all of those reasons to make sure that for the remaining cities that we stay strong as a District and stay in tune with what our different areas need, we'd like to plan a retreat where have time to really delve into what are the needs of our different cities, and different cost saving ideas that we might want staff to explore. We are going to have staff put out scheduling so we can get as many Board Members as possible to look at a path forward.

Board Member Barbieri clarified that Taylorsville wants to stay with WFWRD and are really excited that we've got this team working together to make this an amazing service provider. Another concern is there's not a lot of service providers out there, so if we lose one, we lose competition. Taylorsville wants WFWRD to stay. They just want to make it so efficient everybody wants to join us.

Board Chair Gray clarified that's exactly why we want to have this retreat so that we can kind of do some broad strokes big picture.

Board Member Stringham commented that we also need to make people aware too that when you're dealing with industries like this that are private industries coming in or competing against special districts or governmental entities, there's always this willingness to come in and undercut at first until they get a monopoly in an area and then they pop up their costs and they recover it, so it's a long term recovery. They're not looking at recovery up front, they're looking at recovery towards the end. You may be getting a good deal upfront, but she promised that you will not be getting a good deal at the end. And it's that whole cost - being savings. We've seen this happen across the nation with counties all over the place. It was one of the discussions they had at their national meeting. Undercutting by industries coming in, shutting down the city's services by literally undercutting them and people want to go there and then as soon as they're the monopoly or have the majority of it, one or two businesses will actually combine, pairing off with each other and then they both bump [prices] up at the same time. It becomes extremely costly, so we need to be aware that that is a tactic that's used in the industry and make sure we're aware who's using it, how they're using it, and where they're using it because some of these national organizations that are coming in and trying to undercut right now, that's exactly what they do, and they've done it in multiple places and now [residents] are paying more than they did originally.

Vice-Chair Zuspan spoke about when going with a private company, [residents] no longer have any input. All WFWRD Board Members have that ability to make changes and adapt versus hiring a private contractor, you have no say in operations. A national corporation will act in their best interest, not in their customer's best interest.

Board Member Shelton felt it important to note that WFWRD provides significantly more services than just trash and recycle pickup.

Board Member Jacob commented that he is generally in favor of this because of the circumstance that we are in. He would be more opposed because, in general, of the precedence it sets. In this case we have other operational efficiencies that we can tweak so that it is something we could recover from a one-time thing. If other areas decided to leave, we may not have those one-time efficiencies. The bill in the legislature is taking our legs out from under us as far as what the rest of us can even say.

Rachel explained that is why we want to take this approach on friendly terms, at the table with them and we are discussing things and we can make it pain free as much as possible. The plan is to refocus over the entire remaining year of strengthening the District, strengthening Board member confidence, making sure everyone is expressing issues they may have, and working on it together. That's where we get into the protectiveness of protecting the remaining District. Rachel further stated that this has changed all of our perspectives. We will be more forward-looking and we hope to address these things in advance rather than having to play catch-up.

Board Member Jacob added that the bill that's out now that removes the "say". This unattractive path that we're going down is the only path that we get a say in so if they are willing to come to the table and give us a say, in the amount of a week they won't have to.

The Board supported the development of an Interlocal Agreement with Herriman City to address their withdrawal request.

4.8 Scheduling a Board of Trustees and Leadership Staff Retreat: Emily Gray, Board Chair

The Board directed staff to schedule a Board of Trustees and Leadership Staff Retreat.

Board Member Stringham talked about looking at smaller commercial business that we can service on routes out to areas that will be more distant. We've never competed with the private industry but they're competing with us and she feels that all is fair in love and war at this point.

Rachel remarked that we've talked about expanding our charter and that's definitely on the to do list. Board Member Stringham added that it makes sense if we have a route, let's get every business along that route into where we need to go and make sure it’s paying for itself to get us there.

Board Chair Gray concluded that those are the type of things that we really want to dive into on the retreat and see where the Board is on those on some of those bigger questions because those are the type of things that we really want to look at.

5. **Closed Session *(If Needed)***
   No closed session was needed.

6. **Other Board Business**
   There was no other Board business.

7. **Items for Subsequent Board Meetings**
   - Monday, March 23, 2026: Regular Meeting at 5:00 pm and Public Hearing at 6:00 pm
     - General Manager Report: Updates on 2026 Priorities, Goals, and Initiatives
     - Utah Association of Special Districts (UASD) Presentation
     - Customer Solutions Program Presentation
     - District CDL Driver Drug and Alcohol Testing Policy
     - Public Hearing and Adoption of 2026 Mid-Year Fee Schedule
   - Monday, April 27, 2026: Regular Meeting
     - Overview of University of Utah Recycling Survey
     - Waste Diversion and Recycling Contamination Presentation

8. **Adjourn**

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