

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE LEELANAU COUNTY SOLID WASTE COUNCIL WAS HELD ON TUESDAY, JULY 25, 2023 AT THE LEELANAU COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER.

Proceedings of the meeting were recorded and are not the official record of the meeting. The formally approved written copy of the minutes will be the official record of the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order at 1:00 p.m. by . The meeting was held at the Leelanau County Government Center, 8527 E. Government Center Dr., Suttons Bay MI.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: L. Bahle, J. Fletcher, A. Gale, T. MacDonald, C. Sharp, K. Ross
K. Cavanaugh, T. Petersen

Members Absent: P. Deering
(prior notice)

Ex-officio Members Present: J. Palmer

Ex-officio Members Absent: M. Bevelhymer

Staff: T. Galla, Director, G. Myer, Senior Planner

Public: B. Perkins, T. Dowd, T. Overdier, R. Laporte, K. Shaw and 2 others

PUBLIC COMMENT

Perkins, from Suttons Bay Village, stated that he cleans up at the Suttons Bay recycling site and that they need stickers on the recycling bins that explain how to handle materials that are not recyclable and left outside the recycling bins. There are people helping keep the site clean, and when they are not available there are new people helping out that don't necessarily know how to deal with this. He is also working on getting solar lights at the site. Perkins said the road commission would like two motion detected lights, one at the entrance and one at the exit.

STAFF COMMENTS – None.

CONSIDERATION OF AGENDA

Motion by MacDonald, seconded by Sharp, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried 8-0.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Gale said he had a conflict of interest with agenda item #1, RFPs & Recommendation to County Board for new contracts, c. BARC Proposal.

CONSIDERATION OF APRIL 4, 2023 MINUTES

Motion by Gale, seconded by Fletcher, to accept the minutes as presented. Motion carried 8-0

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None.

NEW BUSINESS

Update – CROWD (Composting, Recycling and Organic Waste Diversion)
Tim Dowd and Kristen Paige from SEEDS

Dowd reported that they had three productive workshops and they are hoping to do a fieldtrip in the future to the Emmett County composting and recycling center. They will also be hosting a seminar this fall. Dowd read the mission statement for CROWD: To gather and continue to engage a group of concerned community members and experts to research alternatives for landfill disposal through alternatives such as organic waste management, recycling, reduction and reuse. Their objectives are to divert waste from landfills and stop the proliferation of CO2 gasses into the atmosphere.

Dowd continued, saying their number one strategy is getting composting integrated into community master plans. They have high priority for the following: entrepreneurs engaged in the waste management business, reuse prioritized over waste, farm produce and people having access to nutritional food. On the lower end of priority were: shrink landfills, educational programming about waste management, compost, recycling and waste diversion for students K-12.

Paige mentioned a group of experts gathering on how to support communities in the Part 115 planning process. They hope to be a resource and to partner with the counties in a ten-county area, to better understand what solutions would help support moving organic waste through diversion in our communities.

RFPs & Recommendation to County Board for new contracts

a. Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) -ERG Proposal

Galla reported that contracts with ERG and Comprenew are expiring at the end of this year. The pricing being used was from 2014, with some extensions along the way. They did work with the companies last year to increase some of ERG's costs on some items since Covid caused a huge increase in pricing.

Galla reviewed the only proposal received from ERG. A prior invoice was used as an example to show the current charges and then what the increase would be, about 50%. One collection would cost around \$32,000.00, and the county does four a year. Galla said they could go back to three collections if needed, or lower the number of participants per collection which would lower the cost. Another option to help cover the increased cost is raising the current \$29.00 recycling fee which the County Board did not raise it after the vote was passed.

Discussion ensued.

Bahle mentioned choosing one of the hazardous material and charging people a fee for bringing that item like they do with tires and mattresses. Galla said she did not want staff collecting money at the collections because this is county government and receipts have to be given. Staff is then responsible for getting that money back to the office after the collection. Tires and mattresses are prepaid before the collection. The HHW collections have always been included in \$29.00 recycling fee. Tires and mattresses were an added collection that use 2% funds and a state grant for tires to help offset the cost

of the collection.

MacDonald questioned the \$2,500.00 setup cost, was this not charged before? Galla said that would be a new charge next year. If this contract is renewed, the total increase would be about \$48,000.00 a year. Sharp asked about SWC members volunteer instead of paying staff. Galla spoke about inmates and other workers and said it didn't work very well.

Motion by Gale, seconded by Sharp, to recommend to the County Board to enter into a contract with ERG in response to the RFP, at the proposed cost. Motion carried 8-0.

b. Electronics services and Document Shredding-Comprenew Proposal

Galla reviewed the proposal from Comprenew, their labor and costs, again using an invoice from 2022 to show current charges and what the new charges would be. This cost jumped from \$5,000.00 to over \$12,000.00. Labor and transportation fees increased \$1,750.00 per event to \$4,470.00 and certain items that they weren't charging for they are now charging a fee for. Galla said the county has had a long history of working with both ERG and Comprenew.

c. BARC Proposal

Galla said this is a different type of proposal than what was called for in the RFP. Galla explained that this was a proposal to hold electronic collections every Friday of the month, starting in May running through October. These collections would be four hours long and in a different township each Friday. The cost per item is comparable to what Comprenew proposed, but this contract does not offer any shredding services like the Comprenew proposal includes

Galla said she and Gale spoke because she has no way of providing numbers based on this type of proposal. She has no idea how many people would show up to this type of collection because they are weekly. Does the county need a collection every Friday? Will this create confusion for people because they can no longer bring electronics to the HHW collection?

Discussion ensued on costs.

Cavanaugh stated that the Comprenew proposal is roughly \$48,000.00 a year and the BARC proposal is roughly \$44,000.00

Kelvin Shaw, ERecycle LLC, who partners with BARC said the current Saturday collections incur cost from the companies to set up. With the BARC proposal, there is no set up fee and no staff that needs to be paid. No appointments are needed and the pricing is similar so it actually would be cost saving for the county.

Gale spoke about BARC's history with ERecycling and said they don't have to charge a fee because of his contacts. The current HHW collections are big events that require a lot of man power. Their idea was to break it up into smaller events, more often, without all of that expense. ERecycling already goes out into the community to pick up electronics. Grand Traverse County has a voucher system for televisions. Residents can drop off one at no charge and at the end of the month they send an invoice to Grand Traverse county. This is another option that could be made available to Leelanau County residents.

Bahle questioned whether or not they needed to offer 22 electronic collections. Shaw said the difficult thing is to know how many people would show up. After the first year, they would reevaluate that number of collections.

Palmer asked if they had locations of these collections and if they have talked to any townships? Gale said no. Shaw mentioned educating people from businesses at the collection, letting them know BARC can take their stuff. Palmer stated that they would need to make sure there is some kind of agreement in place with each township because you can't just show up and hold a collection.

Galla said that would mean staff would need to find new locations when we have four set locations now. She would also hate to see people leaving stuff at a location if they missed the collection, then what? Galla continued, saying she anticipates that the County Board would set three-year contracts with locations, so this would need to be addressed if the locations change after the first year. Gale then mentioned that BARC could also partner up with the county and be present at the four HHW collections to collect electronics there as well in case people show up expecting to drop off electronics. Galla said that Grand Traverse County does not collect electronics at their HHW collections at all. They promote residents taking them back to different stores or locations in the county.

MacDonald is concerned with the logistics. Fridays from 10-2 is very limited. Where would it be in Leelanau Twp? If there were Saturday dates available that would help. Shaw said they have not located sites yet. Gale said that if other days work better they are flexible. Shaw then said he suggests appointments be made for these collections.

Discussion ensued on making appointments.

MacDonald questioned if staff would be scheduling appointments for these 22 collections. Galla explained that staff currently uses an online system that residents use to sign up for a collection or they can call the office. Galla said the proposal is different than what they bid out on and raises a lot of questions on how things would be done. Bahle said it does offer people more times, maybe it would cut down on the dumping at recycling sites. Ross wanted to know what they would do about shredding. Galla reviewed the shredding numbers and said there are other shredding opportunities available. Bahle said they could ask ERG if they could shred? Shaw mentioned they could try to address the shredding and partner with someone in Traverse City to do that. Gale said that they could modify their proposal to include shredding. Galla said it wouldn't be changing the proposal, if it was something that could be done, they would add that to the contract if BARC was selected.

Bahle commented that it would be a big shift and they would need to educate people on what they can recycle, when and where. MacDonald anticipates a lot of confusion with this. People will still show up with stuff at the HHW. Shaw said they could still be available to collect at the HHW collections. Peterson doesn't like that the collections are on Friday's only, that eliminates a lot of people. Shaw said those were suggested days.

Cavanaugh like the idea of going local, might take some adjustment and education. Galla said they could ask for answers on the questions asked here today and meet again in August.

Cavanaugh clarified some of the questions raised: shredding, possibly a Saturday collection for the larger townships, if you switch the days around too much you will just cause more confusion, and make sure townships are on board with this. Members wanted a response on these questions before they meet again. Gale clarified that on the bid sheet, \$300.00 is per event and \$6,600.00 for all 22 collections.

Galla will send out a doodle poll and schedule the next meeting.

Materials Management Plan Planning Committee structure-Recommendation to County Board

- a. Recommend Restructure of SWC to become the MMP Planning Committee
- b. Recommend a new MMP Planning Committee

Galla said not every SWC member can convert to the MMP Planning Committee (MMP) because they won't fit into the categories. The state has notified the county that in September they will initiate the process of updating. Galla reviewed the two options - restructure the SWC to the MMP or keep the SWC and let them continue to handle hazardous waste, recycling issues and anything else that may need to be taken care of, and create a brand new MMP. There may be people sitting on both, so it would help to hold both meetings on the same day.

Discussion ensued.

Galla said the SWC could continue to work on issues that the MMP would not. Such as making a recommendation to the county board to increase the recycling fee or handling issues at the recycling sites. The MMP offers a multicounty committee, wherein each county receives \$60,000.00 and then an additional \$10,000.00 if they are involved in a multicounty MMP. Galla has talked to both Grand Traverse and Benzie county on this issue. There is a benefit to the planning part of this, but they don't see the benefit after the plan is done. The issue becomes who is administering what?

Gale said he is against restructuring; he would rather have a separate MMP board. MacDonald stated he is in favor of restructuring to a MMP that would then continue on as the SWC once did, and administer the plan. Ross said this is an opportunity to create a new body that would be more comprehensive, so she is leaning towards creating a new MMP. MacDonald said as he understands it, that is the purpose of the state's new rules. For the size of the county, he doesn't think it is necessary to have two. Bahle said to put out the advertising to citizens that they are looking for MMP members. Galla said that will go through the administration office.

Motion by Gale, seconded by MacDonald, to recommend the County Board, enacts a new MMP Planning Committee to replace the SWC. Motion on the table carried 7-1. Petersen opposed.

Fletcher spoke regarding the frequency of meetings and said he wants additional meetings throughout the year to deal with issues. Waiting a couple months to take action on something causes them to lose momentum. Bahle said they are able to call additional meetings whenever needed.

COMMUNICATION/CORRESPONDENCE

Approval Process for Plan

Recycling Volumes

Revenue & Expense Report

Galla said the current fund balance will be whittled down until the end of the year but they will need to trim expenses at some point to increase the revenue.

Flecher asked about people from Traverse City using our recycling sites and if those numbers are

extrapolated. Galla said no, because there is no way of knowing those numbers and these amounts are provided by GFL. Bahle commented that she doesn't even know how GFL could separate that out.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Perkins urged the board to not cut services on the HHW collections because the taxpayers have voted, and they agreed to raise the tax which could be used to keep those services.

STAFF COMMENTS – None.

MEMBER/CHAIRPERSON'S COMMENTS

Bahle said she has a short-term rental (STR) across the driveway from her, and she showed a picture of the garbage/recycling piled up at the end of the driveway. She would like more education, a mailer sent out again or something, so the owners of STR's can inform their renters what to do with recyclables. Bahle will ask Suttons Bay Township for a list of STR's. Ross supported spreading the information countywide.

Ross continued, saying she thought they were going to look at composting education bids. Galla said two bids did come in and she is pursuing those and looking at dates for a fall session.

ADJOIURNMENT

Meeting adjourned by consensus at 2:38 p.m.