

BARRY COUNTY SOLID WASTE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Tyden Center Conference Room
121 South Church Street, Hastings, MI

Approved Meeting Minutes March 11th, 2022

Call to Order

Chairman Frank Fiala called the meeting of the Barry County Solid Waste Oversight Committee to order at 9:00 a.m.

Members in Attendance:

Jodi Pessell
Jay VanStee
Sarah Moyer-Cale
Matt Rosser
Sarah Nelson
Jim Brown
Patricia Rayl
Frank Fiala
David Jackson
Vivian Conner

Members Absent:

Tom Rook
Bill Sweeney

Members of the Public:

Rachel Frantz
Jerrie Fiala
Sandy Pierce (attended via phone)

Approval of Agenda

Per Chairman Fiala, will proceed with agenda as presented with the addition of discussing the Mini-Grant Program after agenda item #7.

Approval of Minutes

Per Sarah Moyer-Cale, her last name is misspelled in the meeting minutes; it is listed as Moyer-Cole, but it should actually be Moyer-Cale. Vivian Conner stated that on page three (3) of the minutes it states "it was decided that Frank Fiala, Jay VanStee and Sarah Moyer-Cale will meet with Michael Brown to discuss all the specific guidelines for the Planning Committee" and it should actually be her listed (not Sarah Moyer-Cale) along with the other two committee members that will meet with Michael Brown. **Motion to approve the February 11th, 2022 meeting minutes with the corrections mentioned above made by Sarah Moyer-Cale, seconded by JayVanStee and the minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.**

Public Comments

None.

Chairman Comments

None.

Budget/Trial Balance Update (Patricia Rayl)

Patricia Rayl stated that she received a letter from Michael Brown letting us know that we received an extra \$21,000.00 that came in after the end of the fiscal year, which would be applied to 2021; so that means our total that we took in for tipping fees was \$89,118.86. We have been budgeting at a set \$70,000.00, so she

Budget/Trial Balance Update (Patricia Rayl) (Continued)

thinks maybe in the future we might be safe to increase that a little as we have been conservative as far as revenue, so theoretically we could increase that. The Trial Balance report (page 13) shows we have a fund balance of \$250,000.00, so we have money available if we want to spend it. We also got a refund from Drug & Laboratory as they overcharged us \$609.65 for our September 2021 Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) collection event and this has been applied back to our account. Patricia stated she inquired about the questions we had from last month regarding some of the charges and those charges were for conference registrations; they don't have enough room in the software to fully describe what it is for, so they just kind of took the highlights. Per Chairman Fiala, his understanding is that our fund balance is about \$250,000.00, our approved budget from the County Commissioners is about \$117,00.00 and in this current approved budget year is the \$45,000.00 for services like the Recycling Coordinator. So, what we are trying to do with the Recycling Coordinator is basically with our dollars as it's not tax dollars, it's approved by the County Commissioners and it comes from our Fund Balance which comes from tipping fees, which is basically what it is for. Patricia Rayl also provided a copy of the Agenda Request Form so that we can get our adjustment to increase line item "special projects" from \$1,000.00 (which was previously approved for our fiscal year) to \$26,000.00; she also included a section of the meeting minutes and highlighted the part that dealt with the request. Vivian Conner said she would check with Michael Brown to see if Patricia Rayl needs to include all the meeting minutes or is she can just provide the section of the meeting minutes that pertains to this and she will let Patricia know what she finds out.

Per Sarah Nelson, at the last meeting we formed a Mini Grant Program sub-committee that consisted of herself, Jay VanStee and Sarah Moyer-Cale to do three (3) main things: 1) we wanted to clarify with the Barry Community Foundation what exactly they pledged towards the Mini-Grant Program, 2) we wanted to come up with a recommendation for a budget amendment for this group and how we wanted to proceed given whatever the Community Foundation had pledged and 3) we wanted to revise the grant documents. So, they were able to discuss all three (3) of those items and based on that information come up with a recommendation. For the first thing, the Barry Community Foundation pledged \$10,000.00 for the Mini-Grant Program for 2022 to be matched with \$10,000.00 from this committee. So, from that they then discussed on how we should proceed from here...do we go back to the Community Foundation and ask for more money since what we had intended to ask for in the beginning was more than \$10,000.00 or do we look at another option? Their recommendation was to start with the \$10,000.00 as it is not a competitive grant program, it's a rolling grant program as we take applications throughout the year and it's first come-first serve. So, we can use that \$10,000.00 for as many qualified Mini Grants that we get and then if we do exhaust all those funds and still continue to receive applications, then we can go back to the Community Foundation and say you know this is what your dollars have funded so far this year, this program has been a greater success than ever before and we would like to expand on it and then ask for additional monies at that time. For the third thing, revision of the Mini Grand Program documents, copies were provided to all committee members to review and follow along as she points out a few areas that they cleaned up and/or modified.

On the first page, second paragraph, we kept the applicants may request up to \$4,000.00 per project, but then we modified that to say to cover no more than 67% of total project cost; so, they just wanted to clarify that it's just basically a 2/3 grant, 1/3 match split. Then this was further clarified by saying grantees must provide at least 33% of the project total cost in matching funds. So, the grants can be less than 2/3 total project cost and the match can be more than 1/3, but those are the limits. In the third paragraph, they clarified that applications will be accepted throughout the year and qualified applications will be awarded on a first come-first serve basis until funds have been expended. They also removed the total fund pool because to applicants it's really irrelevant as you have a maximum amount you can receive per grant, you're not competing with anyone else and they really wanted to emphasize the fact that it's first come-first serve, so the best bet at

Budget/Trial Balance Update (Patricia Rayl) (Continued)

getting funding is to submit a qualified application as soon as possible. Sarah stated that she also cleaned up the language a little bit under Goals & Objectives just to clarify it better, but there were no substantial changes made. On the second page, this is basically just reiteration of some of those other changes. For example, program requirements, #3 maximum grant award amount, #5 the match requirement and then also these program requirements there were many more numbers before and they were kind of all over the place; so, she tried to group them if there was a requirement that seemed to go with another requirement and she put those together so now there are only nine (9) requirements, which is a lot nicer than say 26 requirements. She was actually a little bit surprised that most of this was in our grant documents as usually these would be things that would be outlined in a grant agreement; however, she doesn't think that is a negative thing as it is nice to be upfront with people about exactly what the expectations are. There were also many instances where she replaced Solid Waste Oversight Committee with our acronym SWOC, but she did make sure that acronym was spelled out on both of the first two (2) pages. There was not much that she updated on the application form, she just indented a couple of lines (like the source of matching funds she indented that under amount of matching funds). She also added the caveat "please attach a full project budget detailing costs" as it was worded a little bit differently before, which was a bit confusing. On the first page, she also added "this grant opportunity is available thanks to the generous support of Barry County and the Barry Community Foundation" as she and Chairman Fiala talked about that recognition as it wasn't actually in the original documents, so she thinks it is good to include that right in the page that would probably serve as the cover letter/press release.

Motion to accept the revised Mini-Grant Program documents as presented by Sarah Nelson made by Jay VanStee, seconded by Patricia Rayl and the motion was approved by a unanimous vote.

Update On Solid Waste Plan/Planning Committee (Frank Fiala, Jay VanStee & Vivian Conner)

Per Chairman Fiala, in terms of the Solid Waste Plan we currently have (created in 1992 and last updated in 1999), Sarah Nelson helped him get with the EGLE folks and we have a couple of contacts; one of those contacts that is assigned to our area here, is willing to come in to meet with this committee to help us with this process. We are not the only ones behind like he had thought going into this as he was informed that we are not alone at all in being behind on this process and there are things coming down the pipeline to help us do this in the future. So, as of right now, there is not a sense of urgency. He also spoke with Ben Geiger (informally) about forming a 14-person Planning Committee and his response was that he didn't want to do that right now if reasonable, so then the question is can the same committee do both? The answer is yes, but the Planning Committee for example has to have 14 members and it names in the statute where they need to come from; however, you can have the same basic people on both committees as there can be a subset & a superset and you could even hold the meetings back-to-back. There is no requirement for the Planning Committee meetings. In his opinion, the takeaway is that we are going to get more guidelines about updating our Plan and there is no point in rushing into some of that if it's going to change a little bit. So, he would like to have a professional from EGLE come in to help out with that; he believes that when the dust settles a little bit, we will have someone from EGLE come in to talk about the Planning Committee and updating the Plan, and just give us some general guidance and recommendations on how to proceed with this.

Recycling Coordinator Contract – Possible Extension (Sarah Nelson)

Per Sarah Nelson, at last month's meeting, a lot of really good points were brought up and it kind of gave her cause to reflect on how they presented their thoughts about moving forward and how they should be presenting it. She has since asked Rachel Frantz for a list of her contacts for all the township, village and city meetings that she attends and then she reached out to all of those folks asking for feedback much like she did

Recycling Coordinator Contract – Possible Extension (Sarah Nelson) (Continued)

with this committee, i.e. what has their experience been working with the Recycling Coordinator? Where can they improve? What would they like to see done in the future? etc. She has received some feedback so far and has identified some areas that she thinks they will expand more on in the proposal that is more in a narrative format rather than the list of items she previously presented because if you just look at the list of items, it doesn't look like much has changed, but what that lists means is changing quite a bit and is developing really nicely. She has received some feedback already, but would like to finish getting feedback from the Local Units of Government she hasn't heard back from yet so she can include all of this with the proposal. She would also like to include the County Commissioners and sit down with them (may be after Rachel Frantz's presentation on the progress for the first year) on an individual or small group basis and just say you know this is what we have been hearing from your region of the county that you cover so what do you think we should be doing? Where should we be improving? What should we be working more or less on? We really want to be able to serve the entire county as well as possible. So, she does not have the narrative for the proposal at this time, but is hoping to have it for next month. Their current contract expires at the end of May/beginning of June, but they are not going to let Rachel Frantz go if that isn't extended immediately; she is stuck with us long-term one way or another and we certainly aren't going to drop Recycling Coordinator services immediately, so she wants to make sure we are doing this the right way and not rushing into it.

Sarah Nelson asked the committee if they think it is appropriate to go back and ask for approval on the contract again or if it's appropriate to go to Michael Brown and ask if we have the budget approved for this, is it appropriate to treat this like we treat our other contracts and just move forward with contracting within that budget and work more on keeping up the relationship with our Board of Commissioners in the sense that we are talking about the work that we're doing and guiding that work rather than focusing on the contract. Dave Jackson replied that talking with Michael Brown is always a good starting point because of his depth of breath of knowledge on these things and he's going to format anything that comes through the Board of Commissioners with Ben Geiger and Vivian Conner at the same time, so he has got a very good 10,000-foot view of how things work at the county level. Sarah Nelson expressed that it seems to her that bringing this one (1) specific contract and all of the details for approval is not in line with the way that we treat other items and it's not in line with the way other departments treat other items. Sarah Moyer-Cale replied that the difference could be that this contract being a multi-year contract is different from the other contracts that she had mentioned because the budget is approved a year at a time. So, that money has been authorized, but if we enter into a multi-year contract the money for those other years hasn't actually been authorized, so she doesn't know if we would have the same authority to enact those. Sarah Nelson stated that she would be in support of a one (1) year contract as she thinks that might be the direction we should head in anyway. If it is just a matter of us bringing that proposal and the Board approving it every year, it's not that onerous to her and last time we talked about the caveat of if Rachel Frantz is not available to be the Recycling Coordinator then everything is null and void anyway, so it seems to her like it would be something that would be good to approve every year.

Annual Report of Activities to County Commissioners (Rachel Frantz & Jay VanStee)

Per Chairman Fiala, we want to come to the Board of Commissioners every year with a report of here is what we did last year, here are the people that participated and here is what we plan on doing next year. Per Rachel Frantz, the Annual Report is done now that she has got the updated numbers from Patricia Rayl, so she will send that back to Patricia to make sure all those budget numbers are correct. She also expressed that she is doing a presentation on general recycling out at Pierce Cedar Creek and she wanted to report on this specific presentation to the Board of Commissioners as well, so if possible, she would like to present the Annual Report to the Board of Commissioners in May so she can also include the presentation she is doing at the end

Annual Report of Activities to County Commissioners (Rachel Frantz & Jay VanStee) (Continued)

of April. Per Dave Jackson, if Rachel Frantz does the presentation in May, then she could also promote the HHW collection at the same time, there will be media there and you can probably combine the two (2) together because you would be right on top of it versus if she gives the presentation in April, the HHW collection event will be forgotten about by May. The Board of Commissioner meetings are usually the second & fourth Tuesday of the month, so the second Tuesday in May (10th) would be a good time since this would be just a couple weeks prior to the May 21st HHW collection event. Dave Jackson also mentioned that he & Vivian Conner could piggyback on that and hopefully we'll have some flyers out to people & the media so we can get the word out. The committee agreed that Rachel Frantz would give her presentation at the BOC meeting on May 10th, 2022 and she will email the final presentation out to all the committee members as well as bring hard copies with her to next month's meeting.

Rachel Frantz mentioned that the tire hauler contract needs to be signed and she thinks it should be signed by Michael Brown since he is the contact listed on the tire grant. Vivian Conner stated that in the past Ben Geiger has been the one to usually time the contract, so Rachel Frantz will send the contract over to Michael Brown for his or Ben Geiger's signature.

Household Hazardous Waste - May 21st, 2022 (Jodi Pessell)

Per Chairman Fiala, we have Sandy Pierce from Padnos on the phone so we can discuss possibly taking electronics at the HHW collection events. Per Chairman Fiala, we used to do electronics recycling at the HHW collection events, but that slowly went away over time. However, several people have recently inquired about electronic recycling and he feels we should whatever we can do to bring this back to the HHW events. So, we need to discuss the following: How we can do it? Do we need to charge a fee for it? Do we have enough time to incorporate it into the upcoming HHW in May 2022?

Per Sandy at Padnos, what they have done in the past for events like this is they provide collection boxes that they can deliver to our location. So, once we have a collection event & date identified, they can deliver those materials to us and then we would probably have to have someone to monitor the traffic and guide residents where to place the materials. Our signages we'll have pictures as well on them, so they should easily be identifiable. However, batteries can be nightmare with trying to figure out what kind goes where so they could provide signage for that as well. They can also give us a list of the materials that will cost and materials that will pay so that at the end of the day accounting isn't looking at the recycling boxes as a loss.

Per Chairman Fiala, we have another way of accepting batteries and we have been doing that for a long time, but we pay dearly for that to our vendor. From his view, what we have been doing with batteries works just fine, so we can just continue to do that for the time being and kind of separate that from the electronics recycling. Per Jodi Pessell, in the past when we used to do electronic recycling, we had it so when people came through they could drop off their tires & electronics and then if they had batteries or medicine or anything else then we would just ease them into the line from the barn. Chairman Fiala asked for TVs, CRTs computers, cell phones, etc. do you have funding for that or do we have to pay for that recycling fee? Sandy Pierce replied that we would have to pay a recycling fee for the CRT's; we do get a very small amount of funding for it, but that doesn't really cover their labor and that is why they are charging the counties and a lot of the charges are minimal because they are more residential collections. The state has a law that says if the materials CRTs/LCDs are coming from residences or small businesses (defined as ten (10) employees or less) so a small business CRT TVs, LCD monitors, LCD TVs or any sort of display in devices, they are used with those constraints. The state is basically giving Padnos \$0.03 cents a pound and the \$0.03 cents a pound they then use to transfer the material to other recyclers out of state to process, which is basically taking it apart and then having to get the mercury bulb out of it and that transfer fee is already \$0.04-\$0.05 cents in terms of rates, so we are already in

Household Hazardous Waste - May 21st, 2022 (Jodi Pessell) (Continued)

the negative. So, they basically charge the labor to put things together because a lot of the caddies when you collect materials will get may be two (2) to three (3) TV's in one big box and what they do is they actually layer them all out so they repack everything so that it will fit more condensed in the trailer to help with the freight. They charge for CRTs (because they are bigger, heavier and bulkier) is right around the \$0.30 cents a pound range and the LCD is cheaper as that is right around the \$0.24-\$0.25 cents a pound range to repackage those. She can send us the packaging guide that they have as there might be something helpful and then we can discuss transportation from your location to our location cause she doesn't think we will get a full entire trailer load of CRTs/LCDs, so they would combine them with their volume and ship it out so at that point you would only be looking at transportation. Per Chairman Fiala, what would the typical cost for say half-a-load of whatever being transferred from our location to their location, are you talking about like a few hundred dollars or a few thousand dollars? Per Sandy Pierce, she will have to check on that as she doesn't have that numbers accessible right now. Our expenses for this are already up there so we need to look at expenses and costs with these things and with this pennies per pound he is unable to see how that would transform into something we are going to do in about 60 days, how that is all going to fit together? Jay VanStee agreed that he is also a little bit hesitant about trying to incorporate this for the upcoming HHW event in May 2022 as we would need to do form a sub-committee and do some extensive homework. Or is it so simple that we can charge people like we did in the past and just set up an area there and then make arrangements with Padnos to come and help us pick it up. Jay VanStee stated that is what he was envisioning that we would have kind of a pay for service with a list of things that are free and if you are going to recycle this X, Y, Z then you will have to pay X, Y, Z. Chairman Fiala asked Sandy Pierce if there is something like that that we can do? Rachel Frantz responded that Sandy Pierce said that she has a list of what costs and what pays, so if she can give us that list then we can kind of go through it and then say if you want to bring these things then you have to pay, but if you bring these items then it's free. Sandy Pierce said she can definitely provide us with that list and then that way we can have that information for the residents.

In terms of batteries she understands there is a solution there as previously discussed. Just to clarify to make sure he is understanding this correctly, Padnos would drop-off a trailer at the event that would be packaged and then we (SWOC) would supply the labor to do that. Per Sandy Pierce, a lot of residents will probably have questions about what things go where and that's why they find it helpful to not only provide descriptions with photos, but also have a couple of people onsite to answer any random questions. Chairman Fiala would like to form a small sub-committee to work with Sandy Pierce from Padnos to see if this is feasible to do at our upcoming collection in May because if so, it will need to be in the advertisement that gets published in the paper. Jay VanStee, Jodi Pessell and Rachel Frantz volunteered to be on this sub-committee. Jay VanStee stated he thinks it may be a little ambitious for our spring event, but let's take a look at the materials for our next meeting and then we should be able to decide then whether or not this is something we can run with and if nothing else hopefully plan on something for the fall event. Sandy Pierce stated she will send the information over to Rachel and hopefully she can meet in person for next month's meeting.

Jay VanStee said the way that he is looking at the electronics recycling is maybe it's too optimistic to try to include this in the spring collection, but if we at least do it for the fall collection; that way we would have an idea of the cost and have something to basis it on going forward and then decide whether or not we would want to charge for this and how we would potentially do that. Sarah Nelson wondered once we see that list we could do like a soft start to this and the first time only take items that we get paid for; labor is also another issue so she would be willing to talk to her staff and if they are willing & available she can provide staffing to specifically help Rachel Frantz with the electronics at no additional cost because it would fit within the current contract. Chairman Fiala stated that he would also get with the City of Hastings to see if their staff would be available to volunteer for this like they have done the past couple of years.

Household Hazardous Waste - May 21st, 2022 (Jodi Pessell) (Continued)

Jodi Pessell stated that she will bring the HHW advertisement to next month's meeting so the committee can approve it for publication in The Banner and The Reminder. Depending on whether or not we are able to include electronics for this collection, the advertisement may need to be updated with that information.

Recycling Coordinator (Rachel Frantz)

See Recycling Coordinator February 2022 Report (report was emailed to committee on 03/07/22).

Member Comments

Jodi Pessell – None.

Jay VanStee – None.

Sarah Moyer-Cale – None.

Matt Rosser – None.

Sarah Nelson – None.

Jim Brown – None.

Patricia Rayl – None.

David Jackson – None.

Vivian Conner – None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Frank Fiala at 11:23 a.m.

Approved at the 04-08-2022 meeting