

**A REGULAR MEETING OF THE LEELANAU COUNTY SOLID WASTE COUNCIL WAS HELD ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2021 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 Chairman Perkins. The meeting was held at the Leelanau County Government Center, 8527 E. Government Center Dr., Suttons Bay MI.

**ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:** None.  
(Via Zoom)

**Members Present:** B. Perkins, J. Fletcher, A. Gale, M. Bevelhymer, M. Harris  
(At Government Center) L. Bahle, T. MacDonald, P. Deering, C. Sharp, J. Palmer.

**Members Absent:** M. Lautner, T. Bolin.  
(prior notice)

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

**Public:** Casey Petz, Suttons Bay School Superintendent.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** -None.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

Galla updated members on cameras at the recycling sites. The Elmwood Township site and the Glen Arbor site both have cameras. Cameras are ordered for Cedar, Northport, Empire, and the Glen Lake School. Peshawbestown did not request a camera, the Leland site is temporary, and they have a proposal from the Suttons Bay School to consider before moving forward there. Galla said the grant ends in October, so it was important to move forward getting cameras at those sites where it was the easiest and quickest to get them set up. Galla is working with two different companies. EPS will provide cameras for three of the sites, and Security 101 will take care of three sites. Signs will be posted on the bins stating the sites are under surveillance and the law pertaining to violation. Galla said the camera for the Cedar site will be mounted on top of the fire department since there isn't electricity at the site. This route was chosen so that the camera could be mounted and surveillance could begin immediately. If this doesn't work, they will look into putting in electricity at the site. Harris questioned how and if the public would know when the cameras are turned on. Galla stated she has been posting on Facebook, and the *Enterprise* also printed an ad.

Galla continued, saying the bids came in for the work at the Popp Rd. recycling site, and the lowest bid was \$45,000. They did get approval from the township to use the site for five years and there is an agreement between the township board and the County Board. However, the township board voted 4-1 not to pay that expense. Galla said there is a small group working on a way to pay for this and they may approach the SWC for help.

Galla continued with the last HHW & Electronics Collection of the year on October 16<sup>th</sup>, in Elmwood Township. Appointments are limited, so contact the Planning Department to make an appointment.

Galla concluded by saying in the November 2020 election, the recycling fee passed by an average of 81%. This was for a ten-year renewal, up to \$35.00. Galla said the SWC has enough money to carry them over and they do not need to ask for an increase at this time. Perkins questioned the cost associated with the cameras and installation. Galla stated that was being paid for through grant money.

## **CONSIDERATION OF AGENDA**

*Motion by Bahle, seconded by Harris, to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried 10-0.*

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST** – None

## **CONSIDERATION OF JULY 6, 2021 MINUTES**

*Motion by Bahle, seconded by Harris, to accept the minutes as presented. Motion carried 10-0.*

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS** – None

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Suttons Bay School site- 90-day termination/proposal for new location

Casey Petz, Suttons Bay School Superintendent, stated the Suttons Bay recycling site is very popular. It became even more popular during the pandemic when people were spending lots of time in their homes, thinking about how they were going to spend their day. Suttons Bay has become ever more important and visible to village residents, county residents, and district families. Petz said the first seven days of his tenure in Suttons Bay he heard from a good number of residents, mostly village residents, that the recycling site had become a nuisance with the noise, items being dumped, and ongoing maintenance on the back lot where the bins were located. He dismissed them at first, because he was seven days into running the school and thought surely there was more important things to discuss. What he found was that this issue is the second most discussed agenda item for the school board. Petz said people really care about what they have going on there, but also really care about appropriately addressing Suttons Bay School as a host site for recycling. He estimates this site is one of the more popular ones. Petz said they did a needs assessment to study what was involved with hosting the site and he would like to share what this study revealed. He spoke with their operations team, worked with a couple neighbors, and previous superintendents, regarding the history and how this site developed over the years. What he found was that they have a need to add 24/7 surveillance because they don't have adequate cameras pointed on the bins and they have significant issues with dumping. The bins were recently moved to the southern end of campus, on Herman Rd., and someone just dumped a load of stuff in the parking lot at the old site. Petz continued, saying they have a dumpster specifically for the random stuff left, which they have to hide, otherwise it will attract all of the local construction companies. The maintenance of the site is just incredible. Having to send staff members out to throw stuff into their dumpster and pay to get rid of other people's stuff is just ridiculous.

Petz continued, saying the school also experienced a few issues with suspicious people on site during school and school related activities. Multiple calls have been made to the police regarding these people, causing the school to go into lockdown. It is important for them to get the bins as far away from the children as possible. Petz said they don't have a proper wind break, which means they have to send people out to pick up what has blown out of the bins. Even though Green For Life (GFL's) people clean up and they have volunteers, it's just not enough. He hates having people on the campus seeing

the trash because they blame the school. The school provided snow plowing as part of their agreement, but normally they wouldn't plow most of the back lot where the bins were located. Petz said the school doesn't have a ton of extra anything right now and it's hard to get subcontracted services for things like snowplowing. It's hard to get someone to maintain that when they are having a hard time maintaining their own sidewalks in the winter. People living in the village, and along the spot where the bins used to be located said it was an eyesore and they wanted some level of mitigation and landscaping. Petz said there is an administrative cost involved because he has to deal with ongoing feedback from people regarding the recycling site. Petz concluded by saying the proposal submitted by the Suttons Bay School has two parts, upfront costs and ongoing management costs. The upfront costs are pretty expensive, but they will address some of the issues they have identified through their study. These include: fencing, landscaping, mitigation measures, orientation of the site for a wind break, signage, and cameras which would require electricity.

Sharp thanked Petz and said she knew there were issues, but not to this extent. Petz said not one week goes by where he doesn't hear a complaint. They know the school is a good site, for staff and families, but it is taking dollars out of the classroom to maintain it. Petz continued, saying in terms of ongoing investment, they have estimated costs for snow removal, daily trash pickup, administrative host fee, rent for hosting the site, maintenance to the lot and surveillance. Significant ongoing costs, but the school is not trying to make money off this, they are just trying to cover costs.

Bahle stated she was sympathetic with the neighbors because it got out-of-hand once the Lake Leelanau recycling site closed. The SWC is working on finding another location for the site and opening another site in Leland Township to help spread thing out a little. Gale questioned if the Herman Rd. site, where the bins are now located, was owned by the school. Petz said yes, they have a large campus and they moved the bins over there to the south side, between the soccer field and the softball field. Gale commented that it was good that they found a solution to the issues. Deering clarified, the Herman Rd. site is not a solution, the proposal from the school is for the Herman Rd. site.

Harris questioned how Petz differentiated the ongoing investment between the administrator host fee and the rent for site hosting. Petz said rent is for the square footage, the space it is located on, and administrator host fee includes his costs and his teams' costs for dealing with residents who want to talk about it, providing feedback, attending meetings or sending emails.

Bevelhymer questioned if it was determined the site needed to have concrete or asphalt. Petz said they did not talk to an architect, but they felt a cement pad would lend to at least a couple feet of embankment which would help contain blowing trash. Bevelhymer stated that several of the recycling sites are on gravel or crushed concrete, why does this have to be concrete or asphalt when there are other measures for that. The estimated cost for this was \$25,000.00 - \$50,000.00? Did an architect or engineer propose that? Petz stated no, that was internal, they have some smart people at the school. Bevelhymer said he has been involved with the Suttons Bay site for a long time and for many years it was a model site. In the last couple years, it has become an issue. GFL has people working on the holidays to dump the busiest sites. Perkins said gravel may be a quieter option for when the bins are set back in place. Petz agreed and said there are less people living near the site on Hermann Rd. to hear the noise. Bevelhymer stated that the noise does dissipate into the gravel. Bahle suggested Petz look at how the Northport recycling site is setup.

Galla stated that the Suttons Bay School Board sent a termination notice for the agreement between the County Board and the School Board. October 19<sup>th</sup> is the deadline. Any decision made today will not get back to the County Board before then. Galla continued, saying what they have done in the past is a one-time investment and then an annual fee, which is nowhere near what the school is asking for. In the past, the County Board has had a lot of discussion revolving around a way to treat each site fairly.

The last discussion regarding the annual fee, resulted in the County Board reducing the amount. Another option may be to find two locations, have two smaller sites, and split the bins up. Staff has been looking and has located some possible sites, but this will take time. Galla suggested the SWC consider making a counter offer to the school. Harris asked about an extension on the termination date while the SWC explores options. Galla said they currently pay the host sites \$1,250 a year. Petz stated that the school spent that much money yesterday. Bahle suggested increasing the current \$29.00 recycling fee, per household, and giving more money to host sites. Petz requested that anything the SWC proposes be sent to him, so that he can get it before the school board.

(Petz left meeting due to a prior commitment)

Bevelhymmer questioned the site investments at other sites. Palmer stated that they needed to ask for an extension first, then work on negotiating the costs. Galla said that according to the policy the SWC has on the use of the funds, they need a couple estimates on costs to consider. The school has not provided that.

Discussion ensued on asking the school board for an extension on the date of termination.

Perkins questioned whether they should ask for a specific amount of time, say a 6-month extension. Galla stated that the school would need time to get estimates. Gale said a 6-month extension was good. Palmer stated that if they are forced to pull the bins, Petz will receive pressure, and not in a good way. Bevelhymmer thought 6-months might be too long, according to the school, the site is costing them over \$2,500 a month to maintain.

***Motion by Bahle, seconded by Sharp, recommending to the County Board, a request for a 6-month extension of the October 19<sup>th</sup> termination date, set by the Suttons Bay School Board, of the recycling site, while the SWC explores all options.***

Discussion continued.

MacDonald stated that they need to find a new site. Gale said the 6 months would allow the SWC to go over the one-time costs and let the school board know what they need quotes on. Palmer stated that they need the 6-month extension, then a Plan B. Bahle commented that if they start getting bids, they will realize 6 months is not long.

***Motion on the table carried 10-0.***

Discussion continued.

Harris questioned if there was a potential new site in that area. Galla stated that staff is working on it. Perkins mentioned changing the zoning in Suttons Bay Township, Suttons Bay Village and Bingham Township, to include recycling sites. Bahle commented that we all need to solve these problems, the townships/villages, not just the county. Perkins stated that as the point person, Galla needed to approach the Village of Suttons Bay and let them know what is going on so that they could help with a site. Galla replied that the County Board had not directed her to go speak to the village council about this. Perkins said that is has to go to public property, that way you get around the zoning. The village has parks, the sewage plant and the spot where they hold the farmers market.

Perkins asked Galla if the County Board would be able to see the proposal from Suttons Bay School. Galla said she would be taking the recommendation for an extension to the County Board. The proposal is public information, anyone can read it.

Annual Payments for Site Hosts and Maximum Investment in Sites

Galla reviewed the previous funds invested in recycling sites since 2013 and pointed out that prior to 2013, two sites were leased, one received \$150.00 per month, and the other received \$200.00 per month. In 2013, the host sites were paid \$1,250.00 a year, which averages out to be less than what was being paid to lease the sites. Galla continued, saying they are now about nine years into this, and nobody has received an increase. She has been told by a couple different sites that this dollar amount is not covering their costs.

Galla continued, reviewing the budget and stating the available cash was \$538,851.92. Moving forward, they should keep 40%-50% of their annual budget held back, which is about \$225,000.00, this leaves \$313,851.92. Galla explained that the PA 69 goes on December tax bill to pay for next year. They are collecting each month, as people pay their taxes, but they still have bills coming in. The Treasurer will do the settlement in May, and at that time they will get whatever has not been paid yet. The remaining expenses for this year are just over \$180,000.00, they will still have over \$133,701.00 left, besides the “cushion”. Galla recommended that the SWC increase the host site payments to \$3,600.00 a year. Almost 70% of their recycling budget is spent on recycling sites and they are currently only paying the site hosts \$1,250.00 a year which does not cover their costs. More money needs to be put into the sites for upgrades. HHP Perkins commented that they trust Galla’s research and the dollar amount she recommends. MacDonald pointed out that the County Board did reduce the amount they asked for last time. Galla said she recalls that the SWC asked for \$1,800.00 a year for the site hosts and after much discussion, the County Board settled on \$1,250.00. Gale suggested including language regarding what this money should pay for. Harris said she didn’t agree, it sounds controlling. Palmer stated that the cost of replacing the sites out ways paying the hosts more money.

***Motion by Gale, seconded by Harris, to forward a request to the County Board, to increase the host site annual payment to \$3,600.00 per year, starting January 1, 2022. Motion carried 10-0.***

Cedar site- 1-year extension of Host Site Agreement

Galla said the Cedar recycling agreement expires this year and the township supervisor didn’t think they had the votes to pass a five-year extension, maybe a one-year extension. Deering commented that with the river project they are working on down there, he doesn’t see them agreeing to either. At every township meeting there are complains about the site. He would be surprised if anything was passed. Galla said the new increase host site payment would be included in the one-year extension proposal. Perkins stated that cameras were going to be installed at the site. Galla said yes, the cameras have been ordered and they are next.

***Motion by Harris, seconded by Bevelhymer, recommending the County Board ask for a one- year extension on the Solon Township recycling contract. Motion carried 10-0.***

Galla asked if members wanted to set a maximum dollar amount that could be spent on a site for improvements over a certain period of time. This way everyone will know that if improvements are needed on their site, here is the maximum dollar amount that will be spent. If it costs more than what the cap is, they would need to bring in some community support and donations. This would help ensure that each site is treated on a more equal basis. Perkins questioned why Galla thought it was necessary. Galla replied that in the past, the County Board has questioned why certain sites got more money than others. Gale suggested a \$20,000.00 cap per site. Palmer commented that every site basically needs the same things, a pad, a fence, and landscaping. Bevelhymer said \$30,000.00 would cover half of those costs. Deering stated that each site is somewhat uniform, so they should cost about

the same.

Discussion ensued on setting a cap on the dollar amount and/or percentage paid.

***Motion by Sharp, seconded by Gale, to table this discussion until the next meeting. Motion carried 10-0.***

#### Membership Number

Galla explained how the SWC board was set up, with 14 members and categories, to amend and update the Solid Waste Management Plan. She is not sure it makes sense anymore. If the SWC is not going to update the plan, there is no reason to have 14 members. She suggested reducing the number to seven or nine and removing the categories to allow anyone to apply to the board. The County Board will of course make the final decision. Galla concluded by saying that if the state says they have to update the plan, then they can reinstate the fourteen members/categories. Bahle stated that board members with expiring terms could still show up and speak as a member of the public.

Discussion ensued on members with expiring terms.

Bahle and Palmer agreed with reducing the number to nine and continuing the discussion at their next meeting. Galla said the County Board doesn't make their recommendations until the end of the year.

Perkins stated they should make it nine and table the discussion until their next meeting.

#### 2% requests: Mattress Recycling, Tire Recycling

Galla explained the tire recycling is similar to last years except they are asking for more money because the GTB has been very supportive of tire recycling. This collection would target large piles of tires on farms or other properties. The mattress recycling would have to be bid out because it's over \$5,000.00. Staff based the cost off estimates provided by BARC

***Motion by Bahle, seconded by Harris, to forward 2% requests for mattress recycling and large pile tire recycling, to the County Board. Motion carried 10-0.***

#### Coordination of Scrap Vehicle Recycling Event

Galla explained that the SWC supported this event years ago and several hundred cars were collected. The cost involved is for advertising only, they don't get involved in the event. Fletcher questioned what all this included: cars, trucks, tractors?

***Motion by Sharp, seconded by Fletcher, for staff to explore a scrap vehicle recycling event for next year. Motion carried 10-0.***

#### Michigan Green Schools

Harris stated that she contacted the person who was in charge and has since retired, and found out that nobody has been hired to replace them. She will continue to explore this.

Harris continued, with regard to the Sutton Bay recycling site possibly closing, could they ask for a temporary site here at the Government Center? Perkins said if the County Board sees what the Suttons Bay School wants, and it is going to close, it might make a difference. Gale stated that they were

reacting to a problem that didn't even exist right now. They might get the extension they are requesting.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS** – None.

**COMMUNICATION/CORRESPONDENCE**

Copy of Revenue & Expense Sheet provided.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** – None

**STAFF COMMENTS** – None.

**MEMBER/CHAIRPERSON'S COMMENTS**

Bahle asked if the signs going up on the recycling bins regarding illegal dumping were going to include language regarding a fine? Galla said yes, up to a \$2,500.00 plus disposal costs. Bahle continued, saying that new multi-unit developments should have receptacles for recycling, not just waste.

Discussion ensued on who could enforce recycling bins to be included in developments.

**ADJOIURNMENT**

**Meeting adjourned by consensus at 2:52 p.m.**