

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CLINTON COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE (SWMPC) HELD THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2015, AT THE CLINTON COUNTY COURT HOUSE, 100 EAST STATE STREET, ST. JOHNS, MICHIGAN 48879**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Dan Coss, Denise Donahue, Tim Fair, Anne Hill, John Lancour, Tim Machowicz, Tonia Olson, Julie Powers, Kurt Ray, Roger Simon, Walt Sorg, Christine Spitzley, Rodney Taylor and Lori Welch

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** All present

**STAFF PRESENT:** Kate Neese, Chris Hewitt and Therese Koenigsknecht

**GUESTS:** No guests

**1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:**

Chairman Taylor called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA:**

Chairman asked to add 2a Public Comment at the beginning of the meeting and 7a Public Comment on the end. ***A motion was made by Member Fair, supported by Member Powers to approve the agenda with amendments as requested. Motion carried.***

**2A. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

No public comment.

**3. APPROVAL OF PER DIEM VOUCHERS**

A motion was made by Member Machowicz, supported by Member Coss to approve payment of the Per Diem Vouchers. Motion carried.

**4. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 22, 2015 MEETING MINUTES & APRIL 30, 2015 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES:**

***A motion was made by Member Fair, supported by Member Coss to approve the minutes from the January 22, 2015 and April 30, 2015 meetings. Motion carried.*** Chairman Taylor asked for comments. Member Sorg asked if the minutes could reflect that he was in attendance (via telephone) for the April 30, 2015 Public Hearing.

**5. REVIEW PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Chairman Taylor called for questions on the public comments that were received at the Public Hearing and stated if not he felt it would be efficient to move into the reviewing amendment language section and talk about comments that were received.

**6. REVIEW AMENDMENT LANGUAGE**

Chairman Taylor asked DWMC Neese to recap what the committee's purpose is; what the specific action is and talk about the resolution as a discussion item.

DWMC Neese explained that tonight the SWMP Committee is going to review the language for the proposed Plan Amendment, which is in the original memo that was shared in February. She stated that originally in January she sent out a draft resolution, however, the DEQ has since asked her to send it in memo form. She explained that the committee's job is to review the request; language and agree on a draft document, which is basically the final version of the document. At that time if agreed by the SWMPC, it will go forward to the Board of Commissioners (BOC), who will review the request and the draft Plan Amendment and will take a vote on it. If they vote yes, it will go to the municipalities for their review and vote. If they vote no, it will come back to the SWMPC for a revision. If the BOC votes no, they have to give their list of reasons.

DWMC Neese also stated the SWMPC has two options. They can state they are finished and not go further with the amendment or agree to a Draft Plan Amendment; agree to the language in it and DWMC Neese will put into Resolution to be presented to the BOC for their review and vote. Chairman Taylor asked if all SWMPC members had a copy of the proposed resolution. DWMC Neese stated she also attempted to contact Christina Miller from DEQ, regarding questions pertaining to other county plans that had recycling language in the reciprocity section of their Plan and was unsuccessful in reaching her.

Chairman Taylor called for a motion. ***A motion was made by Member Fair, supported by Member Lancour to review and consider the memo and proposed language so the committee could move into discussion. Motion carried.***

- Member Lancour questioned the language and if it made sense to state the annual cap is not changing. DWMC Neese stated it is already in the language and it hasn't changed. Chairman Taylor clarified that section is simply replacing what's already there but adding the additional counties.
- Member Powers asked if this memo, as currently written, does nothing more than add the additional counties as requested and if it doesn't, add any of the suggestions, recommendations or public comments that were heard at the public hearing. She also asked if it changes the fees that were set in 1989 and have not been changed since that time.
- Member Ray asked if changes were only to Sections 5.5 and 5.6.
- Chairman Taylor asked DWMC Neese when the BOC established the SMWPC, did they provide any direction to the Committee, in terms of what their charge was. DWMC Neese stated it was to move forward with this specific amendment. Member Olson read from the January 28, 2014 BOC minutes that the Board recommended the approval of the reopening of the Solid Waste Management Plan for the sole purpose of reviewing an export/import agreements for the counties of Clare, Hillsdale, Lenawee and Mecosta and it was unanimously approved.
- DWMC Neese stated at the Public Hearing there was discussion about adding additional amendments/changes to the Plan and after having conversations with County Administrator Wood, she feels there is little to no support from the BOC to do any additional amendments at this time. Part of that is because the state is currently reviewing PA 115 in hopes of updating and revamping the program. This could mean there may be some changes as early as next year.
- Member Lancour stated likewise with recycling where the Governor is also initiating a new plan. Member Welch asked DWMC Neese if what she said also includes any language pertaining to recycling and waste reduction. DWMC Neese stated that language could be included in that section, however, it wouldn't be for just the 4 counties. Member Olson stated that each of those counties would have to amend their plans, which is not likely, unless you ask them to and pay them to do it.
- Member Coss stated the proposed legislation is to revamp solid waste management plan review processes to make them more regular and that would potentially cause the existing plan to be looked at and go through some sort of an update. DWMC Neese agreed and said it could create a state mandate at which point, Clinton County could redo the entire plan. Ms. Neese would prefer to do this with everything going on at the state level, however, it is up to the SWMPC to decide.
- Member Coss asked if any amendments outside of these sections would start the process over again and DWMC Neese stated it would.
- Member Powers asked at the time the request was made by the BOC, were they specifically apprised that tipping fees and other pieces of the Plan had not been amended since 1989 and wanted to be clear of what the BOC was informed of when they made the charge to the SWMPC. She also remarked that the state standard is five years. Discussion followed among the SWMPC members regarding the tipping fees and DWMC Neese stated the BOC is aware that it's been 15 years since the last update has taken place and she regularly puts this in the DWM's budget. Member Olson stated that the state standard is five years but it is not required.

***Chairman Taylor asked for additional discussion on the language proposal and called for a vote to forward the proposed amendment changes to the Solid Waste Plan to include the addition of the four (4) additional counties. YEAS: Dan Coss, Denise Donahue, Tim Fair, Anne Hill, John Lancour, Tim Machowicz, Tonia Olson, Roger Simon, Walt Sorg, Christine Spitzley, Rodney Taylor and Lori Welch NAYS: Julie Powers & Kurt Ray. Motion carried.***

## **7. OTHER BUSINESS:**

- Member Sorg stated there was testimony and significant concern regarding increased efforts on recycling and reduction and asked members for ideas on how to send the message to the BOC and the other counties. There was discussion and several members felt this is coming from the state level.

- Member Olson stated she is assigned to the Governor's Recycling Council and she is seeing good leadership on the issue of recycling, waste reduction, and sustainability.
- Member Machowicz suggested that in order for Clinton County to move forward, perhaps an unpaid advisory committee could be established that could support this recycling effort solely for this county.
- Member Taylor agreed that the group did receive testimony and it would be appropriate to make a recommendation for the County to potentially reevaluate the existing Plan and see if there's a broader opportunity for analysis. He also stated that as a planning group, this commission could make this recommendation to the County BOC and ultimately it is up to them to make that decision.
- Member Ray stated he supports this philosophy and that he voted no on the language proposal not because of objections to any of these 4 (four) counties but the concern being volume without addressing issues such as recycling.
- Member Machowicz clarified that this advisory committee would not be limited by just amending the Solid Waste Management Plan, however, there could be positive assistance to county government and local businesses to provide recycling and educational resources
- Member Lancour stated he feels Clinton County does a good job with the Department of Waste Management and stated with the Governor's committee this is about studying markets and what it takes to pull it out of the waste stream and find viable markets for this.
- Member Fair stated that he feels recycling is a personal choice and if recycling options are provided; more people do it. He also remarked on what took place at the Public Hearing that he rarely smells Granger as was remarked by many in attendance and stated that Granger is a good business partner to its' neighbors. He doesn't see the conflict.
- Member Ray stated he doesn't dispute that it's a personal choice to recycle but also a good business choice and encourages looking at more recycling options.
- Member Sorg stated that Granger is not the issue but the fact that you're working with many counties that are all over the ballpark contributing to this landfill that are not being as responsible as Clinton County, Lansing, MSU or Granger.
- Member Welch asked what the SWMP Commission could do as a group and asked to move forward with language in the Resolution that would suggest some kind of action at the Clinton County level. Member Welch also remarked now is the time to add any other language.
- Chairman Taylor clarified that the resolution voted on in the past; the SWMPC could make a separate motion in terms of a recommendation back to the BOC.
- Member Olson stated the Questions & Answers document answers addresses Member Sorg's concern about recycling in the other communities.
- Member Fair stated he doesn't see how it is Clinton County's responsibility to make other counties be more responsible and recycle. He agrees with encouraging but not with enforcing recycling. Member Sorg pointed out that Clinton County has to then accept their trash that they don't recycle.
- Member Welch stated that anytime you are involved in a solid waste planning committee of any kind and have an open plan, she would try to encourage recycling.
- Member Lancour stated all of these programs are subsidized and he feels it won't happen by itself as a business entity; it can't sustain as it has to be funded. He is unsure if it's this committee's ability to determine how the monies are going to come in (funding), what programs and debating on how to spend it.
- Member Machowicz stated the committee is talking two (2) issues and they should be separate. One is the mandate and funding part of it and the other is providing support to the Department of Waste Management to assist them with recycling efforts. He attended the Governor's Summit on Recycling and stated one of the gaps is access to recycling; the DWM could provide greater access to help the community to recycle.
- Chairman Taylor stated the SWMPC is debating solutions but suggested the Committee forward this to the BOC and encourage them to re-evaluate the existing Plan.
- There was additional discussion among the SWMPC regarding the advisory/citizen council that could research and study the issues so when a plan amendment is sought, there are ideas of what needs to be accomplished.
- Member Olson asked if this is something the Solid Waste Management Council (SWC) could lead and DWMC Neese stated they could as they meet quarterly and have representation from a broad area.

- Member Sorg asked if a clear message could be sent to the people who testified at the Public Hearing and is unclear on how the SWMPC will do this. Member Spitzley stated there is a lot going on with the state that is not being disseminated beyond industry professionals and stated it may be worth putting together regional dialogue to share this with all of the county commissioners at this point. Member Fair agreed with this suggestion.
- Member Donahue suggested if Members Welch & Machowicz could create a resolution asking the BOC to consider an adhoc task committee to the standing SWC. She also remarked that when she testifies publicly, she doesn't expect a letter in return unless the SWMPC would supply a letter to the editor to citizens. She also noted the SWMPC did what they were asked to do and to put this back in the BOC's hands.

**Member Welch made the motion, supported by Member Powers to recommend to the Clinton County Board of Commission to consider forming a Citizens Advisory Committee in conjunction with the Clinton County Solid Waste Council to explore recycling, waste reduction, user fees and other issues that the SWMP Committee was not specifically charged with dealing directly. YEAS: Dan Coss, Denise Donahue, Tim Fair, Anne Hill, John Lancour, Tim Machowicz, Tonia Olson, Julie Powers, Kurt Ray, Walt Sorg, Christine Spitzley, Rodney Taylor and Lori Welch NAYS: Roger Simon Motion carried.**

#### 7a. PUBLIC COMMENT

#### 8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, **it was moved by Member Fair, supported by Member Hill to adjourn. Motion carried.** The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

---

Rod Taylor, Chairman

---

Kate Neese, Waste Management Coordinator

---

Therese Koenigsknecht, Recording Secretary