

**Emmet County Materials Management Planning Committee (MMPC)  
Meeting Minutes**

**1/13/2026, 10:00AM**

**EMS Eppler Station, 1201 Eppler Road, Petoskey, MI 49770**

**Emmet County Staff Present:** Ashley McMurry, Lindsey Walker, Jayna Steffel

**Guests:** Kris Jolley (MSU), Chris Haar (Hubbard County, MN), Kristen Wieland (RRS)

**Resource Recycling Staff Present:** Elisa Seltzer (virtual), Stephanie Robinson (virtual)

**Call to order:** Doug called the meeting to order at 10:06a.m.

**Roll Call**

- a. Lindsey Walker – Present
- b. Kevin Donner – Present
- c. Denny Keiser, Chair – Absent
- d. Doug Fuller, Vice Chair – Present
- e. Allen Elya III – Present
- f. Jayna Steffel – Present (virtual)
- g. Caroline Moellering – Present
- h. Stephanie Marchbanks – Present (virtual)
- i. Chris Gee – Present
- j. Don Mapes – Present

**Committee Updates**

At the direction of a committee member, a member of the public introduced herself and her organization at the start of the meeting, Preservation 49740, which focuses on preserving local homes and buildings.

Public Meeting Planning

A. McMurry reviewed plans for an in-person public meeting in April. The proposed format is an open house with activities; it was proposed to be scheduled for the first Tuesday of the month after school hours. To maximize participation, the committee discussed hosting two events: one at EMS Eppler Station in April and another in Pellston or Mackinaw in May. Suggested outreach strategies include contacting apartment managers, recruiting neighborhood representatives, and using survey data to identify engaged residents.

E. Seltzer (RRS) noted that similar events will be required during the public hearing phase of the materials management planning process, but they are not required at this point. The April meeting will serve as early community engagement while the plan is drafted.

#### Committee Membership

A. McMurry reported on efforts to add a business representative to the committee. She shared that she contacted Petoskey Plastics but received no response. She has also reached out to other local businesses, such as Habitat for Humanity and Circuit Controls Corporation, and is waiting for responses.

#### NextCycle Michigan Opportunities

E. Seltzer shared updates on opportunities through NextCycle Michigan, an initiative of the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy, that Emmet County may be interested in. Opportunities include a circular economy grant, for which applications open Jan. 12<sup>th</sup> and awards range from \$25,000–\$250,000, and the Public Led Solutions Track, for which applications open Feb. 2<sup>nd</sup> and accepted teams can receive technical support and other resources for public-sector materials management projects. A. McMurry shared that the County will likely wait until materials management goals and infrastructure needs are defined before pursuing these opportunities. E. Seltzer noted that any committee member meeting requirements may apply.

#### **December Follow-up**

##### Survey Results

A. McMurry reported that the business survey received 23 responses and the residential survey received 188 responses. The survey deadlines were initially extended through Dec 31, 2025. However, the residential survey will now remain open through at least May 2026 for ongoing input. The business survey will also remain open as County staff aim to contact 10 additional businesses for input.

Committee members were encouraged to share the residential survey link via social media and newsletters. Questions arose about targeting multi-family residents. A. McMurry confirmed the survey is open to all residents and suggested sending the link to landlords and apartment managers. L. Walker offered to share contacts but proposed using a QR code on door hangers instead. Other ideas included putting a QR code on magnets at drop sites or County staff conducting live surveys at drop sites.

#### Expanding Materials Management

The committee revisited December's discussion on managing special materials (C&D, scrap metal, textiles, shingles, carpeting, food waste). This aligns with a proposed goal to explore recycling opportunities for shingles, dimensional lumber, and other materials. L. Walker noted challenges with market availability and contamination issues limiting lumber recycling in the County. A. McMurry suggested creating a goal to advocate for state-level market development. L. Walker also raised Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) as a potential mechanism for improving circularity.

## **Reuse**

### Michigan State University Surplus Store & Recycling Presentation – Kris Jolley

K. Jolley (MSU) introduced himself, noting 30 years of experience managing MSU's waste and his involvement with MMP committees in Clinton and Ingham Counties. He shared that MSU's Surplus Store & Recycling Center programs collected 26.3 million pounds of material in FY 2025, with 4.4 million pounds reused. Their 72,000 sq. ft. Recycling Center functions as a "mini MRF," where these materials are processed and sorted. Any reusable materials that are found during the sorting process are separated out and generally end up in the Surplus Store. MSU also composts pre-consumer food waste and sends other organics to their anaerobic digester or local partner. They offer the finished compost for sale at the Surplus Store. At the Recycling Center, they also sort C&D waste and separate out any recyclable or reusable materials, which has reduced their C&D processing costs by 50%. L. Walker asked how MSU manages returnable beverage cans generated during sports game days; K. Jolley said they recover about 83% of those returnable beverage cans by working with a distributor. Recovering and returning those cans generates about \$12,000 annually.

K. Jolley shared that MSU's Surplus Store sources most items from its main campus but also accepts materials from students, faculty, staff, and local organizations. The Store now operates one day per week, with most sales online, and hosts about 25 special sale days annually. K. Jolley highlighted that one of these days includes an annual clothing sale at \$2 per pound. In 2025, the clothing sale drew 1,800 students and sold 5,000 pounds of material. The Store also regularly sells upcycled goods, including cutting boards from urban wood found on campus and pillows from old marching band uniforms. In FY 2025, the program sold about 290,000 items (40% priced under \$5), returned \$2 million to campus departments, paid \$1 million toward debt service, and saved \$418,000 through waste avoidance and \$632,000 through cost avoidance.

L. Walker asked about the urban wood upcycling program; K. Jolley explained it began as a partnership with MSU's forestry and landscape departments. The wood is processed using

a mill purchased for \$40,000, the forestry department's kiln, and local artisans who craft the materials into new goods. A. McMurry asked what materials are not accepted at the Surplus Store. K. Jolley said hazardous materials and upholstered furniture are generally excluded, though they recently started battery and lightbulb collection and recycling programs. A. McMurry also asked about the process for managing items in the Surplus Store. K. Jolley explained that items typically remain on the floor until sold and they host frequent sales for high-volume items. Unsold items are also sometimes moved to a "free area" in the Store where they can be purchased at no cost.

After another committee member asked about staffing, K. Jolley shared that their program employs 40 full-time staff and 50–60 student workers who work about 10-12 hours per week. L. Walker also asked about how hazardous materials like vape waste and batteries are handled, and K. Jolley said that the battery fires in the news the last few years prompted them to start their collection programs, which now includes collection points in every residence hall and is expanding to academic buildings.

#### Hubbard County, Minnesota Reuse Center – Chris Haar

E. Seltzer introduced C. Haar, explaining that Hubbard County, Minnesota has many similarities to Emmet County, and their reuse program could serve as a model for future programs. C. Haar, Hubbard County's Education & Outreach Specialist, said their County follows a waste hierarchy like MSU's, with reuse as a priority. Hubbard County has about 22,000 full-time residents, and the population triples seasonally. The County operates two transfer stations (each with a demolition landfill) and 14 remote recycling sites, with 18 full-time, 6 part-time, and 2 seasonal employees. Services are funded through a solid waste assessment: \$245/year for residential properties, \$306+ for commercial, and \$310 for out-of-county permits. The fee covers MSW, yard waste, metal, HHW, recycling, organics, demolition waste, tires, and reuse. Commercial hazardous waste is not accepted. Revenue sources include 48% residential assessments, 40% commercial, 8% tip fees, and small shares from grants, sales, and other categories.

Most of the collected material goes through the south transfer station, which houses the reuse center. Upon entering the transfer station property, visitors are directed to the main transfer station building and there they are asked if any of their materials are reuseable; if yes, the attendant inspects the materials, and they are directed to stop by the Reuse Center unloading area to drop off their materials. The materials are inspected a second time before being accepted for drop off. Materials accepted for reuse in the County include non-hazardous household items, pallets, clean wood, select C&D materials, brush, yard waste, organic food waste, paint, certain cleaners, crushed concrete, ground asphalt

shingles, and metal. In 2025, the reuse center diverted 382 tons, mostly household items and furniture, with peak activity from April to October.

C. Haar described strategies that make reuse successful in Hubbard County, which include placing reuse options near disposal sites, adopting policies that encourage diversion, educating residents and contractors, and ensuring convenience. Funding through assessments keeps their services affordable and reduces illegal dumping. The County does not charge for items purchased at the reuse center, which C. Haar believes increases diversion compared to other programs in the region that sell reuse items. Challenges they've faced at the Reuse Center include scavenging outside bins, crowding during drop-offs, loading and unloading needs, unsanitary donations, traffic congestion, rule enforcement, non-permitted visitors, and possible hoarding. To address these challenges and create a successful reuse program in Emmet County, C. Haar recommends creating a separate intake and processing area, weighing diverted materials, offering loading assistance, and partnering with nonprofits.

During Q&A, E. Seltzer asked about the size of the south transfer station property; C. Haar said he did not know the acreage but noted there are plans for expansion into the surrounding land. When E. Seltzer asked about rules for visitors at the Reuse Center, he said customers may stay 10 minutes and visit up to three times per day, which helps manage traffic and safety concerns. A committee member asked about contractor incentives for reuse; C. Haar said contractors avoid disposal fees by bringing reusable materials to the Reuse Center. E. Seltzer asked if contractors try to offload waste in order to avoid those disposal costs, and C. Haar said inspections prevent this from being an issue. All items must be safe and in good condition to be accepted. L. Walker asked about disposal rates for contractors, and C. Haar answered that the rates are \$45/ton in-county and \$90/ton out-of-county. L. Walker also asked about how asphalt shingles are managed on site, and he explained they use a horizontal grinder with belt magnets to remove nails, then offer the material for public use or road projects.

### **Construction & Demolition (C&D)**

#### Construction & Demolition Debris and Your MMP – Kristen Wieland

K. Wieland introduced herself as a Senior Consultant with RRS and shared her experience managing C&D waste as a previous employee of the Department of Public Works in Kent County, Michigan. She explained that C&D waste includes materials such as concrete, asphalt, wood, and drywall. According to a 2018 EPA report, about 600 million tons of C&D waste are generated annually, roughly twice the amount of MSW. She noted that C&D

stream composition varies by region; for example, the Southwest sees more clay tiles and stucco, while the Midwest has more shingles.

K. Wieland outlined the three main sources of C&D: heavy demolition, new construction, and renovations. Heavy demolition produces large volumes of concrete, asphalt, and aggregates, which are often sorted and recycled on-site. New construction and renovation projects generate mixed materials, including cardboard and siding, which are harder to recover because they are often unsorted or contaminated. She also explained how C&D moves through the waste system. Most is collected in roll-off boxes or truck trailers. Mixed debris loads typically go to landfills due to limited end markets and processing infrastructure, while clean, sorted loads are processed locally and diverted for uses such as road construction.

K. Wieland emphasized that C&D is optional in the County's materials management plan, but it can help meet diversion goals. State data shows C&D accounts for 6% of declared landfill waste in the County, though actual volumes are likely higher. A. McMurry suggested analyzing contractor charge accounts and gatehouse invoices to better quantify C&D. K. Wieland added that true figures often range from 20 - 40% of total waste. L. Walker noted that Emmet County has tried to manage C&D with a new compactor due to equipment wear. K. Wieland also shared data from a Minnesota study showing roofing, concrete, and aggregates as the largest C&D components.

She concluded by recommending steps if the County includes C&D in its plan: identify key players, verify local material types, document current diversion, assess end markets and infrastructure gaps, and evaluate policy or incentives. She cited a Colorado example where tip fees were adjusted lower for source-separated C&D and higher for mixed loads, which encourages the generators to sort their materials. L. Walker commented that construction practices have shifted over 20 years, with big developers now budgeting for disposal rather than prioritizing recovery. She suggested policy could be critical for motivating diversion and asked for examples of how other counties address C&D in their plans.

#### **Committee Input Form Feedback**

None.

#### **Public Comment**

The member of the public, who introduced herself earlier as a member of Preservation 49740, offered to present to the Committee at a future meeting about their work to preserve local homes and buildings.

**Next Steps**

The committee will meet again on February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2026, from 10am to 12pm.

**Meeting adjournment**

Motion to adjourn the meeting by L. Walker and seconded by D. Fuller. Meeting adjourned at 12:03pm.

Approved by: 

TO BE APPROVED AT FUTURE MEETING

