

**MINUTES**  
**WORK SESSION MEETING OF THE CENTRAL UPPER PENINSULA**  
**MATERIALS MANAGEMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
December 18, 2025 at 3:00pm ET  
2920 College Ave Escanaba, MI 49829

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Kelli van Ginhoven at 3:01pm.

**Roll Call**

<b>Name</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Bruce Birr	Schoolcraft	Virtual	
Phil Carter	Marquette	Virtual	
Brian Ciupak	Alger	In-person	
Lyn Durant	Marquette	Virtual	
John Groleau	Menominee		Excused
Nick Hanchek	Menominee	In-person	
Todd Kangas	Delta	In-person	
Barbara Kramer	Dickinson	Virtual	
Kelly Livermore	Alger		Unexcused
Dave Lundquist	Delta		Unexcused
Jim Nankervis	Marquette	Virtual	
Ken Ohman	Marquette	Virtual	
Terri Rabitoy	Delta		Unexcused
Mike Stannard	Marquette		Excused
Peter Swanson	Dickinson		Excused
Kelli van Ginhoven	Delta	In-Person	
Kathy Vermaat	Marquette	Virtual	
Brad Younk	Menominee	Virtual	
Brad Zellar	Schoolcraft		Unexcused
(vacant) Alger, City or Village Elected Official	Alger		
(vacant) Dickinson, Environmental Interest Group	Dickinson		
(vacant) Dickinson, Waste Diversion Facility	Dickinson		
(vacant) Schoolcraft, Optional Elected Official	Schoolcraft		

**Other Attendees**

Ryan Carrig, Designated Planning Agency Contact, CUPPAD  
Tracy Tomaszewski, EGLE (virtual)  
Nico Vermaat, Marquette County Planning (virtual)

*With a quorum of members not present, and no official business requiring approval on the agenda, the Committee moved forward with the Work Session.*

## Public Comment

There was no public comment.

## Work Session

### Materials Management Goals

Ryan Carrig began by following up on questions that were posed during the November meeting:

- *On whether legal review should be sought prior to submission to EGLE-* EGLE will review the final MMP and would require any portion of an MMP that was illegal or unlawful to be amended or removed prior to issuing final approval.
- *On the determination of capacity for facilities and how that would relate to how a consistency decision is made-* "Capacity" in the sense of how much material is and/or could be processed relies on an individual facility to determine and report to be included in the MMP. EGLE would like to see capacity aligned to what a facility reports as part of Part 115 reporting requirements. Mechanisms or requirements in the Plan do not need to consider capacity, and EGLE advised to not use capacity in these processes to avoid limitations.
- *On appeals to denials to the siting process-* An aggrieved party would likely seek relief against the County Approval Authority and EGLE in a relevant Court.

Ryan moved on to the materials in the packet, beginning with examples from the linked EGLE presentation from the 2025 Michigan Recycling Coalition Conference and how goals should be framed. Ryan then presented draft pages from the MMP beginning with the Benchmark Recycling Standard requirements under Part 115.

Lyn Durant asked about cardboard and other materials generated by commercial entities that is generated within the planning area, but not otherwise restricted to local facility or reported locally. Discussion included how to approach entities to report recyclables and other diverted materials to be included in the local rate calculations, and what mechanisms could be used to enforce such.

Kathy Vermaat asked a question to clarify that the Benchmark Recycling Standards require that recycling be "available" in certain areas by private hauler or municipal service. Ryan confirmed that "available" does not necessarily mean mandatory service.

Lyn Durant asked if the Committee or EGLE would require a municipality to contract with single haulers to ensure recycling access. Ryan related that a likely action that would ensure access in areas required by the Benchmark Recycling Standards would be for a municipality to pass a hauler licensing ordinance that would require a hauler providing waste collection services to also offer recycling collection services, it would be more likely that the requirement would only apply to the urban areas detailed in the Part 115 requirements. Todd Kangas asked if rural areas could have different service frequencies or provisions other than the Benchmark Standard Requirements, which Ryan confirmed only applied to more urban areas. Kangas related difficulties with low household density and distance for Delta Disposal to provide curbside recycling in rural Schoolcraft County.

Lyn Durant asked who the responsible parties would be for the goals described in the MMP, and who should implement them. Ryan related that the Committee is responsible for determining the goals and assigning a responsible party to implement them. Whether the identity of a responsible party can be determined, or is also an action step required for a goal can be included.

Ryan then moved on to the short-term goals described in the draft pages, and asked if the Committee members had any considerations.

Nick Hanchek asked about the logistics for implementing recycling at areas like schools; how that material would go from the school to a materials recovery facility. Discussion included how a hub-and-spoke style system would work, and how local municipalities should ensure that collected materials are ultimately delivered to materials recovery facilities to address misinformation about disposal of recyclables. How transportation of materials across the region has been a difficulty, and how to incentivize use of local facilities to process locally generated materials.

Kathy Vermaat asked who is responsible for determining how materials generated within the region are reported, and how those are counted for the local recycling and diversion rates. Ryan detailed that a base set of materials are required to be included in determining the recycling rate, but the Committee could determine that additional material types that are defined as recyclables are included in the calculation, and other types of diverted materials could be included in consideration of a diversion rate.

Lyn Durant described efforts to have MCSWMA include a per-municipality recycling rate calculation in their monthly reporting, in order to better communicate to the municipalities and public where gaps are present. How addressing these gaps and better educating residents would help raise the local rates and be effective communication tools.

Barb Kramer described efforts and lack of public participation in Norway and Kingsford to initiate recycling services. Discussion took place regarding mandatory recycling programs that provide carts to all residents, and examples from municipalities of costs.

#### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

#### **Committee and Staff Comment**

Barb Kramer wished everyone a Merry Christmas, which was also voiced by other members.

Kelli van Ginhoven thanked Ryan for the preparation going in to meetings.

Ryan Carrig related that the next meeting would be Thursday January 15 at 3:00pm and would be the Committee's annual reorganizational meeting requiring in-person attendance. Other items would include meeting dates and times for 2026 and starting on the 2026-2027 work program for the planning grants. Kelli van Ginhoven asked if the January meeting could be scheduled at 1:00pm; Ryan will see if the room is available and confirm.

#### **Adjournment**

*The work session was adjourned by consensus at 4:10pm.*

Minutes recorded by Ryan Carrig.

