**Michigan Recycling Coalition**

**Board of Directors Meeting**

**Monday, October 10, 2022**

| ***Mission:*** *The Michigan Recycling Coalition fosters sustainability by leading, educating, and mobilizing business, government, nonprofit, and individuals to advance their own and collective resource use and recovery initiatives in Michigan.*  |
| --- |

**Attendance:** *Nick Carlson, Becky Andrews, Libby Rice, Bill Whitley, Dave Smith, Jeff Krcmarik, Kate Melby, Libby Rice, Natalie Jakub, Steve Kent, Tim Botzau, Tracy Purrenhage, Justin Jungman*

***Absent:*** *Rick Lombardo?*

**10:30 am**

1. Call Board Meeting to order - N Carlson
2. Public Comment
3. Consent Agenda - PLEASE REVIEW ALL MATERIALS PRIOR TO MEETING - ACTION
	1. Additions to Agenda, Approval - D Smith motion to approve, T Botzau seconded - no opposition
	2. Acceptance of Minutes from September Meeting
	3. Monthly Financial Report for August
		1. K O’Brien - Current gain of $115,000 in income, some of the biggest ever, but there is a lot of year-end bookkeeping and adjustments that still need to happen. Will probably take about 2 months to complete themselves. More thorough about the end of the year in November or December.
		2. N Carlson - Key ratios look good except #1 - percentage variances, might be nice to put percent to goal - shows 90% but that’s 190% over what you want it to be. And the need to hire
			1. K O’Brien - interviewing this week.
	4. Committee Reports
	5. Membership Update
		1. K O’Brien - got new members over the event, but looking to recruit municipal members to generate more materials from those areas.
4. Staff Updates
	1. Event Updates
		1. K O’Brien - Event last week. Didn’t meet goal of 200 people, but high quality people, well received event. Educational topics very advanced, about funding and financing. Speakers who measure billion dollar entrepreneurial funds. That was really great. Have recordings - may decide to make those available to the audience sooner rather than later, just as a way to get people interest. Sensing that we have primary event in the spring and second event in the fall. FIR is traditionally a 1 day event but the past 2 years has been 2 years. Will be an anchor event moving forward, not sure on number of das. NextCycle stuff was great to show people what partners have been working on. A very diverse array of teams presented about their projects - tires to roads, Benton Harbor trying to get a program to deal with waste & recycling and setting foundation. Unfortunately, in the end, 22 teams presenting as 2 sets of concurrent sessions, which means you couldn’t see all of them. Would have been good to have logistics worked out so they could see all of them. Exposing members to the variety of what’s out there helps people think about how to apply it to their communities. Liesl Clark was there to hand out awards. Wished more people had been there, but think it was well received by all. Facility was really nice, but not having the hotel connected meant people weren’t close by each other.
		2. K Melby - thought the energy at the event was great. Agree about missing half the pitches. The pitches had a great energy, interaction with judges good. More diversity than our events usually have. Maybe a goal to go to SE Michigan more.
		3. T Purrenhage - agree, the event was amazing, agree about not hearing all the pitches. Calibur of sessions was next level. Something you had to be ready for. Disappointed that more people weren’t there. Would like to figure out how to attract more people. Would like to see how to attract more people to sit through pitches. The pitches are valuable for a variety of things. Pitches for I2P3 valuable for communities to see technical assistance available and where NextCycle can come in as an example. Disappointed that not enough people came. Afraid to bring more people in because not sure what to expect, but then sitting through pitches, realized people need to see it. People need to see what’s available through NextCycle. In terms of what these teams can develop, people need to be able to see it.
		4. J Krcmarik - if you looked at the agenda, you may not have realized what there was to see. Everything there was applicable to all MRC members. As we move forward, we have to have a message that people understand.
		5. N Carlson - need to think of it not as listening to pitches but seeing the cutting edge of what’s happening in recycling. Also, this is completely up for debate, but the awards thing being the last thing on the last day, there’s a draw to be there, and at the regular conference, maybe that would be the way to keep people around. Maybe at May conference, do awards with an important person the last day. RIT - noticed that they’re trying to schedule that in January and not attach that to the conference.
			1. K O’Brien - guessing something will be attached to the conference, but not sure what. 2 tracks coming up, just not sure what.
		6. K O’Brien - couple of thoughts - concern that the educational program was a bit advanced. We got good information because that’s not stuff people know a lot about, but the topics may have been a little advanced. There are basic topics people need to understand, and that’s what could bring people to the table. Also, NextCycle - there’s a misunderstanding or people don’t fully understand or are tired of hearing about NextCycle, but it is the opportunity that is going right now. Without Part 115, NextCycle is the vehicle to move forward because it’s the only thing we’ve got right now. So the MRC will keep moving forward with it because it is the thing. If we grow without the benefit of Part 115, it has to be in this context.
		7. K Melby - one way to approach financing stuff is with people who have gotten this type of funding in Michigan rather than the high up people.
		8. T Purrenhage - we talk about the blended funding, and use examples of Closed Loop financing and industry funding opportunities but maybe we should tell that story specifically. Have someone talk about closed loop financing story, and someone with industry or brand funding, financing, or grant from FPI or whatever, and have that story actually told as examples.
		9. K O’Brien - tried to do that with Brad Austin in that last section, but that project is so big, Closed Loop funding was a teeny little part. Need to talk about mechanics more.
		10. T Purrenhage - convince communities if they don’t have a funding mechanism, they’re going to miss out. There’s been a round of every NextCycle track so far so how do we think about messaging that now that it’s been around once. At least for the next 2 years, NextCycle isn’t going anywhere and it’s an opportunity. Take advantage of it, don’t be tired of hearing about it, it’s the state’s way of supporting you with technical assistance. Doing that next week with DPAs and Materials Management Planning call with Christina Miller - trying to explain I2P3 track. Maybe something to talk about at least in I2P3.
		11. K O’Brien - overall, a really well received event. Don’t know what the financial gains are going to be, but don’t expect a lot from events like these. Will at least break even. If this is one of those events that becomes an anchor, we can begin to build sponsorship around it. Also, marketing.
	2. Part 115
	3. Others
	4. Membership Prospects, Segment Focus: Municipality Focus
		1. K O’Brien - got new members over the event, but looking to recruit municipal members to generate more materials from those areas. If you have municipalities that aren’t part of the network, send contacts to Terri and she will follow up.
5. Strategic Priorities
	1. KO slides - link
	2. Member engagement - at Board Forward, we talked about effective member engagement framework and how to move forward to engage members & move things forward. Typical committees moving things regularly. Council focus today - we’ve got an Organics Council, talking about Product Stewardship Council. Also, workgroups & action projects - may need to talk about the difference. Roundtable first maybe. Then make it an action project.
	3. Product Stewardship is a priority identified last year. It deserves that standing. Maybe start out as roundtable or workgroup, and then decide if it needs a council, or maybe the Board is the workgroup? Challenge with councils is that they have their own membership fees, dues, operations, etc. They operate very independently. They weren’t able to sustain and maintain that. So it’s back under MRC, hold money they raise themselves, but we nurture them along. So, proposing that we have a Michigan Product Stewardship Council. Been in touch with PSI and EGLE who also see this as a priority.
	4. J Jungman - manufacturing council make sense under this format?
		1. K O’Brien - we have to figure out maybe manufacturing council under product stewardship council
			1. J Jungman - or separately as its own council
	5. N Carlson - do we need to vote on this?
		1. K O’Brien - Product Stewardship Workgroup - bring that to members, let them have conversations, then bring Council to the table later?
6. Committee Reports
	1. Executive Committee - N Carlson
		1. ED Review Summary
			1. Created template, refined it, sent to Kerrin, Kerrin filled it out, sent it back, EC reviewed it, had a robust conversation about everything on that document. Vision is that this will take place after conference but before the board forward, that way during board forward, everyone can see where everything is at. Not really looking for blessing or anything, just the process. Any comments on process?
				1. K O’Brien - hard to provide numbers halfway through the year, so it’s hard to base anything on these numbers. Numbers tracked on a monthly basis anyway. Not sure if the numbers are necessary to keep. Conference/Sponsorship yes, but annual financial and member performance is trickier.

N Carlson - either take that out or come up with a mechanism for year to date and budget to date.

* + - * 1. N Jakub - does everyone have a conversation about it?

N Carlson - yes, Kerrin filled it all out, then had a 2 hour conversation to talk through it all. Consensus was it all went super well. Financials were most difficult because it’s not year end and everything is off. Felt it was a very good constructive time and feedback, ensuring everyone is on the same page.

T Purrenhage - thought it was a worthwhile process for the EC and Kerrin to have that two-way communication. Also thought it was beneficial to have EC discussion points to get feedback so it’s not all just EC metrics, asked KO questions so she could give input on where the board could do better or what she needs.

K O’Brien - that part was most beneficial. So refining questions - what are the right ones to ask - is critical.

B Andrews - really happy with it. 2 hour call got everyone on the same page and planning for the future. Initially, it was intimidating, but it really focused everyone. Kerrin had to type it all in and really think about it, so it focused everybody to think about things, which was really valuable. In the future, plan to do between conference & board forward, also following board forward was helpful. Process has been moved around, and there’s not a perfect place. Compromises wherever it’s done.

T Purrenhage - everyone knows broadly what Kerrin does, but it helped with a more specific grasp of what she’s doing. Board taking time to read through this and even read narrative questions, it gives a better sense of the scope of what she does.

* + - 1. N Carlson - want to ensure the process of the EC doing the review and whole board not needing to vote on it is okay with the rest of the board, so asking for any objections to that process.
				1. K O’Brien - it’s the responsibility of other board members to go to the EC directly if something seems amiss or something seems to not be delivered, it should go through the EC.

K Melby - would like to see it go to the board for a vote just to encourage board members to engage with it.

EC - that would change the timeline and move it prior to board forward to get it on the September agenda to get it done before the end of the fiscal year.

B Whitley - haven’t closed last year’s books yet. Don’t know details, but at prior company, all bonuses were issued after the end of the fiscal year and backdated so they went in the prior reporting period. They never calculated it until the financials were completed. So October 1 date may not be a deadline that has to be worked around.

K Melby - move that we bring the executive director annual review to the board for a vote

Support - N Carlson

No opposition

* + 1. Open and Changing Seats on Board
			1. Scott Cabauatan - open seat
				1. K O’Brien - Can we bring someone in now? We would start recruiting and thinking about it between December and January for ballots to go out at the end of march/beginning of April. This is an opportunity for someone to be appointed for a 3 year seat. Or we could turn it over to members in March or April. If we know someone we’d like to bring on board, now is a good time for that.
	1. Policy Committee - N Jakub
		1. N Jakub - met this morning, supposed to do elections - 3 open voting member spots. But that is pushed back to Feb. Changing to meeting bimonthly, then switching to quarterly meeting to get lengthier, high quality meetings to
			1. Presentation from Urban Ashes - learned about urban forestry and some challenges/policy opportunities in that industry. That’s it.
	2. Conference Committee - K O’Brien
		1. Started regular meetings, Kalamazoo this year, developing theme and logo, starting to talk about education sessions that we want, what we think we can do at the conference this year. Important to find location for 2024 conference. Starting that process - putting Muskegon area in the mix this year. Board several years ago made the choice to stay along 96-94 corridor, so Muskegon, Traverse City, Mount Pleasant are outside of that area, so want to double check on interest with that. Limited because of our size what facilities can handle us. Thoughts about that?
			1. N Carlson - Any hub shouldn’t be a problem. TC, Muskegon, Holland. Even Mackinac Island would be awesome (but $$$$)
		2. Bylaw issue - there’s conflicting information about how to fill open board seats. Draft correction and send out virtual vote for that?
	3. Committee Forum
		1. K Melby - looking at strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/threats, and brainstorming/prioritizing to create clarity around Education committee. 3 new members.
	4. Board of Directors Updates
		1. K O’Brien - fire at (??) mill - could impact market here.
		2. J Jungman - paper markets are very very bad now. Material stacking up everywhere, pricing dropped significantly. Some economic, some export being all but gone. Recycling outlook for paper not good for the remainder of this year. Could be talking about landfilling in the next month. Specifically cardboard and mixed paper. Municipalities are going to have some hard decisions to make in the next 30-90 days.
		3. T Purrenhage - reasons?
			1. J Jungman - mills are high in inventory right now. Made a bunch of stuff, and now they’re sitting on it. Supply and demand - demand for scrap not there because suppliers aren’t making rolls right now, lots of down time.
		4. J Jungman - member survey - how to keep that on the radar and push that forward.
			1. K O’Brien - came up at policy committee, too. Maybe a policy that trees that are planted are based on value of tree at the end of its useful life as a tree so it can be harvested for wood use, that kind of thing.
		5. Dry Dock event
			1. T Botzau - weather was not ideal but overall brought in some good money. $3800ish.
				1. K O’Brien - commercial liability insurance wouldn’t allow liquor, so had to get a different one with liquor rider, so we have to pay $1600 for that insurance. Next year when we update commercial liability insurance we’ll make sure that’s not an issue. Have to assess to see if it was really valuable. Took a lot of Tim’s time.

T Botzau - good networking thing if nothing else, spurred HHW talk in the county, which is huge.

T Purrenhage - chatted with Sarah and Darrel at RREM meeting - they worked both Friday and Saturday. $2100 on Friday - make sure to include them in the conversation when you talk about it. They had some conversations with someone there - had some really good input from someone there about if we do it again next year, what dates to put on application etc. Sarah said people were asking about food, so suggesting selling individual snack, bags. They had some good ideas. Should try another year with different dates. Summer better.

1. Wrap-up and Call to Action
	1. Bylaws checkup, ‘24 conference, survey of members, delayed bonus, EPR article
2. Close Meeting
	1. J Jungman motion to adjourn
	2. K Melby seconded

**1:00 pm**