



SPU Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)

December 2, 2015 Meeting Notes
Seattle Municipal Tower, 700 Fifth Avenue

Room 4901

5:30 pm – 7:30 pm

Chair: Heather Levy

Vice-Chair: David Della

Committee Members & CAC Staff	Present?	SPU Staff & Guests	Role
Quinn Apuzzo	Y	Tim Croll	Solid Waste Planning and Program Manager
David Della	Y	Sally Hulsman	Director, Solid Waste Compliance
Anna Dyer	Y		
Ben Grace	N		
Holly Griffith	Y		
Katie Kennedy	Y		
Jamie Lee	N		
Heather Levy	Y		
Rodney Proctor	Y		
Joseph Ringold	Y		
Chris Toman	Y		
Heidi Fischer, CAC Program Support	Y		
Sego Jackson, Policy Liaison	Y		
Sheryl Shapiro, Program Manager	Y		

ACTION ITEMS FROM OCTOBER SWAC MEETING:

- ✓ Chris will write a SWAC letter regarding the compost requirement and tools for achieving compliance, including fines. He will send it to Members for review on Monday, with a firm deadline for response sometime next week.
- ✓ Members should send SWAC officer nominations to Sego by the end of the first week in January.

Regular Business

- Committee members and staff introduced themselves.
- November meeting notes are approved.

Clear Alley Program, Sally Hulsman, Director, Solid Waste Compliance

- Sally referred to a power point presentation.
- Solid Waste Compliance is a team of 12 with significant solid waste knowledge.
 - We have 6 residential inspectors, 3 multi-family inspectors, 1 operations support person, 1 data quality intern, and 1 supervisor.
 - Our data quality intern comes from Seattle's Youth Employment Program, and helps us to continually improve our data.
 - Billing issues can arise from inaccurate data, like the wrong size of can or the wrong information about extras (additional waste collection for which there's a fee).
 - We want our data to be accurate and timely, and are working to improve it with measures like proactively calling our customers.
 - What we do:
 - Resolve residential and multifamily customer issues.
 - We get approximately 1000 service orders a month including service level changes. We expect them open and closed within an expected time-frame.
 - Our proactive calls to customers have helped reduce our service orders from approx. 1,600 per month (when Sally started as Director a few months ago) to 1,000 now.
 - Some are more complicated issues that require deeper solid waste knowledge or field presence, such as multiple misses, disputed extras charges, new building set-ups, construction inspections, back-yard service setups, dangerous situations, etc.
 - Where we find inaccurate data, we fix or improve it. We use outbound customer calls, Contact Center data, and contractor data.
 - Support commercial interests in the Clear Alleys Program (CAP), dumpster in the right-of-way (ROW), and in multi-use buildings, litter can checks, and community programs.
 - We partner with contractors to solve customer problems.
 - We train contractors as needed – i.e., diversion inspections, extras training, etc.
 - We also audit the contractors in the areas of extras monitoring, customer service, noise complaints, etc.
 - Support other City agencies and community partners.
 - We work with Business Improvement Areas (BIAs), the Department of Neighborhoods (DON), the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), and the Department of Planning & Development (DPD).
 - We are working closely with the BIAs and with Waste Management (one of our waste haulers) to manage the Clear Alleys Program (CAP), which prohibits permanent storage of

containers (dumpsters/recycling and food waste bins) in the right of way in some business districts, including downtown, Pioneer Square and the International District.

- Our team is working to educate them on the CAP requirements.
 - We want to make sure we are charging for illegal bags and for picking up bulky items.
 - We want to use an equitable approach to transition customers from using dumpsters to using the appropriate waste disposal bags.
 - We want to ensure that our customers have the appropriate services.
 - The desired outcome is reduced illegal dumping.
- In the U District, we would like to expand the Clear Alleys Program and work with the North of 45th Group (which works with fraternities and sororities) to improve cleanliness and public health outcomes.
 - SPU provides extra waste collection services during the move in and move out periods in the U District to help minimize illegal dumping.
 - SPU also works closely with UW Solid Waste and other organizations to handle the increasing amount of solid waste that results from the increased population density.
- In the International District, we would like to encourage more compliance with the Clear Alleys Program to reduce illegal dumping.
- In the Pike-Pine Area, we would like to reduce the number of dumpsters in the right of way (alleys) to improve livability and safety. The area recently received a grant from the Office of Economic Development and the Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce to address this work.
- Inspections for recycling in the garbage.
 - We inspect 300 multi-family dumpsters per month, 250 commercial dumpsters per month, and 25 compactors per month (at the transfer station).
 - The inspection process is as follows:
 - Dumpsters are randomly chosen via a list provided by SPU data team.

- 1st and 2nd inspections are Zero Tolerance (failure notices are sent if ANY recycling or food waste is found in the garbage).
- A letter is sent with collateral.
- The 2nd inspection is 4 weeks later.
- The 3rd inspection is another 4 weeks later.
- The 3rd inspection results in failure only if approximately 10% of the material in the garbage is recyclable, and there are no fines for food waste at this time.
- Failure of the 3rd inspection results in a \$50 fine.
- Our inspection team now has smart phones and can take photographs to add to the inspection records.
- Based on these inspections, we have imposed the following number of fines:
 - 13 fines in 2015 to multi-family property owners
 - 1 fine in 2015 to commercial customers (Sally later corrected this number to 0.)
 - 0 fines in 2015 to customers at the transfer station
- We've encountered some issues with inspections.
 - Locked dumpsters
 - Not knowing whether a dumpster is locked can cause some inefficiencies. However, it's not illegal to lock a dumpster; in fact, we encourage it because it prevents illegal dumping and encourages better sorting of recyclables and food waste. We now have the keys to dumpsters. We can also follow the waste hauler on collection days if we have significant logistical issues. Another possible approach for locked dumpsters is to call ahead and schedule a visit, making it more of a waste audit/educational tool rather than an inspection.
 - Black bags
 - These are a challenge because our waste haulers cannot see what's inside the bags, and we do not encourage them to open bags when doing inspections.
 - Studies show that clear bags not only make inspections easier, they also reduce waste.
 - Availability
 - At compactor inspections done at the transfer station, our inspectors sometimes have to spend time waiting. One of our inspectors shows up for a few hours and inspects loads that happen to be brought in during that period. Since we don't know whether any

loads will be brought in then, or how many, it's not the most efficient use of our inspectors' time and we are considering other approaches, like cameras or sharing an employee with the Transfer Station.

- Education opportunities
 - It's challenging to make the inspections a meaningful learning opportunity when the property managers or her/his representative is not present.
- We want to make the following inspection process improvements:
 - Photos taken for each inspection failure.
 - Better recording of data for 2nds and 3rds.
 - Send data weekly to education team.
 - Call to customer after each failure.
 - Locked dumpsters are not counted as inspections.
 - Conduct waste audits, similar to water conservation audits.
 - Cameras at Transfer Station (TS) or shared employee between TS and the Solid Waste Compliance Team.
 - Encourage partnerships with local retailers to sell CLEAR bags.
 - Clear trash bags lead to 31% waste decrease, 20% recycling increase.
- We are a field team.
 - We have 2 remote offices and a fleet of cars for field checks.
 - Our remote offices are located in Haller Lake (in a very small SDOT facility) and in the Old South Transfer Station (also a very small office).
 - Our fleet has 11 cars. This enables us to provide on-site services, but our vehicles also contribute to the traffic on Seattle's crowded streets.
- Customers can also access services at the City's six Neighborhood Service Centers located throughout the city, as well as the SMT Customer Service Center in the lobby of the downtown Seattle Municipal Tower.
 - These "little city halls" are where you can go to find information about Seattle services and programs.
 - In addition, they provide payment and information services with customer service representatives assisting more than 225,000 residents each year to obtain pet licenses, pay City Light and Combined Utility bills, pay traffic tickets, apply for U.S. passports (except the downtown SMT Customer Service Center), or to find information about City of Seattle jobs.
 - Neighborhood service centers are located in [Ballard](#), the [Central](#) District, [Lake City](#), the [Southeast](#), the [Southwest](#), the [University](#) District, and [Downtown](#). For more information, click here: <http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhood-service-centers>

- ❖ Committee Member Question: Do you have dedicated commercial inspectors?
- Answer: Most of the commercial inspections are done by our contractors. Our team of inspectors does some of them, though, along with the multi-family dumpsters.

- ❖ Committee Member Question: In the first and second inspections, commercial and multi-family customers receive a warning for ANY amount of recycling and/or food waste in the garbage. The third inspection only results in a fine if there is approximately 10% or more recycling in the garbage, and food waste does not result in a fine. Why is the amount of recycling/food waste in the garbage less stringent in the third inspection?
- Answer: The first two inspections are about creating awareness of the requirement to separate recycling and food waste from the garbage. Current legislation only calls for a fine for commercial customers and multi-family property owner customers if there appears to be 10% or more recycling in the garbage dumpster after receiving two prior warnings. Food waste fines for commercial customers and multi-family property owner customers have not yet been implemented.

- ❖ Committee Member Question: It sounds like not knowing whether a dumpster is locked is a barrier to effective inspections. Are you beginning to keep track of which dumpsters are locked?
- Answer: We now have the keys to all the dumpsters.

- ❖ Committee Member Question: If you send out an inspector to do ten inspections, with how many can you generally follow through?
- Answer: Here is our follow on inspection contamination rates: Here is 2015 data. We now have keys, as per the above, and we are analyzing the commercial rate to understand the discrepancies between Multi-family (MF) and Commercial (COM).

Inspection Contamination Rate		
	MF	COM
1st	17%	4%
2nd	25%	1%
Fine	7%	0%

Compost Requirement Survey Results, Tim Croll, Solid Waste Planning & Program Manager

- SPU recently conducted another survey on awareness of the food waste requirement and on support for a noncompliance fee.

- Tim referred to a handout that reported the November survey’s results and compared it with surveys done in March and July.
 - The percentages of survey respondents reporting awareness that food is no longer allowed in the garbage are as follows:

	March	July	November
All respondents	71%	79%	81% (this number was later corrected to 87%)
Single-family	75%	80%	88%
Multifamily	64%	76%	83%
Single-family non-white	62%	81%	82%
Single-family non-English primary language	49%	82%	82%

- In July and November, the percentage of people surveyed by home phone, cell phone, and in person were as follows:

Interview Method	July	November
Home phone	45%	39%
Cell phone	44%	38%
In person	11%	23%
Total contacts	671	771

- Demographics for the November survey respondents were as follows:
 - 30% in multifamily housing
 - 68% under 50
 - 45% non-white (% black, % API, % other, % decline)
 - (this was later corrected to 40% non-white: 14% black, 12%API, 13% other)
 - 9% Hispanic
 - 21% with English not as their primary language
 - 60% in South and Central Seattle
- While the results are not necessarily representative of the average Seattleite, Tim noted that SPU did a good job of surveying Seattle’s diverse communities. SPU made significant efforts to contact people in person and to include people who may not usually do surveys.
- Tim explained that the results indicate that most respondents are aware that food waste is not supposed to go in the garbage.
 - We spent significant resources to raise awareness and we saw a significant increase in awareness among all single family respondents (from 80% in July to 88% in November). Multi-family resident respondents showed a respectable increase (from 76% in July to 83% in November). Non-white single family respondents increased awareness by one percentage point to 82%, and single

family respondents who speak a primary language other than English remained at 82% awareness.

- One Member noted that the numbers are phenomenal.
 - Another Member commented that Tim and his team had done a great job.
- SPU has been planning to implement a \$1 fine for single family customers for each instance of noncompliance with the requirement to put food waste in the compost bin rather than the garbage.
 - The November survey also asked respondents for feedback about this proposed fine (the survey referred to it as a fine, but it could also be viewed as a fee for extra service, as in the fee charged for extra garbage).
 - The percentages of survey respondents expressing an opinion on the fee are as follows:

Pop. (SF)	Support \$1	Oppose \$1	Not Sure \$1	Support \$1, of those expressing an opinion		Support \$1 OR \$5, of those expressing an opinion		Support \$1 OR \$5, OR 50¢, of those expressing an opinion	
				% support	Ratio supporters to opponents	% support	Ratio supporters to opponents	% support	Ratio supporters to opponents
All SF	60%	33%	7%	65%	1.8:1	66%	2.1:1 (later corrected to 2.0:1)	69%	2.5:1 (later corrected to 2.3:1)
Non-White SF	49%	38%	13%	56%	1.3:1	57%	1.6:1 (later corrected to 1.4:1)	62%	2.0:1 (later corrected to 1.7:1)
Hisp. SF	62%	29%	9%	68%	2.1:1	68%	2.3:1 (later corrected to 2.1:1)	72%	2.9:1 (later corrected to 2.6:1)
Non-English speaking SF	63%	23%	14%	73%	2.7:1	75%	3.5:1 (later corrected to 2.9:1)	77%	4.0:1 (later corrected to 3.3:1)

- Tim explained that in expressing the ratios, they took out responses that indicated “Not Sure,” and used only those responses indicating support for a fine and those that expressed opposition to any fine.

- Among all single family respondents, there are 1.8 respondents who support the proposed \$1 fine for every 1 respondent who opposes it.
- Among nonwhite single family respondents, there are 1.3 respondents who support the proposed \$1 fine for every 1 respondent who opposes it.
- Support for the fine among Hispanic single family respondents was higher: there are 2.1 respondents who support the proposed \$1 fine for every 1 respondent who opposes it.
- Support was higher still among non-English speaking single family respondents: there are 2.7 respondents who support the proposed \$1 fine for every 1 respondent who opposes it.

❖ Committee Member Question: If the fine goes forward, will there be any warning for single family customers before they are fined?

➤ Answer: No. Since January, waste haulers have been leaving notices for customers when they find food waste in the garbage. If the fine goes into effect, no further warnings will be given, and a \$1 fine will be added to the customer's bill if a significant amount of food waste is in their garbage.

❖ Committee Member Question: Have you done any further analysis of the survey responses that indicate no opposition to the fee, including the 'not sure' responses?

➤ Answer: No.

❖ Committee Member Question: Any ideas for the reasons behind the fine's higher support among non-English speaking respondents?

➤ Answer: No.

Sally, Solid Waste Compliance, noted that SPU had done a lot of outreach to non-English speaking communities.

However, Tim clarified that the outreach focused on the food waste requirement, rather than the fine for non-compliance.

- Tim explained that the survey asked respondents who did not support the \$1 fine what they might like to see implemented instead. One choice was a \$5 fine, and one was a 50 cent fine. We added supporters of these choices to the supporters of the \$1 fine to get the number of respondents who supported any kind of fine, and expressed it as a ratio with those opposing any fine (found in the last column of the above table).
 - Generally, the ratios here show more support for a fine than the ratios that only consider the \$1 fine. Indeed, here, among non-English speaking single family respondents there are 4 respondents who support a 50 cent, \$1, or \$5 fine for every 1 respondent who opposes any fine. (This was later corrected to 3.3 respondents who support a 50 cent, \$1, or \$5 fine for every 1 respondent who opposes any fine.)
 - Tim noted that while the results indicate more support for the fine than for an earlier proposal for having garbage collected every other week (which did not

come to pass), the support for the fine is not as exciting as the support for the compost requirement. The ratio of supporters to opponents for the actual \$1 fee is just 1.3 to 1 for non-white SF.

- Tim went on to explain the last part of the survey.
 - The percentage of respondents that reported putting no food waste in their garbage can are as follows:

Survey Respondents	July	November
All residents	38%	56%
Single-family residents	41%	63%
Multifamily residents	28%	34%

- We see a significant increase among all residents (from 38% in July to 56% in November) who report putting no food waste in their garbage cans.
 - These are self-reported numbers.
 - More people may be complying with the compost requirement, or, more people may realize that they should be complying and so are reporting accordingly.
 - However, SWAC commented at an earlier meeting that actual garbage tons are an important indicator of our recycling and composting success. We have seen some decrease in the garbage tonnage.
 - However, 83% multi-family property resident respondents report awareness of the compost requirement, yet only 34% reported that they put no food waste in their garbage.
 - SPU’s Director is exploring what the barriers to compliance might be, and whether different access to compost bins/services might be creating a problem.
- Heather, SWAC Chair, noted that SWAC needed to have some discussion on the survey results and the group’s opinion on whether the \$1 fine for noncompliance with the compost requirement should be implemented for customers living in single family dwellings. She suggested that SWAC might want to write a letter to the City Council on this topic, and asked the Members to discuss what it might say. She also asked Tim for his thoughts.
 - Tim responded that the November survey results indicate that we’ll probably see diminishing returns if we continue to spend money to increase awareness of the requirement. He added that the unremarkable response on support for the fine might enter into SPU’s calculations when deciding whether to hold off on implementing the fine. SPU also wants to consider barriers to multi-family property compliance, and possibly work with landlords to overcome them.

- ❖ Committee Member Question: Is the fine up in the air?
- Answer: It's tentatively scheduled to begin January 1, but it's not a done deal. We will be deciding in the next couple of weeks whether to go forward.

- ❖ Committee Member Question: Are you seeking input from SWAC on this?
- Answer: We are open to it.

- ❖ Committee Member Question: Who will make the decision?
- Answer: SPU Director Ray Hoffman.

- ❖ Guest Question: If implemented, how will the fine be paid?
- Answer: It will be added to your bill. Technically, it's a fee like you would pay for extra garbage.

- ❖ Committee Member Question: If you decide not to implement the fine now, would it have to go back to the City Council?
- Answer: To remove it, yes, but not if we just delay it.

- ❖ Committee Member Question: We're talking about the fee for residential (single family dwelling) customers, but not for commercial customers?
- Answer: We are talking about whether to implement the \$1 fine for residential (single family dwelling) customers for putting food waste in the garbage. Right now, single family dwelling customers have no fines. Multi-family property owners and commercial customers can be fined only for recycling in the garbage, and this will continue. If we do fines for multi-family property owners and commercial customers, the fines will be the same for both.

- ❖ Committee Member Question (for Sally): What happens when you threaten a fine to multi-family property owners and commercial customers?
- Answer: A fine is another tool in the toolbox to achieve compliance. In multi-family dumpsters, it can be difficult to identify the residents responsible for noncompliance, and the fine goes to the bill payer, which is usually the property owner. Some commercial customers are more motivated to achieve compliance than others.

- ❖ Committee Member Comment: I'm wondering if there's been any study of the approval rate of the existing recycling fine, because there comes a point where you need to institute a fine.

- ❖ Committee Member Comment: There's a lot of customers that can already be fined now. I'm not sure that adding a dollar fine to more customers will change a lot of behavior.

- ❖ Committee Member Comment: No fines have been imposed for recycling in the garbage (on single family dwelling customers).

- Tim noted that the low rate of participation among multi-family dwelling residents and the probability of barriers are key factors in SPU's deliberations about whether to go forward with the food waste noncompliance fine.
- ❖ Committee Member Comment: A fine for multi-family property owners might make sense to compel them to provide better infrastructure to achieve compliance.
- Tim responded that we want owners to provide compost service onsite to residents and to make it accessible, but we don't think it's likely that owners will put in expensive infrastructure like a compost chute.
- ❖ Committee Member Comment: One multi-family building resident that I spoke with wanted a fine for multi-family property owners to encourage them to provide better compost services to residents.
- ❖ Committee Member Question: What is the fine fee for extra garbage for single family dwelling customers?
- Answer: Effective April 1, 2015, \$10.45 is charged for each extra bag, bundle or can (up to 32-gallons, maximum weight of 60 lbs). If you regularly have extra garbage, you may want to subscribe to a larger garbage can.
- ❖ Committee Member Question: What are the big reasons that might encourage SPU not to go forward with the \$1 fine for single family dwelling customers?
- Answer: In March, our primary concern was that awareness levels about the compost requirement were low, and even lower among non-whites. Most recently, we asked people directly for feedback about the fine and the response did not express rousing support for it.
- ❖ Committee Member Comment: But no one wants a fine.
- ❖ Committee Member Comment: I'm proud of SPU for all of the outreach and for the high level of awareness of the compost requirement across the survey groups. Given those numbers, I'm a bit more hawkish in support of the \$1 fine.
- The SWAC Chair asked Members to raise their hands if they had formed an opinion about their support for the \$1 fine.
 - All Members raised their hands.
- The Chair asked Members if they were in favor of SPU imposing the fine.
 - One Member responded that since the multi-family property owners and commercial customers are already subject to a fine for recycling in the garbage, a fine for food waste in the garbage may be okay. But since there's no fine for recycling in the garbage for single family dwelling customers, a fine for food waste in the garbage may or may not be a good tool.

- Another Member agreed that the \$1 fine may not achieve a lot. If a lot of people comply with the compost requirement, we may not need the fine. Also, if the fine was implemented, SPU may have to spend significant time dealing with complaints about the fine.
- The SWAC Chair clarified that the fine system for multi-family property owners and commercial customers for recycling in the garbage is currently two warnings, and then a \$50 fine, and that for single family dwelling customers, the system includes a yellow warning tag but no fine.
- The Chair went on to note that the proposed fine for food waste and/or recycling in the garbage for single family dwelling customers is one dollar.
- A guest from King County Public Health said that compost producers were making more than they could sell.
 - Tim reported that SPU has not found that to be the case.
 - Sejo Jackson, the SPU SWAC Liaison, added that Cedar Grove Compost had informed him that there was a rumor that compost sales were down, but that in fact they are selling more than what they are currently producing.
- The Chair brought the discussion back to the fine, noting that multi-family property owners and commercial customers are currently getting fined for recycling in the garbage and not food waste, and single family dwelling customers are not being fined for anything.
 - Tim noted that SPU does want to treat all customers consistently, and asked SWAC Members whether they supported the \$1 for single family dwelling customers.
 - One Member asked whether SPU considering not implementing the \$50 fine for food waste in the garbage for multi-family property owners and commercial customers.
 - Tim responded that we are considering it. SPU is viewing the food waste fines for all three sectors together. There will still be a fee for multi-family property owners and commercial customers for recycling in the garbage.
 - One Member said that perhaps SWAC should write a letter supporting the food waste fine for multi-family property owners and commercial customers and waiting on the \$1 fine for single family dwelling customers.
 - Another Member noted that the group seemed to express a lot of support for the \$1 fine ten minutes ago.
 - One Member noted that the three sectors are currently being treated differently. There seems to be high awareness of the compost requirement among multi-family residents but low compliance, likely due to barriers. Multi-family property owners and commercial customers are already subject to a fine (for recycling in the garbage).
 - Another Member noted that Sally had expressed support for more education, not fines, to increase compliance.
 - One Member said that fines are one tool, and another agreed that SPU should have all options to increase compliance, including education and fines.

- Another Member explained that he saw an equity component in implementing the \$1 fine for single family dwelling customers. If multi-family property owners are fined, they may pass that fine on to tenants. If so, it would be inequitable not to also fine single family dwelling customers for noncompliance, especially in housing market that includes so many renters. Education should be emphasized, and the fine shouldn't be a big revenue generator, but it is a motivator.
 - One Member suggested the SWAC letter might express excitement about the gains SPU has achieved in awareness of the compost requirement, and expressing support for using a fine for noncompliance as one tool of many to reduce waste in Seattle.
 - One Member asked Tim how much money has been collected as fines from multi-family property owners and commercial customers for recycling in the garbage.
 - Tim answered that the cumulative total from 2005 - present is less than \$10,000.
 - One Member noted that fines are not imposed in a heavy handed way, but they do act as a deterrent.
 - Sally noted that in the Clear Alleys Program, dark green bags are used, which are difficult to inspect. We want to make sure we can accomplish equitable inspections in all sectors.
- The Chair asked Members if they would support a letter from SWAC supporting the addition of a fine to be used as one tool among many to achieve compliance.
 - One Member responded that he would not support the letter, because the fine could be a significant political issue and more progress in achieving compliance could be made with education.
 - Another Member said that education in the commercial sector is good but may not be enough. She is strongly in favor of the fine for the commercial sector, but felt that the multi-family property owners and single family dwelling customers are different.
 - Another Member noted that the survey numbers are really good, and there seems to be a solid base of support for the fine.
 - Another Member said that she felt SWAC may be forgetting why the fine was passed by the City. The data looks good, and there are no red flags. Seattle is not meeting its recycling goals, and if SWAC supported the fine before, she felt they should support it now.
 - Sheryl, the Program Manager noted that she was hearing a lot of support from the group for SPU on achieving equitable awareness of the compost requirement among Seattle's diverse communities, and support for more education to increase compliance.
 - A Member suggested that the SWAC letter could talk about how impressed they are with the progress that's been made, emphasize the benefits of education, and then also add that SWAC still supports the fine.
 - All Members supported this approach.

✓ Chris will write the letter and will send it out to Members for review on Monday, with a firm deadline for response sometime next week.

- The Chair noted that the Committee had lots of good discussion on this topic.

2016 Workplan Discussion, Heather Levy, SWAC Chair

- This topic was postponed to allow additional discussion on the compost requirement and the proposed fine.
- Heather did report that she had received some great comments on the work plan and that Members could still add comments.
 - She will use the input to create a work plan document, and discussion will be on January meeting agenda.
 - She encourages Members to review the work plan soon.

2016 Officer Elections Procedure, Segó Jackson, SWAC Policy Liaison

- Officer elections will be conducted at the February meeting.
 - The officers' job descriptions will be sent out soon.
 - SWAC will be electing a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary.
 - ✓ Members should send nominations to Segó by the end of the first week in January.
 - Members may self-nominate.
 - Elections will be conducted using paper ballots.
 - David will not be running for an officer position due to his work schedule.
 - Heather is prepared to transition out of the role of Chair.
 - Newer SWAC Members are encouraged to nominate themselves or others.
 - Terms are one year, and Members may serve for more than one term.

Wrap Up

- Segó suggested Members make a point of noticing availability and access to facility-provided compost carts or other containers for residents at any holiday parties they may attend in multi-family housing.
- Sheryl reported a number of upcoming events of interest.

Meeting adjourned, 7:29pm.