

**Spokane County  
SWAC Subcommittee Meeting #7  
Minutes  
December 15, 2020  
10am-12pm**



**Attendees**

Suzanne Tresko, SWAC Member  
Tonilee Hanson, SWAC Member  
Deb Geiger, Spokane County  
Lindsay Chapman, Spokane County  
Chris Averyt, City of Spokane  
Kris Major, City of Spokane  
Andy Hoye, SWAC Member  
Matthew Pederson, SWAC Member

**Agenda**

Discuss survey results that help identify which goals and actions are the most important to stakeholders.

**Background**

A week prior to this meeting Lindsay Chapman sent out a survey link that asked participants to rank the three most important recommended actions within each of the eight goals listed in the draft SWMP. Six SWAC members and seven county solid waste staff participated in the survey before survey results were compiled December 14<sup>th</sup> end of day. Presentation starts with Goal 8 to Goal 1.

**Survey results presentation – Lindsay Chapman**

These comments relate to the attached PPT that contains the survey results displayed during the this virtual meeting.

**Comments on Goal 8 slide:**

- Suzanne commented that she chose “continue” MRW services over “expand” because she thought that if she didn’t choose to continue that the services would go away.

**Comments on Goal 7 slide:**

- Tonilee commented that she chose to prioritize actions based on whether they would require new funding, knowing that funding is scarce. If any actions were thought to require funding to begin, she did not pick those.
- Perhaps we can illustrate which actions require funding with a dollar sign or icon.

- Andy asked the question if the SWAC is being asked to ratify or vote on a particular goal or action during this meeting. Lindsay responded that the purpose of this meeting is to show you the iterative process of prioritizing goals and actions based on the feedback of County staff and SWAC members. The actions that received votes will most likely be in the prioritized list versus the actions that received little to zero votes. However, the actions that receive zero votes will still be listed in the comprehensive list of all goals and recommended actions within the SWMP.

#### Comments on Goal 6

- Actions that drive multiple goal achievement will most likely be in the short list of prioritized goals.
- Tonilee commented that when she saw those duplicate actions, she voted for it underneath the goal that she thought it would best support, so that could influence the vote count of those actions.

#### Comments on Goal 5

- Lindsay commented that it was interesting to see an inverse relationship of support in the two most voted on actions, which could have been a result of SWAC members not voting for actions that require funding. SWAC voted for continuing the litter clean up work while County staff overwhelmingly voted to create an enforcement task force.

#### Comments on Goal 4

- Suzanne wanted included somewhere in the SWMP a definition for sustainable materials management.

#### Comments on Goal 3

- SWAC voted to budget responsibly while County staff voted to find a new way to finance the closed landfills. Lindsay stressed that differences in perspective are healthy and help us understand how the SCRSWS is perceived.
- Tonilee suggested the County include “post-landfill closure activities” into the second most voted action to help the general reader.

#### Comments on Goal 2

- There were 30 actions and at least 20 of those received at least one vote, which means that there is a wide breadth of interest within this goal. Because this goal is based on better serving customers, the wide array of voted actions speaks to the myriad of ways we can do that from HHW disposal access to education and outreach at public events to building partnership to capital improvements that lead to more automation at the scale houses.
- Tonilee commented that she chose education and outreach items that were not already in existence.

#### Comments on Goal 1

- Same conundrum of almost 30 actions and at least 20 of those received at least one vote, which speaks to the wide breadth of interest within this goal.
- Suzanne question if Lindsay saw any trends between increasing services or increasing knowledge. Lindsay responded that she sees a desire for both services and knowledge or education and outreach.

General comments

- Tonilee would like to see these actions categorized and presented some suggested categories: communication and promotion, partnerships, facilities and services, financial implications, research, and lastly legal requirements. These categories could help balance the attention and resources needed for the different foci.
- Andy commented that none of these goals or actions have been spelled out in terms of the quantifiable SMART acronym (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound). Lindsay responded that County staff will try to create those metrics for these prioritized actions but that sometimes these can be difficult to quantify.
- Next subcommittee meeting will likely be in mid- to late-January and County staff are working toward a March submittal to Dept. of Ecology.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:43am.