

# Salt Management Strategy (SaMS) Government Coordination Workgroup First Meeting

Dec. 3, 2018

## Proposed Outcomes for Each Meeting

Three meetings were envisioned for each workgroup. The anticipated outcomes for each meeting are:

- 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting:
  - Identify the scope of the recommendations the group will prepare.
  - Identify process to develop recommendations.
  - Begin work on proposed topics; identify tasks/research to be conducted for next meeting.
  - Okay if we accomplish more!
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting:
  - Report on tasks/research conducted prior to this meeting.
  - Brainstorm recommendations.
  - Identify additional research/other workgroup coordination needed to finalize recommendations.
  - Plan for a workgroup status update at the 3<sup>rd</sup> SAC meeting.
  - Prior to the 3<sup>rd</sup> workgroup meeting, begin consolidating recommendations into a draft document.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting:
  - Report on tasks/research conducted prior to this meeting.
  - Discuss proposed recommendations and draft document (as status warrants).
  - Finalize recommendations, or plan a fourth meeting to finalize recommendations.

## Membership Roles and Expectations

### **Roles**

Workgroup membership types are identified as follows:

- Primary: Organization representative
- Alternate: Organization alternate(s)
- Adviser: Experts in the field who may offer comments on our process/recommendations
- Follower: Others who desire to stay informed of specific workgroups' progress

There will be one workgroup "Primary" member from any single organization. This workgroup member will be the primary representative and generally serve as spokesperson for the organization in workgroup meetings.

Where an organization has more than one person interested to participate in a given workgroup, others (beyond the "Primary") are considered "Alternates." Alternates can attend all workgroup meetings, and would serve as the "Primary" in that member's absence.

Alternates should limit their speaking in meetings to ensure that primary members who wish to contribute are able to. However, alternates should not feel unable to contribute important facts and perspectives that will contribute to the workgroups’ deliberations. Rather, they should be alert to avoid limiting the participation of other primary workgroup members (i.e., smaller organizations/individuals).

**Expectations**

To foster efficient substantive dialogue in workgroup meetings, members are expected to review materials DEQ sends in advance of meetings and be ready to provide feedback for discussion during meetings. DEQ will aim to send materials out at least one-week ahead of the meeting date. To ensure accurate meeting records, members are also asked to review and provide comments on meeting summaries sent by DEQ following each workgroup meeting.

**Workgroup Purpose**

The Government Coordination workgroup will focus its discussions on effective government coordination related to pursuing the specific SaMS goals and objectives.

**Scope of the Workgroup**

**DEQ’s Proposal (*Potential revisions in italics, per SAC member comments below*)**

This workgroup will be asked to discuss and offer recommendations for areas such as:

- Folding SaMS into existing government processes/operations
  - Impacts from proposed actions on existing programs/ordinances/initiatives
  - MS4 Permits (*see cautionary comment below*)
  - Other Watershed Restoration/Action plans
  - Government Road and Property Management contracts/operations
- *Fostering improved coordination among local governments (including schools and parks) in Northern Virginia for winter maintenance activities*
- *Informing and engaging MW COG agencies, local government officials, and elected leaders in SaMS development*
- Funding options/sources for implementation

**SAC Feedback**

Response	Additional Feedback
This meets my expectations	I still echo my previous comments that this project should not be defined just to Northern Virginia but rather to the whole State.
I would like to see the following also addressed...	Coordinating with county governments in Northern Virginia (Arlington, Fairfax, Loudon, Fauquier, etc)
I would like to see the following also addressed...	I could see other workgroups' efforts meshing with this one. For example, the legislative aspects from Workgroup #2, and the elected official and public education aspects from Workgroup #3. Hopefully through the steering committee they'll be the ability to cross-

	collaborate or to rotate issues to other workgroups for their deliberation.
I would like to see the following also addressed...	Include in MWCOG agencies; Forwarding copies of the SaMS Workgroup process and materials to local government officials so they can follow progress. Somewhat surprised that staff members from local elected official offices are not included in this valuable effort.
I would like to see the following also addressed...	strengthening current regs, standards and enforcement
I would like to see the following also addressed...	Where do School Systems fit into this? Where do Park properties fit into this (National Park Service, Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority, Fairfax County Park Authority?)
I would not like to see the following addressed...	MS4. That process already exists and allows for adaptive, iterative management for the permittee to meet its WLA. It is not likely that the SAMS will be maintained as a living document with timely updates to adjust and adapt to advances in technology, BMPs, weather-tracking and forecasting. It will likely be out-of-date the day it is published. Therefore, the SAMS should serve as guidance for practitioners, rather than a regulatory mechanism.

**Additional Feedback:**

- Government employers’ policies about snow days and PSA content to inform the public, etc.

**Additional DEQ thoughts:**

- MS4 Action Plan templates

**Resources To Consider For Developing Our Recommendations**

SaMS Workgroup Meeting Highlights: to consider areas warranting better government coordination

[https://www.deq.virginia.gov/Portals/0/DEQ/Water/TMDL/SaMS/MeetingMaterials/GCwg/Meeting1/SaMS\\_IP\\_GCWG\\_WrkgrpMtgHighlights.pdf](https://www.deq.virginia.gov/Portals/0/DEQ/Water/TMDL/SaMS/MeetingMaterials/GCwg/Meeting1/SaMS_IP_GCWG_WrkgrpMtgHighlights.pdf)

City of Toronto Salt Management Plan: See Section 4: consistent multi-jurisdictional reporting

[https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/9111-Salt-Management-Plan\\_2016\\_Summary.pdf](https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/9111-Salt-Management-Plan_2016_Summary.pdf)

Clear Roads: see pp. 44, Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC)

[http://clearroads.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm\\_uploads/0537\\_2015-Clear-Roads-Best-Practice-Guide-WEB.pdf](http://clearroads.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/0537_2015-Clear-Roads-Best-Practice-Guide-WEB.pdf)

Federal Emergency Management Agency: Incident Command System Information Resources Webpage

<https://training.fema.gov/emiweb/is/icsresource/>

Virginia Department of Emergency Management: Winter Weather Preparedness

<http://www.vaemergency.gov/prepare-recover/threat/prepare-recover/threats/winter-weather/>

## Guiding Questions:

### **Welcome and Introduction**

1. Briefly introduce yourself, including the organization you represent and your interest in participating on this workgroup.

### **Member Expectations**

2. Are there any questions or concerns on the roles and expectations for members, alternates, and DEQ and ICRPB as summarized above in this handout?

### **Purpose and Scope**

3. Does the scope, as outlined in the handout, adequately address your interests and/or needs? (*Note potential revision in italics, from SAC member written feedback on proposed workgroups scopes.*)
4. What, for you, will be the most useful outcome from this effort?

### **Content Areas for Recommendations**

5. Should the recommendations we develop address or include:
  - Local Government coordination, inclusive of schools and parks?
  - Metro Washington regional coordination?
  - Coordination between local governments and State Agencies (VDOT, VDEM, Others?)
  - Any specific coordination with Federal Agencies?
6. What potential SaMS recommendations present the biggest opportunities/challenges for government operations?
7. Below is a list of potential priority issues for our recommendations. Do these priorities match your expectations and should any be added or removed?
  - winter maintenance planning, pre-storm planning
  - training/support for implementing SaMS recommendations
  - sharing BMP lessons learned
  - expertise and resource support/sharing
8. Existing N.VA government coordination processes for winter maintenance
  - Describe any known existing formal and informal coordination
9. Benefits of more formal government coordination on winter maintenance?
  - Are there existing formal coordination processes being used now?
  - What opportunities exist for improved coordination to ensure safety with less negative impacts (public messages, etc.)?
10. Do large scale storms warrant enhanced government coordination?
  - How well do current coordination mechanisms meet needs for large storms?
  - Is some form of Incident Command System used now (see FEMA entry in resources listing)? Does application of ICS warrant our consideration (could it help reduce negative impacts)?

### **Process for Drafting Recommendations**

11. What is the desired product from this workgroup's effort? Discuss ideas for product(s) beyond a written set of recommendations.
12. How will this group work on the identified priorities? Should we all work on a topic and discuss, or should we assign a few people to each and report back to the workgroup for discussion?
13. To ensure the next meeting is productive, what materials should be prepared and/or sufficiently researched in advance to better inform discussions during that meeting?

### **Workgroup Communications and Decision-Making**

14. Soliciting input:
  - What input from other workgroups do we need? Share thoughts on specific needs and ideas for addressing them.
  - Is there any critical outside (the SAC) expertise needed to develop recommendations? Share ideas on how to reach experts.
15. How will this group seek consensus and make decisions?
16. Communication between meetings
  - Are you agreeable to DEQ sending a day after the meeting a follow-up survey to gather any additional thoughts that arise?
  - We recommend limiting use of "reply-all" in email correspondences to be sensitive to the level of email traffic that its use generates. DEQ can serve as recipient of any information to be shared and compile to send out to the group. Are there concerns with this approach?

### **Next Steps**

17. What are the tasks we want (or have decided) to work on in preparation for our next meeting?
18. Volunteers to work on these tasks?
  - Review other jurisdictions/organizations use of formal and informal coordination processes for winter maintenance activities.
  - Draft ideas for workgroup consideration of enhanced/new government coordination in winter maintenance.
19. When should the next Government Coordination workgroup meeting be held? Before or after other workgroups have draft recommendations (to be presented at the planned Spring 2019 SAC meeting #3)?
  - In advance would be April 2019 timeframe
  - Following SAC Meeting #3 would be May/June 2019
  - Is there a preferred time of day?