

SaMS: Discussion Questions for 2nd Government Coordination Workgroup Meeting: July 31, 2019

Purpose and Scope:

1. Do the Action Item Summaries/Materials provide what the workgroup needs to develop its recommendations?
 - a. **SaMS Workgroup Scope/Focus** following 2nd Round Meetings/SAC Mtg – any questions of other workgroups activities? Workgroup/SAC meeting summaries provide additional detail.
 - b. **SaMS Timeline** – does it meet need for visualizing SaMS development? Any suggestions to refine?
 - c. **Existing Communications Forums** – any questions, comments, or additions for the handout of existing forums?

Idea Lightning Round: Share any new thoughts for workgroup recommendations

Government Coordination Needs/Processes to Support SaMS Implementation:

2. Coordination, Information Sharing, and Collaboration/Resource-sharing
 - a. What **existing forums** could best meet SaMS coordination/information sharing needs? What specific types of collaboration/sharing would be most valued?
 - b. Does **membership** of existing forums align with SaMS implementation responsibilities? Can additional ad hoc members be added, if warranted?
 - c. Are any new forums needed to effectively support NoVA-wide SaMS Implementation? Would a continued SaMS **Gov. Coordination workgroup** and/or **Steering Committee** be valuable?
 - d. Can MW-COG (including Montgomery County road salt) centralized **salt contracts** meet additional needs/interests to support SaMS implementation? Would there be interest/ability to expand centralized contract(s) to share costs for promising **non-traditional de-icers**?
 - e. Would local governments be interested to consider collaborating/sharing costs to host “Smart Salting” **training** (C.Fortin, MN) or another national winter service trainer on BMPs.
 - f. How should we articulate a **workgroup recommendation** for overall SaMS Implementation Government Coordination? (*Polling and Seek Volunteers*)

Post-Storm and Post-Season Lessons Learned:

3. Participants GC Workgroup Meeting #1 observed that Pre-Storm coordination is good, and suggested post-storm or season coordination to assess how well monitoring, maintenance and messaging worked during storm events.

- a. Would **Post-Storm** discussions be valuable? Is there a **storm-scale threshold** that might serve as a trigger?
- b. Would **Post-Season** discussions of **lessons learned** be of interest? How might they be structured and conducted, in terms of participation and roles?
- c. How should we articulate a **workgroup recommendation** for sharing Post- Lessons Learned? (*Polling and Seek Volunteers*)

Levels of Service and Public Messaging

4. A current government coordination challenge is inconsistent **messaging** among politicians, governments, and organizations; common storm messages to these groups would allow for consistent general public messages. (*Sarah will summarize E&O workgroup efforts*)
 - a. What would it take to attain **consistent** internal and public **winter storm messaging**? What action(s) by this and other SaMS workgroups would support common storm messaging?
5. Developing and communicating a commonly held **definition/expectation** of what a “**Clear Road**” is, with consistent levels of service goals, was suggested in Meeting #1.
 - a. What would it take to attain consistent NoVA government LOS goals? What action(s) by this and other SaMS workgroups (Non-Traditional BMPs/Educ & Outreach) would support common storm messaging?
6. Should we articulate a **workgroup recommendation** for consistent NoVA LOS Goals and Public Messaging? (*Polling and Seek Volunteers*)

Funding Sources for Improved Government Coordination

7. What potential **funding sources** could support **enhanced government coordination** to support implementation of the SaMS?

Regulatory/Legislative Actions:

8. What **local programs/authorities** exist to address discharges from **salt storage piles**?
9. Are there any **specific regulatory or legislative ideas** the workgroup should consider recommending in the SaMS report (consider both local and state levels of government)?
10. Are there regulatory/legislative ideas/concepts the workgroup would like to flag “**For Future Consideration**” in the SaMS report (as was suggested in SAC Meeting #3)?
11. Two possibilities previously suggested are a certification/liability relief program and a directive for Agency policy guidelines. Existing statutory provisions related to these ideas include the **New Hampshire certification program** at: <http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/l/489-c/489-c-mrg.htm> and the **Maryland requirement for salt management guidance** at: <https://law.justia.com/codes/maryland/2010/transportation/title-8/subtitle-6/8-602-1/>. Discuss these and identify other ideas.
12. Should we articulate a **workgroup recommendation** for any specific, or potential future legislative/regulatory ideas? (*Polling and Seek Volunteers*)