

# Salt Management Strategy (SaMS) Non-Traditional BMPs Workgroup First Meeting October 24, 2018

## Proposed Outcomes for Each Meeting

Three meetings are envisioned for each workgroup, although a fourth meeting may be necessary for some workgroups to complete their work. 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 by identifying tasks/research to be conducted in preparation for next meeting.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting:
  - Report on tasks/research conducted prior to this meeting.
  - Identify any additional research needs/other workgroup coordination necessary to finalize recommendations.
  - Begin brainstorming recommendations.
  - Prepare for a workgroup status update at the 3<sup>rd</sup> SAC meeting.
  - Prior to the next 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 (if prepared at this point).
  - 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**

To address the following SaMS Objectives:

- No. 2: Collaboratively develop a suite of best practices to minimize the negative effects of deicing/anti-icing salts.
- No. 4: Explore funding opportunities, operational cost savings, and broader incentives, such as certification requirements/tort reform, to support implementation

### **Scope of the Workgroup**

#### **DEQ's Proposal** (*Potential revisions, per SAC member comments below*)

Discuss and offer recommendations on the following, such as but not limited to:

- Non-traditional management practices, such as, but not limited to:
  - lower levels of service or *review of urgency of service*
  - alternative pavement type or *alterative deicing compounds*
  - *behavioral BMPs such as telework options*
  - *Decision Support Systems for maintenance actions (MDSS) and other tools (other tools (pavement & atmospheric sensors, AVL/GPS, etc.) and techniques (snowplow rout optimization algorithms)*
  - *templates such for seasonal contracts*
  - *promoting a continuous improvement program*
  - certification/training programs
  - *award/recognition programs*
- Legislative initiatives, such as, but not limited to:
  - winter speed limits
  - slip and fall liability protection for certified applicators
- Funding options/sources and financial incentive to support implementation

**SAC Feedback**

Feedback provided through the survey:

Response	Additional Feedback
This meets my expectations	I see this group being challenged with this task, and restricted with/to outcomes that will make an impact.
I would like to see the following also addressed...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again, looking outside the box to understand how others have successfully implemented this and how success was measured.</li> <li>• Urgency of service (tied to lower levels of service, but not quite): length of target period, depending on total snowfall, after which roads are expected to be clear.</li> <li>• Identification of alternatives to salt and jurisdictions that have taken those approaches.</li> <li>• Either in Traditional BMPs or Non-Traditional BMPs consideration should be given to the use of Decision Support Systems for maintenance actions (MDSS) as well as the use of other tools (pavement &amp; atmospheric sensors, AVL/GPS, etc.) and techniques (snowplow rout optimization algorithms); all of which may help the snowfighters do their jobs better.</li> <li>• Ensure the potential drawbacks of lower levels of service are clearly communicated to citizens, government agencies and property owners/management. This may fall under #6 - moving government entities away from legacy RFP and contracting methodologies that do not foster more efficient use of de-icing chemicals.</li> <li>• Telework Options including incentives for employers who allow employees to telework during inclement weather</li> <li>• When a non-traditional practice is being considered, the discussion should include how continuous process improvement can be institutionalized as requirement to keep an eye on how the practice must evolve over time, rather than just considering the practice a one-time step.</li> </ul>

**Other Workgroup Feedback**

*Education & Outreach Workgroup:*

- Identifying behavior alternatives, such as telework, etc. may overlap with the efforts of the Non-Traditional BMPs WG.

*Traditional Best Management Practices Workgroup:*

- Two (2) recommended topics for discussion in the Non-Traditional BMP Workgroup are certification programs for private winter maintenance professionals and best practices related to contracts for snow and ice management.

## Resources To Consider For Developing Our Recommendations

**Certification Programs** (includes a training component and some include a salt use reporting requirement):

Minnesota: <https://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/smart-salting-training>

Milwaukee Riverkeeper (MN's program but funding provided so event is free for those who want to sign-up):

<https://www.milwaukeekeeper.org/snow-ice-control-workshop/>

City of Madison, WI: <https://www.cityofmadison.com/live-work/sustainability/winter-salt-certification/get-certified>

New Hampshire: <https://www.des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/wmb/was/salt-reduction-initiative/salt-applicator-certification.htm> (includes liability protection)

Ontario, Canada, Smart About Salt: <http://www.smartaboutsalt.com/becomesascertified>

WIT Advisors, Sustainable Winter Management Program: <http://witadvisers.com/swim/>

### **Winter Storm Management / Levels of Service**

Virginia: <http://www.virginiadot.org/travel/snow.asp>,

[http://www.virginiadot.org/news/resources/Statewide/snow17/17221\\_snowFactSHEET\\_4-5.pdf](http://www.virginiadot.org/news/resources/Statewide/snow17/17221_snowFactSHEET_4-5.pdf)

Maryland: [https://www.roads.maryland.gov/OOM/Statewide\\_Salt\\_Management\\_Plan.pdf](https://www.roads.maryland.gov/OOM/Statewide_Salt_Management_Plan.pdf)

Washington, D.C.: <https://ddot.dc.gov/page/district-columbia-winter-snow-and-ice-plan>

Minnesota: [http://clearroads.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm\\_uploads/tsr-levels-of-service.pdf](http://clearroads.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/tsr-levels-of-service.pdf)

City of Toronto: <https://www.toronto.ca/services-payments/streets-parking-transportation/road-maintenance/winter-maintenance/levels-of-snow-clearing-service/>

### **Salt Alternatives**

Road Weather Information System:

[https://www.vaisala.com/sites/default/files/documents/RDS\\_Idaho\\_The%20road%20to%20efficient%20and%20cost%20effective%20winter%20road%20maintenance.pdf](https://www.vaisala.com/sites/default/files/documents/RDS_Idaho_The%20road%20to%20efficient%20and%20cost%20effective%20winter%20road%20maintenance.pdf)

Minnesota DOT Literature Review: <https://www.dot.state.mn.us/research/RFP/Lit/LS-504.pdf>

## Guiding Questions:

### **Welcome and Introduction**

1. Briefly introduce yourself, including the organization you represent and your interest in participating on this workgroup.
2. Are there any questions or concerns on the roles and expectations for members and alternates as summarized above in this handout?

### **Purpose and Scope**

3. Is the scope, as outlined in the handout, adequate to address your interests and/or needs?
4. What, for you, will be the most useful outcome from this effort?

### **Content Development**

5. Are there any topics that:
  - a. Are listed in the materials that you feel should not be addressed by this workgroup?
  - b. You feel are missing from this effort and should be included/explored?
6. Plan Content:
  - a. Should we consider developing content to address the possible different needs of the private vs. public sector?
  - b. Should the SaMS encourage that recommendations related to behavioral BMPs be pursued at a regional or locality/individual entity level?
  - c. Given some the recommendations this workgroup develops likely will need (or benefit from) support from elected officials and/or the public to pursue (i.e. legislative initiatives), how does the group recommend proceeding in light of those challenges? Should these be recommendations to pursue a later date?
  - d. Of the recommendations we feel are important to be part of the SaMS, which ones should be prioritized first?
  - e. What sort of form should this content take? Should it be a series of recommendations for entities to consider or should it also include, for example, a framework for a certification plan and various templates?
7. Developing the recommendations/plan:
  - a. How will this group work on each task? 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?
  - b. To ensure the next meeting is productive, what material should be prepared and/or sufficiently researched in advance to better inform discussions during that meeting?
8. What resources are available (or potentially available) within the group to accomplish these ideas (both to develop and later, to implement)? Are there organizations willing to lead an effort and/or funding sources to help develop specific materials?

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

9. Soliciting input:

- a. Should input from other workgroups or experts or audiences be solicited? Which ones/how urgent?
- b. What is the best method to coordinate with other workgroups on our status and share any relevant information? At what frequency should this coordination occur?
10. What activities/resources/content to be developed by this workgroup is dependent on work from other workgroups?
11. Is there any critical expertise needed to develop recommendations that our members do not bring to the table?
12. How will this group seek consensus and make decisions?
13. Communication between meetings
  - a. Are you agreeable to DEQ sending a day after the meeting a follow-up survey to gather any additional thoughts that arise?
  - b. 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**

14. What are the tasks we want (or have decided) to work on in preparation for our next meeting?
15. Volunteers to work on tasks identified?
16. Currently, the next meeting is anticipated to occur no earlier than January or February, depending on schedules.
  - a. Will this timeframe work?
  - b. Any known timeframes (conferences, etc.) that we should avoid?
  - c. Is there a preferred time of day?
  - d. Will three (3) meetings, including this one, be sufficient?
  - e. Do we want to extend the duration of the next meeting longer than 2.5 hours to accommodate the list of anticipated outcomes for that meeting?