

Salt Management Strategy (SaMS)

Salt Tracking and Reporting Workgroup

First Meeting

October 16, 2018

Proposed Outcomes for Each Meeting

Three meetings are envisioned for each workgroup, although a 4th meeting may be necessary for some workgroups to complete their work. The anticipated outcomes for each meeting are:

- 1st 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 is we accomplish more!
- 2nd 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 3rd SAC meeting.
 - Prior to the 3rd workgroup meeting, begin consolidating recommendations into a draft document.
- 3rd 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

To address the following SaMS Objectives:

- No. 6: Develop options to assess effectiveness and methods to track and report salt usage.
- 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:

- Salt use tracking
 - Internal business record keeping
 - Uniform metrics for data comparability
- BMP Tracking
 - Process for tracking iterative BMP adoption *for continuous improvement*
 - Monitoring success of BMP adoption
- Reporting of salt use data for region-wide trend analyses and to DEQ
- *Focused tracking for highest intensity developed areas*
- Funding sources to support this effort

SAC Feedback

Response	Additional Feedback
This meets my expectations	As a general principal, I'd like to see mention of institutionalizing Continuous Process Improvement (CPI), perhaps alongside each mention of BMP's, to emphasize the point that there is no one-time step to take on best practices, but, rather, it takes a continuous effort to keep improving. Quality Management Systems (QMS) references such as ISO 18091:2014 and CMMI are useful for describing how CPI should be approached. It could be that QMS is a better acronym to use than CPI in this area, or

Response	Additional Feedback
	other vocabulary: I'm not wedded to a particular label for the concept.
I would like to see the following also addressed...	I'd like to see either an additional sub-bullet under BMP Tracking that emphasizes continuous process improvement, or change the first sub-bullet to something like, "Process for tracking iterative BMP adoption for continuous improvement."
I would like to see the following also addressed...	Review of location of BMP's near highest development concentrations - eg business centers, Beltway and major highways. Possible retrofitting of culverts which drain these areas to better contain salt runoff.
I would like to see the following also addressed...	Requiring training and certification of truck drives/spreaders; requiring calibration of all vehicles/spreaders. Convincing state agencies and the legislature to fund research on approaches that do not put excess salt or other substances into the water and land.
I would like to see the following also addressed...	This suggestion applies to all categories. Release of data to the public should be required as part of the process. This can be done anonymously.

Resources To Consider For Developing Our Recommendations

Minnesota

Inventory of Road Salt Use in Minneapolis/St. Paul Metropolitan Area:

<https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/115332/pr503.pdf?sequence=1>

Field Handbook for Snowplow Operators, see pp. 13-14 and Appendix (Reporting Forms)

<http://www.mnltap.umn.edu/publications/handbooks/documents/snowice.pdf>

New Hampshire Dept. of Environmental Services

- Green SnowPro Certification Program Rule, see accounting system/reporting requirements, see pp. 5-6.
<https://www.des.nh.gov/organization/commissioner/legal/rules/documents/env-wq2200.pdf>
- Green SnowPro Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tUXX25GrVsw>
- Salt Management System: <http://www.roadsalt.unh.edu/Salt/Default.aspx>

City of Toronto

Salt Management Plan: See Section 4.4: Material Usage Audit

https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/9111-Salt-Management-Plan_2016_Summary.pdf

Smart About Salt: Training Workbook, see Module 13:

<http://www.smartaboutsalt.com/resources/Documents/Training%20Workbook%2020180222v3.pdf>

Clear Roads: Manual of BMPs for Road Salt Use in Winter Maintenance, see pp. 30-33.

http://clearroads.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/0537_2015-Clear-Roads-Best-Practice-Guide-WEB.pdf

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, adequate to address your interests and/or needs (*Note potential revision in italics*)?
4. What, for you, will be the most useful outcome from this effort?

Content Development (to frame options to assess effectiveness of strategy, and track and report salt use)

5. For the recommendations we develop, should these address or include:
 - a. Salt Tracking only, or Tracking BMP implementation as well
 - b. Should the recommendations be targeted/specific to various sectors or generalized?
6. What are the top priority issues we should focus on and develop recommendation for?
 - a. From your perspective, what type of **salt use** reporting is most important for this strategy?
 - b. From your perspective, what type of **BMP implementation** reporting is most important for this strategy?
7. What thoughts do workgroup members have for other audiences/divisions for our recommendations?
 - a. Would dividing our recommendations by Public/Private Sector be sensible?
 - b. Should we identify tracking and reporting roles/expectations for different “levels” in each sector?
8. When considering recommendations, how do we promote or otherwise encourage voluntary tracking and reporting? What leverage points are available to support tracking/reporting recommendations?
9. What is the desired product from this workgroup’s effort? At a minimum, we need a written set of recommendations. Tracking formats, automated tools and other specifics should be discussed.
10. Are there potential lead organizations and/or funding sources to develop specific materials and promote their use?
11. 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?
12. 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

13. Soliciting input:
 - a. What input from other workgroups do we need? Share thoughts on specific needs and ideas for addressing them.

- b. Is there any critical outside (the SAC) expertise needed to develop recommendations? Share ideas on how to reach experts.
14. How will this group seek consensus and make decisions?
15. 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

16. What are the tasks we want (or have decided) to work on in preparation for our next meeting?
17. Volunteers to work on these tasks?
- a. Review other jurisdictions/organizations salt management approaches/documents, Fact-finding/research, follow-up communications among members/outside experts, drafting language, etc.
18. 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. 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?