



Salt Management Strategy (SaMS)
2nd Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
held at Northern Virginia Regional Commission, Fairfax, VA
June 13, 2018

The second meeting of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) for the Salt Management Strategy (SaMS) was held from 10:00 am – 12:00 pm on June 13, 2018 in Fairfax, Virginia at the Northern Virginia Regional Commission (NVRC) at 3040 Williams Drive, Fairfax, Virginia.

Attendance

Thirty six (36) individuals, in addition to four DEQ staff and three staff from the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin (ICPRB; DEQ’s contractual support), participated in the meeting – 41 in person and 2 via conference call.

Meeting Summary

The meeting opened with brief introductory remarks from the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and then people in attendance briefly introduced themselves, providing their name and the organization they represent.

Review of the SaMS Scope: DEQ next provided a brief overview of the scope of the Salt Management Strategy (SaMS) due to the extended time between the first and the second SAC meetings. The points from this part of the meeting are identified in slides 3 and 4 of the [meeting presentation](#).

Consensus and Decision Making: DEQ next led a discussion on consensus and its role in the SAC decision-making process. This discussion was guided by slides 5 and 6 of the [meeting presentation](#), with slide 6 containing the proposed process.

In general, the SAC voiced support for consensus being the goal but with majority vote being pursued should further discussions be unsuccessful in finding resolution or agreement. In addition to what DEQ proposed, there were the following suggestions:

- Provide a time limit on discussions (both in the meeting and for how long over subsequent meetings it is revisited) to help keep the discussion moving forward.
- Clearly identify if a topic is either temporarily placed in a “parking lot” or has been permanently decided.
- Members commented that surveys used to date have been helpful to gain feedback and for tabled discussions, but are not appropriate for decision-making. It was also suggested that prior to making any final decision, that time (i.e. additional time after the meeting) be provided for members to consider the proposal.

Some other members noted that because the SaMS will be a “toolbox” of recommendations, it enables flexibility in what an entity chooses to implement and should reduce the need for consensus. DEQ reiterated its goal of reaching consensus on the recommendations that are included in the SaMS.

DEQ then requested those in attendance to share their thoughts on the number needed to have a quorum for a vote (consensus or majority) and also what number of votes is needed to be considered a passing majority vote. After minimal discussion, the members present chose 51% of those SAC members present as being sufficient for a passing majority vote. It was also agreed that in most cases the number of votes will be counted only, not identifying how each person or organization vote.

The number required for a quorum resulted in more discussion. Discussion focused on whether SAC voting should be by “popular” vote (i.e. each person votes) or by the number of organizations represented, due to some organizations having multiple members on the SAC. It was also commented that any vote should try to be balanced, and not occur when certain sectors, such as snow and ice professionals, are not present. Another suggested that each organization get one vote to help balance voting. The discussion resulted in a quorum being obtained by those who attend, with no specific number required to meet quorum. The resolution to who may vote was left at a popular vote but voting by organization may be considered in the future. Lastly, it was resolved that when certain sectors are not represented and a vote was held, DEQ should reach out to that source sector and record any dissenting views on the vote.

DEQ explained the process proposed for documenting dissenting opinions and majority votes that fail to pass. The reason for proposing this level of documentation is to provide the opposing view so that a comprehensive document is provided in addition to provide opportunity to revisit the dissenting view in the future. The exact format of how the dissenting view would be presented was questioned, to which it was stated that those views will be clearly identified but exact presentation will be looked into more during the development of the document. DEQ was open to those with the dissenting views providing a write-up of their view to assist with documenting those viewpoints.

Finalizing the Goals, Objectives, and Participation Guidelines: Guided by slides 7 through 10 of the [meeting presentation](#), DEQ briefly reviewed the results of the survey on Goals, Objectives, and Participation guidelines and finalized them using a consensus voting process. When presenting the revised goals and objectives, DEQ explained the reasons for the minor edits. A more detailed explanation for the changes to the language of the goals and objectives can be found in the [handout summarizing the results of the survey on goals, objectives, and participation guidelines](#). The participation guidelines and revised goals and objectives all met consensus with minimal discussion. The results of the consensus vote are summarized below:

- Goals
 - o I support it: 25
 - o I can live with it: 5
 - o I cannot live with it: 0
- Objectives
 - o I support it: 23
 - o I can live with it: 5
 - o I cannot live with it: 0
 - o Additional discussion: Regarding Objective #5, what does “and impacts” mean? Impacts to what?
 - § DEQ: This was intentionally made broad so workgroups could deliberate.
- Participation Guidelines

- I support it: 29
- I can live with it: 0
- I cannot live with it: 0

Workgroups Overview: Guided by slides 11 through 13 of the [meeting presentation](#), DEQ reviewed the concepts of the workgroups and their role in developing the recommendations that will make up the final SaMS document, the proposed idea of a steering committee, and summarized the results of the workgroup survey (for more information see the [workgroup survey summary handout](#)). Following this overview, there was discussion among the SAC members. It was commented that if the membership on the workgroups is more diverse the final product will have more credibility. One SAC member asked what the plan is for the workgroup meetings. DEQ responded that the current plan is to have 2 meetings for each workgroup before the next full SAC meeting. The plan is to stagger the meetings, but that will be better informed by having the workgroup membership finalized. Another SAC member asked if some decisions will go through multiple workgroups. DEQ explained that notes from the workgroups will be shared with everyone and issues will be taken to other workgroups as needed. Lastly, a SAC member asked what the plan is for leadership and facilitation in the different workgroups. DEQ responded indicating that leadership roles will hopefully manifest from the SAC members and that DEQ will be responsible for the facilitation.

Breakout Session on Workgroups: The SAC broke up into three different discussion groups to discuss three questions about workgroup membership that remained unresolved after the workgroup survey. The questions were:

1. What should the size limits on workgroups be?
2. What criteria should be in place to determine workgroup membership?
3. Are there any concerns about DEQ determining workgroup membership?

Following the breakout discussions, the three groups summarized their discussions to the entire SAC. These summaries are provided below:

- Group 3

- Q1: Be flexible on group size to allow for expertise and flexibility. The group may be bigger than 15 people. Need good representation on all workgroups.
- Q2: Expertise and stakeholder diversity. Workgroups shouldn't be too large. Meeting locations will be important to attendance. Consider locations close to public transportation.
- Q3: No problem with DEQ doing this. Expect that they will be transparent and document their process.

- Group 2

- Q1: Groups size should be flexible. The groups should have no fewer than 10 people and no more than 20. Aim for an odd number of members to avoid evenly split votes. Too many people in a group would be unruly but too few would make it hard to get things done. Group size should be looked at case-by-case.
- Q2: There should be flexibility on this. Expertise should be one criteria. The impacted parties need to be on the workgroups. Groups that are small or might not have the needed expertise, may need to get non-voting participation from outside groups.
- Q3: Comfortable with DEQ making decisions. Reiterate that impacted parties need to be on the workgroups. One to two people from an organization is okay; there may need to be more at times (e.g. VDOT).

- Group 1

- Questions 2 and 3 inform answer to question 1.
- Q2: Need a balance of perspectives and subject matter experts. Don't overload a workgroup with people from one organization.

- Q3: Have confidence that DEQ will be fair and balanced. Encourage them to exercise judgement when selecting groups.
- Q1: The target should be 5 to 15 people. Would like DEQ to clarify that groups are open to everyone to listen in on and encourage participation. There can be in-formal, non-voting members.

Before wrapping up the meeting, DEQ indicated that they will be drafting workgroup membership for SAC review based on the preferences indicated by SAC members already. Additionally, in order to better inform workgroup membership, DEQ stated that SAC members can submit their expertise to DEQ (by email) if they want to be considered for a specific workgroup.