

Community Environmental Working Group
SILICA TESTING TASK FORCE (STTF)
Minutes of the Meeting of September 8, 2010

Members Present: John Alsobrook, Hugh Church, Thomas Little, Edward Pineda, James Tritten.
Members Not Present: Pat Clauser. Consultants Not Present: John Bartlit, Mike Williams, Judy Hemphill. Non-Members Present: Roberta King, Lynne Kinis, Stephen Littlejohn

Materials: Draft minutes of September 1.

The meeting started at 7:00 PM. James Tritten called the roll and determined that a quorum was present.

Minutes

Mr. Church moved that the minutes of September 1 be approved as submitted. Mr. Pineda seconded the motion. The minutes were approved.

Old Business

Mr. Little reviewed item 6 of the draft plan (Review proposed procedure to measure HMDS usage before and during testing timeframe.) During the discussion, Mr. Pineda asked for careful consideration of dialogue so that the group can make informed decisions in each case and that everyone have an equal opportunity to speak. After further discussion, Mr. Church moved *that Intel will deliver a proposed procedure to compare measurements of HMDS usage before and during the testing timeframe and will deliver as well the required decision date to the STTF and its consultants. The consultants will review this proposed procedure and make recommendations to the STTF. The STTF will then provide input according to its established procedures.* Mr. Alsobrook seconded the motion. After further discussion, the motion passed.

Mr. Little moved that *everyone review the updated draft plan and email their comments to Mr. Tritten by 1:00 Wednesday, September 15, before the regular CEWG meeting. If any issues remain, these will be settled at the STTF meeting following the CEWG meeting, and final approval of the draft will also be considered at the same next meeting, except possibly item 13, which is not urgent at this time.* Mr. Church seconded the motion, and the motion passed.

New Business

None

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 PM.

Note: Draft plan as revised to September 8, 2010 is attached.

Respectfully submitted,
Stephen Littlejohn, CEWG facilitator

DRAFT

Intel plans to move forward with silica testing on Durr and Munters thermal oxidizers before end of 2010

Note: Changes to September 8, 2010, in blue.

	Item	Ref. Citizen Protocol (CP) Summary	ECD ¹	Intel	CEWG ²	NMED	ATSDR	EPA	Other (Village counselors)
1	Approve sampling dates and number of sampling events.	4.1		I ³	D ⁴	I	I	I	
2	Intel contractor (ERM) to finalize response to Intel questions	1.2, 1.3		D	I	I	I	I	
3	Intel approval for testing	1.1		D					
4	Recommend qualified laboratory to conduct analysis	2.5, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2		D	R	I	I	I	
5	Determine to whom lab results get sent	3.4, 5		I	D	I	I	I	
6	Propose procedure to measure HMDS usage before and during testing timeframe	1.4		D	R				
7	Provide plan to monitor equipment operation and % operational capacity before, during and after sampling event	1.4		D	I	I	I	I	
8	ERM will develop sampling, measurement, and analysis plan per the CP	3.1		D	R	I	I	I	
9	Schedule of Events			D	I	NA ⁶	NA	NA	
10	Progress reports			D	NA	NA	NA	NA	

DRAFT

11	Provide a list of representatives to witness stack testing	Not addressed in CP		I	D	I	I	I	
12	Conduct stack testing	4.1							
13	Draft report review (follow CP process)	3.4, 5		R	R	I	I	I	

Explanation

1) Estimated Completion Date

2) The CEWG will be represented by members of the Silica Testing Task Force. This decision was documented and passed by consensus in CEWG meeting held July 21, 2010.

3) Input – requested but not required for process to move forward. [Input means providing comment and advice.](#)

4) Decision maker - decides how to proceed. [When Intel is the decision maker, Intel will be responsible for the work and any presentations to the STTF that may be needed.](#)

5) Review – [providing input with the qualification that the process will not move forward until input has been received, except that if the input is not received by the deadline, the process will proceed according to Intel's decision](#)

6) NA – Not applicable

DRAFT

CEWG Actions

In order to execute the following recommendation, the STTF needs to have a chair and agree that their meetings are governed by *Roberts Rules*. Nominees for chair should not include any Intel employees. Method of approval of election of a chair and acceptance of *Roberts Rules* is majority of STTF members present and voting in affirmative. Following that vote, a chair should be immediately elected and all other recommendations should be presented as motions. Decisions can be communicated to Intel by the Chair. Further, all actions and approvals are to be conducted at formal meetings.

All questions and answers to them relevant to CEWG action will be presented to the members of the STTF in the form of a written request prior to a briefing on the items, and before the required action, the STTF will provide input by majority vote

1. Obtain input on sampling dates, locations, and number of sampling events

There are a total of 5 RTOs: 2 Durr units and 3 Munters. Samples will be taken day and night both beginning of the week and end of the week, 4 samples per unit, to be taken simultaneously, plus QA/QC samples. The dates of sampling will be provided later. A process for blinding and sample coding will need to be developed.

Sampling will follow protocol already developed for silica testing per item 8. A procedure for securing the sampling data chain will need to be established.

Intel has set aside these dates (*insert dates*) for proposed silica testing. This is done to ensure that 1) the sampling can be done efficiently by ERM since they are on-site to perform standard quarterly sampling and 2) it affords time for resampling if for some reason the samples taken do not meet quality control standards. Decision on dates, locations and number of events by STTF on behalf of CEWG is needed (*insert date*). Dates chosen by the STTF have to be in the window of time offered by Intel so as not to interrupt other planned sampling. Process to decide these dates will include a briefing by Intel on scheduled dates and types of tests planned. Intel can explain how coordinating the silica testing with an existing sampling schedule is mandatory. Then STTF should approve the planned dates for CEWG testing at its next meeting with an attempt to schedule the tests as soon as possible in order to permit re-testing in the event of a problem. Method of approval of testing dates is majority of STTF members present and voting in affirmative.

5. Determine to whom lab results get sent:

Background

DRAFT

Results from the testing will be stand alone and not part of an overall report. The results can be sent directly to the CEWG. These copies can then be distributed to selected members. In addition, a copy must be sent to ERM so they can put the report into the context.

Process

The lab results will be mailed to the appointed recipient(s) from the STTF with a mailing address and ERM at the same time. STTF should appoint analytical data recipient(s). Method of approval of appointee is majority of STTF members present and voting in affirmative.

11. Provide a list of representatives to witness stack testing

Background

Provide concerned members of the CEWG (or their specialized appointees – possible expert in stack testing not a member) access to the sampling, and if familiar with sampling protocol, ensure the sampling protocol is followed as per the guidelines set forth in the standardized sampling procedure. Intel requires in advance a list of visitors, which sampling event(s) they want to review and approximately when they would be on site. Since they are not approved vendors and will be in a particularly sensitive area of the site, we will need to ensure they have an Intel sponsor with them at all times. The sponsor will more than likely be Thom Little but we need to make those arrangements in advance.

Process

The number of witnesses at each test will be limited by physical conditions as well as the number of tests and time of day/night for those tests. Each non-Intel member of the STTF will provide two names that meet the minimum criteria outlined in the plan with their time preferences. The preference is that one of each person's nominees be a task force member, and this could be a self-nomination. The designated representatives should visit the site in advance if possible. If any representative cannot make it as scheduled, the testing will still need to proceed.

Upon each visit, STTF witness will need to follow procedure for procuring access. They must be able to provide valid identification. Intel will need to advise witnesses the type of clothing suggested and indicate the level of physical exertion in case any personal health issues may preclude participation. Non-disclosure agreements are required. If possible, Intel will provide advance copies to any volunteer witness prior to the start of testing to preclude any last minute problems.

CEWG – Line items requiring a CEWG Review (process will not move forward until input has been received)

4. Recommend qualified laboratory to conduct analysis

DRAFT

Background

The CP devotes Appendix A to describe how a vendor would theoretically be selected. Since this process is being driven by Intel for the sake of “speed of knowledge”, Appendix A will be highly modified. However, Intel would like to encourage a member or members, to recommend a qualified lab, preferably a lab that has not performed work for Intel in the past. In this round of sampling and testing Intel has picked the consultant to expedite the process but is affording the CEWG (STTF) to review potential labs of choice.

Process

The STTF consultants will submit a list of labs to Intel for review of qualifications, and the consultant will evaluate these labs in terms of pros and cons. The STTF consultants will then brief the STTF on the list of possible labs, including their qualifications, pros, and cons. Upon satisfactory review, the STTF shall recommend a laboratory of choice by majority vote according to its procedures. If Intel chooses a lab not recommended by the STTF, Intel will provide a specific written justification.

6. Review proposed procedure to measure HMDS usage before and during testing timeframe

Background

The community has suggested that Intel can and will adjust the usage of chemicals to get the preferred results. To provide the community with the greatest assurance that the levels of HMDS usage is consistent throughout the time of sampling Intel will have to decide the appropriate method but we will work with STTF members to determine the best way to do this. Intel would propose possible data solutions that would demonstrate that usage of chemical is not altered

Process

Intel will deliver a proposed procedure to compare measurements of HMDS usage before and during the testing timeframe and will deliver as well the required decision date to the STTF and its consultants. The consultants will review this proposed procedure and make recommendations to the STTF. The STTF will then provide input according to its established procedures.

8. Review ERM sampling, measurement, and analysis plan

Background

DRAFT

Intel's consultant will provide the sampling and analysis plan prior to sampling. The plan will reveal all the details of sampling, monitoring, sampling QA/QC and the necessary details as though the samples were being submitted to a federal or state agency. The sampling plan will follow what is outlined in the CP.

Process

Intel will deliver the sampling, measurement, and analysis plan and the required decision date to the STTF and the STTF consultants. The consultants will review the sampling and analysis plan and prepare recommendations for approval by the STTF and Intel. Intel should respond to any rebuttal. The STTF is a reviewer and can suggest edits, but Intel is the decider. The STTF may choose to vote regarding their own edits, but if comments and edits are not received by the predetermined deadline, Intel will proceed.

13. Draft report review (follow CP process):

Background

Intel's consultant will follow the CP process for the report review as noted below.

The following was copied directly from the CP:

“The vendor will provide a report to the CEWG (*suggestion is to appoint the Chair for the STTF as a recipient and use their mailing address*). Intel will have access to it through its representatives on the CEWG. The report will include at a minimum the raw data, a quality control statement, and results and analysis. A comparative analysis will also be required to put the results in context. This could be (a) time comparison, (b) ratio between variables (e.g., amorphous vs. crystallized silica), or (c) comparison to a standard. The executive summary and final conclusions must be notarized.”

“Only the CEWG will be permitted to release the information to the public. The report will be handled in the following way:

1. Upon receiving the report, the CEWG will post it as a draft on the CEWG website. The draft will be clearly marked that it is not for circulation (*As an addendum Intel suggests the vendor mail a notarized copy to the appointed STTF member and Intel rep simultaneously. Intel personnel are the only ones who can post something on the CEWG web site so Thom Little will post the report on the CEWG web site and have it marked as per the CP*).
2. The report will then go to the Protocol Task Force for discussion. The Task Force will resolve questions and disagreements with the vendor as needed (*as an addendum to the CP in this instance the report will be mailed directly to the STTF which is serving the function of Protocol task Force*).

DRAFT

3. Once the Task Force is confident in the results, the report will be posted in final form on the website and presented at an open CEWG meeting (*Intel suggests we limit on the number of days the report is in review*).
4. Open public dialogue on the results will be encouraged (*What is the process to move from “Not for Circulation” to open public dialogue*).
5. Results will be considered acceptable and valid if they have met all the requirements outlined in the protocol including:
 - a. Specified and approved test methods were utilized.
 - b. Accurate comparisons were made as specified.
 - c. % operational levels were approved.

Process

Intel will deliver the report to the STTF chair and the review process will follow the above procedure with timelines agreed to by the STTF. Comments on report will be reviewed and approved prior to sending to ERM. Method of approval is majority of STTF members present and voting in affirmative.

CEWG – Line items requiring a CEWG Input

All questions requiring an input from the STTF will be presented to the members in the form of a written request and/or briefing on the item. Following those briefings, the STTF will provide an input in the form of a motion that has been approved by a majority of the STTF members present and voting in the affirmative.