

Community Environmental Working Group  
SILICA TESTING TASK FORCE (STTF)  
Minutes of the Meeting of September 29, 2010

Members Present: John Alsobrook, Pat Clauser (late), Hugh Church, Thomas Little, Edward Pineda, James Tritten. Consultants Present: John Bartlit, Mike William. Not Present: Judith Hemphill. Non-Members Present: Roberta King, Lynne Kinis, Jeff Radford, Stephen Littlejohn

Materials: Draft minutes of September 15; email exchanges between Thomas Little and Peter Kowalski regarding silica testing

The meeting started at 7:00 PM with a roll call. A quorum was established.

### **Minutes**

Mr. Church moved that the minutes of the meeting of September 18 be approved. Mr. Pineda seconded the motion. The minutes were approved with one abstention. All approved changes to the planning matrix will now be depicted in black (rather than draft blue).

### **Old Business**

Returning to Item 13 on the draft planning matrix, the group reviewed Mr. Littlejohn's proposed wording for a motion. Mr. Pineda moved the following wording for Item 13: (1) The lab will send the analysis to the chair of the STTF; (2) the chair will send the analysis to the sampling contractor (ERM) and to the STTF-designated consultants; (3) ERM and the STTF consultants will each write reports meeting the minimum requirements outlined in the CP; (4) the consultants will make a recommendation regarding acceptance of the report to the STTF; (5) the STTF will resolve any problems with the data or report with the STTF consultants, the lab, and/or ERM and then vote on acceptance of the report; and (6) the chair of the STTF will then forward the report and its approval to the CEWG. Mr. Alsobrook seconded the motion. After discussion, the motion passed with one abstention.

### **New Business**

NIOSH involvement in 2010 Testing—Mr. Little reported the possibility of having NIOSH conduct the lab testing. (See attached email exchange.) He had contacted Peter Kowalski of ATSDR about contributing to the testing. Kowalski referred him to Rosa Key-Swartz of NIOSH about conducting the sampling in the NIOSH lab. Her method of testing samples from ambient air uses a different kind of filter, which cannot withstand the temperatures of stack sampling. She is currently looking at whether her lab can handle hot-air stack samples. If her lab can do this, the NIOSH lab will be used. The matter was discussed.

Sampling Schedule—Mr. Little reported that sampling will take place the first week in December on Tuesday and Thursday.

Observers—STTF members designated individuals to observe the sampling process. Observers include Jim Tritten, Jasmine Tritten, Pat Clauser, Jeff Radford, Hugh Church, John Bartlit, and John Alsobrook. Mr. Alsobrook and Mr. Pineda will make additional nominations soon.

Trust—Mr. Pineda questioned why the group had not heard about the possibility of NIOSH testing sooner. After discussion, Mr. Alsobrook moved that all members and observers of the STTF share communications, written or verbal, in as timely a fashion as practical with all of the other members and observers. Ms. Clauser seconded the motion. After discussion, the motion passed.

After a straw vote, the next meeting of the STTF was set for Oct. 20, 7:00 – 8:00. The agenda will include a possible revision of the process involving external links. Mr. Pineda will send Mr. Tritten something in writing to help structure this discussion.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 PM

Respectfully submitted,  
Stephen Littlejohn, CEWG facilitator

## EMAIL EXCHANGE REGARDING NIOSH TESTING

Tom

Let's go with Sept 23, 2010 - 1 PM Eastern (11 AM Mountain Time). We can use NIOSH's call in number listed below. It can accommodate many participants.

Thank you.

Peter Kowalski, MPH, CIH,  
Captain, U.S. Public Health Service  
Lead, Health Consultations Team  
Exposure Investigations and Site Assessment Branch  
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation  
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry  
4770 Buford Highway NE MailStop F-59  
Atlanta, GA 30341-3717  
770-488-0776  
770-488-1542 (Fax)

**From:** Little, Thomas M [mailto:thomas.m.little@intel.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 16, 2010 4:38 PM  
**To:** Kowalski, Peter J. (ATSDR/DHAC/EISAB)  
**Cc:** Gallegos, Frank E; Key-Schwartz, Rosa J. (CDC/NIOSH/DART)  
**Subject:** Re: Silica Testing - Intel NM

Thursday next weeeek anytime after 10. I would be happy to set up a phone conf call so I can also include a couple of engineers from our side as well.

Thom Little

---

**From:** Kowalski, Peter J. (ATSDR/DHAC/EISAB) <pek2@cdc.gov>  
**To:** Little, Thomas M  
**Cc:** Gallegos, Frank E; Key-Schwartz, Rosa J. (CDC/NIOSH/DART) <rjk9@CDC.GOV>  
**Sent:** Thu Sep 16 13:32:18 2010  
**Subject:** Silica Testing - Intel NM

Thom,

Are you available to discuss possible NIOSH support for silica testing with Dr. Rosa Key-Schwartz (NIOSH) and me.

We are available the following times (Eastern) next week.

- Tuesday Sept 21 (1 - 4 PM)
- Thursday Sept 23 (10 AM or 1 PM).

Toll-free meeting number: 1-866-732-8496

Passcode: 572184

Thank you.

Peter Kowalski, MPH, CIH,  
Captain, U.S. Public Health Service  
Lead, Health Consultations Team  
Exposure Investigations and Site Assessment Branch  
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation  
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry  
4770 Buford Highway NE MailStop F-59  
Atlanta, GA 30341-3717  
770-488-0776  
770-488-1542 (Fax)

**From:** Little, Thomas M [mailto:thomas.m.little@intel.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, September 02, 2010 12:05 PM

**To:** Kowalski, Peter J. (ATSDR/DHAC/EISAB)

**Cc:** Gallegos, Frank E

**Subject:** RE: Drinking Water Arsenic and Cancer Risk - in New Mexico

Dear Mr. Kowalski

I understand that you may have facilities that can analyze our stack samples for crystalline silica. If this is correct, do you have a contact that I can talk with to ensure we can get aligned on sampling procedures and sample extraction from the filter media? In addition, we would be looking for a turnaround time that is typical for industry (2 week). We would hope that your lab could accommodate that request. The end result will be fantastic as it will add an element of trust the community desires.

*Thom Little*

Environmental Sustainability Manager  
Intel Corporation  
Rio Rancho, New Mexico  
(505) 893-9058 (office)  
(505) 659 3062 (cell)  
128\*843\*1649 PTT  
Office Location R54-175-285 (pole C3)

Greetings – nice to talk with you today. Attached is the draft of the NIOSH request. Please review for accuracy.

1. Technical feasibility would commence immediately up on receipt of 20 Teflon-coated GFF from Intel
2. If step 1 is successful, we would target Monday, Nov 29, to have all pre-weighed media to the field people – a week prior to the sampling. Make sure that is the date that will work for you. Of course, you will send us all the filters prior to that so that the laboratory can weigh and send back to you.

I've also attached final reports on total particulates and silica from a mining environment so that you can see what a final report will look like. We would add additional text to detail the sampling and analytical procedure used as this is a modification of NMAM 7500.

1. Data tables in excel format (you will need to increase the width of columns to view all data)
2. Reports

Let me know if you have any questions.

Regards to all,

Rosa K-S

**Rosa Key-Schwartz, Ph.D.** (CDC/NIOSH/DART), Cincinnati, OH  
Quality Manager, Division of Applied Research and Technology  
**Office:** 513.841.4355 | **FAX:** 513.458.7189 | [rjk9@cdc.gov](mailto:rjk9@cdc.gov)

**Telework Day:** Wednesdays | **Telework Phone:** 513.503.5004

**From:** Kowalski, Peter J. (ATSDR/DHAC/EISAB)  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 16, 2010 4:46 PM  
**To:** 'Little, Thomas M'  
**Cc:** Gallegos, Frank E; Key-Schwartz, Rosa J. (CDC/NIOSH/DART)  
**Subject:** FW: Silica Testing - Intel NM

Tom

Let's go with Sept 23, 2010 - 1 PM Eastern (11 AM Mountain Time). We can use NIOSH's call in number listed below. It can accommodate many participants.

Thank you.

Peter Kowalski, MPH, CIH,  
Captain, U.S. Public Health Service  
Lead, Health Consultations Team  
Exposure Investigations and Site Assessment Branch  
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation  
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry  
4770 Buford Highway NE MailStop F-59  
Atlanta, GA 30341-3717  
770-488-0776  
770-488-1542 (Fax)

**From:** Little, Thomas M [<mailto:thomas.m.little@intel.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 16, 2010 4:38 PM  
**To:** Kowalski, Peter J. (ATSDR/DHAC/EISAB)

**Cc:** Gallegos, Frank E; Key-Schwartz, Rosa J. (CDC/NIOSH/DART)

**Subject:** Re: Silica Testing - Intel NM

Thursday next weeeek anytime after 10. I would be happy to set up a phone conf call so I can also include a couple of engineers from our side as well.

Thom Little

---

**From:** Kowalski, Peter J. (ATSDR/DHAC/EISAB) <pek2@cdc.gov>

**To:** Little, Thomas M

**Cc:** Gallegos, Frank E; Key-Schwartz, Rosa J. (CDC/NIOSH/DART) <rjk9@CDC.GOV>

**Sent:** Thu Sep 16 13:32:18 2010

**Subject:** Silica Testing - Intel NM

Thom,

Are you available to discuss possible NIOSH support for silica testing with Dr. Rosa Key-Schwartz (NIOSH) and me.

We are available the following times (Eastern) next week.

- Tuesday Sept 21 (1 - 4 PM)
- Thursday Sept 23 (10 AM or 1 PM).

Toll-free meeting number: 1-866-732-8496

Passcode: 572184

Thank you.

Peter Kowalski, MPH, CIH,  
Captain, U.S. Public Health Service  
Lead, Health Consultations Team  
Exposure Investigations and Site Assessment Branch  
Division of Health Assessment and Consultation  
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry  
4770 Buford Highway NE MailStop F-59  
Atlanta, GA 30341-3717  
770-488-0776  
770-488-1542 (Fax)

**From:** Little, Thomas M [mailto:thomas.m.little@intel.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 02, 2010 12:05 PM  
**To:** Kowalski, Peter J. (ATSDR/DHAC/EISAB)  
**Cc:** Gallegos, Frank E  
**Subject:** RE: Drinking Water Arsenic and Cancer Risk - in New Mexico

Dear Mr. Kowalski

I understand that you may have facilities that can analyze our stack samples for crystalline silica. If this is correct, do you have a contact that I can talk with to ensure we can get aligned on sampling procedures and sample extraction from the filter media? In addition, we would be looking for a turnaround time that is typical for industry (2 week). We would hope that your lab could accommodate that request. The end result will be fantastic as it will add an element of trust the community desires.

*Thom Little*

Environmental Sustainability Manager  
Intel Corporation  
Rio Rancho, New Mexico  
(505) 893-9058 (office)  
(505) 659 3062 (cell)  
128\*843\*1649 PTT  
Office Location R54-175-285 (pole C3)

## DRAFT SILICA SAMPLING & TESTING PLAN MATRIX

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

Note: Incorporates changes approved through September 29, 2010.

|   | Item   | Ref. Citizen Protocol (CP) Summary | ECD <sup>1</sup> | Intel          | CEWG <sup>2</sup> | NMED | ATSDR | EPA | Other (Village counselors) |
|---|--|------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|------|-------|-----|----------------------------|
| 1 | Approve sampling dates and number of sampling events.  | 4.1                                |                  | I <sup>3</sup> | D <sup>4</sup>    | 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 <sup>5</sup>    | 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 <sup>6</sup> | NA | NA |  |
| 10 | Progress reports   |                     |  | D | NA | NA              | NA | NA |  |
| 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

## **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 of custody 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.

### **2. Intel contractor (ERM) to finalize response to Intel questions**

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.

### **3. Intel approval for testing.**

No CEWG action required.

### **4. Recommend qualified laboratory to conduct analysis**

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.

### **5. Determine to whom lab results get sent:**

Background

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.

## **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 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.

## **7. Provide plan to monitor equipment operation and % operational capacity before, during and after sampling event.**

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.

## **8. Review ERM sampling, measurement, and analysis plan**

### Background

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.

## **9. Schedule of events**

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.

## **10. Progress reports**

No CEWG action required.

## **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.

## **12. Conduct stack testing**

No CEWG action required.

## **13. Draft report review**

(1) The lab will send the analysis to the chair of the STTF; (2) the chair will send the analysis to the sampling contractor (ERM) and to the STTF-designated consultants; (3) ERM and the STTF consultants will each write reports meeting the minimum requirements outlined in the CP; (4) the consultants will make a recommendation regarding acceptance of the report to the STTF; (5) the STTF will resolve any problems with the data or report with the STTF consultants, the lab, and/or ERM and then vote on acceptance of the report; and (6) the chair of the STTF will then forward the report and its approval to the CEWG.