

Air Quality Advisory Committee

Minutes: June 15, 2016 Meeting

Next Meeting: Special meeting – July 13th. John H polled AQAC members to find the best date. Notice confirming the time and location will be sent to AQAC members and the public.

Next scheduled meeting: September 21st, Location to be confirmed after library room scheduling opens (expected to be in the Community Room (on floor level 1), Hillsboro Library, 2850 NE Brookwood Pkwy, Hillsboro, OR 97124)

Attendees:

Members present:

Robert Bailey
Russ Dondero
Jill Eiland
Spencer Ehrman
Andrew Hawley
Todd Rallison
John Williams
Tom Wood

Facilitator

John Harland

Notes

1. **Introductions:** Members of the AQAC introduced themselves – members in attendance listed above.
2. **Opens items for members of the AQAC**

Concern was raised about how minutes are approved and that some changes suggested to the March minutes by members of the AQAC were not included. For the future, it was decided to use the following process to review and approve minutes

 - i. John H send out draft minutes to members for review
 - ii. AQAC members send comments and any suggested changes to all AQAC members within 10 days
 - iii. If there are significant disagreements, Robert, John W and an Intel representative have a teleconference with John H to review comments and finalize the minutes (Andrew will attend if available)
 - iv. For the March minutes, Robert, John H and an Intel representative got together by phone to incorporate Robert's suggested changes (This was completed June 30th)

3. Emergency Response:

It was agreed at the March meeting to provide more detailed review of Intel's emergency response system. The review was led by Tripp Robinson of Intel. Tripp was joined by Hillsboro Fire Department Deputy Chief Mark Prince, Hillsboro Fire Department Prevention/Education Manager Storm Smith and Washington County Director of Emergency Management Cooperative, Scott Porter.

- a. Tripp Robinson has been the Intel Oregon Site Emergency Manager for 18 years overseeing emergency response teams, emergency management and business continuity for the Intel Oregon campuses. Tripp also is responsible for Intel's global disaster response and post seismic building evaluation program. He has been on the Board of the American Red Cross in Oregon for 16 years and served as liaison officer with Tualatin Fire and Rescue.
- b. Tripp indicated that Intel has 36 full time trained responders who get any initial call; these people are also responsible for checking safety equipment. The responders are supported by 600 trained emergency response team members to provide coverage onsite at all times. In addition, there is an Intel internal response center, more than 100 medical team members and more than 200 people trained in post seismic building inspection. Annually the site does a risk assessment to look for vulnerabilities. Intel works with their suppliers to develop their own business continuity plans.
- c. Question to Tripp regarding whether there is a plan with emergency response agencies and whether it is rehearsed. Tripp responded that there is a plan and that regular training and drills occur with Intel and emergency response agencies.
- d. Question to Deputy Chief Prince about how regularly the fire department reviews Intel operations. The answer was that there is an inspector assigned to the Intel campus and also people on-site during construction. As Intel is continuously upgrading they get regular updates. The Fire Department does not go onto the campus without an escort so there is a continuous round robin of communication and efficient response to specific location on campus. DC Prince indicated he had been with Hillsboro FD for 10 years and there has not been a hazardous material problem at Intel. If there were a problem, there are additional resources that could be brought in from Portland and other communities.
- e. Scott Porter, Director of Washington County Emergency Management Cooperative indicated that Oregon does not have Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs) as was originally visualized by the Federal Government in the Community Right to Know regulations – In Oregon, emergency planning requirements are managed at the State level, but there are efforts underway to develop LEPCs and local plans. There are now about 10 LEPCs in Oregon. A question was asked whether not having a LEPC make Intel's risk an issue for the neighbors. Tripp indicated that Intel does have an emergency plan in place and that other facilities such as the Umatilla Chemical Depot have visited Intel to

discuss ideas for their own plans. 8 Intel responders have gone on to get hired by local Fire Departments as Fire fighters

- f. Storm Smith, Hillsboro FD Prevention/Education Manager handed out cards with instructions for members of the public to get text messages in the event of an emergency. There was a suggestion that Intel partner with the Hillsboro FD to facilitate neighbors' awareness of the emergency notification system.
 - g. A question was asked about the emergency response for prolonged toxic air releases that go beyond the city limits. Scott Porter responded that unincorporated parts of Washington County have the same emergency response resources as incorporated cities.
 - h. A follow up question asking about the citizen response planning and whether a LEPC is needed. There is little community based training available to residents. DC Prince responded that having a plan is important and that they are on the path to deliberate planning in the area. When asked what the cost would be to put a plan in place, it was estimated about \$20-25K and that the county is on its way to put a plan in place. Asked if have similar close planning with other industries near Intel, DC Prince indicated these are not as robust and Intel's plans are often used as an example of a good plan.
 - i. John W indicated that Intel in their Risk Management Plan (RMP) reviewed major risks and did not identify earthquakes. Also Intel shows that they store less than 10,000 gallons of 50+% HF on site, but reported as part of the 2015 annual air permit report the use of 12,000 gallons per day. Rafe indicated that there was a conversion error in the report and Intel over-reported usage by a factor of approximately 100 or 1% of the reported usage, which is in line with previous reported year's usage. Intel will contact DEQ and correct this over-reporting value.
 - j. Intel plans seismic design for an importance factor of 1.5, built to 50% more than required in the codes. Intel stores HF in smaller containers (drums and totes) indoors rather than external tanks. Exhaust from the storage areas is treated with wet scrubbers so there would be air treatment if a drum or tote ruptured.
 - k. Todd Rallison added that there was a series of emails between AQAC members in mid-April, which included questions about Intel's emergency plan and reporting, and the storage of 49% HF. Todd indicated that Intel does not have bulk storage of HF. All HF is stored inside and within drums or totes. 49% HF is used because that is the standard commercial grade that is available. Regardless of if a chemical is part of the RMP or not, Intel's safety controls and precautions for non-PSM and non-RMP systems and will include similar design standards.
4. **Agenda change:** the AQAC decided to postpone discussion of the GNA-specified agenda items so there would be time to hear the "Introduction to Ambient Air Monitoring" presentation by Dr. Kent Norville. Dr. Norville had come especially to the meeting for this presentation. The GNA-specified items will be distributed to AQAC members in the meeting materials for their review after the meeting

5. **Introduction to Air Quality Monitoring.** Dr. Norville's presentation is included in the materials posted to the web site.
- a. The purpose of the talk was to provide members of the AQAC and the public with general information to assist in the monitoring plan development.
 - b. It is important to look at monitoring as a planning phase and an implementation phase. For the planning phase it is important to define the project – what is to be done and why? The output being a written plan (Quality Assurance Project Plan – QAPP) that includes details on the nuts and bolts on how the project will be run and is generally prepared by a consultant based on the input from the AQAC.
 - c. Questions asked:
 - i. How good an indicator is moss? Moss is only good as an indicator for metals and not other contaminants. Moss gives an indication of problems that need to be followed up with monitoring to calibrate the extent of the actual emissions. Testing moss in urban areas is relatively new.
 - ii. How long does planning take? The approach is iterative: draft, review, revise, review, revise etc – may take several months. Preparing the QAPP may take a month after the planning decisions have been made
 - iii. How do we monitor a variety of pollutants, as identified in the Health Risk Assessment? It will depend on what the community wants to look at, but Dr. Norville recommended focusing on a particular pollutant and develop a plan. For example, if you are looking at HF, you would need specific instruments and the selection of the instruments depends on what detection limits are desired. If you are looking for a small quantity of an obscure pollutant, you would use a different strategy.
 - iv. EPA process for planning is assumed to be quite robust; are there other resources to get indicators? EPA also has programs that can be adapted for community monitoring
 - v. Intel emits many chemicals. The challenge is to do screening. Moss appears to be a good indicator to inform what could be monitored.
 - d. Follow up on next steps: Spencer recommended a group look at this further to develop a proposal. The Committee agreed to hold a meeting between now and the next meeting to work specifically on ambient air monitoring. John Harland will send out date options to the committee. The public distribution list will be notified when the meeting is scheduled.
6. **Public comments and questions**
- a. (Public): To shape discussion, need plan on a long term monitoring equipment -- \$150,000 is enough for planning, may not be enough for long term monitoring.
 - b. (Public): Clarification was made that a bucket brigade is grab sampling, rather than personal monitors.

- c. (Public): What monitoring does Intel use now? Intel has continuous parametric monitoring to ensure abatement equipment is functioning properly. This is a part of the Good Neighbor Agreement.
- d. Spencer Erhman asked for the Health Risk Assessment Emission Inventory be shared? It is on the website, along with the Title V air permit application
- e. Robert Bailey asked if there is a possibility of negotiating changes to the last meeting minutes. (Subsequently a meeting was held June 30 and the minutes finalized – see item 2 above)
- f. (Public): What was the follow through on questions asked at the last meeting?
* All questions asked from the last meeting were either answered at the last meeting, incorporated into the June meeting discussion, or noted for future ambient air monitoring discussions.

7. Upcoming Meetings for 2016

- a. September 21
- b. November 16