

ITRC Summer Board Call

August 16 - 18, 2021, 1:00-5:00pm

Attendance: **Keisha Long, Rebecca Higgins, Sara Pearson, Randy Chapman, Doug Bacon, Naji Akladiss, Melinda McClanahan,** Nathan Barlet, Paul Beam, Michelle Brown, Poppy Harrover, Richard Mach, Lisa Matthews, Jeremy Musson, Dan Powell, David Tsao,). Kaitlyn Nelson, Rob Seifert (voting members' names are in bold).

ITRC Staff: Patty Reyes, Evan Madden, Carolyn Sistare, Devin Seckar, Nicole Henderson (contractor support)

Co-Chair Welcome, Introduction & Meeting Expectations

Patty Reyes did roll call. **Keisha Long** opened the meeting and introduced **Devin Seckar**, ITRC's new Project Associate.

Approve June Minutes

Keisha introduced the June 2021 board call minutes. No amendments submitted previously, and none were given during the meeting. **Keisha** called for a motion to approve the minutes. **Melinda McClanahan** gave the motion; **Rebecca Higgins** seconded. All members Approved the Minutes.

FY21 Budget Status & Proposed FY22 Budget (Patty)

Patty introduced the FY21 and FY22 budget and reviewed total revenue, expenses, and estimated the beginning and ending of FY year balances. **David Tsao** asked for clarification of the website and team expenses. **Keisha** asked if the changes to the website are complete and if we have cloud servers – Patty confirmed yes to both questions.

Patty asked the Board for any comments or further review on the budget proposal. **Melinda** stated the budget looked reasonable and had minor risk. **Patty** asked how the Board feels about \$1 million in the bank. **Melinda, Randy Chapman, and Naji Akladiss** agreed that \$1 million is fine for now. **Rebecca** asked to hold the vote on the budget until after the 2022 teams were discussed. The Board agreed to postpone the vote until Wednesday.

ACTION ITEM: Patty will do a final update to the FY22 excel spreadsheet to update notes and finalize calculations.

IAP Update/Dues Discussion

David Tsao presented the IAP update & IAP Dues discussion using the PowerPoint presentation supporting the discussion. The reports show membership numbers higher than last year, and the second highest in total companies (139). IAP dues revenue are the highest they have ever been (\$622k). There is also substantial individual participation from industry members (999 out of 1459). **David** noted that most of the turnover seen in IAP membership comes from smaller companies (\$5k or less) leaving, followed by a dozen or so new companies joining. **Rebecca** noted that it seems like ITRC struggles with attracting non-remediation involvement from the state and federal level. **David** presented the membership percentages across the teams. **Keisha, Doug, and Randy** agreed that funding and availability is an obstacle in securing state agency participation. **Rebecca** asked how to translate ITRC's success of IAP

involvement to state and federal agencies. **David** noted that IAP members find a unique benefit and value from ITRC regulatory and technical guidance documents, as well as training opportunities. **Rebecca** stated that ITRC should consider thinking about getting ECOS to reach out to their respective states about participation/membership. **Lisa Matthews** noted that part of the problem could be that participation is volunteer based; she suggested finding experts in topics so maybe they can reach across organizations.

David presented an assessment of company views of IAP dues and current flow of funding. **David** recommended to keep the dues structure the same, including staying with the half-year pricing for membership, since there is insufficient data to support whether a change would be needed. **Jeremy** stated ITRC might want to consider reigning in IAP presence on teams so not to overshadow states. Moreover, employee ranges and cutoff for dues may need to be evaluated to ensure all companies are able to engage with ITRC in the long-term.

David reviewed the process for selecting the IAP Liaison and reminded the Board that their 3-year term ends December 2021. Thus, the IAP Liaison nomination and initiation process needs to begin soon. **David and Jeremy** both stated they are going to run again.

ACTION ITEM: Develop process to engage ERIS in supporting state staff participation and volunteering with ITRC.

ACTION ITEM: ITRC will initiate the IAP Liaison nomination process and start the solicitation period for the letter of interest/resume.

DECISION POINT: The IAP dues structure will remain status quo for 2022. ITRC will evaluate the half year rate in 2022 to determine if it makes sense to keep offering it.

DOD/DOE/EPA Partner Updates

DOD: Richard Mach stated that the DOD funding is remaining status quo. If extra funding is available, the DOD will address it as it comes up. Mr. Kidd has been selected in the non-political position to replace Maureen Sullivan, other political leadership are still being selected. **Kaitlyn Nelson** provided updates on the Cooperative Agreement (CA), which is scheduled to end December 31, 2021. USACE will begin working on the new CA in October so that it will be in place by December. **Michelle Brown** added that ITRC funding from the Department of the Air Force is in process at AFCEC and will be processed through MIPR shortly.

DOE: Paul Beam asked the Board to prepare the justifications for FY22 funding. He noted that DOE is working in seven states right now and stressed the importance of DOE involvement in ITRC teams. **Patty** provided an update that the DOE training class was ITRC's biggest outside Clu-In, and it resulted in interest about ITRC. **Paul** noted he is retiring in December 2021.

EPA: Lisa noted that EPA is still in the process of onboarding political appointees. ORD is focusing on research planning and is gearing up for the next iteration of research action plans, and is currently working with Dan Murphy on a new Cooperative Agreement. **Nate Barlet** provided an update for EPA OSRTI, thanking **Patty, Randy, and Keisha** for attending a virtual meet and greet to new senior leadership. He noted that Clu-In continues to be a popular training platform and ITRC should continue to coordinate with Jean Balent.

ACTION ITEM: ITRC will prepare the FY22 DOE justification for funding and send to Paul Beam.

Strategic Plan Metrics

Patty presented the overview of ITRC’s strategic plan, identifying proposed metrics for each goal and recommended that we move forward with individual action plan (goal metrics), to be presented to the board twice a year, as opposed to the previous annual action plan.

Rebecca suggested ITRC work through ECOS and commissioners to make connections with state agency members that identify as tribal members to increase tribal participation within ITRC. **Rob Seifert** suggested ITRC utilize the DOE connections with tribes as well.

David Tsao mentioned a concern about the metric for the Develop & Deliver Products – having 10 proposals to be evaluated every year. **Patty** proposed changing “proposals evaluated” to “funded proposals.” **Rebecca** suggested we include “equity” in our Promote a Culture of Excellence. Board supported a 4-5 question survey to ITRC membership. **Rebecca** suggested including a hover over function on team names to give elevator speech about benefit and goals of team.

ACTION ITEM: Patty will work on outreach for increasing tribal membership. This may include asking ECOS for contacts within state agencies that identify as tribal members. Patty to follow up with Rob Seifert on finding opportunities through DOE for tribal participation.

ACTION ITEM: Update the Strategic Plan metrics for final approval in September. Edits will include add “equity” to the Promote a Culture of Excellence; update the metrics for Develop & Deliver Products based on input from the Board.

ACTION ITEM: Update the ITRC membership registration form to include – how did you learn about ITRC, how many years have you been a member, how many years of professional experience do you have, and why are you currently participating in ITRC?

ACTION ITEM: Build Fall Membership survey for circulation among ITRC Membership to help identify desires for training, and demographics of membership.

Document Update Process

Naji provided the Document Update Process proposal. The outline for the proposal is in the PowerPoint presentation and is inclusive of all products produced/published by ITRC. **Michelle** inquired if there was a template ITRC provides for document updating. Patty noted that ITRC uses templates for all proposals, which could be used for document update proposals as well.

Naji noted that currently ITRC does not have anything regarding document validity or expiration time. **Sara** noted that trainings would need to be included in this process. **Keisha** expressed concern about ITRC requiring the addition of a document’s expiration date as it may incite more work than anticipated. **Patty** stated that the current update process did not include external review and recommended that all updates should be sent for external review. **Patty** expressed concern about hiring one independent consulting company for external review support, especially if an IAP member.

Rebecca noted that the process described in the presentation more reflects the time and resources required of an ITRC team, rather than special project, and should thus be subject to the same selection process as ITRC proposals. She proposed for states to begin with a review to gauge how relevant certain documents are to other topics/projects being evaluated. **David** recommended adding a metric to update one document

per year to the 5-year strategic plan. **Patty** said the Board Special Projects Coordinator could lead the process.

Randy supported a proposal for a full document update and supported writing down a timeframe for doing high level reviews. **Doug** agreed that there is a need to review and update documents and stated that documents updated beyond text and grammatical updates should be subject to a proposal selection process for a full overhaul. **Jeremy** expressed concern about ITRC's ability to stay relevant if we cannot establish a more efficient process and include innovative technology in our guidance. **Naji** is going to look at the documents that **David** and the team did not look at. **Patty** committed to offering ITRC staff or contractor support. **Patty** noted that **Keisha** would need a vote from the board on whether to move forward with **Naji's** proposal because of the budget impact. **Keisha** asked **Naji** to clarify what he needed and **Naji** estimated \$50,000. **Naji** is going to look at the documents that **David** and the team did not look at and develop a recommended list. **Patty** committed to offering ITRC staff or contractor support.

ACTION ITEM: **Naji** (Special Projects Coordinator) will lead the Document Update process and will work with ITRC staff (as dedicated by **Patty**) to work through the process. Next steps will include:

- Develop the full list of documents that need to be reviewed in this update cycle (includes documents not previously reviewed, as well as documents from 2018 – 2020).
- Collect data on document usage to help prioritize updates (download numbers for documents). Once prioritized, **Naji** will make a recommendation to the Board for which documents to update.
- Once selected by the Board, **Naji** will reach out to experts and pull together a group to go through the process for each document (and share that list of experts with the Board).

Rebecca made motion to adjourn; **Doug** seconded. **Keisha** adjourned the meeting at 5:15pm ET.

Board Roles, Responsibilities & Transitions

Randy provided the review of the roles and responsibilities for the Board, referencing a need for engaged and involved members; seeking younger Board members (transition planning); having clear expectations of Board members; recruiting for leadership; succession planning; and a plus/minus discussion of term limits. He noted that this leads to the need for a better description of positions – and the Governance Document does not currently provide that level of information.

The board discussed the State Association Representative role on the BOA, deciding whether to fill it as is, delete it (remove position), or reframe it. **Naji** proposed combining the role with Special Projects Coordinator. **Patty** reminded the group that this position was created for Ken Zarker and Mike Murphy to participate in various State Association meetings. **Randy** recommended deleting the position from the Board. **Keisha** suggested changing the position to outreach to non-cleanup agency staff (air, water). **Rebecca** said that it should be considered if this eighth position could grow the connections to non-remediation and integration into other topic matters. **Lisa Matthews** noted that State Associations are of high value but it would require a person with a broad understanding of ITRC and multiple environmental issues. **Patty** highlighted the necessity to increase outreach to non-remediation networks/growth marketing. **Rebecca** stated it is not fair to look to the POCs to be the growth for ITRC and outreach to other offices and areas.

Doug stated that this has been a discussion with the POCs on an expansion of the POC to non-remediation. States will struggle to fund two volunteers. **Randy** commented that the underlying discussion would include a staff member from a different agency and would be a different funding discussion. The Board position could be focused more on research and non-remediation work, with an ability to approach upper management. **Lisa** stated that State POCs should not be limited to remediation

background; she recommended using the ERIS State Science Contacts network to help spread the word about ITRC teams/products across the state environmental agencies.

Keisha summarized that the Board is proposing to redefine the State Association Representative position based on outreach to other media and growth, research or data collection on behalf of the Board. **Naji** motioned for a vote to reclassify the Board State Association Representative position and responsibilities. **Keisha** seconded that motion. **Randy** called for a vote, and the board voted unanimously to reclassify the position.

Randy proposed putting a schedule for the Board of Advisors positions to be posted to the website, walking through the current terms and the current governance language on how positions are filled. **Patty** presented a breakdown of teams and membership.

ACTION ITEM: ITRC staff will work on planning and communications for upcoming Board transitions. This will include redefining the “State Association Representative” role and responsibilities, posting Board information to the website, and developing a Board of Advisors Handbook to help with recruiting and onboarding.

ACTION ITEM: Schedule call with Lisa Matthews with Science Contacts for a Fall ITRC Presentation.

External Review Process

Randy introduced the External Review Process, highlighting concerns that came out after the publication of the full 1,4-Dioxane guidance document. The concerns were focused on the fact that there was a component of the document that did not have state involvement and limited state review.

Patty mentioned that she has identified some steps that will be added to PA contracts to help with some of the concerns with managing communications and documentation. The Board reviewed the steps that **Patty** plans to implement with the PAs and to help with communication and documentation.

Randy and **Patty** proposed amendments to the External Review process, including posting external review comments and responses to comments on ITRC’s public website. **Rebecca** expressed concern at the idea of providing these comments to the public, which could diminish interest in overall ITRC or team membership as a result.

Jeremy supported **Rebecca** in the concern with posting the comments on the public webpage. **Richard Mach** stated that ITRC can develop a standard response that is better than “noted.” **Randy** added that ITRC should make it clearer that materials serve as guidance, not policy, developed by consensus. **Jeremy** commented that consensus is a hard definition because teams don’t come to consensus - there is an agreement on ‘agree to disagree.’ **Rebecca** felt that there is always the opportunity for a lawsuit based on any one person looking at the guidance from a specific angle. Every time someone comes in wanting to fix or add to a document/training, a proposal should be submitted. **Naji** added that in some cases teams were able to put two opinions in a document. **David** stated that he believes that is the norm for ITRC – putting both opinions in the document and let the user decide.

Michelle Brown advised against making comments to responses public. Moreover, ITRC should be using language that acknowledges the contributor’s input to avoid dissenting comments. **Michelle** noted that approaches not mentioned in document or comments could risk the credibility of document. **Rebecca** supported the idea of refining our response statements.

Lisa Matthews added that the discussion should be focused on the concern about credibility of ITRC. **Lisa** stated that she is struggling with making a case on why someone should review the document and

what that reviewer will get out of the participation in the review. **Lisa** said there needs to be messaging around the process and stated there are other mechanisms for review that are not volunteer. **Doug** agreed and said the POCs could use that messaging as well.

Sara Pearson stated that the most important thing for us as an organization, and to maintain integrity, is to spell out the process and adhere to it. **Randy** asked that the Board look at Slide 5 in the External Review slide deck and provide comments on the proposed recommendations to help improve the external review process.

ACTION ITEM: **Patty** will review the discussion from the Board and come up with a potential new recommendation for external review. This will include changes to PA contracts and additional line items for the Team Work Plan. Additional changes will include an edit to slide 5 (external review): Options: no Comment (reviewed, but have no comments to submit), no Review (could not find anyone at the state level to review). ITRC will once again look at the ASTM process for review comments

Training Program Update

Sara provided the Training Program Update, highlighting that there will be 38 dates on Clu-In (covering 14 topics). Clu-In is changing platforms to move from Adobe to Zoom, official on Aug 31, 2022. ITRC is working with LNAPL to change the training setup accordingly.

Sara stated that ITRC has discussed offering CEUs. The feedback form results show low need for official accreditation for CEUs and low interest in paying for CEU's. **Sara** proposed a pilot for accreditation for CEUs. The pilot would work with the American Institute of Professional Geologists to register the In Situ class as an accredited pilot. This is a \$100 investment/expense for ITRC and will ask for a \$50 fee per person to receive the CEUs. ITRC will customize the feedback form to help gauge the popularity of the CEU. The Board supported moving forward with this pilot.

Sara stated that there is no current Training Contractor Program Advisor, but there is access to training support contractors for the teams right now. There are costs with developing new content and ways of offering training. When the ITRC Training Program is defined, the budget will need to be evaluated. These costs could come to look at platforms beyond Clu-In such as Mural, videos, etc. Teams are interested in piloting the services offered by TruScribe, which is a white board animation and video production service and costs \$7500 for 2-minute video (320 scripted words) – which would be subject to an additional 15% non-profit discount.

Sara summarized her recommendations for the Training Program: (1) redefine the Training Program and develop updated policy (Fall 2021); (2) maintain hosting classes on Clu-In platform (finish the year on Adobe Connect); (3) evaluate options for changing the format (ISM-2, LNAPL, RCT-3); (4) prepare the CEU Pilot; (5) Accept Zoom platform on CLU-In for 2022; (6) develop a new TP PA RFP to define the role and support needed; (7) evaluate new training classes and associated expenses. **Sara** would like to host an interactive discussion and planning discussion to help define and guide the training program. The slide deck includes the discussion points that would help set parameters for the training program.

Sara's preference would be to have a focus group to work on Training Program direction. **Doug** proposed that the Focus Group could include some non-Board members (industry, state) to include in this effort. **David Tsao, Keisha Long, Randy Chapman, Naji Akladiss** volunteered to join a small focus group. Recommendations are to define the training program, update the policy, and develop the subgroup to characterize some of the specific questions, as well as additional questions.

ACTION ITEM: Sara will develop a training focus group and set up discussions to move ahead with the Training Program updates.

States Engagement Strategic Plan Update

Doug Bacon provided the update for the State Engagement Program using the PowerPoint Presentation to support the discussion. 90% of the SEP provided input on the 2022 ITRC proposals, and **Doug** provided the overview of the rankings. **Doug** stated that HI is not currently participating in ITRC. Microplastics is helping with state team member participation increasing. **Doug** provided an overview on the current POC Transition Process. Many states have their own process for transitions. The presentation includes the current transition process and directions to follow to support the transition of a POC. **Doug** stated that he did some initial outreach and received feedback from the POC Network that they did not want to see ITRC set selection criteria. ITRC POC's stated that guidelines and qualities to consider in the selection process would be helpful, as well as in the POC transition. **Matt Placky** and **Doug** are working on packaging information to help address comments from POCs. **Doug** stated that some states are making progress bridging relationships across divisions and offices. **Doug** also provided feedback from the states to ITRC. There is no support for an additional POC without a funding source associated with the role. States also asked that ECOS/ERIS level members reach out to POCs to engage in a dialogue.

Lisa inquired about how many of the POCs have a remediation background. **Patty** offered to invite the ERIS Commissioners to the next Board meeting in order to facilitate introductions and communication. **Patty** offered for the co-chairs to attend the Spring ECOS meeting speak on the Board's behalf directly to each commissioner. **Rebecca** commended the presentation, and **Randy** agreed that getting ERIS Commissioners involved in POC is important.

Lisa expressed the need for a more formal process to selecting POCs, which should include formal guidance, interviews, management involved in the selection, and be broadened to non-remediation people. **Doug** noted that any state that selects the POC they vet the person through their own process. ITRC can provide qualities and guidance on a good POC, but it comes down to the state who will serve as the volunteer for the position. **Doug** welcomes the idea of the new Board member helping with "business development."

Lisa asked if **Doug** sat on the ERIS Science Contact call. **Lisa** feels like someone from ITRC should be on an ERIS SCC. **Lisa** stated that the connections are not being made. **Patty** agreed and that there needs to be action. **Sara** stated that upper management is very supportive of ITRC, but it doesn't come out a lot. **Lisa** suggested that ITRC think of success stories to present to ERIS. **Patty** supported the idea.

ACTION ITEM: Collect ITRC POC Success Stories to present to the ERIS Commissioners.

Website Overview

Evan Madden presented the updated ITRC website developed with the funds approved in 2020. **Evan** showed the Board the internal website, ITRC Connect, and the external website, itrcweb.org. **Evan** also highlighted the new Google search capability added to the website.

Naji and Keisha asked for clarification on the access to member lists and information. **Keisha** also asked for clarification on the RSVP function and what are the options for receiving invitations. **David** asked if we have received feedback from other users. **Evan** stated that we are hearing that it is a learning curve, but the top users are liking the opportunities for new outreach and tools. **Rebecca** commented that some PA and TLs like the new website and some don't want to work with the site. **Michelle Brown** provided feedback about the decrease in Air Force participation. The feedback was that there were issues with accessibility and that all Air Force emails changed and are slow to get to the Air Force contacts. **Evan** closed with the comment that ITRC has seen an increase in engagement with the ITRC website.

ACTION ITEM: ITRC will continue to conduct website cleanup associated with the transition.

ACTION ITEM: ITRC will set up a call with Michelle Brown and BeaconFire to determine why the Air Force cannot access the guidance documents (PFAS example).

Team model options (mini, tradition, special, update)

Patty provided a brief overview of the team model options. She stated that ITRC typically refines the team schedule, products, and process after the rankings are completed by the ITRC Board of Advisors. **Patty** clarified that a mini team is not cheaper than a typical team, it is just a matter of the length of time and the product development of each team. **Rebecca** stated that teams are coming back after setup and changing direction and scope and timing. **Patty** noted that any changes going over 6 months requires a new proposal process. **Rebecca** and **Patty** discussed that there is a need to do more outreach to the non-remediation TLs to make sure they are connecting with the organization. The Board needs to be engaged to encourage non-remediation participation. And for non-remediation projects, perhaps ITRC needs to offer to write the follow-on proposal to keep the project and the members engaged.

Proposal Rankings Discussion with Federal Partners & IAP

Patty Reyes reviewed the proposal topics, as well as highlighted the current ITRC team schedule, noting three teams ending at the end of 2021 and early 2022.

Proposals for Consideration

- Ethylene Oxide Emissions and Environmental Justice
- Sediment Cap Chemical Isolation Layer Design Guidance
- Environmental Applications & Implications of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning
- Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) in Environmental Compliance
- Tire Chemicals of Emerging Concern: Use and Fate of Tire Anti-Degradants
- PFAS Team Extension: Collection, Evaluation, & Distribution of the Emerging Science of PFAS
- Moving UST Remediation Sites to Closure
- Remediation of Contaminant Mass in Low Permeability and Heterogeneous Matrices
- Identifying and Evaluating Chemicals of Emerging Concern
- Managed Aquifer Recharge and Modeling

David Tsao stated that 38 companies responded (out of the 140+ companies), but those companies represent 50% of the IAP funds annually for ITRC. IAP uses two ranking methods, and the top three teams stayed the same through both rankings.

Paul Beam stated that three cleanup office staff members ranked the proposals. Proposals identified as of interest were *PFAS, AI/Machine Learning, and UAS, Low Permeability*.

Lisa Matthews stated that OLEM, ORD, OAR, OW, and some regional offices reviewed the proposals. EPA did an average for a combined ranking. She noted that EtO would likely support state decision-making and EPA/Administration priority for EJ communities. CECs may be duplicative of some agency programs, so it would need to be well coordinated. Sediment Cap needs an update since 2014, and low Permeability is important for the EPA remediation programs. UST is a long-standing issue – but she expressed concerns that the deliverables might not meet the stated purpose.

Michelle Brown provided the Air Force, DOD and USACE rankings, noting that interest in PFAS remains high among all groups.

Jeremy stated that ITRC should keep energy in PFAS and consider taking it out of the rankings every year. If the ITRC TLs are losing energy, ITRC needs to support the group to keep going.

Doug Bacon presented the POC rankings. Proposals of note included: *PFAS, CECs, UST, Aquifer Recharge, Low Permeability and Sediment Cap.*

Jeremy stated that the UAS and AI likely tie together and will change the face of our industry as they become cheaper and more accessible for data gathering and analysis. There is a need to get state and EPA adoption on how industry gathers the data.

Proposal Ranking Discussion (Voting Members Only)

Melinda McClanahan summarized the 10 stakeholder rankings that represent a wide range of opinions. Stakeholder top rankings: PFAS, Low Permeability, CECs, Tire Chemicals, Aquifer Recharge, Sediment Cap. ITRC Board of Advisors reviewed their rankings individually and collectively.

The voting Board of Advisors held a discussion on the top ranked proposals, focusing on concerns and opportunities for ITRC as an organization. **Rebecca** and **Keisha** recused themselves from the scoring of the proposals as they were involved particular ones – Rebecca with Aquifers and Keisha with EtO proposal. The following proposals were discussed:

- **PFAS Team Extension:** Voted to take on through unanimous consensus with little discussion due to the magnitude of the issue to States and the amount of interest in ITRCs current team.
- **Identifying and Evaluating Chemicals of Emerging Concern (CECs):** Concerns were expressed that this is likely a large topic, and it was suggested to place EtO under CECs. It was also suggested that Tire Chemicals could potentially be added to this project. The Board discussed what the scope of the proposal is and what the team would work on and for how long. The board agreed that CECs would need to have tight management from ITRC to reign this in and only focus the first year to develop a framework.
- **Remediation of Contaminant Mass in Low Permeability and Heterogeneous Matrices:** There was a lengthy discussion on the purpose of the topic and its overlap with other recently released guidance. Of the voting board members, only one member scored the proposal high.
- **Moving UST Remediation Sites to Closure:** Maine and Michigan both have a need to move sites to closure, but other states did not find the proposal innovative and that a guidance won't help at this time.
- **Sediment Cap Chemical Isolation Layer Design Guidance:** The board acknowledged that sediment cap technologies are not settled and need new evaluation; the last documentation by ITRC completed by 2014. Crossover to stormwater, (update of previous guidance and trainings), and power companies could be involved (coal ash lagoons on the river) in the project as well.
- **Managed Aquifer Recharge and Modeling:** It was brought up that every western state ranked managed aquifer high predominantly because of drinking water for states. It was discussed that this is not just a western issue, but carries broader possibility as an option for drinking water solutions. This topic was also identified of high interest to ECOS.
- **Ethylene Oxide and Environmental Justice:** The Environmental Justice component of EtO was taken out of the team name, as it was proposed to be included within ITRC's governance document and applicable guidance.

The Voting Board decided to move four new team proposals forward and to maintain support for **PFAS**. The four new teams are: **CEC's, Sediment Cap, EtO, and Managed Aquifer Recharge**. The Board came to a unanimous consensus through much discussion and following the proposal selection process; a formal vote was not needed.

ITRC Budget

Patty reviewed the budget with the voting Board. Patty stated that EDM wants to develop a Wiki for all data management. The Board all agreed that a wiki's long-term management is not something they want to fund. The budget was adjusted to add funding (\$25,000) for the training program and to add funding (\$25,000) to support **Naji's** Special Projects (initial focus on Document Updates). Travel was adjusted to add an extra Board position (State Association Representative). Patty outlined travel-related expenses for the BOA, accounting for participation at conferences and departures from the BOA. Revenue for 2022 is projected at -\$211,474, with a closeout of \$1,390,752 remaining in the bank at the end of the year.

The budget was finalized with the changes, which including the five 2022 teams selected. **Rebecca** made a motion; **Doug** seconded the motion. **Randy** called for a vote on approving the budget as finalized. All approved.

Wrap-Up & Adjourn

The voting board members briefly discussed the merits of moving ahead with smaller monthly board calls, limiting required attendance to voting members, with occasional participation from board liaison and federal members.

Randy made a motion to close the meeting. **Doug** seconded the motion. Randy called for a vote. All approved, and the meeting was adjourned.

ACTION ITEM: Add a discussion about 2022 Board Meeting attendance to September BOA call