

ITRC November 18, 2021 Board Call

11:30am-12:30pm / Zoom Call

Attendance: David Asiello, **Douglas Bacon**, Nathan Barlet, Paul Beam, **Randy Chapman**, **Rebecca Higgins**, **Keisha Long**, Lisa Matthews, **Melinda McClanahan**, Dan Murphy, Jeremy Musson, **Sara Pearson**, David Tsao

ITRC Staff: Nicole Henderson, Evan Madden

1. Approval of October Minutes

Keisha Long opened the November call and stated that Patty Reyes was not able to attend the November Board call due to a family emergency. Keisha stated that there were no edits to the October minutes sent prior to the meeting. Keisha asked for verbal edits to the minutes. **Sara Pearson** asked for her name to be bolded in the attendance list. **David Tsao** stated that Jeremy Musson's name should not be bolded. **Keisha** asked for a motion to approve the minutes. **Randy Chapman** motioned and **Melinda McClanahan** seconded. The board voted unanimously to approve the October minutes.

Action Item: ITRC staff will finalize and post the October minutes to the ITRC website.

2. Governance Changes

Keisha introduced ITRC's proposed governance changes, sharing a presentation of each change. Keisha asked if anyone had discussion about the board roles as amended. **Doug Bacon** asked if there will be a vote on the entirety of the changes, or whether the board will vote on changes and passages individually. **Keisha** said the board would vote on the entirety of the Governance Document changes. David had minor editorial changes to the governance document to clarify that the IAP Liaison was two representatives. David sent his edits to **Nicole Henderson** to incorporate. **Doug** shared comments on the proposed edit for *4.2 Technical Teams and Leaders*. Doug's concern was the arbitrary nature of the term "low" as applied to participation and membership of a given team. Doug commented that the final decision should not be made by a single individual, rather a group of individuals. **Randy** asked if adding language which stipulates a group to review a team for continuation or termination would appease Doug's concern. Doug stated that a group review would address one of his concerns. He stated that the use of "low" in the language still remains a concern due to its vagueness. **Doug** mentioned that in the past, ITRC had concerns over whether a team was too large rather than small. He referenced David Tsao and Jeremy Musson's suggestion that the presence of subject matter experts on a team would be more indicative of whether or not a team can proceed. **Keisha** asked about the last sentence, regarding "substantive input" and whether this was reflective of the relative success of a team. **Randy** brought back the conversation to minimum qualifications regarding whether a team should be permitted to continue or not and acknowledged that looking

at early membership numbers would be the easiest metric. The purpose of this revision is to allow ITRC to evaluate a team and potentially terminate a team if needed. **Rebecca Higgins** focused on fact-based metrics as a good judge of a team's effectiveness: *Is a team hitting its benchmarks? Is a team on target with a workplan or scope objectives?* **Randy** asked if the board would be comfortable altering the update to include consideration of team direction and workplan achievements in a 90-day review period. The board agreed to remove the language specifically relating to "low membership," and alter the language to reflect a given team's direction and benchmarks as indicators of relative success. **Lisa Matthews** asked if 90 days is required to determine a team's effectiveness, remarking that it seems a bit long. **Rebecca** said that she thinks 90 days is an acceptable timeframe, given a lengthy amount of time spent in logistics during the first month of a team's lifespan. **Randy** suggested altering the 90-day benchmark to be *within* 90 days. **Nicole** asked for additional wordsmithing; **Doug** included a minor grammatical correction.

Keisha brought up the *11. Amendments* revision. The initial statement required that all amendments to ITRC's Governance Document be approved by a majority of membership. Proposed edits were to omit the portion of the governance that required a majority vote of membership. The board provided grammatical corrections, but approved this edit without further discussion.

Keisha reviewed the revisions and asked for a motion to vote on the full changes to the Governance Document. **Rebecca** motioned to approved the governance edits as discussed and revised, **Doug** seconded, and the board voted to approve the Governance Document with the changes made during the meeting.

Action Item: ITRC staff will finalize the Governance Document with the approved changes. Patty Reyes will send the updated Governance Document to ERIS for approval.

3. Finalize Document Update Process

Randy led the discussion on ITRC's document update process, stating minimum changes since last month's discussion. He asked if anyone had additional revisions to this process, re-reading the document update discussion from last meeting. The board was asked to provide any feedback on the process via email, but no one submitted comments. **Randy** added that this discussion doesn't need a vote.

Rebecca asked if by approving the document update process the board was approving additional expenditure of funds dedicated to any special entity taking up this review process. **Randy** remarked that this is a conversation about the steps in the review process and the particular projects which should be considered for updating, rather than a conversation about whether or not to hire someone for completing the work. Funding for this project will need to be discussed in 2022. **Rebecca** stated that update teams might solve some of this discussion. **Randy** acknowledged **Naji's** departure from the Board of Advisors will influence the direction of this project.

David clarified that **Naji's** original intent was his desire to revisit older ITRC documents with the help of a team of colleagues. **David** also stated that he worked on

this in the past, but he is hesitant to take up this any further given his workload. He suggested discussing this project later and considering this project with regard to selecting Naji's replacement. **Rebecca** supported holding this discussion on the Project Update process until Naji's replacement is selected. Rebecca also stated that there will need to be consideration for other potential special projects.

Action Item: ITRC will add the Document Update discussion to the January or February Board Meeting Agenda – depending on the selection of the new Special Project Coordinator.

4. Other Topics

1. Naji's Departure

Randy read Naji Akladiss's formal letter stating his resignation as the Board of Advisors Special Project Coordinator. Randy and Keisha spoke with Patty about next steps for filling his position. Randy asked if any Board members had recommendations for anyone qualified to fill the Special Projects Coordinator role.

Keisha stated the position will likely be advertised the beginning of 2022.

2. Final Selection of Program Advisors

It was noted that two new companies were selected for Program Advisor (PA) positions. **Randy** shared that there were some negative feelings expressed from those denied a contract, but assured the board that each PA was selected due to expertise and their perceived likelihood to function well with each respective team.

Keisha asked for the list of selected PAs.

- Arcadis: Sediment Cap Update
- Tetra Tech: Ethylene Oxide
- Environmental Works: Emerging Contaminants
- Sage Risk: Managed Aquifer & PFAS

3. Board Nominations – Next Steps

Nominations for the Board Co-Chair, Industry Affiliate Program (IAP) Liaison (2 positions), Outreach Coordinator, and State Engagement Program Coordinator are due on Friday, November 19. The Special Project Coordinator position will be solicited by early 2022.

Keisha asked for details on the voting process. **Nicole** stated that both the Co-Chair and IAP liaisons will be subject to voting starting the week of November 22 and ending December 8. IAP will be distributed among industry members, and Co-Chairs will be distributed among ITRC 2021 membership. Electronic voting will be conducted via Survey Monkey. Co-Chair and IAP presentations will be held on December 1, 2021 and a registration link will be circulated the week of November 22nd.

4. ITRC & ME – December 14

Keisha gave an overview on the upcoming webinar and agenda. **Evan** circulated a registration link.

5. Adjourn

Doug motioned to adjourn the meeting, **Rebecca** seconded, and the board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.