DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY
Community Environmental Working Group

"Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel"

Date: March 21, 2007
Time: 5:00-7:00 p.m.
Location: Your Place Or Mine

Members Attending

John Bartlit, Acting Chair
Hugh Church, American Lung Association
Edward Pineda, Rio Rancho Resident
Teresa Fleming, Intel Corporate Affairs
Mike Williams, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water
Lane Kirkpatrick, Corrales

Technical Support Staff

Andrew Moen, Intel
Sarah Chavez, Environmental Engineer, Intel
Harry Hunsaker, Intel

Public

Roberta King, Corrales resident
Lynne Kinis, Rio Rancho resident
Veronica Simons, PNM
Jim Hill, PNM Project Manager
Nicole Bennett, Ryley West Custom Builders
Emilie Dohleman, PNM
Susan Sponar, PNM
Charlotte Otero-Goodwin, PNM
Craig Exum, Southwest Stucco
Kurt Parker, ERM Rocky Mountain
Susan Weiss, Conflict with Coyotes, Corrales
Steve Mackie, Tenpins and More
Kevin Winner, PNM
Laurie Mage, PNM

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Domenici Littlejohn, Inc.
David Bergeron, recorder

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft February 21, 2007 Meeting Summary
- Action Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- This month's newspaper ad
- Analysis of Community-owned FTIR Measurements presentation
- John W. Shomaker bio
- Notice of Open House flyer
- Letter to state and local water resource agencies
- PNM transmission line project flyer

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS:

John Bartlit read the mission statement and had the group introduce themselves. He then asked for comments or revisions to the agenda. There were no substantive comments or changes to the agenda. Mr. Bartlit then asked for comments on the meeting summary.

- Edward Pineda recommended that the group continue to maintain good records. Mr. Bartlit commented that the group would take the lack of comments about the records as tacit approval that the record accurately reflected comments and actions of the group. Mr. Pineda clarified that the lack of comments, corrections, or necessary improvements of the meeting summary meant that the public was in consensus that they accurately reflected what had transpired at the meeting.
- Mr. Bartlit also took it to mean that the amount of detail in the meeting summary was appropriate.

Public Comment

- Lynne Kinis stated that she was wants to have the old major source permit put back in place and asked Mr. Bartlit why he thought she was so anxious for that to happen. He responded that she saw some advantage to having the major source permit reinstated. He went on to say that the group was attempting to explore the advantages and disadvantages of both the minor and major source permits.
- Ms Kinis then raised a concern with the CEWG newspaper advertisement. While she agreed that changing to a major source permit would allow an increase in hazardous air pollutants (HAPS), the ad neglected to tell the other side of the story. Her reason for having the Intel permit changed from a minor source to a major source permit was so that the public would have more consistent monitoring of Intel's emissions on a daily basis. It would also give NMED more clout in enforcing the requirements of the permit. She asked why Mr. Bartlit only put one half of the major source permit information into the advertisement?
- Mr. Bartlit responded that in his view, he did not put just one half of the issue. The information that the group received from the EPA in Dallas stated the relationship between NMED and Intel would be the same under either permit. He recognized that there is more to the story, but that it was in fact, how the EPA responded to the group's questions. He went on to say the monitoring requirements placed upon Intel were approved by the EPA and that they met the guidelines for emissions monitoring. Based on that, Mr. Bartlit did not see that changing permit types would result in more or better monitoring. He reminded the group that the state leadership, including the governor, was perceived to have a very poor record in enforcing the Intel permit, so how would giving NMED more clout result in fewer emissions by Intel?
- Ms Kinis reiterated that she felt the ad only presented half of the information and that it made it appear that everything with the permit was okay. She asked Sarah Chavez whether the monitoring would be greater under the major source permit than under the minor permit. Ms Chavez stated the old major source permit did not have more stringent monitoring guidelines, but it was unclear what the new monitoring and reporting requirements would be under a new major source permit. Ms Chavez opined that it would not be much different than what was required under the current minor source permit.
- Roberta King concurred with Ms Kinis' concern that the ad gives the impression that everything is okay. Everything that gets reported in the newspaper gives the public the impression that everything at Intel is fine. She recognized that the purpose of the CEWG was to take steps to reduce emissions, but that the people living in Corrales are still suffering. She believes that the ad give a "false positive" impression.

- Mr. Pineda suggested that the group discuss who writes the ad and how the ad is written at a later time, either later in the meeting or perhaps the next meeting. Mr. Bartlit responded that he has either written or had input in to all the CEWG ads that have appeared in the paper. He said he understood that what is not said is as important as what is said. He said that the group could put the fact that there is uncertainty in what would be gained by changing from a minor to a major source permit in the next ad.
- Mr. Littlejohn said the group should really consider how the ad was written to ensure that all the voices be included in its formulation.
- Ms King suggested that the ad should only state the topic and not give any additional information or argument.
- Lane Kirkpatrick expressed the concern that the ad suggested that everything was okay. The purpose of the group is to make improvements in the environment and that if everything was okay, the group would be wasting its time.
- Mr. Pineda emphasized that the group needed to find a way to make any permit that was issued effective. The only way to do that, would be to put pressure on political leadership to change the guidelines.

PNM Presentation

Laurie Moy and her team Charlotte Otero-Goodwin, PNM Senior Distribution Planning Engineer, and Emilie Dohleman, PNM Senior Transmission Engineer, presented information on their new transmission line project.

- The purpose of the project was to bring more reliable electrical service to the people of Corrales and parts of Rio Rancho.
- It involves building approximately 1.5 miles of new overhead transmission lines that start at the corner of 528 and Southern Blvd, go east on Meadowlark Lane, turn south on Stephanie Rd and follow Stephanie Rd. to Sara Rd, where the line will travel through an easement to the existing switching station behind Intel.
- The second portion of the line would start at the Panorama Substation behind Rio Rancho City Hall, go south on Grande Blvd., to Peggy Rd. and across Route 528 to tap into the existing transmission line along Route 528.
- Currently, Corrales and Rio Rancho are dependent upon a single transmission line to provide electrical power to the six substations serving the area. The proposed construction project would separate this source into two feeds, allowing the majority of the residents to have a second independent source of power that can serve them. This should minimize outages.
- Ms Otero-Goodwin showed the group the current transmission lines and the proposed route of the new transmission lines.
- Ms Dohleman provided a detailed explanation of the new transmission line route, and what it would take to install the line. The poles installed would be similar to the existing poles currently in use on Route 528. She showed photographs of the places where new poles would be installed.

- Mr. Pineda asked why PNM did not consider using an underground transmission line at the corner of 528 and Souder? Ms Moy responded that the intersection is already very well developed and underground crossings are more expensive and that expense would have to be borne by the city.
- Mr. Pineda asked about permits for installation of the transmission poles that were outside of the Intel fence. Ms Moy said that in Rio Rancho, PNM could install lines in easements without the permits.
- Construction would start at the end of 2007 and would take approximately 3 months and electrical service would not be affected. There may be some temporary lane closures along the streets where construction is taking place.
- Mr. Pineda asked the purpose of taking soil samples and was it to help with corrosion of the poles. Ms Dohleman said it had more to do with the foundation design of the poles.
- Ms Moy brought up the cost of underground lines and whose responsibility it was to cover the expense of installing them. Rio Rancho requires that distribution lines be placed underground. The Public Regulatory Commission passed a rule that if a community requires undergrounding for the benefit of the community, the citizens (PNM customers) in that community must bear the cost of installation. Transmission lines are not generally placed underground. It would also cause a disruption of service while it was being installed. Underground transmission lines are also less reliable.
- Ms Moy discussed permitting and the soil samples. The permitting in Rio Rancho is handled administratively, not through the planning commission. The soil samples are used in the design of the foundation of the poles to ensure the ground was stable enough for the foundation to carry the weight of the poles.
- Mr. Kirkpatrick asked about health effects from the high voltage power lines, wanting to understand the effects of electromagnetic (EMF) radiation and its effect on people living in close proximity to the transmission lines and the substations. Ms Dolheman said the EMF radiation was high around the substations, but fell off to background levels within 100 feet of the station. All residences are far enough away to be at background levels of EMF. Mr. Kirkpatrick asked about the long-term effects to low level EMF. Ms Moy responded that while there have been numerous studies on the long term effects of low level EMF, there have been no conclusions of adverse human health effects.
- Mr. Bartlit said the stated purpose of the project was to increase reliability. Was there any increase in capacity when the project is completed? While there may be some additional capacity, the main reason is to increase the reliability by providing additional paths for the electrical service.
- Ms Kinis asked if the growth in Rio Rancho is to the west, why is PNM putting this in the already developed area. Ms Moy responded that PNM is putting new service and transmission lines in the growth areas, but PNM is also focused on providing reliable service to existing areas and this project will increase the reliability in the Corrales and Rio Rancho service areas.
- Will the installation of poles along Meadowlark disrupt the natural vegetation in that area? Because the poles will run along the top of the bluff, the existing vegetation will not be disturbed.

- Someone asked whether a thunderstorm could knock out power to the area. PNM responded that it doesn't necessarily take a thunderstorm. An insulator failure could cause an outage. There was a failure last year that caused a five-hour power outage. With this improvement in transmission capability, power outages will be much shorter because power can be re-routed through the second transmission line.
- Someone asked whether PNM was paying for the installation of the new transmission line and since it wasn't for new capacity, were they installing just to increase reliability. The answer was yes. The PRC requires the PNM provide reliable and safe electrical power to its customers. PNM is constantly studying how to do that. This was determined to be the most cost effective way to provide the most reliable service possible. The question was then asked whether this was to provide Intel a more reliable backup power source. PNM answered that no, that Intel got its power from a completely different substation and transmission line.

REPORT ON FTIR DATA

Mike Williams provided a report on his analysis of the FTIR data obtained using the community's FTIR sensor taken in January of 2004. (His power-point presentation is attached.)

- The analysis showed that the instrument indicated an average CO_2 level of 58 parts per million (PPM) with a peak of 78 PPM and an average methane level of 295 parts per billion (PPB) with a peak of 617 PPB.
- CO_2 and methane are the most important greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and are responsible for absorption of infrared radiation.
- There are high background concentrations of CO_2 in the atmosphere as measured in remote areas such as Greenland, Antarctica, or at the top of volcanoes in Hawaii and they have been increasing over the past one hundred years.
- The CO_2 readings by the FTIR are roughly 1/4 what they should be. In an urban environment, such as Rio Rancho, the CO_2 levels should be elevated above the background environment. Clearly there is something wrong with the reading.
- The same holds true for the methane readings. The methane background measurements are roughly a third as high as they should be.
- Conclusions: CO_2 and methane measurements are much lower than background levels. Local sources and sinks would lead to higher levels than the background.
- The FTIR measurements are in serious error for two of the most abundant and important IR absorbing gases, therefore, no confidence can be placed in the FTIR measurements reported to the task force.
- The foundations of the analysis included only the FTIR measurements themselves and reported CO_2 and methane background measurements, it did not include other irrelevant local factors such as Intel's reported or actual emissions, local terrain or winds, air permit requirements, status of operating equipment, emission spikes, or Intel's monitoring or lack thereof.
- The analysis provides no information on the presence or nature of health effects, odor, or possible causes of any air pollution effects.

- Good FTIR data might form the basis for conclusions about the nature of community exposures.
- With good knowledge of exposures, identification of key contaminants and links to specific effects may be possible.
- The FTIR cannot identify aerosols. The increase of aerosols with rapid economic growth will probably produce some effects even without Intel emissions.
- FTIR gives only path average concentrations, not what people actually breathe. However, measurement of the plume is more likely.
- Strong statistical inference requires many affected people.
- Possible ways forward include repairing the FTIR instrument if necessary, find a mutually acceptable independent party to analyze the output of the FTIR with no knowledge of where or how the measurements were made (e.g. Citizen Protocol), and ensuring measurements include known compositions as well as ambient measurements.
- Mr. Bartlit asked whether NMED performed the same measurements. Mr. Williams said they had not analyzed their data for CO_2 and methane. NMED could have performed the same analysis on the community's FTIR data and come to the same conclusions, but they did not. Neither did Intel.
- Harry Hunsaker from Intel said NMED did record readings for methane, but did not report it because methane does not pose an exposure or health risk, but there is some documentation of the presence of methane. The Intel and NMED FTIR's were operated in accordance with EPA methods, which provides reasonable assurance that the results are correct.
- Ms King pointed out that when people got sick and had reactions it was documented and that one reason for monitoring with the FTIR was to see if there was a correlation between people getting sick and what was detected in the air. Several people were trained to use the computer that controlled the FTIR. Whenever people were having reactions they would notify Fred Marsh and he would come over and read data in the computer and it would show spikes in the emissions. Her understanding was that the machine was programmed to get information on specific compounds and it could not see everything that was out there. Mr. Marsh provided two reports to the task force showing the correlation between people getting sick and spikes in the emissions.
- Mr. Kirkpatrick asked Ms King whether the FTIR was run continuously or was it turned on only during times when there were complaints. She responded that the instrument was run continuously. Mr. Kirkpatrick wondered whether it was possible to detect patterns using the FTIR data, even though you could not determine actual concentrations.
- Mr. Bartlit suggested that an independent consultant evaluate the data.
- Ms King asked to read a response to Mr. William's analysis from Fred Marsh. (Mr. William's report was sent out prior to the meeting). The following is the text of that response:

  > Mr. Williams draws many unwarranted conclusions, based on his false premise that the Community FTIR results I reported were below background levels.

If Mr. Williams had attended the public meetings when I presented these results, he would have heard me explain that I intentionally focused on the short-duration "spikes" that accompanied the strong chemical odors and associated illnesses reported by residents living near Intel.

I therefore treated all reasonably constant background levels as baselines, and only measured the peaks that began and returned to these near-constant background levels. By doing so I intentionally subtracted the background levels that concern Mr. Williams.

When I examined these short-duration peaks, I often found that several compounds followed the same release profile, which indicated they were being released from the same source at the same time. Moreover, these multiple- compound spikes occurred when the wind was blowing from Intel.

Thus, instead of Mr. Williams' unjustified conclusion that the community FTIR results are unworthy of confidence, these results deserve extra confidence due to the conservative approach I used that subtracted the near-constant background reading of all observed compounds.

But we needn't relay on the community FTIR results, as additional FTIR measurements were made on Intel property by TRC, Intel's own contractor. These TRC results were reviewed by Steve Martinez, a highly qualified engineer/data analyst who served on the task force. I quote from Steve's report to the task force: "In analyzing the data provided, I have attempted to make it as clear as possible, using facts and data collected by the same TRC contractor that does all of Intel's quarterly compliance monitoring for the NMED, and using evaluation methods accepted by the NMED, that pollutants measured at the extreme boundaries of Intel exceed acceptable short-term and long-term screening levels designed to protect the health and welfare of those living and working in Corrales and Rio Rancho.

"This fact was confirmed by scientists from the New Mexico Department of Health who later did an additional independent analysis and found the same compounds, and others, that exceeded safe screening levels. A majority of the compounds found are carcinogens.

"In addition, much of the data evaluated was collected at a time when Intel admits their emissions were substantially lower than normal due to production problems in mid-summer, 2003. It is therefore likely that the problem is much worse than these optimistic measurements portray.

"I would also like to emphasize that Professor Darko Koracin's modeling study confirmed a strong correlation between citizen health and odor complaints and modeled plume concentrations from the Intel plant. His expert analysis clearly shows that resident complaints

are attributable to Intel emissions. His graphical analysis demonstrated that the impact of Intel pollutants is not just a Corrales and Rio Rancho problem; they are a Rio Grande Valley problem and, as such, contribute substantially to the air quality problems in Albuquerque.

"As such, I support the Task Force member's recommendation calling for the institution of a regional air quality review board to comprehensively address these issues, as 'Air knows no boundaries.' "That concludes the quote from Mr. Martinez.

Although Intel tried to blame the TRC- measured compounds on traffic emissions, the highest concentrations TRC found were furthest from major highways, but closest to the Corrales residents who have repeatedly reported strong chemical odors and related illnesses. Moreover, the highest concentrations were found during the hours when highway traffic is lightest.

To summarize, if we replace Mr. Williams' erroneous assumptions with facts, we find that the community FTIR results are not only reliable, but they are supported by Intel's own FTIR measurements, as well as the findings of the NMED-funded, highly reputable Koracin study.

The conclusion that Intel is the source of these toxic emissions is therefore unavoidable.

- Mr. Williams asked Ms. King whether Mr. Marsh was saying the readings from the FTIR were an average? Ms King recalled that the format was the total amount, the highest amount or peak reading, and the number of times the reading was taken. There was some confusion over just what the data reflected. Mr. Williams asked whether it was an average above some baseline that Mr. Marsh didn't provide in the data? Ms King said Mr. Marsh did not say anything about a baseline. When Mr. Marsh gave his presentation at the Task Force, he intentionally focused his discussion on the short-term peaks and he treated all constant background levels as baseline and measured the peaks from those constant background levels.
- Mr. Williams commented on Mr. Marsh's statement that when all pollutants increased at the same time it meant they were all coming from the same pollution source. Mr. Williams said that pollutant levels rising at the same time indicated that the pollutants were in a basin with low dispersion capability. This does not mean it all came from the same source; pollutants from all sources would be amplified.
- Ms King responded that the Darco report took terrain into account and what happened to the plume.
- Mr. Bartlit said that this might be the most exciting thing to happen in the working group in some time. He thanked Ms King for providing the data and suggested that the group use the citizen-owned FTIR with the Citizen Protocol to take measurements in an agreed upon fashion and gather new, important, relevant, and understandable data. It represents a remarkable opportunity to build the group's database.
- Mr. Kirkpatrick suggested that Intel might want to fund the data collection because it would be in their best interest to get data that everyone has confidence in. He then asked whether anyone had taken a look at the data from all the sources?

- Mr. Church asked about the operation of the FTIR; who set it up, who operated it, and were they competent? Ms King responded that they had contracted with the company that provided the instrument and that the company set it up, and trained people to use the computer, read the data, and make sure the data was recorded.
- Mr. Littlejohn pointed out that the Citizen Protocol had provisions to ensure competence is in place to run the instrument during data collection.
- Ms King asked the group how many members had read the Darco report or the Gradient report that were presented at the Task Force? She suggested everyone should read them and draw their own conclusions.
- Mr. Bartlit suggested that we needed to read the reports, but also get the raw data (not the reduced data) and do our own analysis so that we can get as much out of it as we can.
- Mr. Kirkpatrick asked whether Intel would consider funding the operation of the citizen's FTIR instrument. He was not making that suggestion, but was just wondering whether they would consider it.
- Ms Fleming responded the group needed to look to the Citizen's Protocol on the issue.
- Mr. Bartlit asked whether there was any other data that might be evaluated, beyond the NMED, Intel, and citizen's FTIR data. Ms King reiterated that the group should read the existing reports, including the Koracin report.
- Mr. Kirkpatrick asked whether any federal agency such as the ATSDR had evaluated this data? Ms Fleming said that they had taken a look at it, but have not reported on it.
- Mr. Bartlit responded that it had been over two years, and no report. He suggested the group write a letter asking for the status of the evaluation of the data. He also volunteered to write the letter.
- Ms King suggested the group look at the public comments from the two Task Force sessions that were open to the public.
- Mr. Littlejohn summarized that Mr. William's analysis had crystallized the need to pull together the reports and analyses and look at them together to determine next steps.

ACTION ITEMS FROM THE DISCUSSION:

1. **Write a letter to the ATSDR asking about the status of their report – John Bartlit.**

WATER

Mr. Littlejohn reviewed actions taken since the last meeting. These included refining the questions asked at the last meeting and contacting people at the different water regulatory agencies. Mr. Littlejohn talked to Katherine Yuhas the conservation officer for the city of Albuquerque and contacted Jess Ward, the state engineer's permits/water rights person, Cheri Vogel, the office of the State Engineer, Dennis McClelland, with the Environmental Health Division, and George Shuman of the Ground Water Quality Bureau. They all agreed to review the questions and provide answers where they could. Two of them have already responded and Mr. Littlejohn will follow up with the others.

- There are a number of references available online and Mr. Littlejohn will put together a high level briefing of all the information and send it out so that everyone can be prepared for the discussions of water in the future.
- Mr. Bartlit said that he and Mr. Littlejohn decided to send out the letter with the questions from the last meeting after receiving positive feedback on the questions clarity from the folks that Mr. Littlejohn had contacted. He did this to save the three weeks it would have taken to report back to the group for approval of the questions.

- Mr. Church introduced the idea of bringing a hydrologist to do some pro bono work in support of the group's evaluation of water issues and provided a bio of John Shomaker, who might be available to do this. Mr. Shomaker had stated up front that he had been a consultant for Intel for a number of years. Mr. Shomaker is very familiar with the issues raised by the questions provided by Mr. Bartlit. He said he would be happy to present the information, but that he would have to pass it by Intel prior to presenting it in order to avoid jeopardizing his working relationship with Intel. Mr. Church posed the question: could we still view Mr. Shomaker as a reliable, independent source?
- Ms Fleming asked whether Mr. Shomaker had had a contract with Intel? Mr. Church answered in the affirmative, to which Ms Fleming pointed out that Intel contracts generally had a clause that prohibited either party from commenting publicly on the other party.
- Mr. Kirkpatrick suggested that it would be useful to hear what he said. Mr. Shomaker is obviously knowledgeable and knowing of his relationship with Intel the group should be able to "read between the lines".
- Mr. Church said Mr. Shomaker agreed to do the work pro bono, provided it did not get out of hand. He then asked the group what kind of arrangement should be pursued; participation in a panel or perhaps a presentation to the group by Mr. Shomaker?
- Mr. Littlejohn pointed out that the group had started to work on putting together a panel and had several leads. There is a professor at New Mexico Tech [John Hawley] who comes highly recommended, so with the addition of Mr. Shomaker, the group had a good start at a knowledgeable panel.
- Mr. Bartlit concurred with Mr. Kirkpatrick that it was good to get data and information from as many sources as possible and that by comparing data from many sources you were more likely to get reliable answers to your questions.
- Mr. Littlejohn then asked whether there were any objections to Mr. Shomaker addressing the questions and to asking him whether he would be willing to support a panel session. There were no objections.
- Ms Fleming said she liked the panel idea. She pointed out that there had been an update to the 2000 report on water. She volunteered to find out who had supported the update in the State Engineer's office to see if they would be willing to support a panel session.
- Mr. Littlejohn pointed out that Mr. Shomaker had been a participant in putting together the original 2000 water report. He asked Ms Fleming if she would provide a citation for the 2006 update.
- Ms Fleming asked whether Mr. Shomaker's relationship with Intel violated the Citizen Protocol with regard to independent third parties? Mr. Church asked whether the public would consider Mr. Shomaker "tainted" because of his previous work.
- Mr. Bartlit pointed out that everyone on the CEWG was tainted, NMED was tainted, everyone was tainted in some fashion. He reiterated getting all the data then making a decision was the best course of action.
- Mr. Kirkpatrick agreed, especially since Mr. Shomaker would be part of a panel and as long as all sides of the issue were represented, it would not make any difference.
- There was consensus that the panel was to provide information and enable the community to ask questions and determine the credibility of the answers for themselves.

ACTION ITEMS FROM THE DISCUSSION:

1. **Mr. Littlejohn will develop a high-level brief of references to prepare the group for future discussions on water issues.**
2. **Ms Fleming will provide a citation for the 2006 Water Report.**

3. **Mr. Church will ask Mr. Shomaker for details on contractual issues associated with providing information to the CEWG.**

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS:

Citizen Protocol Update
The Protocol has been reviewed by George Shuman of the NMED Ground Water Division. He is waiting for input by the Air Quality Division before providing a combined input. The group still needs to get a legal review and Mr. Littlejohn is still exploring how that has to happen.

Permit Open House
There is an announcement of an Open House for the Intel Permit Review being held on April 3rd at the Corrales Community Center starting at 7 PM.

EPA Response Evaluation
The CEWG needs to form a small group to evaluate the EPA response and bring their results back to the larger group. There was not time to form the group at this meeting, but it is an open action.

- Mr. Bartlit offered that he had received an email from Jay Stimmel of the NMED Air Quality Bureau saying that the person that had been in charge of the Intel permit had left and that Mr. Stimmel is now filling that position. Mr. Stimmel is interested in the CEWG and wants to understand what the group does and may be interested in attending CEWG meetings in the future.

EHS Report
Sarah Chavez gave a brief synopsis of the EHS report.

- Plant status was still running a reduced rates.
- Quarterly VOC monitoring was on-going.
- Mr. Stimmel had been on-site twice already as part of the technical review of the permit.
- Mr. Bartlit asked whether it was appropriate for Mr. Stimmel to contact Intel directly (without the public present) for fear of being "tainted" in the public's mind.

Last Thoughts
Mr. Kirkpatrick suggested the group might need to look at what it was doing and evaluating whether it was working the most important issues in order to have the greatest effect.

NEXT MEETING

- Wednesday, April 18, 2007

Ongoing Agenda Items:
Future Agenda Items:

- Ongoing discussion of Citizen Protocol
- Continuing discussion of permit issues
- Continuing discussion of water issues
- Noise issues
- Panel on epidemiology & report from USATSDR
- Continued cooling tower discussion
- ISO 14,000

- Emergency response
- Thermal oxidizer maintenance
- Ads and public communications