

MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: August 19, 2009
Time: 5:00-7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Senior Center

Members Attending

John Bartlit, Acting Chair	Hugh Church, American Lung Association
Sarah Chavez, EHS Department, Intel	Frank Gallegos, Intel
Mike Williams, NM Clean Air & Water	Edward Pineda, Rio Rancho

Public

Roberta King, Corrales resident	Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident
Judy Hemphill, Corrales resident	

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator, DLI Communication Consultants; CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary July 15, 2009
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- August newspaper ad
- Draft letter regarding hazardous waste violations
- Priority topics—status report
- Attempted panel on NMED and public engagement
- Alternative Draft Letter Regarding Hazardous Waste Management Regulations

AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements
- Short Report to the Community
- CEWG Materials and Web site
- Draft Letter on Hazardous Waste Violations
- Baseline Modeling
- CEWG Priorities Status Report and Discussion
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_8-19-09 v 3	Approved: 9-16-09
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn	
Prepared for: CEWG	
Date prepared or presented: September 9, 2009	

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

John Bartlit opened the meeting by stating the CEWG mission, which is to work towards environmental improvements and improved community dialogue. Introductions were made. Mr. Bartlit asked if there were any changes to the agenda items.

Stephen Littlejohn asked Frank Gallegos to give a quick status report on the CEWG budget. Mr. Gallegos reported that travel dollars would be reinstated immediately, and it looked favorable for Intel's increasing the CEWG budget for next year. Currently, Intel was in the process of finalizing budgets, and he would know whether it was approved in a couple of weeks. Mr. Littlejohn asked about the possibility of increasing the budget to cover unfacilitated meetings for the remainder of 2009. Mr. Gallegos asked if they could discuss the issue in more detail. Mr. Littlejohn moved this agenda item to the end of the meeting for further discussion.

Meeting Summary—Revisions and Approval

- Lynne Kinis commented on Frank Gallegos's statement on page 5—first bullet—in the July Meeting Summary: “Mr. Gallegos said that although the vendor made the errors, it was Intel's responsibility to make sure the process was followed correctly and they would take responsibility for it.” Ms. Kinis said that this line corresponded with comments she made repeatedly in the past, that there had to be accountability within the Intel factory and not just with the outside vendor. Ms. Kinis made an umbrella statement: there should be a chain of command set up within Intel to automatically supervise outside vendors to ensure they followed procedures, and this Intel staff person should act “just like a boss” to outside vendors.
- Ms. Kinis referred to a comment on page 7 in the July Meeting Summary, by Edward Pineda, about endangering workers in the community. She said she was led to believe that lids on chemical containers might have been askew. Frank Gallegos said that the violation was for an open cardboard box of used light bulbs and not for open chemical containers. Ms. Kinis referred to the July Meeting Summary page 8/9, where Mr. Gallegos commented, “In addition they continued to attempt to identify other sources for the odor, such as not capping drum containers,” and said she thought she had heard this previously.
- Lynne Kinis requested that when the group talks about complaints and odors in the future, they refer to it as “odor and air quality” because it's not just the “odor.” The morning of August 19 she was outside and smelled an odor; the air quality was acidic, debilitating, and irritating to her air passages. She immediately had to run inside for relief. Stephen Littlejohn asked the group if he should add “air quality” to “odor” on the July Meeting Summary. Hugh Church suggested using “contaminant.” John Bartlit proposed using “chemical.” Edward Pineda said that meeting summaries should reflect exactly what was discussed during the particular meeting, so the term should come as new business in the August Meeting Summary. Mr. Littlejohn asked that the August Meeting Summary

specifically stipulate adding a qualifier to “odor” in future meeting summaries. There were several suggestions: “chemical,” “air quality,” “contaminant,” and “pollutant.” He asked the group their preference. Mike Williams preferred “contaminant” because H₂O or CO₂ were chemicals, whereas “contaminant” suggested negative effects. “Pollutant” meant that it was above health levels, and they didn’t know the levels yet. A contaminant might or might not be a pollutant. The group agreed to adding the qualifier “contaminant” and writing it using a “slash” (/), which indicated either/or or both. Specifically, it would be written as follow: odor/contaminant complaint. Therefore, all CEWG meeting attendees, Stephen Littlejohn and CJ Ondek will use the qualifier “contaminant” when discussing odor/contaminant complaints.

Announcements

There weren’t any announcements.

Report on Monitoring Station

Hugh Church said he did not know any new information about the monitoring station, but he created a Google Earth map, which he passed around, showing the possible locations. He said the Southern Sandoval County Flood Control Authority had a piece of land on which a 10-meter tower could be placed.

John Bartlit asked if Roberta King had communicated with the Corrales mayor’s office. Ms. King responded that she had e-mailed the mayor and others about location, and they suggested she consult with the director of SSCAFCA (Southern Sandoval County Arroyo Flood Authority), since SSCAFCA was a potential location. Mr. Bartlit commented that the issue was bogged down because of confusion at NMED and the mayor’s office. Mr. Church reminded the group that the EPA ordered moving the tower. Ms. King said that Terry Hertel at NMED replied to her email that “he would carry the ball on it” and supposedly contacted the mayor who turned him over to SSCAFCA. Mr. Bartlit asked the group what action they should take. Stephen Littlejohn recommended tagging the question to the last half hour of the meeting and discussing it then.

Update on the Community Complaint Task Force

Frank Gallegos said that they were continuing to look at 1-heptanethiol, and its odor threshold was in the parts per trillion—it could be detected by odor. They also continued to look at pH adjustment. He visited the wastewater treatment plant, and they showed him how they handled low odor threshold compounds due to neighbor complaints. So, they were looking into increasing the scrubber pH, but because the odor threshold was so low, they were trying to identify other sources. Mr. Gallegos said they increased the CUB scrubbers pH to 10, which has helped. Roberta King asked if they planned to increase it to 11. Sarah Chavez said that they had to make sure that the scrubbers were treating all the pollutants effectively and had to take into consideration manufacturer’s recommendations. Mr. Gallegos said that Intel engineers were working with the manufacturer in the process.

Edward Pineda reported that some neighbors had complained about the night odors, noise and, in some cases, visible fumes from certain stacks—the effects from ramping up production—and asked if Intel would consider warning the community about ramp-up times. Stephen Littlejohn said that “ramp-up warning” should be added to the agenda to discuss in more detail later.”

Update on ATSDR/UNM Public Health Presentation

Stephen Littlejohn said he downloaded from iTunes Luli’s ATSDR presentation to UNM doctors but had trouble e-mailing it. Instead, he copied it onto a CD and brought it to Sarah Chavez to place it onto the CEWG Web site. The presentation was in audio/video format and in a MP3 file. Ms. Chavez said she would figure out how to put it on the Web site so it would be available to everyone and list instructions on how to view it. The particular presentation was tailored to UNM doctors and more detailed than what was presented to CEWG.

ACTION ITEM: Sarah Chavez will try to place the presentation or a link to it on the CEWG Web site along with instructions to access it, if necessary.

Public Comment

Susan Weiss, a resident of Corrales who walks the area east of Corrales on a regular basis, made a brief appearance at the beginning of the meeting to leave copies of her reports to Intel of odors smelled, the physiological effects on her body, and the ways in which irregular wind patterns change the flow of the emissions along the many paths she walks in the area. Stephen will deliver this by email to appropriate personnel at the NMED and will distribute the document to those present at this CEWG meeting.

DISTRIBUTION OF SHORT REPORT TO THE COMMUNITY

John Bartlit asked the group how they wanted to distribute the CEWG Short Report that was approved in July. Edward Pineda suggested placing it the CEWG Web site, since that was done in the past. Stephen Littlejohn said that the options were to put it on the Web site, send it to the distribution list, or publish it as an advertisement in the newspaper, which costs money. Roberta King said that the draft she had downloaded said “not approved.” Mr. Littlejohn said it must have been his oversight and he would fix it and remove the word “draft” and check “approved.” Ms. Kings also said the print was so tiny she couldn’t read it nor could she increase the font size. Mr. Littlejohn said he would get her a copy she could read. Ms. King said the version on the Web site also should be readable.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Stephen Littlejohn will ensure the “approved” version of the Short Report is marked “approved” in the footer and the word “draft” is removed.
- Stephen Littlejohn will send Roberta King a version of the final approved Short Report that she could read in a Word format.

Stephen Littlejohn asked the group if they wanted to distribute the report any other way besides the Web site. The group agreed that the document should be sent to the enlarged list with

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_8-19-09 v 3

Approved: 9-15-09

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: September 9, 2009

“approved” marked on it. Mr. Bartlit said taking out an ad might not be appropriate in tough economic times. Everyone agreed; consensus was reached.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Stephen Littlejohn will send the “approved” version of the Short Report to the enlarged list.
- Sarah Chavez will place the Short Report on the CEWG Web site.

CEWG MATERIALS AND WEBSITE

Stephen Littlejohn said this segment was informational, and if the group wanted to discuss the item in detail it could be added to a future agenda. The purpose of the presentation was to provide the group with documentation on the process behind creating and posting the meeting summaries and other meeting materials.

Stephen Littlejohn explained that, from her meeting notes, CJ Ondek created draft 1 of the meeting summary and sent it to Mr. Littlejohn by Monday or Tuesday of the following week. Mr. Littlejohn then went over draft 1 and made changes to produce draft 2, which he sent to all meeting attendees (as per a previous group agreement) to review and return to him with comments by a specified deadline. He also sent the Action Item Report and Ad Draft at that time.

Stephen Littlejohn’s philosophy is that a meeting summary should state what the person meant to say so everyone should have a chance to make corrections or clarifications. He also invites members to clarify technical comments and to review for accuracy. He integrates virtually all changes returned to him. Since requested changes were sent to the whole list, group members had the opportunity to object to a change. The usual changes requested were spelling and grammar errors, incorrect names, technical corrections and statement clarifications. Incorporated changes produced draft 3, which is handed out at the meeting for final modification and approval. Within days after the meeting, Mr. Littlejohn next changes the footer to version number 4 and changes the status to “approved.” He told the group that if he forgot this part of the process, they “should call me on it.” Anything that was officially part of a meeting summary, for example, a presentation delivered and discussed at the meeting, became an attachment to that meeting summary since it was part of what was discussed. He e-mailed the meeting summary with attachments to Sarah Chavez.

Sarah Chavez described the process for posting material to the CEWG Web site. An outside contractor maintains the CEWG Web site, and Sarah has to fill out a form to ensure the documents meet certain formatting criteria. All information placed on the CEWG Web site must be in a PDF document format, for example, and headers and titles have to be formatted specifically. Ms. Chavez takes the documents e-mailed by Mr. Littlejohn, creates PDF files when necessary, and then submits the form about the posting to a database. The contractor reviews the form and the documents for proper formatting, makes sure particular fields are filled out in the proper section, and posts them according to Ms. Chavez’s direction. The contractor

never reviews for content and never denies posting a document. Short reports, brief biographies of CEWG members, meeting summaries and presentations made at meetings should be posted to the Web site and filed under categories/section headers in alphabetical order.

- Roberta King said it was important for dates to be listed on documents. Sarah Chavez said that they did not modify documents to include dates. Mr. Littlejohn said that basic information footers—who, what, when information—could not be added to PowerPoint presentations because PowerPoint lacked the capacity to use footers. He suggested everyone in the group agree to put their names and the date on every document they created.
- John Bartlit asked the group if they thought there should be a formal approval process for posting documents to the Web site. Stephen Littlejohn said that any document listed in the meeting summary should go on the Web site. Edward Pineda suggested that the group create parameters around what documents to post on the Web site, for example, only post documents that were fully presented and discussed at a CEWG meeting. Other documents could go into a “background information” category. Sarah Chavez said that during the unfacilitated meetings, information was presented and discussed but there were no official records of comments.
- Mr. Bartlit said that the main difference between the facilitated and unfacilitated meetings was the meeting summary. While the previous unfacilitated meeting was orderly, the meeting summary was noticeably absent.
- Mr. Littlejohn asked the group if they wanted to place this item on a future agenda for further discussion. Mr. Bartlit said he thought the current discussion was sufficient. Mr. Littlejohn said that anyone wanting to discuss the matter in the future let him or Mr. Bartlit know and it will be placed on the agenda.

DRAFT LETTER ON HAZARDOUS WASTE VIOLATIONS

John Bartlit drafted a letter to Intel regarding their recent hazardous waste violations. He sent a first draft to Stephen Littlejohn, who forwarded the draft to meeting attendees for feedback, and the comments he received in response were that the letter was not clear in its meaning, the amount of risk involved, the extent of the violations, and how to characterize the violations and their seriousness and hazard levels. Mr. Bartlit said from that feedback he wrote draft 2—or an alternative draft. The main differences between the two drafts were that the alternative draft did not characterize the violations but stated that regulations had an environmental purpose and described the violations. Draft 2 also said that all interested parties desired to have no violations, and because violations were reported, there was a need for improved processes within Intel, and the violations raised distrust of Intel in the community. He believed that the alternative draft was stronger because it exerted more pressure on Intel to look at processes for reducing violations. The alternative draft put the focus on reducing violations rather than on characterizing the

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_8-19-09 v 3
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
Prepared for: CEWG
Date prepared or presented: September 9, 2009

Approved: 9-15-09

violations. The focus was on the main point—reducing violations. Stephen Littlejohn said the group had to consider two questions: 1. Should CEWG send the letter? 2. If so, which draft should CEWG send?

- Edward Pineda recommended sending the letter and preferred the alternative draft. He said that the year was missing in the first paragraph and asked to have the year listed in the letter. Mr. Pineda said the CEWG ought to send the letter so they don't appear to be "Intel's monkey." He said he felt responsible to protect the environment and community residents, and CEWG should communicate to Intel their concern about the violations rather than ignore it. The alternative letter expressed concern without prescribing to Intel what to do about the violations. Mr. Littlejohn said that for Mr. Pineda, the issue was community trust and confidence in the CEWG. Mr. Pineda agreed.
- Mike Williams agreed with sending the letter but felt suggesting "training" might have a counterproductive effect since, in performance studies, skill-based employees who were forced to follow rule-based processes usually ended up making more errors. He thought it would be more productive to suggest to Intel to investigate ways to reduce errors by improving the system and to leave off the training part in the letter. Frank Gallegos said that employees and vendors needed training on how to properly store hazardous wastes. Mr. Bartlit suggested using the term "other means" instead of training.
- Edward Pineda said that he trusted Intel knew how to manage procedures and operations and they would know how to improve the situation. John Bartlit said that Intel didn't know it perfectly because no one knew it perfectly; it was impossible to train people not to make any errors. Mike Williams said that the system needed to be as error free as possible.
- Mr. Williams suggested the following: "Intel look into methods of mitigating or making errors less likely." Mr. Littlejohn asked Frank Gallegos if it was fair to say that Intel looked into ways to mitigate errors. Mr. Gallegos said yes. Mr. Littlejohn asked if it were accurate to say "training and other means." Sarah Chavez suggested putting something about training in the last paragraph that lists CEWG recommendations rather than in the paragraph that lists what Intel is doing.
- Lynne Kinis said that accountability applied in this situation. As a teacher, she was held accountable for everything she did by "higher ups." She wanted to know if there were training at Intel, then who was conducting the checks and balances? It was not a question of the trained person doing the job, it was a question of proper supervising and having a system of checks and balances.
- Judy Hemphill asked about Intel's quality assurance system. Frank Gallegos said that they used ISO 14001 (International Standards Organization) and OSHAS 18001 (Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series), and applied it in regards to the violations. Intel

identified the root cause and prescribed corrective action, and worked with the vendor and their management to make sure they investigated and followed up. Intel proliferated the lesson to other sites so they were aware of the requirements. John Bartlit suggested specifically referring to “14001” in the letter.

- Stephen Littlejohn tested the revised paragraph: “...Intel has quality assurance programs such as 14001 for their workers and outside waste handlers...that these violations occur says there’s still room for improvement in the programs.” Mr. Littlejohn said the sentence didn’t mention trainings but mentioned quality assurance programs, and asked if the revision worked. People agreed.
- Roberta King said she did not believe there was sufficient supervision to know the behavior behind the violations. She felt it was a matter of education to make sure things were handled correctly. Hugh Church called it “promoting awareness.” Mr. Littlejohn asked if anyone could think of a way to clarify that point in the draft.
- John Bartlit proposed that Mr. Littlejohn take all the group’s comments and revise the paragraph “We realize that Intel has the goal of zero violations...” in the alternative draft and then send out the revision to the group for their approval. The group agreed with sending the revised alternative letter and with having Mr. Littlejohn draft the last paragraph by next week. He needed to include something about oversight, accountability and prevention, and the date.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will revise the alternative letter as discussed and send out to the group for their final approval with a deadline of one week.

BASELINE MODELING

Mike Williams introduced this topic by saying baseline modeling could be used to measure whether continuous improvements in emissions were being made. The best tool to track that would be looking at modeling concentrations in real emissions.

- John Bartlit reminded the group that modeling emissions were created for worst-case scenario, in contrast to real emissions. Sarah Chavez said for a general permit modeling, which considered NOX, CO2, SO2, combustion of natural gas, it was a worst-case scenario because it assumed all equipment were running all the time at the same time. “Baseline modeling” would need to be defined. Mr. Bartlit said it was permit modeling vs. real modeling,
- Mike Williams said it was important to do fine particle modeling (2.5 um diameter, PM 2.5) as well as to model representative pollutants from the thermal oxidizers or scrubbers, which would help arrive at the transformation between what came out of the stack and what people breathed. He also said it was important to use a consistent modeling system to capture trends, since trend lines told what improved in the community.

- Edward Pineda asked if Intel could provide a write up on what modeling they were required to do, which might help decide what other kinds of modeling were needed. He agreed that CEWG needed to know whether or not they were doing enough with reducing concentrations. Mike Williams said the other question to consider was how to capture 1-heptanethiol; learning emission results and transfer coefficients would be helpful.
- Sarah Chavez said she understood why they were discussing the topic but to pursue it they needed to decide on what “baseline” meant. Starting with permit modeling would not be appropriate. To see what improvements were made, many technical points needed to be decided upon to set a baseline. The inputs would have to be decided and agreed upon as well as the cost involved—and modeling could get costly. Mike Williams said that was why he suggested using fine point particle modeling. Ms. Chavez said that wasn’t a valid baseline because it assumed worst-case scenario. To move forward with doing baseline modeling, technical and economic issues needed to be discussed in detail.

This topic will be continued in the future.

CEWG PRIORITIES STATUS REPORT AND DISCUSSION

Stephen Littlejohn brought the group’s attention to the handout “CEWG Topics Status Report”. The purpose of this agenda item was to revisit the brainstormed and prioritized topic list. From a facilitator’s point of view, the list was very useful because it helped inform setting the monthly meeting agendas. Mr. Littlejohn went through the handout and presented a history of the group’s addressing the topics by priority category. He asked the group whether or not they wanted to go through another prioritizing process in the fall or to stick with what was on the current list.

- John Bartlit said that there were plenty of topics on the list to address so he did not see a reason to reprioritize. Mike Williams said one item missing from the list was the 1-heptanethiol issue. Mr. Littlejohn said that topic came as a subtopic under the community odor/contaminant complaint response process. Everyone agreed to put this topic/subtopic in the first group of priorities.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will add 1-heptanethiol as a subtopic under the community odor/contaminant complaint response process.

EHS REPORT

Sarah Chavez apologized for the EHS report not going out with the meeting materials. She then gave the report. Q’3 VOC permit testing began on thermal oxidizers. More construction activity was happening around the CUB building, since Intel planned on expanding the building.

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_8-19-09 v 3	Approved: 9-15-09
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn	
Prepared for: CEWG	
Date prepared or presented: September 9, 2009	

- John Bartlit asked if there were unusual amounts of herbicide or pesticide activity. Ms. Chavez said no. Ms. Chavez went through information requested by or provided to regulatory agencies. Intel did an administrative permit revision about installing new emergency generators and making name changes on the permits.
- Mr. Littlejohn asked Ms. Chavez, since they did not have the chance to read through the report before the meeting, if there was anything in particular that would concern CEWG. Ms. Chavez said no, not on the first page.
- Edward Pineda asked what kind of “line” was going to be installed on the third item in “Site Events.” Ms. Chavez replied it was “electrical,” and she would add this to the EHS report and re-send it to Mr. Littlejohn. Mr. Pineda asked about the emergency generators and if it would change average annual limits. Ms. Chavez said that emergency generators were exempt from permitting and did not count toward annual limit. Specific permit language said that as long as they operated less than 500 hours a year the emission limit was not changed. Lynne Kinis asked if the two downtimes reported on page 11 in the July Meeting Summary were in July’s EHS report. Ms. Chavez said yes.

Frank Gallegos explained how the complaint report was compiled. When security was notified by someone in the community, they called ERT (Emergency Response Team), who did a site investigation, and checked additional areas to see if anything was out of the ordinary. Mr. Gallegos said he reviewed information from ERT and security reports to create the report to CEWG. He next went through each complaint. The peak in calls occurred around the August 7-8, and many of the complaints were about a skunk, chemical or burnt hydraulic odor. On the first call on August 7, ERT investigated the site and did not identify any odors. They checked the units and everything was operational. NMED requested Intel send them information on wind direction or if anything unusual was occurring at the time of the call. The next call on August 7, ERT investigated and identified a skunk odor. No unusual activities or operations were reported. On August 8, ERT investigated the complaint. A strong sulfur odor was found in a neighboring cemetery parking lot. No unusual activities or operations were reported. On August 10, ERT investigated a skunk odor report. No unusual activities or operations were reported.

- John Bartlit asked Mr. Gallegos if he told ERT that the chemical “skunk odor” was a “skunk odor,” and that instead they may be thinking something that smelled like a skunk. Mr. Gallegos said that ERT said it was more of a natural smell. Mr. Bartlit said there was no difference—you could not distinguish between the two because an odor from a skunk was also chemical.
- Judy Hemphill said she experienced odors on August 8, 10 and 12 at 3:00 am. She noticed it while she was in bed on the 12th, but on the 8th and 10th she did not notice it until she stood up. The odor was at a higher level. The odor was different than before, kind of like an acidic hot metal and burnt coffee smell.

- Hugh Church asked what the odor from meth labs smelled like. He suggested the meth lab activity might be related to the smell. Edward Pineda suggested having trained dogs track meth lab odors in the neighborhood.

Frank Gallegos continued his odor/contaminant complaint report. ERT picked up some odors from the wastewater treatment plant and crematorium.

- Judy Hemphill asked Mr. Gallegos if there were any other complaints this week, because the complaints were in clusters. Mr. Gallegos thought there was one more complaint this week, which he would add in to the report. Lynne Kinis asked how many people phoned in the cluster. Mr. Gallegos said he talked to 3. Lynne Kinis said she did not call about the odor she experience that morning and asked Mr. Gallegos to add it to the report. Ms. Hemphill said she was on the road often the last month, so she wasn't often home. The smell tended to come into her home via the exhaust fan.
- Lynne Kinis reiterated that Intel staff could walk the site and not pick up the odor since the odor would have been blown down into the community. Ms. Kinis said, in regard to the meth lab possibility, Susan Weiss smelled the odor in her home, which was in a different neighborhood.
- Stephen Littlejohn brought the group's attention to the Action Item Progress Report number 5, and asked if field tests were still occurring and whether or not they should keep that point on the list. Ms. Kinis said it was ongoing and to keep it on the list. Everyone agreed.
- Roberta King said she had an air conditioner and sometimes she smells a skunk outside, which means there's a leak in her air conditioning system. Sometimes she got a burnt coffee smell, also.
- Lynne Kinis said the odor this morning gave her an instant headache, along with a burning sensation, which took a while for it to go away,
- Judy Hemphill asked if the CUB action was closed. She said she hadn't smelled the odor affiliated with that operation in a long time—that it had improved “tremendously.”
- Stephen Littlejohn summarized that action on this item would continue into the future. Two new agenda items would be put on the agenda for next month: 1. Unfacilitated meetings; 2. Status of the monitoring station. Littlejohn asked Edward Pineda if his suggestion of a production-increase warning could be discussed as part of the larger odor/contaminant discussion, and Pineda agreed.

- Hugh Church said he would call Terry Hertel at the Air Quality Bureau to follow up on monitoring station action. John Bartlit asked if anyone could call the mayor of Corrales. Roberta King said that the mayor said SCAFCA property was a potential location, and it was out of his jurisdiction.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING

September 16, 2009, 5 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_8-19-09 v 3
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
Prepared for: CEWG
Date prepared or presented: September 9, 2009

Approved: 9-15-09