# MEETING SUMMARY
## Community Environmental Working Group

***"Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel"***

**Date:** April 20, 2011
**Time:** 5:00–7:00 p.m.
**Location:** Corrales Senior Center

**Members Attending**

John Bartlit, Acting Chair, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water
Mike Williams, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water
Sarah Chavez, EHS Department, Intel
Thom Little, Intel
Hugh Church, American Lung Assc. of NM
Edward Pineda, Rio Rancho resident

**Non-Members Attending**

Roberta King, Corrales resident
Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident
Frank Gallegos, Intel
Jami Grindatto, Intel
Bill Davidson, Intel
Richard Elder, Corrales resident
Chris Steiner, Corrales resident
Charles Incendio, Corrales resident
Neil Butler, Corrales resident
Jeff Radford, *Corrales Comment*
Jim Tritten, STTF member and Chair
Pat Clauser, Corrales Councilor and STTF member
John Alsobrook, Corrales Councilor and STTF member
Phil Gasteyer, Mayor of Corrales
Susan Weiss, Corrales resident

**Facilitator**

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

**HANDOUTS**

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary March 16, 2011
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- April Newspaper Ad
- Intel report on EPA 114 follow-up process
- John Bartlit's commentary in the *Corrales Comment*
- Silica Testing Task Force Report—Abbreviated version

**PROPOSED AGENDA**

- Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items
- EHS Report
- Silica Testing Results
- STTF Test Report—Next Steps
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

**WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ANNUNCEMENTS, AND BRIEF ITEMS**

John Bartlit opened the meeting by stating the CEWG mission, which was to work towards continuous environmental improvements and improved community dialogue. Introductions were made.

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

John Bartlit asked if there were any comments on the agenda. Edward Pineda suggested dedicating the meeting specifically to discussing the silica testing report, and postponing the other items on the agenda, in order to give the public more time to digest the report. Stephen Littlejohn asked if any CEWG members objected to Mr. Pineda's suggestion. Thom Little said the EHS report should only take a few minutes, but he could live with postponing this item. Mr. Littlejohn reminded the public that tonight's meeting would not be the only opportunity to have a discussion or dialog about the report. He said he would send the approved, full report out to the distribution list, and after the public had time to read the report, opportunities for discussion would be made available as needed. He said the full report that he will distribute would not have the 600-page appendix attached.

Stephen Littlejohn asked the group if there was consensus on Mr. Pineda's suggestion. The group agreed with Mr. Pineda's suggestion. He also asked the public if they had any comments around changing the agenda. No one from the public commented on changing the agenda.

**CONSENSUS**: Tonight's meeting agenda would be changed as follows: Cover the Meeting Summary item and then dedicate the remainder of the meeting to the silica testing report.

Meeting Summary (March 16, 2011)—Revisions and Approval

Lynne Kinis commented on page 12, fourth bullet. She said her comment listed in this bullet was in response to a statement made by Jami Grindatto and that to understand her comment it was important to include Mr. Grindatto's statement in the Meeting Summary. CJ Ondek said she would find Mr. Grindatto's comment and send to Mr. Littlejohn.

**ACTION ITEM**: CJ Ondek will find Mr. Grindatto's comment as per above and send to Mr. Littlejohn.

Lynn Kinis also commented on page 9, the first bullet, where Jami Grindatto asked Lane Kirkpatrick what he meant by spikes, and Sarah Chavez, Thom Little, and Mr. Grindatto went on to say that Intel did not have any spikes. She said that Intel seemed to say that a spike was an unabated emission when the community called to complain. Ms. Kinis said she asked Coleman Smith for a definition of a spike, and he said that a spike was "a brief unabated emission." Therefore, Ms. Kinis said, a spike had nothing to do with whether someone complained about an odor or a reaction to an emission. Stephen Littlejohn said that the Meeting Summary needed to accurately reflect what was said in the meeting. Ms, Kinis said that what was in the Meeting Summary was accurate, but she wanted to correct the "definition" of a spike. Mr. Littlejohn said that her comment about the definition of "spike" would be recorded in the April Meeting Summary. Mr. Littlejohn asked Ms. Chavez, Mr. Little and Mr. Grindatto if they wanted to make any corrections about what they meant to say in the March Meeting Summary. They did not make any corrections.

**SILICA TESTING RESULTS**

Jim Tritten reported on the Silica Testing Task Force (STTF) efforts over the last year (see attached PowerPoint presentation).

- First Jim Tritten described the STTF's history and tasking. The CEWG approved creating the STTF at its July 21, 2010, meeting to continue with the work of the ATSDR follow-up committee, namely to: 1. Follow up on 2010 silica testing; 2. Seek approval of silica-testing and funding proposals; and 3. Hire a management agency. The CEWG delegated authority to the STTF to decide how to accomplish CEWG tasks around 2010 testing.

- Mr. Tritten said the STTF proceeded by meeting numerous times between August 13, 2010 and April 20, 2011. The STTF meetings were conducted differently than the CEWG meeting in that they elected a Chair and used *Roberts Rules of Order*. The STTF constantly provided feedback to the CEWG on the status of their efforts. The STTF approved processes for 2010 sampling, Mr. Tritten said, by actively seeking and obtaining community input, including additional citizen volunteers to observe the sampling. Sampling was conducted December 7 – 10, 2010, and citizen volunteer observers were present for all sampling events. Once the samples were completed, the STTF took custody of samples all the way to transmission to the federal government—NIOSH—for testing. Results were then sent back to the STTF and received by March 14, 2011, Mr. Tritten said. After the STTF received the results, they prepared an independent report for delivery to the CEWG on April 20, 2011

- Mr. Tritten reported the test results showed, in short, that crystalline silica was found on only one of the 20 collected stack samples from the five (5) Intel RCTO's, and the

crystalline silica levels were at 1/15,000 of CEWG provisional levels. The details of the test results were contained in a full report, which included a 600-page appendix.

- Mr. Tritten next outlined community concerns. He said that the community was concerned that Intel would have influence on the testing or analysis of results. In order to preclude this concern, the STTF had the federal government conduct analysis of the collected samples. From the time the samples were collected and packaged, Intel had nothing to do with the process. STTF consultants and the Chair prepared the initial draft report. Members of the STTF (including the Intel member) did not see the draft report until April 13, 2011. From that time on, no substance from the initial draft report was changed. There were administrative changes and clarifications, but the results were not altered. Mr. Tritten also noted that the community expressed concern that they were not involved with the report's preparation. No one outside the STTF had a role, and the release of the report to the public was not under the STTF's purview.

- Mr. Tritten said that the STTF was adjourned *sine die* or for an indefinite period. The STTF had no plan to meet again unless the CEWG sent back the report for clarification or additional information. If there were no concerns or requests, he, the STTF Chair, would resign once the CEWG made it clear that the report was accepted and satisfactory. He said he requested that the CEWG reestablish the STTF to conduct any future tasks, if warranted. He said that his resignation should be perceived as nothing other than his having lived up to his obligations as the STTF Chair for the 2010 study.

Stephen Littlejohn asked if there were any objections among the CEWG members to accept the report as complete. There were no objections.

**CONSENSUS**: The CEWG accepted the STTF crystalline silica testing report as complete.

John Bartlit proposed extending appreciation to the STTF members for their volunteer hours and considerable and conscientious work. There were no objections to Mr. Bartlit's proposal.

**CONSENSUS**: The CEWG extended appreciation to STTF members for their volunteer time and considerable work in completing silica testing and the ensuing report.

Stephen Littlejohn thanked the CEWG, the STTF, and the community members for their patience. He acknowledged the process as painstaking and cited the delays; they waited months for testing results from NIOSH. Now that the CEWG accepted the report, it could be made public, he said. Mr. Littlejohn provided copies of an abbreviated report to those present at the meeting and said he would e-mail the full report without the 600-page appendix to the

distribution list. He would place a copy of the full report with the 600-page appendix in the Corrales library. Mr. Littlejohn said that the CEWG was committed to conducting good, full public dialog on the report for as long as necessary, and that dialog would start but not stop this evening. Public dialog would continue after the public had time to digest the report. He went on to pass out copies of the abbreviated report to all in attendance.

Stephen Littlejohn said that the STTF viewed a brief PowerPoint report summary presented by Mike Williams and Kurt Parker, the two technical consultants on the report, which could be shown tonight, if the meeting attendees would like. This presentation would have more technical details. One of the reasons the CEWG asked that the results not be discussed until tonight was, in addition to that it needed to be approved, because they wanted the public to have the full context. Mike Williams agreed to make the presentation to the meeting attendees.

*Briefing of Results: Crystalline Silica Test, April 13, 2011*

Mike Williams gave a brief, more technical presentation (PowerPoint attached) on the crystalline silica testing to the audience.

- Mr. Williams referred to a graph on slide 2 of his presentation. Crystalline silica was found on only 1 of the 20 collected stack samples from the five (5) Intel RCTO's. This graph showed the CEWG provisional level, which was 1.0 $\mu g/m^3$ at fence line compared to the detected value of sampling, which equates to 0.0000177 $\mu g/m^3$ at fence line and other non-detect samples, 0.0000634$\mu g/m^3$ at fence line. The amount was 1/15,0000 the CEWG provisional level.

- Lynne Kinis asked what "fence line" referred to. Mr. Williams said the "fence line" was the highest concentration area taken from modeling previously done on stack heights.

- Edward Pineda asked about the five (5) Intel RCTO's units. Mr. Williams said he based his calculations on three (3) Munters stacks because there was modeling on the Munters stacks. The other two units were Durrs, but there was no modeling on Durrs stacks. Also, the Durrs units would be replaced by Munters units in the near future. Mr. Pineda asked that since Intel was in the process of requesting a revision to its permit to operate 17 Munters units, how would this effect the calculation. Mr. Williams said it was a mathematically proportional extrapolation—divide by 5 and multiply by 17.

- Lynne Kinis asked if any Durrs were tested, because the citizens who suffered from pulmonary fibrosis had the condition before the Munters units were installed at Intel, and when only Durrs stacks were in operation. Mr. Williams confirmed that two Durr units were tested and crystalline silica was not detected in these two units; crystalline silica was detected in one Munters unit.

- John Alsobrook commented that possible contribution from the Durr units was discussed in the body of the report, and Mr. Williams' presentation was meant to be a summary.

- Richard Elder asked if sampling were done at the fence line. Mike Williams said no, and that he took the highest concentration point in the modeling, which happened to be at the fence line, and he used this point to create dilution ratios.

- Mike Williams said that the objective of the testing was to determine the presence of crystalline silica through source testing Intel RCTO stacks, and if crystalline silica was found, then to determine if crystalline silica emissions were potentially high enough to pose a health hazard. The approach used in the testing was to conduct EPA approved stack sampling methods to collect sufficient particulate matter (PM) from RCTO exhausts to quantify emissions; use the citizen observers to ensure that the sampling was done in an unbiased, objective manner; and then to use NIOSH approved methods to analyze for crystalline silica from collected samples by X-ray diffraction (XRD) technique.

- Mike Williams next discussed the approved field measurements. The STTF developed approved methods compatible for both source and analytical labs to support collection and analyze for PM and crystalline silica; coordinated a field program to support simultaneous testing of all oxidizer stacks; sent all exposed filters to NIOSH for gravimetric (PM) and XRD (silica); and consolidated field and lab data to report results. Mr. Williams said NIOSH looked at how much particulate matter (PM) of all kinds was on the filters, and then they used an X-ray defraction (XRD) method to look specifically for silica.

- Mike Williams said sample collection and handling was done as follows: EPA sampling techniques were used by Intel contractor ERM to collect particulate matter from all 5 Durr and Munters stacks simultaneously under observation by citizens; a collaborative approach to designing the field and analytical methods was supported by NIOSH (Key-Schwartz), ATSDR (Kowalski), and ERM (Parker); ERM conducted the field sampling; and NIOSH contractors measured particulate mass and crystalline silica on the filters.

- Mike Williams said the results would be used to: determine if crystalline silica was emitted from the Intel RCTO stacks; if crystalline silica was detected, determine if the levels were significant; if levels were significant, investigate further; and if the levels were insignificant, the CEWG would change focus from the crystalline silica concerns to other areas.

- Mike Williams said to determine whether crystalline silica emissions were significant, the STTF tested for crystalline silica emissions from all oxidizer stacks; estimated the highest

crystalline silica concentrations to be expected outside the Intel fence line; and then compared the calculated crystalline silica concentrations to that of the CEWG provisional silica level of 1μg /$m^3$.

- Mike Williams explained that the model estimates from the stack heights analysis said that if you start out with 178,000 micrograms per cubic meter in the stack, which would produce 1 microgram per cubic meter at an annual average at the highest point, which in this case was the fence line.

- Mr. Williams next discussed the amount of sampling that was collected. He said they estimated that a minimum of 50μg's of sample was needed on the filter for proper detection or the labs would not be able to detect anything during the analysis. A complication encountered was that one of the samples had spots of graphite on it. Because this graphite masked some of the testing, the lab assumed a minimum of 300 micrograms would be needed on this sample. John Bartlit emphasized that NIOSH set these levels.

- Mike Williams continued that ERM sampled, on average, 289 actual $ft^3$ of stack gas for 4-continuous hour periods from each RCTO (sample volume corresponds to 8.19 $m^3$); the 50 μg's per 8.19 $m^3$ divided by the estimated 178,000:1 dilution ratio meant that we could potentially measure crystalline silica concentrations that correspond to only 0.000034 μg/$m^3$ in the community. Thom Little commented that each RCTO was sampled for 4 continuous hours and then asked about the sufficiency of that time period in regards to calculation. Mr. Williams said was 80 times over the necessary time period, plus an additional 20 times.

- Mr. Williams said that sampling came from all 5 stacks for 4 continuous hours for 4 separate test runs supporting a total of 20 stack samples. The testing supported 2 daytime (~8:00-Noon) and 2 nighttime (Midnight – 4:00AM) events on different days of the week in order to collect a variety of sampling. What they found was 19 of 20 samples were non-detects for crystalline silica; 1 sample had a positive detect of 310 micrograms of crystalline silica;1 sample had loose particles on the filter that affected the analytical limit of quantification to 300 μg/$m^3$ and was reported as non-detect (ND) for silica.

- Mr. Williams explained next how they arrived at the result, using conservative calculations. If they assumed that all the non-detect samples were just below (or at) the limit of detection, the samples would support an average of 92.5 μgs of crystalline silica. This number corresponded to 92.5 micrograms divided by 8.19 cubic meters sample size divided by 178,000=0.000063 μg/$m^3$ in the community. This number was very small, he said, approximately 1/15,000 the provisional level.

- Mr. Williams discussed how the CEWG calculated the provisional level of 1 $\mu g/m^3$. California used a safe level of 3 $\mu g/m^3$ for a larger cutoff size and a safety factor of 3. The CEWG estimated 1 $\mu g/m^3$ and used a safety factor of 10. He said the provisional level methodology was subject to review by independent toxicologist(s). The levels were based on longitudinal studies of miners in South Africa showing that health effects (silicosis) of crystalline silica exposure began at about 1 $mg/m^3$ per mining year—5 days a week, 8 hours a day, of breathing heavy while performing physically intensive labor. Mr. Williams adjusted this number for people living in the community at 7 days a week for 24 hours for a lifetime of 70 years to get about 10 $\mu g/m^3$ to produce the same damaging potential exposure to the general population. This value was adjusted by 10 to account for lack of women and children in the original data and resulted in a value of 1 $\mu g/m^3$. Mr. Williams said that a study in California found a similar number and divided by three to adjust for a non-worker population and found 3 $\mu g/m^3$ as a screening level.

Mr. Williams thus completed his presentation and the floor was open for questions.

- Jami Grindatto asked if the California study was based on an epidemiological study. Thom Little said it was based on a worker study of diatomite mining in southern California.

- Neil Butler asked if the material was heavier than air, and then asked why they used the highest point of expected exposure. Mr. Williams explained that crystalline silica was a fine particle, small enough to lodge deep in people's lungs. John Bartlit clarified there was a misunderstanding: Mr. Williams was referring to the area with the highest level of exposure and not to elevation. Mr. Williams said that elevation was incorporated into the modeling. Mr. Butler said he lived below the plant and was concerned as to whether the material was coming down the hill. Mr. Williams said that the stack functions to place emissions high enough to disburse. Crystalline silica was lighter than air because it was so much hotter; but other emissions could be heavier than air.

- Hugh Churched asked if the modeling accounted for wind variations. Mr. Williams said yes, that the modeling was based on an annual average.

- Jeff Radford asked how to handle corrections to the report. Stephen Littlejohn said corrections should be to e-mail directly to him.

- An audience member asked when silica comes through the RTOs and lands on the ground, if it remained in the same formation and if it could build up and be sent into the air again. Mike Williams said crystalline silica was finer than talcum powder, and could be disturbed by a car driving by or by wind and rainwater, but at this point it was hard to

build high concentrations. He also said that crystalline silica did not diminish over time but it became more and more diluted. He explained that silicon dioxide might be found in the community, but this was quartz whose particles were large and therefore would not lodge into the lungs. The finer particles were the ones to worry about health effects.

- An audience member asked to repeat the minimal exposure and quantity over time that created a health hazard over a lifetime. Thom Little said that the annual averages are five orders of magnitude less the provisional level--1 $\mu g/m^3$. Mr. Williams said he used an annual average in his calculation.

- Edward Pineda asked if Mr. Williams multiplied by 70 the exposure and length of time of exposure over a lifetime. Mike Williams said he had already incorporated that into his calculations. This standard assumed a lifetime at that level. How Mr. Williams calculated the numbers was in the report's appendices.

- Richard Elder asked if the detail on the model was included in the appendices. Mike Williams said it was not, but the model was identified in the report, and it was the "AER" model, which was an EPA model.

- Lynne Kinis asked if the modeling was done on 30- or 40-meter stack height. Mike Williams said it was done at 38 meters. She next asked if crystalline silica would be found in a soil sample taken at the fence line. Mr. Williams replied "yes," but it would also be found in a soil sample from his own backyard. Thom Little said that the stratigraphy of the area, which was sand, sandstone, and volcanic ash, contained crystalline silica.

- Lynne Kinis asked about multiple exposures. If she were watering plants outside, she had one exposure to the initial release. Then, when the wind kicked it up, she would get a second and third exposure. Mike Williams said that crystalline silica was diluted by the wind and deposited very slowly. The levels would have to be highly concentrated to get anything significant on the ground—referred to as the deposition velocity, which represents the effective speed at which material moves from the air above the ground to the ground.

- Lynne Kinis asked what the black material was that was detected in the sampling. Thom Little explained that during the sampling, when the contraption to take the sample was taken apart, it was done over the sample itself. Graphite ferrule was used to create a seal between two metal pieces in the contraption, so when it was unscrewed, bits and pieces of the black graphite ferrule fell into the filter. The protocol was to leave the substance where it was. When the black material fell on the sample, it inhibited the detection limit of

that one sample. In conclusion, he said, we know what the black substance was and where it came from, and it was witnessed and documented in the sampling. John Bartlit confirmed that he witnessed this event and it was documented in the shipping report. He said that the filter was very white, and the black material stood out prominently.

- Charles Incendio said Intel planned to expand production by roughly 3, and that would increase the amount of silica emissions. Mike Williams said that the amount would still be relatively small over 70 years.

- An audience member asked where the pulmonary fibrosis came from. Mike Williams said that the results did not say that Intel emissions were "safe", but that they needed to look at things other than crystalline silica. She said that the community was getting sick, and the question was "why". Mr. Williams said that there were other chemicals to look at, and the CEWG had spent a lot of times worrying about silica. John Bartlit said that the results did not end the CEWG's work; there was more to do. Mr. Williams mentioned that the ATSDR mentioned 5 chemicals that tended to be elevated in the community, and this would be a good place for the CEWG to start another investigation.

- Charles Incendio said he was told that the NMED did not test for what came out of Intel's stacks. Mike Williams replied that the NMED had a list of things that they tested for. He gave a brief background on how air pollution was regulated in the US. First they looked at epidemiological studies and then set acceptable levels from there. They only did this procedure for about 6 pollutants and the process took at least 5 years for one pollutant. So with ten thousand chemicals, it would take forever to complete each one, Mr. Williams said. What the EPA chose to do instead was to tell industry to control at least 90 percent of potentially hazardous pollutants.

- Sarah Chavez confirmed that NMED did not do the testing themselves, but they required testing in the permit, and industries had to test themselves. Intel hired a contractor to conduct testing, and its permit specified what testing to do. She said that Intel had been testing on the thermal oxidizer stacks and the scrubbers and reporting the results to NMED since the permit was issued in 2000. While the CEWG focused on one particular chemical, the Intel permit required extensive testing on multiple chemicals. She said that for the thermal oxidizer stacks, they tested for all the VOCs. They typically saw one or two individual VOCs above the detectable level—ethyl lactate and methanol. Ms. Chavez went on to say that Intel used 20-30 volatile organic compounds at the site, and these were listed in the permit. When Intel tested, they look for all the compounds.

- A member of the audience commented that she learned at an NMED meeting they would have to work through the government to change the permit. She next asked at what temperature the Durrs units operated. Sarah Chavez responded 1365 degrees. The

audience member said that people were getting sick before the Munters units were operating at higher temperatures. She said it was important to look at other possibilities that made people ill.

- Hugh Church gave a definition of pulmonary fibrosis. When it was known to be caused by silica, it was referred to as silicosis.

- Richard Elder asked what caused the crystalline silica to come out of stacks. He recalled reading something about high temperatures being problematic. Sarah Chavez said Intel used a chemical called hexamethyldisiloxane in the manufacturing process, and when the temperature reached a known degree, crystalline silica would form. Thom Little said two types of silica could form: amorphous silica, which was like glass, and crystalline silica. Mr. Elder asked how close to that temperature Intel's stacks ran. Mr. Little said the temperature was somewhere in the 1400s, and Intel ran the stacks at 1380-1385. He went on to explain that crystalline silica could also form during the cooling process. Intel had a 3 second residence time, where the silica vapor blew through the hot part of the chamber. Mr. Little said both the operating temperature and residence time were below the amounts needed to form crystalline silica. Mr. Elder asked how often the units operated at higher than 1385. Mr. Little said that Intel operated the units according to the manufacturers recommendations, and the system automatically shut down when the temperature increased. He said Intel has shown the temperature profile over six months to some observers who requested it.

- Edward Pineda asked how temperatures were controlled. Sarah Chavez said it was recorded electronically and continuously. Mr. Pineda asked for a copy of the temperature chart during the testing period. Ms. Chavez agreed to get that information for the CEWG.

  **ACTION ITEM**: Sarah Chavez would provide a copy of the temperature chart during the silica testing period to the CEWG.

- Mike Williams said hot spots occurred in some combustion processes, and he asked whether Intel had temperature fluctuations. Sarah Chavez and Thom Little said they would have to look for that information—a volume of temperature sensor and evidence of homogeneity in combustion.

  **ACTION ITEM**: Thom Little said he would provide to the CEWG the volume of temperature sensor and evidence of homogeneity in combustion.

Stephen Littlejohn checked if the group wanted to further discuss the report, and said they should plan to continue the discussion at the next CEWG meeting.

- Edward Pineda requested that public dialog occur before April 27th, which was before the April 28th deadline for submitting comments to NMED on Intel's permit. Sarah Chavez said there was little significance between the silica testing report and Intel's current permitting process. Mr. Pineda said it was important to give the public fair and equitable time for dialog. Mr. Littlejohn said there was no question that the public dialog would continue, the issue was whether to schedule a dialog at the next CEWG meeting or prior to April 28. Thom Little said he would do whatever people wanted to do.

- Edward Pineda divided his proposal into two parts: 1. To continue the public dialog after the public had time to digest the report, and 2. To attempt to schedule a dialog before April 28. Stephen Littlejohn asked if any CEWG members objected to further dialogue. No one objected.

**CONSENSUS**: The CEWG would provide opportunities for more public dialog around the silica testing report.

Mr. Littlejohn next tested consensus on setting a meeting before April 28. Mike Williams objected.

- Roberta King spoke to the to timing of the 28th. She said it was Easter, Passover, and spring break, and therefore an imposition to set up a meeting expecting the public to attend before the 28th. She did not think many community members would come.

- Sarah Chavez said the permit contained particulate matter modeled at significantly higher levels than what was seen in the report. NMED could not do anything about the silica testing results in regards to the permit because it was regulating total particulate matter. She said that wasn't to say that the public could not provide comments to the NMED, but NMED was bound to regulate total particulate matter in the permit according to state and federal regulations.

- Stephen Littlejohn said it appeared they did not have consensus to hold a meeting before April 28th. Mr. Littlejohn said that two processes needed to happen. The first was to hold the next public dialog around the silica testing report, and the second was to hold a dialog on CEWG's next steps, which hopefully the public will contribute to.

Stephen Littlejohn summarized that there was grave concern about silica in the community, and the ATSDR identified silica as a concern. He said that a parallel process was the development of the Citizens Protocol, which was a way to get data everyone could trust. The CEWG spent a lot of time developing the Citizens Protocol, and silica testing was an opportunity to test the Citizens Protocol. Ways to build trust in the data were to have a citizens' body manage the process (the

STTF), have an independent lab doing the analysis, and have observers witness collecting the samples. The hope was that the report was trustworthy. He said the CEWG welcomed suggestions for dialog on any additional concerns the public had. John Bartlit added that the dilemma was that everyone wanted more and more detail, and to move faster and faster to get it. However, it took time to get detailed information.

- An audience member said one of the chemicals being emitted had to be the culprit behind people falling ill. Sarah Chavez responded that was what the CEWG was looking for and talking about since 2004.

- Roberta King asked about how to access the report. Stephen Littlejohn said he would e-mail the full report without the appendices to the distribution list, and the full report plus the appendices would be available at the Corrales library. The report and appendices would most likely go on the Web site, but the CEWG needed to make that decision.

- Edward Pineda asked that a full copy of the report be made available at both Rio Rancho libraries. Thom Little said he was happy to place full copies of the reports in the two Rio Rancho libraries and the Corrales library.

- Mike Williams said the CEWG was trying to find ways to reduce emissions, and they had some progress. He said it was very hard to find out what caused health problems, but in the meantime they worked to try to continuously reduce emissions.

**MEETING ADJOURNED**

**NEXT MEETING**
May 20, 2011, 5 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.

**DECISIONS:**

1. Tonight's meeting agenda would be changed as follows: Cover the Meeting Summary item and then dedicate the remainder of the meeting to the silica testing report.

2. The CEWG accepted the STTF crystalline silica testing report as complete.

3. The CEWG extended appreciation to STTF members for their volunteer time and considerable work in completing silica testing and the ensuing report.

4. The CEWG would provide opportunities for more public dialog around the silica testing report.