MEETING SUMMARY
Community Environmental Working Group

"Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel"

Date: May 18, 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
Lane Kirkpatrick, Corrales Resident
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
Jeff Radford, *Corrales Comment*
Kathleen Oweegan, Interested citizen
Bill Davidson, Intel
Jane Dahlgren, Corrales resident
Frank Gallegos, Intel
Joyce and Eric Cameron, Corrales residents
Jim Covallen, Corrales resident
Phil Gasteyer, Mayor of Corrales

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator
CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary April 20, 2011
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- April Newspaper Ad
- Intel report on EPA 114 follow-up process
- STTF Report
- Various newspaper articles
- NM Dept. of Health paper: "Investigation of Pulmonary Fibrosis in Corrales, New Mexico: 2010—2011"
- Draft cover letter for STTF report
- E-mail from John Bartlit with proposals for increased access to the silica testing information and consideration and discussion of it.

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

Stephen Littlejohn commented on the agenda. He said the CEWG had a tradition of finishing exactly at 7:00 pm, and he had been strict on adhering to that schedule. He said that if anyone anticipated the meeting going beyond 7:00 pm, the possibility of extending the meeting a few minutes could be discussed as an agenda item.

Lane Kirkpatrick asked if the state's report on pulmonary fibrosis could be discussed at tonight's meeting. Stephen Littlejohn said he was tracking new topics and added it to the new topic list.

Edward Pineda said he noticed that only 30 minutes had been designated for public dialogue on crystalline silica testing, and recommended extending the meeting by 15 minutes, if needed. Stephen Littlejohn asked if anyone objected to this proposal. No one objected, but Thom Little asked that the extension not be longer than 15 minutes.

CONSENSUS: Tonight's meeting would be extended by 15 minutes, if needed.

Meeting Summary (April 20, 2011)—Revisions and Approval

No comments.

Summary of STTF Report Distribution to Date

Stephen Littlejohn summarized the distribution of the STTF report. He said that he had e-mailed the complete report without the appendices to the distribution list. Several people had requested the full report with appendices, which he then burned on to a CD and snail-mailed the same day. He also sent two copies to the *Rio Rancho Observer*. Thom Little distributed two paper copies to the Corrales Library; two paper copies to the Rio Rancho Library; and one copy each to ATSDR, NIOSH, and NMED. The full report with appendices was also available on the CEWG Web site. Individuals could also contact Mr. Littlejohn for electronic versions of the report.

- Thom Little said that the head librarian at the Rio Rancho Library would only keep the report on the shelf for 60 days, after which she would take it down and possibly recycle it. The librarian at the Corrales Library said after 60 days she would take it off the shelf and archive it.

- Roberta King asked if she would be able to download and print the report from the Web site. Mr. Little replied "yes" and that all the documents on the Web site should be in a printable format. He said to inform him if there were any problems printing a document and he would fix it. He said the report file was about 13 mgs and could only be downloaded as a whole report. If anyone wanted the report in sections, they needed to get it in CD format.

- Lane Kirkpatrick said he respected Mike Williams' work on the testing report, and there was a lot to learn from it. He said they ought to look at the implications of the report relative to what silica emissions might have been in the past. He said he realized that there was no way to resurrect history, but they might be able to learn something from this kind of analysis. Stephen Littlejohn said he would add Mr. Kirkpatrick's suggestion to "next steps" on the agenda.

- Jeff Radford suggested making corrections to the report before distributing any more copies. Stephen Littlejohn asked Mr. Radford to send him any corrections he would like made, and he would do another printing with the corrections. Until then, he would create an addendum sheet with the corrections. Edward Pineda recommended an editorial expert or a subcommittee of two people check any editorial changes to ensure accuracy.

Tracking New and Additional Topics

Stephen Littlejohn said every year the CEWG prioritized all potential discussion topics. This evening he would track all topics that came up related to silica testing to add to the discussion topic list.

Other Announcements/ Public Comment

Edward Pineda congratulated Jeff Radford for receiving an award for his reporting on Intel emissions and crystalline silica testing. John Bartlit added that Mr. Radford's journalism contributed to the recent crystalline silica testing , and he appreciated that Mr. Radford publicized the value of NIOSH,

John Bartlit commented that, with the crystalline silica testing, the CEWG was attempting to perfect a testing process to get results that everyone could agree on, and then move forward with conducting more testing to achieve more improvements. The more time spent on the past, the longer it would take to move forward with new testing. He reminded that the CEWG's goal was to reduce emissions and then conduct testing on chemicals that have not been tested in the past.

EHS REPORT
Thom Little said one individual called Intel to complain about an odor. He said that Intel personnel checked the equipment, which was running as per specifications. Next engineers checked the stacks on the roof for irregularities but none were found. Mr. Little noted that there was little to report on this month's EHS report with respect to downtime. Edward Pineda asked Mr.. Little to add a footnote at the bottom that spelled out acronyms. Mr. Little said that ABCWUA is the acronym for the water authority. Thom Little and Sarah Chavez agreed to provide a glossary of acronyms with each report.

Lynne Kinis asked if the stacks were at 40 meters yet. Mr. Little responded that construction was underway and should be completed this summer. Ms. Kinis asked if Intel could provide a progress report, since, originally, construction was supposed to be completed by June. Mr. Little agreed.

ACTION REPORT: Thom Little will provide a progress report on construction to raise stack heights.

SILICA TESTING RESULTS: CONTINUED PUBLIC DIALOGUE
Stephen Littlejohn opened the floor for comments.

- John Bartlit referenced an e-mail he sent with several ideas for increasing ease of access to the silica test reports He said he noticed that an article on silica testing in the *Rio Rancho Observer* was opposite in tone and nature from an article on the same issue in the *Corrales Comment*. He said that not only were they extremely different but both articles left out elements of the report that were important to the report and its results. For example, he said both articles omitted the fact that the results would determine whether the CEWG would conduct more crystalline silica testing or testing of some other pollutant. Therefore, Mr. Bartlit proposed organizing a panel of people who participated in preparing the STTF report to stand for questions from a panel of questioners who would represent multiple diverse interests, including media, local government, environmental, regulators, and anyone else. His goal with this idea was to provide easier access to the report as seen through the eyes of its creators.

- Lane Kirkpatrick wanted to make sure that the CEWG was comfortable and confident that the operating conditions under which the testing was conducted was representative because it lead to the credibility of the testing. John Bartlit said that Mr. Kirkpatrick's comment was a frequently asked question (FAQ), and tonight they were compiling a list of FAQs to which the CEWG would provide common answers.

- Edward Pineda said one point that was not clear revolved around the temperature in which

the RTOs were operating at the time of testing. He said there were two versions: One recorded by the controller, the other listed in Appendix F3 of the report. He said these two temperatures "kind of matched," and that the data met the requirements of the NMED permit. He reminded that the RTOs' purpose was to remove VOCs through incineration, and a high temperature was needed to accomplish the task. The temperature recorded during the testing was the same as that required in the permit. The RTOs were not intended to affect the formation of crystalline silica, but crystalline silica could form in RTOs at a certain range above the required temperature. By operating at the temperature required in the permit, no silica would form under any circumstances. In other words, he was concerned that the oxidizers might have been operating at a temperature too low to chemically produce crystalline silica. He said this was a direct challenge to the report and something that needed to be improved upon in the future.

- Sarah Chavez said the RTO temperature for Durr units was set in the 1994 permit, and in 2004 for the Munters units. So the temperature range had always been in place, and it was what the systems always operated at. That's why they did the test, she said, because operations were conducted so close to the temperature at which crystalline silica could be formed. Lane Kirkpatrick said that was why it was important to look at the history.

- Sarah Chavez said that they had discussed past Intel testing in CEWG meetings, and these discussions were documented on the CEWG Web site. Thom Little said there was a discussion around taking the data and applying it to the past. Certain community members commented that current data could not be applied to the past. When the STTF wrote the report as a body, there was a specific discussion on historical references and a concerted decision to leave them out. Lane Kirkpatrick responded that it would be more a qualitative than quantitative analysis, but there was value in looking at history. John Bartlit said he agreed with Mr. Kirkpatrick, but the STTF had responded to community demands. As an example of how to bring in history, Mr. Kirkpatrick suggested looking at the temperatures the thermal oxidizers operated at over time, and qualitatively extrapolate a reasonable judgment about it in regards to crystalline silica formation. He said people wanted to have a general feeling about whether a problem persisted in the past when emissions were higher.

- Edward Pineda said the requirements NMED put in the permit were intended for the removal of VOCs, they were not intended to do anything purposefully for the formation of crystalline silica. He said they needed to investigate the unintentional consequence that the temperature was too low for the formation of silica. Therefore, he said, the testing has a big flaw.

- Several CEWG members disagreed with Mr., Pineda. Mike Williams said that was not a flaw. John Bartlit said the goal was to remove the VOCs without creating crystalline

silica. Mr. Pineda said that should have come out as a conclusion of the testing by varying the temperature range. Sarah Chavez said they could not vary the temperature since they were required by the permit to stay within a certain range—1385 plus or minus 15 degrees on the Durrs. Mike Williams said the lowest temperature he had seen crystalline silica form was 700 Celsius to 750 Celsius. He said that there was not one minimum—it was a complicated issue based on several variables including resonance time and concentration. He said that the testing was to see if Intel was producing crystalline silica, and the answer seems to be in such small quantities as to not be significant.

- Edward Pineda responded that if he asked his wife to give him a 2-minute boiled egg, and she gave him an egg boiled for only 1 minute, it would be raw and he wouldn't want to eat it. He said he understood Intel's permit specified a range, but maybe it was not intentional that that temperature range pre-empt the formation of crystalline silica. Mr. Pineda said this issue warranted further discussion.

- Stephen Littlejohn acknowledged that several people in the room did not yet understand Mr. Pineda's point.

- Lynne Kinis said she had been attending the CEWG meetings for many years, and she had heard Sarah Chavez say previously that Intel could not control the RTO temperature. Then she had heard, when the Munters units were installed, that the highest operating temperature was 1425, and Durrs highest operating temperature was 1385. Now she said she heard that the temperature was always operated at a certain range—15-20 degrees plus or minus 1385. So now the question was, can Intel control the temperature or not? During the December testing, the temperature was controlled, hence the crystalline silica formation was controlled. She asked if they had temperature recordings submitted to NMED in 2003/04 on record.

- Sarah Chavez said the permit stipulated keeping records on site. Anytime NMED had done an onsite inspection, they would look at the temperature chart and, specifically, the units' operating temperature. NMED considered anytime the units operated outside the temperature parameters as downtime, and Intel had to report it. Therefore, Ms. Chavez said, the temperature was tracked and recorded but not required to be submitted.

- Mike Williams asked Edward Pineda if he would rather have tested the RTOs operating at a temperature in which crystalline silica would be produced. Mr. Pineda said no, all he was saying was that the permit required that the RTOs operate below the temperature, and that was something they did not realize while they were designing the testing.

- Stephen Littlejohn asked Mr. Pineda if his concern was that there were times when the

temperature went above the limit and created crystalline silica. Mr. Pineda said no, because the temperature was kept within the limits, but they could research and find the minimum temperature at which crystalline silica could be formed. The RTO was preempting the formation, of crystalline silica, which was good, Mr. Pineda said.

- Sarah Chavez said the reason they tested for crystalline silica was because the RTO operating temperature was so close to that in which crystalline silica was formed that it warranted further checking. John Bartlit reminded the group that the ATSDR called for more testing because of this same reason, which was why the CEWG formed the STTF to produce the report.

- Mike Williams said crystalline silica testing had been done in different contexts, and there were variables other than temperature and other equations in the research, but he did not know if any of it was applicable to Intel's context. Edward Pineda said the ATSDR and NIOSH had experts, and the CEWG could ask them for the temperature range. John Bartlit said that the exact temperature was in the ATSDR report, in the draft comment section. Mr. Pineda insisted that the CEWG still needed to do more work on the issue. Stephen Littlejohn said to add the issue to the "next steps" discussion.

- Jane Dalwin said some silica was observed in the testing, and there were questions around the possibility that there was some adulteration when the sample was scooped. Mike Williams said he was concerned that there were temperature variations inside the chamber. Thom Little said that to ensure that the samples were taken from a known EPA sampling point, the samples were taken from the exhaust stack and calibrated by grabbing samples representative of the airflow around the exhaust stack but not in the center, because the center was not representative.

- Ms. Dalwin asked why only one sample registered crystalline silica. Thom Little said that they did not really know, but they did not conduct a background sample to account for what was blowing in the wind, and in New Mexico there was a lot of sand and volcanic ash in the air. He said that the STTF decided to leave out the background sample because this round of testing was supposed to be a first take. Ms. Dalwin said she was told that once crystalline silica was in the air, in order to get into the lungs and cause damage, it had to happen quickly. Mr. Little said that the windstorms in some areas of NM caused a 2.5-micron spike, which created a huge concern in the state. Ms. Dalwin persisted, why was crystalline silica in one sample and not the others? As a resident, she said she was concerned.

- Mike Williams said that the level of crystalline silica found in the test was way below dangerous levels—15,000 times below the provisional level. The analysis showed that, at least right now, there was not enough silicon in the material that was being burned in the

incinerators to produce enough crystalline silica to be a health problem.

- Lane Kirkpatrick said he and Roberta King lived in the downdraft of the Intel plant, and he worked out of his house and therefore spent 24 hours a day in an area. He thought it important to look at the data and ask what the implication of the test was to what had been going on with emissions since Intel started operations. He wanted this issue looked at and understood so the community could gain some confidence, and he hoped that this kind of analysis would direct future activities around the issue.

- Edward Pineda asked, in reference to background silica, why the inlet wasn't tested as well as the outlet. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was making Intel test both the inlet and the outlet on the scrubbers. If the inlet wasn't tested, then there couldn't be any reference to background material in the report, Mr. Pineda said,

- Sarah Chavez said that Intel tested the same two Durrs units in 2004 that were tested in December 2010, and these two tests were consistent and could be compared to draw individual conclusions. She said, in regards to the inlet data, the STTF designed the testing procedures to ensure Intel's production was normal during testing in order to get representative samples. The testing occurred during normal production and at different times—day and night, beginning and end of the week. Mr. Pineda replied that might be true, but the background material was only coming from inside the plant and not the total environment, and therefore any conclusions on background material were insignificant.

- Stephen Littlejohn asked Mr. Pineda if he had lost confidence in the STTF report. Mr. Pineda responded no, but because they had to rush the testing, they did not have the chance to explore certain things in depth. He made the distinction between the outside background material in Corrales and Albuquerque and the air coming from inside Intel.

- Thom Little said he had misunderstood. The context of Ms. Dalwin's question was "how do you explain the one hit." And Mr. Little responded you couldn't. There were pieces of missing data, for example, the STTF's collective decision not to do background analysis. The STTF chose to move ahead with the testing before the Durrs was discontinued. He said if they wanted to do a more thorough analysis next time around, they could include a background analysis. He emphasized that the STTF made a good effort to produce good data.

- Mike Williams explained that he was concerned with what came out the stacks, because that's what people had to breath; he did not care what went into the front end of combustion processes. For that point all he needed to know was what went into the stack, not what went into the combustion process. He said what they did learn was that what

was coming out of the stack was not significant in regards to crystalline silica.

- John Bartlit said that the ATSDR and NIOSH were peer reviewing the STTF report, and the CEWG may ask them to comment on some specific points. Mayor Gasteyer asked how long these reviews took. Mr. Bartlit said "months." He said that he thought ATSDR might put the results of the STTF's testing in their addition to the 2009 report.

STTF TEST REPORT—NEXT STEPS

Stephen Littlejohn moved the discussion to the next agenda item. He said there were at least 5 options to look at: 1. Whether or not to do any retrospective analysis looking back at historical trends; 2. Continue the dialogue through a panel of questions and answers; 3. Write a cover letter that addresses the CEWG's level of confidence in the report; 4. Consider testing the Munters in 2011 using the full Citizen Protocol; and 5. Consider testing that looked more carefully at temperature levels and inlet concentrations.

- Jane Dalwin said that Intel's new permit was granted, and if Intel decided to expand they would use a three-dimensional waffle process that would require more silica. She said she read it in the paper and asked if it were true. Thom Little said it wasn't true. He said there would be new layers in the process, but the wafer itself would have silica and not the layers. Ms. Dalwin asked, with 7 additional stacks, wouldn't that mean more silica emissions? Sarah Chavez said that even if the silica increased 100 times more, it would still be way below the provisional level. The chemical that formed silica in the thermal oxidizer was a VOC, and Intel had a permit limit on how many VOCs they could use. Even if Intel used the whole amount in the permit, up to 100 tons, the order of magnitude was still well below the provisional level. Ms. Dalwin replied that she was still wondering why people were getting sick.

John Bartlit summarized his next steps proposal, which was to organize a panel with people who created the report, and then have a panel of questioners representing multiple interests: city government, media, environmental, business, and regulators (NMED; ATSDR, NIOSH). The meeting would be held in Corrales or Rio Rancho. He said the CEWG could arrange for questions. Lane Kirkpatrick said to include a layman's interpretation as part of the effort to be easier understood by the public. He also said Mr. Bartlit's proposal was a good one, and the key was to figure out how to make it work.

- Lynne Kinis said that Intel thought tonight's meeting would be packed. It wasn't. Her interpretation on why few members of the public attended was that the message they got from previous meetings was that Intel controlled the airwaves, media, etc. She said that people could get the same answers at Mr. Bartlit's proposed panel if they attended CEWG meetings and asked questions. She said the interested public felt discouraged and cut off because they were not allowed to have a voice. Lane Kirkpatrick added that Intel was

quick to create an assessment of the report, send out a letter to the community and issue a press release; the message the public perceived was that Intel was pushing the issue rather than letting it come out independently. Ms. Kinis said that when the 114 letter came out, CRCAW contacted every media source in the area, and only the *Rio Rancho Observer* and *Corrales Comment* picked it up. When the new Intel permit was approved, the media contacted her because Intel told them to. And the *Rio Rancho Observer*, rather than publishing her full quote—"I knew it was going to be approved before I even started the petition. It was a done deal. It's politics, we know that."—quoted only a portion of her statement— "I knew it was going to be approved."

- John Bartlit said if he were a lawyer or executive for Intel, he would hope that the CEWG would spend the next three years working on crystalline silica rather than investigating chemicals that have yet to be investigated, such as hydrogen fluoride. Sarah Chavez clarified that Intel had tested for hydrogen fluoride every year for the last 10 years.

- Stephen Littlejohn said he heard support for Mr. Bartlit's suggestion, but it had to be carefully constructed and CEWG-driven, and it had to be an honest attempt. Mike Williams was concerned with who was going to serve on the panel. Mr. Bartlit suggested that Jim Tritten, Stephen Littlejohn, and himself visit with Mayor Gasteyer, members of the Village Council, the mayor of Rio Rancho, the *Observer,* the *Corrales Comment* and talk to them one-on-one to see if they would be interested in participating in the panel.

- Roberta King said they were not being realistic. The *ABQ Journal* owned prime real estate in Corrales, and they didn't want press about the bad air in Corrales. She said it was important to be aware of the political background. She said Rio Rancho was an Intel town; all the officials were related to Intel in some way. The politics in this state were about jobs and not health effects, and Intel did not want to deal with the health effects either. She did not think having a meeting with the *Rio Rancho Observer* would help; reporters there who reported factual information were shipped out somewhere else.

- Stephen Littlejohn asked how to do a panel that would avoid the political overlay. Everyone laughed. Mr. Littlejohn said he took it that it was not possible to do that, and asked what should be the next step. Roberta King said the best thing that could happen was to produce a good YouTube video, because there were people and lawyers out there who were concerned.

Stephen Littlejohn asked if anyone would object to putting together a panel according to John Bartlit's proposal.

- Edward Pineda said he objected because of the political reality. He said that the Vice President of Intel is a Vice President of the Chamber of Commerce. Any way the panel

was organized, more people would have opinions that favored Intel, so it would be unfair. Lane Kirkpatrick said in the past they used to discuss environmental issues in the media. There had to be ways to open it up and get some interest and dialogue on the issue. Hugh Church said that they were having a problem with the definition of community. Before it was the local citizens, and now it was being stretched into Albuquerque and the nation.

- Thom Little said that what he heard was people were not against the panel, just that the panel would not get the level of attention they desired. Three people were willing to do the legwork to generate interest among the different sectors, and the worse case scenario was that they would be told "no." John Bartlit expanded his proposal and invited concerned citizens to join in the initial legwork. He said that in the conversation process, representatives would hear that the discussion on health effects did not end with the crystalline silica testing, it just meant the CEWG would move on to other testing. The *Rio Rancho Observer* and *Albuquerque Journal* did not want to hear that testing would continue. They just wanted to hear that there were no health effects, end of story, but that's not what the report said.

Stephen Littlejohn summarized the discussion. One point of view was that if there were people willing to do the initial legwork, why not move forward. Another perspective was that there was no way to do a panel that was not political.

- Thom Little asked why folks like Fred Marsh couldn't be questioners. For every person with a political agenda, have a person from the opposite point of view to strike a balance. John Bartlit said that they should try to engage all political interests. Stephen Littlejohn asked Mr. Bartlit if putting effort into the panel would take away from time needed to move forward with work on other chemicals and emissions, and, if so, what would be the trade off and which was more important. Most people in the room responded that the latter was more important. Mr. Bartlit said that before they could move forward with work on other chemicals, they had to agree that the crystalline silica testing was closed.

- Lane Kirkpatrick reiterated his suggestion of looking at the test results in the context of history. Mr. Bartlit said that community members disagreed very strongly with analyzing historical data based on recent test results, so there was a dilemma. Mr. Kirkpatrick said he had been breathing the air the last 20 years, as had others, and they had been subjected to a problem even though that at one point in time test results showed that there wasn't a problem. He did not think that this had to be done scientifically, but could be done using reasonable judgment based upon data from 2004 and looking at temperatures. Another aspect was to look at the state's report on pulmonary fibrosis. Mr. Kirkpatrick emphasized that there were legitimate questions that needed to be looked and a little more analysis was needed before moving forward with any public comment or panel.

- Stephen Littlejohn said they needed a concrete proposal on how to do historical analysis. He made the distinction between two kinds of post analyses. One method used recent data and applied regression analysis to see what might have been emitted previously. Community members objected to this kind of post analysis, so the CEWG decided against it. The second method proposed by Mr. Kirkpatrick was qualitative analysis. Mr. Kirkpatrick added that they hadn't merged the data and analyzed it properly using qualitative methods. John Bartlit reminded that the ATSDR was going to review the data.

- Edward Pineda proposed tabling the historical analysis and the state's report for a future meeting. He asked what was the best use of time for the remainder of the meeting.

Stephen Littlejohn suggested working through the remaining next steps. Important issues to discuss were whether to continue silica testing, and how the 2010 testing could have been done differently. The 2010 test was driven by Intel and to be completed before the Durrs were removed. The 2011 test would focus on the Munters and be based on the full Citizen Protocol. The group needed to decide how to proceed with the 2011 test.

- Lynne Kinis said she would love to go forward with testing, but without the participation of any Intel personnel, contractors, or entities. Stephen Littlejohn said that they would be using the full Citizen Protocol, which was arm's distance from Intel, but part of the process entailed getting Intel's approval.

- Edward Pineda said it was always understood that they would continue with the 2011 testing using the Citizen Protocol. John Bartlit said that testing using the Citizen Protocol would be a much more expensive and time-consuming project. He did not think NIOSH would participate because of the recent results, and he did not think NMED was going to allow them to shift funds from one test to another in light of the 2010 results, which were nowhere near the provisional level. He said that was a factor to consider in moving forward. His preference was to test a new substance.

- Lane Kirkpatrick suggested spending two or three weeks to spread the word about the report and gathering questions to address, as well as writing editorials in Corrales and Rio Rancho newspapers. Stephen Littlejohn said the agenda committee came up with idea of preparing a "frequently asked questions" or "FAQs". They planned to use tonight's meeting to begin generating these questions, and then to invite people to email additional questions or concerns. They also planned to add this invitation to advertising in the *Corrales Comment, Westside Journal* and the *Observer* over the next few weeks. Mr. Kirkpatrick suggested after receiving the questions, to do some analysis and interpretation on the data, create information to distribute to the public, and then provide an opportunity using a panel to ask final questions, and then to move on afterwards to new issues.

- Mr. Littlejohn asked if anyone objected to Mr. Kirkpatrick's suggestion. No one objected. Mr. Littlejohn said he would send this proposal to everyone for their review.

  CONSENSUS: Spend the next two-three weeks to spread the word about the report and gather questions to address.

  ACTION ITEM: Mr. Littlejohn would draft the proposal and send it via email for Review.

- Roberta King asked what could be done to assure that the *Observer* and *Albuquerque Journal Westside* will print the ad as written. Mr. Littlejohn said it would be a paid advertisement that could not be changed.

Thom Little suggested bringing in an epidemiologist to go over the state's report on pulmonary fibrosis so as to have a qualified professional on the panel. John Bartlit moved to invite the report's author to talk.

- Stephen Littlejohn asked if there was any objection to inviting the report's author to participate on the panel.

- Roberta King objected because the report was a state department document and therefore political. She had read the report and found that it did not make sense to her. She said the only person she trusted was Peter Kowalski. John Bartlit suggested inviting Peter Kowalski on the panel.

- Mr. Littlejohn asked if any CEWG members objected to inviting the report's author to participate on the panel. Edward Pineda said he would approve on one condition, and that was to invite Dr. Donna Epsom, who was on the board of the American Lung Assn. of NM. She was not under any political influence, Mr. Pineda said. Thom Little commented that a physician and an epidemiologist were two different disciplines, and therefore they wouldn't be talking in a similar way about the issue. Thom Little said that UNM had one of the leading epidemiologists who might be a good alternative.

- Stephen Littlejohn said that the CEWG had produced a cover letter to attach to the report. He asked if the group wanted to wait until the next meeting to deal with it. Edward Pineda proposed distributing and finishing it by e-mail. No one objected to this proposal.

  CONSENSUS: The cover letter will be distributed and possibly completed by e-mail.

  ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will distribute the cover letter by email.

- Lynne Kinis commented that if the CEWG wanted to include wind and blowing sand in their discussion of the results, then they would need to take a baseline to include in the testing. She did not hear a call of consensus on the previous discussion of having an epidemiologist or physician on the panel.

- Lane Kirkpatrick suggested checking with UNM for an epidemiologist who would volunteer to be on the panel, and having a doctor on the panel as well. John Bartlit suggested contacting the epidemiologists who had spoken at a previous CEWG meeting. Thom Little said he was making the point that if they wanted to counter the epidemiologist who authored the article, they would have to do it with another epidemiologist and not a physician because the two were different disciplines. Several people suggested getting both a countering epidemiologist and a physician,

- Hugh Church asked to hear more specifics on what topics the panelists would be expected to cover. Lane Kirkpatrick said that the key issue was the public wanted to know if crystalline silica was currently or had been a health problem to people living in the vicinity, and they were taking stock of everything that they now knew and making an assessment and a judgment on it. Out of this assessment, there may be more action that needed to be taken, but they still needed to look at these issues in a systematic way.

- Stephen Littlejohn proposed they could have a panel on crystalline silica, silicosis, pulmonary fibrosis and other lung-related diseases, with epidemiologists, lung specialists, and the report's author. He also proposed that he, Hugh Church, and Lane Kirkpatrick work together to refine the topics and panel participants. He asked if anyone objected to either proposal. No one objected.

  CONSENSUS: The CEWG agreed to hold a panel on crystalline silica, silicosis, pulmonary fibrosis and other lung-related diseases, with epidemiologists, lung specialists, and the author of the state report on pulmonary fibrosis. Stephen Littlejohn, Hugh Church, and Lane Kirkpatrick will work together to refine the panel topics and panel participants.

  ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will develop a panel proposal and work with Hugh Church and Lane Kirkpatrick to refine the panel topics and panel participants.

- Hugh Church said that he knew Donna Epsom, and the article she wrote discussed public health statewide and nationally. He wasn't sure if she would be interested on the local level. He would meet with her on Monday to gauge her interests.

- Lynne Kinis asked if the state health report was going to be addressed. Lane Kirkpatrick responded that the questions that ought to drive the panel were what do we know about crystalline silica and its impact on the residents of Corrales and Rio Rancho based on testing; analysis of the state report; anything else that might be known; what remaining questions needed to be asked; and what remaining actions needed to be taken.

- Thom Little asked about FAQs. Stephen Littlejohn said he would go through tonight's meeting summary and create them. Mr. Little said he had created FAQs from tonight's discussion, and he would email them to Mr. Littlejohn. Mr. Littlejohn said he would further develop the FAQs and then circulate them to the group by email.

  ACTION ITEM: Thom Little will email FAQs to Stephen Littlejohn, who in turn will further develop the FAQs and circulate them to the group by email.

- Jeff Radford asked the following questions: would the report be corrected before it was further distributed; would the reports already distributed be replaced; and would certain issues in the report be addressed, for example, the testing chain of custody, which he saw as being exaggerated.

- Stephen Littlejohn said they had to distinguish between an error, such as calling "crystalline silica" "silica," and disagreeing with what was written in the report. He said that unless people informed him of the errors, he would not know what they were. He suggested Mr. Radford send him a list of errors, noting the page number and the corrections. He said he would make those changes in the second printing. As far as disagreeing with the content, he couldn't do anything about it as the facilitator. Mr. Radford would have to take his concerns to the STTF. Edward Pineda said they would have to reestablish the STTF and send the disagreements to them for consideration. Mr. Littlejohn said that for substantive changes, they could bring it up the possibility of reconvening the STTF on the agenda committee.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING
June 15, 2011, 5 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.

DECISIONS:

1. Tonight's meeting would be extended by 15 minutes, if needed.
2. The CEWG will spend the next two-three weeks to spread the word about STTF's report and gather questions to address.
3. The cover letter will be distributed and possibly completed by e-mail.

4. The CEWG agreed to hold a panel on crystalline silica, silicosis, pulmonary fibrosis and other lung-related diseases, with epidemiologists, lung specialists, and the author of the state' report on pulmonary fibrosis. Stephen Littlejohn, Hugh Church, and Lane Kirkpatrick will work together to refine the panel topics and panel participants.