

## MEETING SUMMARY

### Community Environmental Working Group

#### *“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”*

**Date:** February 15, 2012  
**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  
 Hugh Church, American Lung Assc. in NM

Lane Kirkpatrick, Corrales resident  
 Sarah Chavez, Intel  
 Thom Little, Intel

#### Non-Members Attending

Roberta King, Corrales resident  
 Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident  
 Dennis O’Mara, Corrales resident  
 David Gallegos, Corrales resident

Alissa Cramer, Intel  
 Jeff Rudnik, Intel

#### Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

#### HANDOUTS

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Draft Agenda</li> <li>▪ Draft Meeting Summary January 18, 2012</li> <li>▪ Action-Item Progress Report</li> <li>▪ EHS Activity Reports</li> <li>▪ Intel Reports on EPA 114 Follow up</li> </ul> | <p>Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Media reports and articles, as available</li> <li>▪ Draft Plan for Spikes Modeling</li> <li>▪ National Jewish Health Correspondence</li> <li>▪ CEWG Spikes History</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

#### PROPOSED AGENDA

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items</li> <li>▪ EHS Report and 114 Update</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continuing the Spikes Discussion</li> <li>▪ Additional Business</li> <li>▪ Adjourn</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

Filename: CEWG Draft Meeting Summary 2-15-12, v. 3  
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn  
 Prepared for: CEWG  
 Date prepared or presented: February 19, 2012

Approved: 3-21-12

## **WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND BRIEF ITEMS**

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

### Agenda—Revisions and Approval

Stephen Littlejohn commented that the agenda for this evening's meeting took a new approach, and that was to focus on one topic rather than split the agenda by 3 or 4 items.

John Bartlit noted that Edward Pineda was absent due to back surgery.

Lynne Kinis said that she had requested the CEWG to discuss Dennis O'Mara's letter to Jami Grindatto line by line and answer his concerns. She did not see that on the evening's agenda and asked why. Stephen Littlejohn replied that this meeting's focus was on spikes. Mr. Littlejohn said they had hoped to settle and make progress on the spikes issue, which had been lingering for months. He said that adding the letter to the agenda and going over it line by line would take away time from the spikes discussion; therefore it was a tradeoff and a question of priority. He asked the CEWG if they would like to add it to the agenda and to state their priority.

Dennis O'Mara said Thom Little had contacted him to go over the letter line by line. He declined that offer, thinking that the CEWG would go over it line by line in a meeting instead. He said he was open to meeting with Mr. Little and several CEWG members outside the meeting time to go over the letter line by line and then to bring the main points to the next CEWG meeting. He said he was flexible with the process but wanted the letter to be considered more fully.

Thom Little suggested meeting with Mr. O'Mara and others on a separate occasion to go over the letter, and then return to a CEWG with proposed actions and follow up items. Lynne Kinis and Lane Kirkpatrick volunteered to be part of that committee.

**ACTION ITEM:** Thom Little will organize a meeting with Dennis O'Mara, Lynne Kinis and Lane Kirkpatrick to address the details in Mr. O'Mara's letter to Jami Grindatto.

### January 18, 2012, Meeting Summary—Revisions and Approval

No comments.

### Update on Corrales Water Task Force

Thom Little said he attended the monthly Corrales Water Task Force meeting to present an overview on Intel's water use and recycling and where Intel extracted its water. The task force

asked for suggestions from Intel around water. Mr. Little said he suggested they look at a model for the domestic and agricultural water use and its impact on the community. The task force was also interested in Intel's helping them with educational awareness and hardware support, such as well metering. Mr. Little said they were not interested in engagement, rather to learn, cooperate, and share. Roberta King said she thought there were 6 regular task force members. John Bartlit said it sounded like the task force was more interested in Intel than the CEWG. Thom Little agreed. Roberta King added that the task force wanted to meet with other organizations on Feb. 28<sup>th</sup>.

#### National Jewish Health Correspondence

Hugh Church said he wrote a letter to Geri Renardy, a board member of the Lung Association in Colorado who works for National Jewish Health, who in turn contacted Dr. Maier of National Jewish Health to respond to Mr. Church's inquiry around reviewing the silica testing report. Dr. Maier responded to Mr. Church (letter attached), saying that National Jewish did not have the manpower nor the resources to help the CEWG. She suggested that Mr. Church contact Kenneth Scott, Outreach Director of the Mountains and Plains Educational Resource Center (MAPERC) at the University of Colorado, since this organization had more resources, including federal funding and graduate students looking for projects. She also suggested contacting UNM. Mr. Church said he telephoned and spoke with Mr. Scott, who said he would like more information on the silica testing report and the ATSDR peer review.

#### Public Comment

- Roberta King asked if Jami Grindatto sent out a "Dear Neighbor" letter in January. Thom Little said not to his knowledge. Dennis O'Mara said he sent one in December.
- Thom Little said Jami Grindatto changed his position at Intel. Moving forward, communication such as the "Dear Neighbor Letter" will be written by Brian Rashap, Intel site manager. Mr. Little said Mr. Grindatto's replacement as Corporate Affairs Director was Jeanne Forbis. Ms. Forbis would be based out of Arizona.
- Mr. Little called attention to the next "Dear Neighbor Letter," written by Mr. Rashap and in the handout packet. The letter referred to a small fire Intel recently had in its CUB. The fire was extinguished, and one person was treated for first-degree burns. The letter also mentions applying for a permit around downsizing the boilers. Sarah Chavez said that the permit was submitted, approved, and then issued on February 10. She reminded that this was the permit discussed in the December CEWG meeting.
- Roberta King asked who received the "Dear Neighbor Letter." Thom Little said it was sent to every address in Corrales and within a certain radius in Rio Rancho. Ms. King said the first letter was sent to her at her street address, and she had a PO Box, and did not get anything. Mr. Little said Intel went through a service that provided the addresses.

- Sarah Chavez said Intel sold their 500-horsepower boilers, and these boilers would be removed from the building sometime in the next 3 weeks. Neighbors might see a truck carrying 4 big cylindrical tube type boilers out of the north energy center.
- Lynne Kinis said that last summer she and Marcy Brandenburg met with Thom Little and Frank Robinson about security at Intel. Ms. Kinis said she was concerned about chemical security, and asked what security Intel had in place to protect against a lone invader climbing the fence “wearing a backpack”. It came to Ms. Kinis’s attention a couple months later that some drunks with rifles shot out Intel’s lights from the Corrales side. Mr. Little said that they were arrested because they were identified on Intel’s security cameras. Ms. Kinis replied they were arrested because a resident called the police on them. Bill Davidson said both accounts were accurate. Ms. Kinis said that incident was an example of what could happen. She asked what protections Intel had in place against someone jumping the fence and trying to sabotage an area where chemicals were stored. She was concerned because she lived so close to the fence. Sarah Chavez responded that hazardous chemicals were held under high security—behind gates and locks. Ms. Kinis asked about protections against someone blowing themselves up and igniting the chemicals. Mr. Littlejohn said he would add “security” to the list of topics for future discussion.
- Thom Little said Intel did not share its security measures so people could not defeat them. Sarah Chavez said Intel had plans that looked at all possible scenarios to deal with all possible events. Lynne Kinis asked if the scenario she was concerned about was covered. She said she did not want privy information, just to know that Intel had a plan for dealing with someone igniting a bomb near chemicals. Stephen Littlejohn said he would add “potential bombing and environmental implications” on the CEWG topics list.

**ACTION:** Stephen Littlejohn will add potential bombing, environmental implications and security at Intel to the CEWG topics list.

## CONTINUING THE SPIKES DISCUSSION

Stephen Littlejohn said the spikes ad hoc committee met twice and produced a couple of reports. The agenda committee thought it was a good idea to focus on process and next steps around how to move forward with the spikes issue. Mr. Littlejohn put together a brief history on spikes discussion in the CEWG since 2006; although the CEWG touched on the issue, they never addressed it fully. He said the goal tonight was to make decisions on how to move forward around spikes. He asked the group to address a set of questions, with the first listed next.

### *1. What environmental improvements are possible around spikes?*

The group gave the following responses:

- Stack heights
  - Change in chemicals used/process changes
  - Expand scrubbers (scrubbers have stacks at various heights)
  - Operational maintenance
  - Controlled release/weather
  - Non-emissions
- Also, Dennis O'Mara suggested collecting the chemicals and taking them offsite to process or recycle rather than processing and releasing them on site.
  - Mr. Littlejohn asked CEWG members if they felt that some environmental improvement could come out of the spikes issue. Consensus was reached among CEWG members that tangible improvements could be made by pursuing the spikes issue.

**DECISION:** CEWG members agree that tangible improvements could be made by pursuing the spikes issue.

- Mr. Littlejohn asked if any non-CEWG members objected. Roberta King said she objected because corporations were running the show and manipulating people to believe what they wanted them to believe. Regardless of what they worked on around spikes, the CEWG was controlled by Intel. Money talked; not the individual, she said.

*2. What clear, consensual process for conducting the study should be adopted? Does the CEWG favor a community-based task force, and if so, how should it be constructed?*

- Stephen Littlejohn said the ad hoc committee favored a community-based process task force, similar to the silica testing task force. He asked the group if that was also the direction they wanted to take. All CEWG members agreed, consensus was reached on using a community-based process.

**DECISION:** CEWG agreed to use a community-based task force to conduct the spikes study.

- Roberta King objected for the same reason she objected to the first question. The community-based task force was done contrary to everything stated by all members of public as far as trust was concerned, and there was no way she could believe anything that came out of it. Her observation over the many years was that it was a matter of Intel deciding how to manipulate the village representatives.

### 3. How should the task force be chosen?

- Lane Kirkpatrick said all community interests should be represented, and the group should be knowledgeable and have expertise around the issue. He said both hard and soft concerns should be represented. By soft concerns, he meant welfare, real estate values, and community values. Mr. Kirkpatrick suggested the CEWG create a list of people and get input from that list on different interests, including the mayor and citizens' groups, so that no one was left out.
- John Bartlit suggested using the CEWG Web site and Face book page. Lane Kirkpatrick suggested placing an ad in the *Corrales Comment*. John Bartlit asked about the possibility of getting on the village council's agenda.
- Lynne Kinis asked if it were necessary to do actual testing of emissions in this study, and if so, she would not trust the results if Intel had any connection to the company doing the testing. She said she thought the chemical changes were key—Intel could substitute certain chemicals that were more costly but less serious in emissions.
- Stephen Littlejohn tested Mr. Kirkpatrick's proposal, which was: The CEWG brainstorms a possible list of experts; take the list to community sources to expand, modify, refine and suggest; and then advertises the list, as well as time frame, in the *Corrales Comment* for public input.
- Thom Little said Intel would need to know the committee size, and of that size, how many seats would be open. For example, the committee would have to have at least one CEWG member and one Intel member. For the STTF, there were 6 members, three members came from the CEWG, and three members came from outside. Anything over 6 members became unwieldy. Mr. Kirkpatrick said there should be ways for everyone to provide input. Mr. Bartlit said that would be to hold public meetings. Mr. Little said the process should be designed to get the remaining open seats. Mr. Kirkpatrick said they should have a group chairperson viewed as an unbiased representative with good facilitation skills. Mr. Littlejohn said that the STTF chose their own chairperson,
- Hugh Church said he was bothered by Roberta King's previous comments, because she implied that Intel could not be involved in the study. He said Intel had to be involved to provide details and scheduling, among other things. Ms. King said that she observed over time that Intel attorneys decided what would or would not happen. Everything was controlled by politics and based on people trying to get elected.
- Stephen Littlejohn reminded that Ms. King opposed the whole undertaking because of corporate interests and power, so the task force composition for her was irrelevant. He

said that it sounded like, from the group discussion, the task force should include a representative from the CEWG and Intel as well as experts and people representing the public interest.

- Mike Williams said he was concerned about generating the list of people without talking to the mayor first. Thom Little said to give the mayor the composition they envisioned and then ask for suggestions on how to move forward. John Bartlit said to ask the mayor if the CEWG could present to the village council.
- Mr. Littlejohn summarized as follows:

**DECISION:** CEWG members agreed to pursue building a task force using the following process: the CEWG would first consult with the mayor of Corrales and the village council to generate a potential list, and then return the list back for their review. Next they would advertise in the paper.

Mr. Littlejohn asked nonmembers if they had a different view. There were no comments. Mr. Littlejohn asked the group to consider if they wanted other public engagement processes, and that he would address this issue later.

Thom Little suggested the CEWG establish the “model framework” of task-force member types. Mr. Littlejohn asked if there was consensus on this process. John Bartlit also suggested asking the council if they thought the study was worthwhile.

### *3. How should the provisional level be established?*

Stephen Littlejohn said the committee strongly favored establishing a criterion or provisional level to evaluate and compare results to in advance of the testing. He asked the group how they should establish the provisional level. He emphasized that the question was “how” to establish the provisional level, not what it should be.

- Mr. Littlejohn explained that a provisional level referred to a particular level of concentration of a select compound at the point of maximum concentration. Usually it was the ground level concentration in a certain location. The provisional level was the number to which the results were compared. Mr. Littlejohn called this the level of concern. Thom Little said the provisional level was used as a gauge to warrant whether or not to take further action or comparisons, similar to the way it was used in the silica testing efforts.
- Mike Williams said, with spikes, they should look at an average time 24 hours or less, and with odors, no less than 10 minutes. Anything less than 10 minutes would be meaningless to the models. He suggested looking at information provided by Peter Kowalski as well as

from the state of California, and because there were not good ambient measurements, to look historically at the modeling ratios. He added that there was not a lot of information on spikes, and that complicated the matter, which was why it was good to look at what others have done. Lane Kirkpatrick asked if there was any relevant information out of Europe. Mike Williams said they ought to look at the World Health Organization (WHO) levels. (As reference, Hugh Church had sent an attachment ([www.epa.gaovttt/atw/hlthef/hydrogen.html](http://www.epa.gaovttt/atw/hlthef/hydrogen.html)) in his email to the Group on 2/15/12, showing a graphic of health data from exposure of hydrogen fluoride, compiled from various industrial hygiene organizations.

- Sarah Chavez suggested to take a step back and look at the discussion. Mr. Williams was talking about the details, but she thought the meeting's discussion was supposed to be more high level, process-oriented. For example, what was the process, who would be involved, who would review the data, how would the CEWG make decisions, she said. She thought it was important to define the process. If they were going to get 3 or 4 sources of data, then how did they make appropriate data comparisons. What kind of experts were needed? Did they need a toxicologist?
- Lynne Kinis asked Mike Williams about raising the stack heights. Mr. Williams said the stack heights were raised with thermal oxidizers, not the scrubbers. A reason he appreciated the spikes issue was that the CEWG had not looked at the scrubbers yet. The scrubbers were likely to have a plume that came down to the ground faster, and the result was that the highest concentrations would be inside the fence line, in many cases.
- John Bartlit said that the information from Peter Kowalski at ATSDR included information from California. It also had a good description of a screening level, which was similar to a provisional level. If it was below the screening level, then it was not a concern; if it was above the level, then more work needed to be done, he said.
- Thom Little said the group should look at that information and other data and establish a process to develop a provisional level. Mr. Littlejohn said someone needed to look at that information and create a determination and explanation for others to understand. He asked who would do this.
- Roberta King asked when considering different agencies with established criteria based on sea level and flat terrain, to what extent would they have to allow for changing atmosphere and sudden swirls of wind and the down slope of the escarpment? How did these differences get leveled out?
- Mike Williams said there were two pieces to that question. Differences in terrain was addressed in the modeling. Since people breathe more volume of air at higher altitude,



they would have to correct for altitude. Mr. Williams said someone in the group would need to have a level of expertise around the issue. These were the kinds of variables that would have to be factored in.

- Sarah Chavez proposed that the group decide on a person to go through data, look at the sources, and come up with suggestions, and then develop a rationale for the assumptions. She suggested sending the proposed approach to the ATSDR for feedback and approval, since ATSDR was a trusted agency with expertise.
- Mike Williams said they would not know until they looked at the modeling the level of concentrations in 10 minutes vs. 24 hours, but they could they could present multiple times, such as one hour and 3 hours.
- Lane Kirkpatrick said that this needed to be correlated to the complaints. There was almost no ambient data, but there were plenty of complaints. He suggested to categorize complaints over a period of time in different areas. The history, the nature and the concentration of complaints should be correlated. Mr. Littlejohn said that was something the committee could consider.
- Mr. Littlejohn emphasized that this committee would not be the task force but a small committee to survey the literature. Hugh Church and Mr. Littlejohn pointed out that the more technical the topic the less valuable a public meeting because they did not have the expertise to critique the rationale. He said that although a public meeting would be valuable eventually in the process, but not at this point. Lane Kirkpatrick and Mike Williams agreed that this was a pilot stage. Mr. Littlejohn tested consensus on the proposed process..

**DECISION:** CEWG members agreed to the following process:

- Establish a committee with appropriate expertise to survey the literature;
  - Establish a rationale and possible provisional level;
  - Bring the report to the CEWG to review;
  - Send the report to ATSDR for comment;
  - Additional public involvement to be determined.
- No non-CEWG members disagreed with this process.
  - Stephen Littlejohn asked if they could put the committee together. Sarah Chavez nominated Mike Williams and Hugh Church. Lynne Kinis nominated John Alsobrook from the village. No non-CEWG members disagreed.

**DECISION:** CEWG members agreed to the nominations of Hugh Church, Mike Williams and John Alsobrook as small committee members.

*4. What data should be used for the modeling and how should it be sampled?*

Stephen Littlejohn said that previously, they had talked about beginning with modeling based on previous data. What data should be used and how should it be sampled?

- Lane Kirkpatrick asked where the Citizen Protocol fit in to the process. Mike Williams said that the Citizen Protocol was designed for experimental work. It was not relevant now but may be later.
- Thom Little said they should review the available data for the modeling. He said there was weather data from Intel's met station and the airport. Lane Kirkpatrick asked if there were similar operational units at other Intel facilities that might have better data on hydrogen fluoride. Sarah Chavez replied that the Rio Rancho facility had the most stack testing data than any site. He next asked if there were any other sources in the industry. Ms. Chavez said she doubted it; the semi-conductor industry usually did not have stack-testing requirements.
- Mike Williams commented that part of the challenge was to put together the emissions data and the modeling while looking at short term, infrequent situations. He suggested they were trying to answer what the task force should be answering. Thom Little said that they should ascertain what data existed, what got plugged into the model, and where the shortcomings were. Sarah Chavez said that if they wanted to do emissions modeling, they needed emissions data. Intel had limited sources of emissions data, including compliance stack testing data, which was public and collected by ERM. Intel also had emissions factors based on testing done at Intel facilities. The next step was to agree to which data to use, and how to look at that data to come up with an emission rate to use in the model.
- Lynne Kinis said that there was a test done during the task force that took health complaints and/or odor complaints to correlate with the timing of the reported complaints and downtime spikes. Mike Williams asked if DRI did this testing. He said that he had tried to download the data but got a "data corrupted" error. Ms. Kinis said Barbara Rockwell had the data, so she could get it. Ms. Kinis said this study was most likely in 2003-04. Although Intel might have more recent data, there were people that were exposed and affected by what happened in 03-04, so she did not think that data should be ignored.

- Lane Kirkpatrick said the way he thought about it was worse case emissions scenario past, present and future against worse case meteorological scenarios against the concerns. Mike Williams said it was more complicated.
- Roberta King said she went to the Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water, which was established a long time ago, and downloaded information on correlations. She said the correlations were being made before Intel had RTOs. Residents began monitoring with the FTIR monitor, and Fred Marsh made correlations from people's complaints, so the information was there. However, Intel never accepted these correlations.
- Lane Kirkpatrick said that was why he suggested a historical evaluation. He said that since the complaints came in, the HF levels might have changed. Comparing the information over the past, present and future because the situation always changed was common sense. Sarah Chavez said that point could be added to the list the task force would determine. Mr. Kirkpatrick said if you had 100 complaints in 2005 versus 20 complaints now, it would be interesting to see why.
- Stephen Littlejohn raised the issue of "future" because the committee thought they could not know future projections. John Bartlit commented that the STTF got a lot of pressure not to comment on the past, especially from Fred Marsh. The message was that incorporating the past would corrupt the process. By saying to incorporate the past now, would it raise similar objections from the community? He said the public very strongly said do not look at past effects.
- Roberta King said she was confused about the "past" as an issue. Thom Little said that Fred Marsh had said very directly that they could not correlate their findings with anything that occurred in the past due to change of processes.
- Mike Williams said that in looking at health effects of crystalline silica, they were looking at lifetime exposure. Spikes were short term, and effects could occur in one hour. Thom Little suggested this was an issue for the task force to decide. Mike Williams said they would need a statistician to talk about joint probabilities and correlations.
- Sarah Chavez said that, in reference to Lynne Kinis's comment, the data most available was ERM/Intel stack testing data. Stephen Littlejohn said the committee really reality tested this fact, and it was a pragmatic issue. The CEWG could not get the money to do new testing, and they need data to do modeling. Intel had a lot of data. John Bartlit suggested taking this data sampling plan to the mayor and village council to check their opinions on whether or not the spikes plan was worth doing under this circumstance.

**DECISION:** CEWG members agreed to the following process:

<p>Filename: CEWG Draft Meeting Summary 2-15-12, v. 3          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Stephen Littlejohn          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: February 27, 2012</p>	<p>Approved: 3-21-12</p>
---	--------------------------

- Survey existing public data.
  - Hydrogen Fluoride task force will determine what data to use (past and present), how to sample the data, and the length of sampling.
  - Take data sampling plan to village council for “review.”
- Lynne Kinis thanked Thom Little for clarifying his comments on Fred Marsh.
  - Mr. Littlejohn suggested keeping this agenda item going in the next meeting.

### **EHS REPORT/ EPA 114 UPDATE**

- Thom Little said Intel was doing boiler testing and VOC testing in February. He said there were four downtimes but no unabated emissions. On Jan. 17 a scrubber went down for repairs; it should be back up on Feb. 27. An RTO was down 11 hours, and redundancy kicked in with no unabated emissions. Two RTO units were down for semi-annual preventative maintenance, with redundancy online and no unabated emissions. Hugh Church asked that “RTO” be indicated on the EHS Report along with the unit’s “official” name in the permit. Thom Little agreed.
- Thom Little said there were no calls/reports from neighbors. Dennis O’Mara said he had read his complaint letter last month at the CEWG meeting. Mr. Little replied that his complaints were about events that happened in the summer, so they would not be captured in the February report. Sarah Chavez added that the report was only for the month, but Mr. O’Mara’s complaints would be logged elsewhere. Thom Little said that for the record, if anyone contacted him directly, their complaint was logged into the report. Mr. O’Mara asked that the title be more generic, “All communications” versus just “Calls (e-mails)”.
- Lynne Kinis said she believed the shotgun incident should be reported. If she had not mentioned it, Intel would not have mentioned it. Thom Little disagreed. He said if there were legal investigations going on, Intel could not report on it. Sarah Chavez added that the EHS this report was about environmental impact. Ms. Kinis said the incident could have had a serious environmental impact. Mr. Little said the EHS report listed when the lights were replaced. He said he did not understand how the actual fact of the lights being shot out was an environmental fact. Ms. Kinis asked what if he hit a container that could have caused an environmental problem. Ms. Chavez said that Ms. Kinis was asking them to speculate. If something had happened that affected the environment, it would be in this EHS report, she said. Bill Davidson noted that it was a matter of public record, the police department had to comment on the issue, and Intel could not speak for the police department. Anytime there was a reasonable environmental issue, like the fire, Intel reported it, he said.

- Sarah Chavez said Intel did not receive any calls from the EPA on the 114 report. She asked if Intel needed to give a recap on the matter. The group agreed to a reminder.

**ACTION:** Sarah Chavez will recap the 114 inspection/report at the next meeting.

- Lynne Kinis asked for a more substantive report on the major source permit change. Sarah Chavez said the report for next month would only focus on the 114 report. She said she could give another detailed presentation on the permit change at a different time, possibly April.

## MEETING ADJOURNED

## NEXT MEETING

March 21, 2012, 5 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.

## DECISION SUMMARY

1. CEWG members agree that tangible improvements could be made by pursuing the spikes issue.
2. CEWG agreed to use a community-based task force to conduct the spikes study.
3. CEWG members agreed to pursue building a task force using the following process: the CEWG would first consult with the mayor of Corrales and the village council to generate a potential list, and then return the list back for their review. Next they would advertise in the paper.
4. CEWG members agreed to the following process:
  - a. Establish a committee with appropriate expertise to survey the literature;
  - b. Establish a rationale and possible provisional level;
  - c. Bring the report to the CEWG to review;
  - d. Send the report to ATSDR for comment;
  - e. Additional public involvement to be determined.
5. CEWG members agreed to the nominations of Hugh Church, Mike Williams and John Alsobrook as small committee members.
6. CEWG members agreed to the following process:
  - a. Survey existing public data.
  - b. Hydrogen Fluoride task force will determine what data to use (past and present), how to sample the data, and the length of sampling.
  - c. Take data sampling plan to village council for “review.”