

MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: October 17, 2012
Time: 5:00–7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Senior Center

Members Attending

John Bartlit, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water
 Mike Williams, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water

Lane Kirkpatrick, Corrales resident
 Hugh Church, American Lung Assc. in NM
 Sarah Chavez, Intel

Non-Members Attending

Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident
 Roberta King, Corrales resident
 Dennis O’Mara, Corrales resident
 Andrew Moen, Intel

Liz Shipley, Intel
 Frank Gallegos, Intel
 Coleman Smith, NMED
 Karen Schmidt, *Rio Rancho Observer*

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary September 19, 2012
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Reports
- Media reports and articles, as available
- Topics Rankings

PROPOSED AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items
- EHS Report and 114 Update
- Topic Priorities
- HF Spikes Update
- Neighborhood Survey Update
- November Meeting
- CEWG Planning
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

Filename: CEWG Draft Meeting Summary 10-17-12, v. 4 Approved: 11-28-12
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: November 20, 2012

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

No comments.

Sept. 19, 2012 Meeting Summary—Revisions and Approval

Roberta King asked to include qualifications in the meeting summary about the September substitute recorder, Dani Jones-Kvam. She also commented that the Acting Chair's recitation of the CEWG mission as written in the September Meeting Summary was different from what he actually said at the meeting. She said that as written, it seemed like boilerplate language. Stephen Littlejohn asked Mr. Bartlit if the mission was written as he meant to say it. Mr. Bartlit said "yes." Lastly, Ms. King said there was some confusion as to her comments as written on page 3. The line in the second bullet point, "Ms. King said that Intel affects the moisture in the air...", should read instead as "Ms. King said that cloud cover affects the moisture in the air..." She said that the cloud cover was causing the emissions to be held down at ground level where air was breathed, and not Intel.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will make the following changes to the September Meeting Summary: 1. Add the qualifications of the substitute recorder, Dani Jones-Kvam; and 2. Correct the sentence in the second bullet on page 3 as stated above.

Report on weather station

Hugh Church said he spoke with Brian Rashap the day before. Mr. Rashap said he was in Arizona and that Mr. Church should contact his administrative assistant to schedule a meeting.

Other Announcements

Stephen Littlejohn said the new projector had arrived. It was a gift from the CEWG to the Corrales Senior Center for the CEWG's use and others who might need it. The projector would be locked away but available for CEWG meetings.

Public Comment

Roberta King asked people to speak louder.

EHS REPORT, OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS, EPA 114 UPDATE

Sarah Chavez said the EHS report was short this month. Intel had not received any complaints from neighbors, and there were few construction events and regulatory agency activity. She also noted that there was a question about how Intel responds to odor complaints. A copy of Thom Little's answer was attached to last month's EHS Report. The intent of that document was not to

be used as a public document as it as an internal procedure. If the CEWG would like to make it a public-friendly document, then Intel could create a version that eliminates the acronyms and jargon. Mr. Littlejohn said that the CEWG would like Intel to modify it to show the step-by-step process in layman's terms, and then it could be placed on the back of the EHS Report and serve as a constant reminder of Intel's protocol. Ms. Chavez said Intel would summarize all the details in the first version into a new form.

ACTION ITEM: Sarah Chavez will coordinate revising the odor response process for the monthly EHS report in user-friendly language.

- Sarah Chavez reported on the upcoming technical permit revision and provided the following summary. In December 2011, she gave the first presentation on Intel becoming a major source permit holder because of new federal regulations on greenhouse gases, and this change required permit additions. Intel submitted the Title V (major source) permit application in April, and it was approved in June. Now the next step was to draft the Title V permit. Intel would now have two permits to which they must comply—the Title V permit and their current permit. The New Source Review (NSR) permit, which was the permit Intel has held for many years, continued to remain in place as per NMED standard operating procedures. Ms. Chavez, Andrew Moen and Liz Shipley traveled to Santa Fe to meet with NMED to learn about the final technical revision process, and they planned to share what they learned at tonight's CEWG meeting.
- Ms. Chavez said NMED had a permit template that organizations must follow, which contained many tables. Intel's NSR permit was not formatted according to NMED's template, so Intel must reformat the NSR permit to fit the template. Intel would have to make changes to record keeping and recording requirements to be consistent with requirements of Title V sources. Ms. Chavez said that Intel was considered a minor source for all pollutants except greenhouse gas, which will be major source.
- Lane Kirkpatrick asked about greenhouse gas regulation and the current political climate. John Bartlit and Cole Smith both mentioned a Supreme Court case that ruled greenhouse gases endangered public health, and now the EPA was mandated to regulate greenhouse gases.
- Roberta King asked when Intel was deemed a major source. Ms. Chavez responded as of January 1, 2012. Intel was then given a certain amount of time to submit an application to NMED, and NMED had a certain amount of time to issue a permit. John Bartlit asked if it was normal for an organization to be considered a major source on greenhouse gases and minor on all other pollutants. Cole Smith responded that it was very common among many organizations. Ms. Chavez said Intel's Oregon and Arizona facilities were going through a similar process with Title, 5 since it was based on federal, not state, regulations.

- Sarah Chavez summarized the changes Intel was considering making to their permit as follows.
 1. Update or change thermal oxidizer operational monitoring requirements and increase monitoring frequency. For example, Ms. Chavez said currently Intel monitored thermal oxidizer temperature, but they could also include the system bypass damper, which would indicate when emissions were leaving the stacks untreated. This would help with redundancy and provide information on emissions treatments.
 2. Regarding administrative requirements around tool ducting, Intel was looking to change in language to put the tool to the right abatement device, which would help increase the device's efficiency.
 3. Intel proposed imposing recordkeeping requirements on the emissions calculations, emissions factors, and reporting of state air toxins, which would enable Intel to use the most accurate data possible.
 4. Ms. Chavez said that Intel's current permit had a condition that allowed for a reduction in stack testing after 2 years of data collection. Intel was considering asking to reduce the testing frequency based on 12 years of data collection. Currently, Intel tested thermal oxidizers 4 times a year and scrubbers once annually.
 5. Lastly, NMED was regulating cooling towers around the state, and Intel's permit did not contain any conditions on cooling towers. Therefore, Intel must request that cooling tower monitoring requirements are added to their permit. Total solids and water flow rates were typically monitored in cooling towers, as well as the drift eliminator, which minimized how many drops of water were escaping.
- Ms. Chavez said Intel wanted to maintain transparency with the community on this process, and some ideas on how to do this were to: 1. Provide information using the CEWG Web site, since it was more accessible to the public; 2. Bring information to CEWG meetings; and 3. Utilize the ExploreIntel.com Web site to add information on parametric monitoring using real-time data; 4. Post emissions reports submitted to NMED on the CEWG Web site. 5. Add information on cooling towers to the Explore Intel Web site. Ms. Chavez emphasized that Intel would work with the community to increase the amount of accessible information.
- Ms. Chavez said all Intel's pollutants would be regulated as a major source even though some, such as VOCs and NOX, were still considered a minor source. Also, Title V required Intel to submit a compliance certification verifying that Intel reviewed their records and were in compliance with the Title V permit. If anything was remiss, Intel

would have to report why and what they would do to fix it. Ms. Chavez said an Intel environmental engineer would have to check all the records for compliance, and then Brian Rashap must sign off on the final compliance certificate. Ms. Chavez said the Title V permit and the NSR template clearly laid out the regulations, so it was easier for an NMED inspector to look at the facility and verify compliance.

- Roberta King confirmed that the inspector looked at Intel's written records. Ms. Chavez said the permit told what records Intel needed to keep, and then Intel had to prove to inspectors that these records were maintained. Ms. King asked "who watched the foxes guarding the henhouse?" Cole Smith said NMED received semi-annual and annual reports from Intel. Ms. Chavez clarified that Title V had a more routine inspection schedule, and Intel expected to be audited more often. Cole Smith verified that audits occurred every one or two years.
- Ms. Chavez said she would provide a summary of permit changes. She said that NMED had a timeline for writing the permit, so Intel agreed to submit the NSR permit draft by end of October, which would give NMED a year for the Title V permit writing process.
- Roberta King asked Ms. Chavez to specifically name the responsible person as well as their job title rather than just stating "we". She also asked that Intel make the permit easily available in a central location and in a timely manner for review by the public. Ms. Chavez said she intended to provide a summary of changes Intel was considering for feedback via email before submitting the technical permit revision. She would also make the Title V application available for review.
- Stephen Littlejohn said they could put this information on Facebook, the CEWG Web site and in the CEWG newsletter. No one objected to his suggestion. *See page 10 for a consolidated list of communication options.*

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will post Intel's NSR technical permit revision summary of changes and Title V application information on Facebook, the CEWG Web site and in the CEWG newsletter.

- Dennis O'Mara said it didn't make sense to him that Intel would ask for a reduction in monitoring frequency given that they were always exploring new ways of improving their products or developing new products, which seemed to require different approaches to manufacturing and using different materials. Also, he asked what new frequencies Intel was going to request.
- Sarah Chavez said that right now Intel tested thermal oxidizers for 2 consecutive weeks

each quarter; scrubbers were tested 8 consecutive hours annually. Also, over the last 12 years, the chemicals used in the semi-conductor manufacturing process did not change. Intel had found over 12 years of collecting data that the emissions remained stable for VOCs and HAP. Emissions consistently contained the same 3 chemicals at the same levels. Intel was now asking whether it made sense to continue testing at the same rate. Ms. Chavez said that Intel's technology group tested at the tool itself, which showed emissions of smaller chemicals, and that particular testing process would remain in place. Intel would still have information on emissions to include in emissions reporting. Ms. Chavez said Intel was looking to change thermal oxidizers testing to 8 consecutive hours annually, and then for scrubbers, limit testing to chemicals they routinely see. There was no point to test chemicals that they could not identify, Ms. Chavez said. They would rely on the testing the technology development side did to report on the remaining emissions.

- John Bartlit said he spoke in the past about doing less of one kind of testing, and applying those resources to conduct other kinds of testing that have not been done in the past. He had questions for Cole Smith of NMED, and would like Mr. Smith to hear these ideas. Mr. Smith said he would be happy to meet with Mr. Bartlit in Santa Fe. Mr. Bartlit said it was better to have this discussion at a CEWG meeting with an audience present. Mr. Bartlit said Intel did a lot of repetitive testing that didn't get anywhere, and the community did not believe the results. They could take a small fraction of that money and do something different with it. Sarah Chavez said they could consider doing things outside the permit that were easier to implement and change. Mr. Bartlit said there was a lot of opportunity to do something more useful. Mr. Littlejohn said they could put this topic on the agenda to discuss in more detail in a future meeting.
- Lynne Kinis thanked Cole Smith for attending the CEWG meeting. She asked Ms. Chavez if changing monitoring requirements for RTOs would be witnessed in the EHS report. Ms. Chavez replied that she did not think it would change since they reported emissions that went untreated, and that was what NMED wanted to know. So the reporting would be more formalized and not changed. Ms. Kinis commented that she appreciated the clarity with which Ms. Chavez was presenting the permit revision information.
- Ms. Chavez reported they still had not heard back from EPA.

TOPIC PRIORITIES

Stephen Littlejohn said he emailed the topic priorities based on feedback. The lower number represented the highest priority. He asked if there were any comments and concerns, and asked the group to vote on consensus. Dennis O'Mara asked if it were possible to discuss second and third level topic priorities. Stephen Littlejohn replied yes, and that this was just a guide based on current circumstances.

DECISION: The group agreed to the topic priorities as ranked.

HF SPIKES UPDATE

Mike Williams asked Sarah Chavez if meteorological (met) data was put into the new format yet. Ms. Chavez said “Paul” at Intel was waiting to talk with Mr. Williams in order to put the data into the correct format. She said she would set up a conference call to figure out the most efficient way to send Mr. Williams the files. Mr. Williams asked if he had done the quality assurance. Ms. Chavez said she did not know where he was in the process, but she confirmed that they were working on getting Mr. Williams the weather and emissions data that he needed. Also, the majority of the data was coming from Class One, the current contracted provider of processed met data. Stephen Littlejohn reminded that the CEWG needed to spend the money on the statistician by the end of the year.

NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY UPDATE

- Lane Kirkpatrick reported on his Neighborhood Survey. He said that he conducted two interviews and needed to ramp up his efforts. His goal was to have 10 to 12 interviews completed by end of the month. He referred to the survey document handout and spoke about the question order. The survey started out generally, and then asked questions and prompts on environment, air quality, air specific incidences and seasons. He said he learned some things, including that the kind of air conditioning a home had made a difference. Swamp coolers pulled in air from the outside, while refrigerated air recycled the same air indoors. Also, the amount of time people spent at their residences made a difference.
- Lane Kirkpatrick said he noticed that people might be concerned about talking because they might want to sell their houses in the future. They referred to another neighbor with a history of lodging complaints, and said she would never be able to sell her house. To deal with this issue, Mr. Kirkpatrick told interviewees that he would not use names, but he would pinpoint locations. Also, he would concentrate more on the fence line. He was also learning about people’s misconception of certain facts. For example, someone mentioned the ATSDR report and asked why the information was being suppressed (when in fact ATSDR had not responded yet). He said his goal was to get specific information on odors.
- John Bartlit asked Mr. Kirkpatrick how the neighbors were responding to him, in general. Mr. Kirkpatrick replied that the neighbors knew him so it was not an issue. He said he was encouraged that the interviews would give some good insight, at least on what neighbors’ fears or concerns were, and on how to communicate better.
- Stephen Littlejohn reiterated that this was Lane Kirkpatrick’s study and not a CEWG

survey, per se, and it was not a scientific study. However, it could yield good insights that the CEWG might want to take up in a more scientific manner in the future.

- Lane Kirkpatrick added that he had asked people to call him at any time of the night if they smelled an odor, and he would be there in five minutes, since he wanted to smell the odor as well. Roberta King suggested that he might find homes that were empty because people had died or moved. She asked Mr. Kirkpatrick to note how many homes were empty. Mr. Kirkpatrick said the question of pulmonary fibrosis had come up in the interviews. Ms. King commented that refrigerated air was not working like it used to due to a disintegration from chemicals. Mr. Kirkpatrick said he was happy to share what he knew with neighbors, but he did not want to come across as an expert, especially in health effects.

NOVEMBER MEETING

Stephen Littlejohn said the next meeting originally was scheduled for November 21, Thanksgiving eve, which was not a good day for most people. The agenda committee recommended combining November and December meetings. The new, suggested date for the next meeting was November 28th. There would not be a meeting scheduled in December. Mr. Littlejohn asked for consensus.

DECISION: The group agreed to having a combined November/December meeting on November 28, and to not holding a meeting in December.

- Roberta King asked how this change in schedule related to Intel's permit revision schedule. Sarah Chavez responded that she hoped people would send feedback between now and next week or so. Based on the short time schedule, she suggested continuing the discussion in future CEWG meetings on Mr. Bartlit's idea of looking for additional stack testing as well as taking action outside the permit. John Bartlit added that they could also have email discussions.
- Cole Smith said that for the Title V program, NMED issued a public notice when the draft permit notice was issued. The 30-day comment period began when the public notice was published. If there was significant public interest, they could request a public hearing for NSR permits. Otherwise, the applying company provided public interaction and not NMED. Roberta King asked what NMED considered sufficient interest to have a public meeting, and who was the responsible party for that decision at NMED. She said that there were regular public meetings when Jay Stimmel was at NMED. Mr. Smith replied that the air quality bureau requested the Environmental Protection division director to make a determination on whether to have a public meeting based on public interest.
- John Bartlit clarified that they were talking about three things: 1. Submitted paper

comments; 2. A public meeting to discuss issues; and 3. A public hearing. Sarah Chavez said that Intel was looking for community feedback and comments on the NSR permit revision before actually submitting the revision request. Roberta King asked if Intel planned to get word to the community using the CEWG newsletter. Stephen Littlejohn said the CEWG newsletter was distributed to 70 people and opened by 30 to 40. Other options were to post on Facebook and the CEWG Web site. Mr. Littlejohn said they could do more, including putting a notice in the newspaper. Sarah Chavez said that part of the process was to publish a public notice in newspaper, and that would happen at the end of this week. Ms. King asked what would it take to print out the information and post the notice on public information boards in Corrales. She said that Intel could make better efforts to notify the community. For example, there were 6 official posting places in the Village of Corrales, including: 1. At the Senior Center; 2. Inside the Village Office; and 3. Outside the Village office. It had to be somewhere where people could physically see it 24/7, Ms. King said. Lane Kirkpatrick commented that the question was what was the best way to reach people. Ms. Chavez said the notice was posted in the legal section of the *Albuquerque Journal* and *Rio Rancho Observer* as well as in display ads, and that these were the legal requirements.

- Lynne Kinis said she was going to wait for the summary to be printed out before asking questions, but she was concerned that the community would not be able to comment because of timing. Therefore, she insisted that Intel hold a public meeting on these different changes, and she believed others in the community would want one as well.
- Stephen Littlejohn said the public meeting could be sponsored by Intel or NMED, and asked Ms. Kinis her preference. Ms. Kinis replied NMED. Cole Smith said that holding a public meeting was up to the bureau chief. Therefore, the public would need to write or email him so he could prove to management their interest. Dennis O'Mara said if NMED advertised holding a public meeting, they'd get quite a big response.
- Lynne Kinis suggested Brian Rashap write a letter to the community about the permit revision and what it concerned. Sarah Chavez said Intel had talked about permit revisions in at least 2 previous letters to the community. Roberta King reminded about a "dear neighbor letter" in the past that filled the meeting room because the community believed they had a chance to express their concerns.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group about their feelings around public meetings. Lane Kirkpatrick said to combine it with the spikes issues or some other point to draw more people. John Bartlit said spikes study won't be ready, but they could report on what they were doing in the study. Mr. Kirkpatrick said that permits didn't mean anything to many people, so how would they get people to attend? Sarah Chavez said that they used to have regular permit meetings, but the same people always showed up, and those were the

people who attended CEWG meetings. John Bartlit said they could meet at CEWG meetings.

- Sarah Chavez said NMED was restricted on what they could regulate, which was why Intel brought more information to CEWG meetings rather than to NMED meetings. Most concerns in the past were about health effects, but NMED addressed permit changes and not health effects. She asked Ms. Kinis and Ms. King why it was beneficial to hold a meeting like that and how that might be different.
- Stephen Littlejohn suggested dedicating about an hour of the November 28 meeting to permit changes and creating an advertisement that invited the community to come and state their concerns and offer suggestions. They could also put the invitation in the regular newspaper ad, on the Web site and Facebook page, and Intel Public Affairs could issue another neighborhood letter, if they wanted to. Roberta King strongly suggested the latter. Dennis O'Mara suggested giving an exclusive interview to the *Corrales Comment* editor. Stephen Littlejohn said the CEWG advertised every month in the *Corrales Comment* and *Rio Rancho Observer*.

The consolidated list of suggested options to communicate about Intel NSR permit revisions is:

1. CEWG newsletter
 2. CEWG Web site
 3. CEWG Facebook page
 4. Using monthly CEWG meeting newspaper advertisements
 5. A neighborhood letter from Brian Rashap
 6. Post the notice in the legal section of the *Albuquerque Journal* and *Rio Rancho Observer* as well as in display ads (this option is legally required)
 7. Hold a well-advertised public meeting
 8. Post on 6 information boards located throughout Corrales
 9. Bring information to CEWG meetings
 10. Utilize the ExploreIntel.com Web site to add information on parametric monitoring using real-time data and information on cooling towers
 11. Post emissions reports submitted to NMED on the CEWG Web site.
- Cole Smith said the NSR permit might already be issued by November 28. He suggested a better option. NMED would surely hold a public meeting on the Title V draft permit, which would be available in early 2013. There would be a 30-day comment period. This would leave plenty of time for further public meetings since the Title V permit did not need to be completed until end 2013.
 - Stephen Littlejohn said that would leave out the opportunity to comment on Intel's NSR permit recommendations. Sarah Chavez responded yes and no. Mr. Smith said the Title V

rule was that they needed monitoring sufficient to give reasonable assurance on continuous compliance. Lynne Kinis asked if that only applied to greenhouse gases. Sarah Chavez said no, that all pollutants would be regulated as a major so all requirements and conditions applied across the board. Mr. Smith added Title V was designed to umbrella large facilities that had many different requirements, and the Title V program defined all NSR conditions as applicable requirements. Therefore, all the NSR conditions are pulled into the Title V permit. For the most part, the Title V was a copy of the NSR permit within the Title V rules. Mr. Smith said they could also explain the new template during a meeting at that time, if needed.

- Stephen Littlejohn asked Ms. Kinis if this was the meeting she wanted. Ms. Kinis responded yes and thanks. Roberta King asked why Intel couldn't present to public groups. Sarah Chavez asked what kind of groups would be interested. Ms. King responded that there was a Corrales Citizen's group that was interested in the environment.

CEWG PLANNING

Stephen Littlejohn said the CEWG was currently in-between projects. He reminded that the HF spikes study was underway, and they were waiting for the available data. He asked the group to brainstorm what they would like to accomplish next year. And although it was not the same issue as topic priorities, it was similar. He was looking for concrete action objectives.

- John Bartlit said he wanted to complete HF modeling. Although it was out of the CEWG's control, he also wanted to get a response from ATSDR. Lane Kirkpatrick said anything on health effects. Stephen Littlejohn listed the three things the CEWG was waiting for from ATSDR: 1. Community Health Consultation, Final Report; 2. A peer review of CEWG's crystalline silica study; and 3. Peer review of NMHD's Pulmonary Fibrosis Study. If these three issues came to fruition in 2013, then the CEWG would be very busy—it would be a monumental year, Mr. Littlejohn said. Dennis O'Mara asked if the CEWG ever approached political representatives as a way to get action from the ATSDR. Mr. Bartlit said that was a possibility, especially after elections, when there would be a new congressional delegation. Mr. Littlejohn suggested setting an objective with this new delegation.
- Lane Kirkpatrick asked for confirmation about water. Stephen Littlejohn said it was lower priority because other groups were handling it. He mentioned a rule that if anyone had any action item on a topic it would immediately become a higher priority item. John Bartlit reminded that the CEWG already did work on water in the past. Roberta King said that this group issued their report to the Corrales Village Council, and the Council was not happy with it. She said the whole report was published in the *Corrales Comment*. Mr. Kirkpatrick said the CEWG could review the report to see if it met their concerns.

- Hugh Church asked Mike Williams where he would like to see another weather tower erected. Mr. Church said he would like to see one placed on the other side of the fence line. Sarah Chavez asked him to verify if he wanted one that met the EPA requirements, which cost more. Mr. Williams asked if they wanted more than weather data. Mr. Church said they wanted air flow and temperature. Frank Gallegos suggested they decide what they wanted to use the information for. Mr. Williams said they had to keep open the question of other ambient monitoring. He also said they had to be careful about obstructions in an area, because then they would just get a lot of “noise”. John Bartlit asked how much discretionary funds the CEWG had every year. Stephen Littlejohn said \$5,000. Sarah Chavez said that the higher quality the data the more expensive the weather tower equipment would be.
- Lynne Kinis asked about an NMED trailer. Cole Smith said it was there for about 6 months before it was moved down south in 2011. Ms. Kinis asked if that might be helpful to collect data. Mr. Smith said the trailer streamed data to the Web all the time. He said they could probably find the old data that it produced around NOX, CO and particulates. Lane Kirkpatrick asked if 6 months of weather data might be useful to any of the modeling studies. Mr. Smith said he didn’t know. Ms. Chavez said the data might be too short. Mr. Kirkpatrick said it depended on what kind of data they collected, 24-hours of sampling might detect something.
- Lane Kirkpatrick asked how much air monitoring should be done, how relevant was that to what they were trying to learn, and should that be separate from weather data. So sometime in 2013, the CEWG may need to review air monitoring data and whether more was necessary. They may conclude that it was not necessary, but it was important to look at from an ambient point of view. Mike Williams said that was a big task. Cole Smith said most of NMED’s stationary ozone monitors were in San Juan or Rio Arriba counties. The ozone standard is 75 ppb and it ran about 70 in those counties. Mike Williams asked what else was monitored besides ozone. Mr. Cole said that he did not know, but the stationary monitors collected mostly ozone, and the mobile trailer may look at particulates.
- Stephen Littlejohn said that at the very least, they could request information about data collected in the trailer and how to use it. Hugh Church said it would be interesting to learn what weather data Darko Koracin had for his study that they didn’t have now that allowed correlation of wind direction with episodic reports
- John Bartlit suggested having an emergency management team in Rio Rancho conduct a vulnerability analysis that focused on possible terrorism/vandalism issues at Intel.

- Mike Williams said it would make sense to get Koracin's data. Lynne Kinis said she gave it to him. Roberta King said it was available from the 2002 Corrales Air Quality Task Force Study. Sarah Chavez said she could not recall where he got the weather data.
- Cole Smith said that for those who wanted to use OLM or PBMRM method, they needed a meteorological set, and there were only two in state: one in the southeast corner and one in the northwest corner, near Farmington. The only way data was collected was that they modeled and couldn't show attainment, and needed to monitor to show that there was nonattainment. So to model you needed to have good data for every day of year.

The list of objectives to accomplish in 2013 follows next:

1. Complete HF
2. Receive ATSDR report and act on it
 - a. Community health consultation
 - b. Peer review of the silica study
 - c. Peer review of the NMHD fibrosis study
3. Spur the ATSDR to submit its reports—e.g. contact Congressional reps.
4. Receive report of Corrales water group
5. Communicate with Congressional delegation about the work of the CEWG
6. Discuss/recommend desired weather data, what kind of station is needed, and where to put it. What did weather data did Koracin have that we do not?
7. Learn about NMED trailer, what it monitors, and how we might use it.
8. Request information about data collected in NMED trailer at Intel.
9. Review air monitoring that is currently done, what is possible, and whether to recommend additional monitoring.
10. Have emergency management of Rio Rancho conduct a vulnerability analysis related to terrorism/vandalism.
11. Get the complete Koracin report and do an analysis of it.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

None.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING

November 28, 2012, 5 to 7 p.m.
Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.

DECISION SUMMARY

1. The group agreed to the topic priorities.

Filename: CEWG Draft Meeting Summary 10-17-12, v. 4 Approved: 11-28-12 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: November 20, 2012

2. The group agreed to a combined November/December meeting, and to not hold a meeting in December. The November meeting has been rescheduled for November 28.