

MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: July 17, 2013
Time: 5:00–7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Senior Center

Members Attending

John Bartlit, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water
 Hugh Church, American Lung Assc. in NM

Sarah Chavez, Intel
 Lane Kirkpatrick, Corrales Resident
 Mike Williams, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water

Non-Members Attending

Roberta King, Corrales resident
 Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident

Dennis O’Mara, Corrales resident

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary June 2013
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Reports
- Media reports and articles, as available
- CEWG Planning Draft
- Draft letters to ATSDR
- Wikipedia article on ALEC

PROPOSED AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items
- EHS Report, EPA 114 and Permit Updates
- CEWG Planning
- ATSDR Draft Letters
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

<p>Filename: CEWG Draft Meeting Summary 07-17-13, v. 2. Approved: August 21, 2013 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013</p>

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

John Bartlit said the materials to be distributed also included a Wikipedia article about ALEC.

Meeting Summaries (June)—Revisions and Approval

Lynne Kinis commented on page 11, first bullet, June Meeting Summary. She would like an insertion to clarify the order of noted meetings. Roberta King clarified the order of meetings. The first meeting was an Intel permit meeting in which the community was allowed to speak their concerns. Many community members showed up because the meeting coincided with an Intel “Dear Neighbor” letter and wanted to express their concerns around the letter. The following CEWG meeting was canceled by Intel because of security concerns stemming from the previous permit meeting. Then, Intel held another permit meeting, facilitated by someone other than Stephen Littlejohn. Ms. Kinis and Ms. King said that this third meeting was “packed with Intel cheerleaders who live in Corrales.”

Ms. Kinis reminded that Intel did not give a reason for cancelling the CEWG meeting mentioned above, it was only afterwards that Intel mentioned a perceived security threat. Stephen Littlejohn confirmed this statement was true, because Jami Grindatto was advised by local police not to publicize the concern. He said he strongly reality tested with Mr. Grindatto about cancelling the meeting, and given the security concern, he went along with it. Roberta King said the so-called threat was from a man who spent enormous sums of money with drilling wells.

The bullet in on page 11 stood corrected as follows:

- “Lynne Kinis suggested looking at past meeting history. In an Intel permit meeting that coincided with an Intel “Dear Neighbor” letter sent to the community, many Corrales neighbors attended and were able to voice their concerns. The subsequent CEWG meeting was canceled by Intel because of security concerns stemming from the previous permit meeting. Then, Intel held another permit meeting, facilitated by someone other than Stephen Littlejohn. Intel packed the meeting with Corrales residents who were also Intel staff and acted as Intel cheerleaders. Thus, public discussion was interrupted in this order of events, so people said why bother coming to any more meetings. She said community members needed to have an avenue to vent, and when they vented, Intel needed to listen.”

Stephen Littlejohn clarified that his bullet point on page 11 following the one discussed above was a general comment about meeting facilitation rather than a comment that referred to the previous bullet.

Lynne Kinis asked that the following point be added to the June meeting summary, to be inserted in a separate bullet point following Stephen Littlejohn's bullet discussed above on page 11. "People are not heard, and thus they don't want to waste their time coming to meetings."

HF Modeling Update

Mike Williams said that the data were ready and will be mailed to him shortly.

Code Red Update

Dennis O'Mara reported that he and Lynne Kinis met with Rio Rancho officials—Theresa Greeno, Emergency Programs Manager, Jonathan Garcia, Fire Marshall, and Thomas Carrascondola, Battalion Chief—on June 18. He said he and Ms. Kinis were very impressed with the process of planning and preparedness that the Rio Rancho team was constantly undergoing to be as ready as possible for all possible scenarios. Battalion Chief Carrascondola gave a tour of the emergency operations center and said he could get anything he wanted anywhere, at any time and quickly. He cited as an example the case of a young teenage boy swept away by the river. Within 30 minutes, they had mobilized many people working the whole sector of the river, from helicopter and boats to horseback and people canvassing the riverbank on foot. Mr. O'Mara said the next meeting was scheduled for July 24 with Intel, after which the Code Red Committee would write a report detailing their findings.

Achievements—Status

Stephen Littlejohn said he compiled a list of substantive CEWG achievements at last month's meeting, and asked the group if they would like to formalize and publish the document or just let it stand as a resource document. Sarah Chavez suggested the CEWG review and approve the document at the next meeting to make it a resource document. John Bartlit said the CEWG had committed to putting out an annual report and should continue with it. Mr. Littlejohn suggested that, since the CEWG had few recent accomplishments, they could publish the entire list instead, and bring it back as an agenda item for the August meeting.

ACTION: Stephen Littlejohn will add the achievements document as an agenda item for discussion at next month's meeting.

Public Comment

Roberta King commented that the handout article on ALEC was insufficient. ALEC's Web site was cleaned up and public relations-oriented. To get accurate information on ALEC the best Web site that contained extensive investigative reporting was through Alternative Radio: http://www.alecexposed.org/wiki/ALEC_Exposed. John Bartlit said the ALEC meeting handout article was part of a Wikipedia article that contained criticisms of ALEC. Ms. King said this article was not substantive.

Filename: CEWG Draft Meeting Summary 07-17-13, v. 2. Approved: August 21, 2013 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013
--

EHS REPORT, EPA 114 UPDATE

Sarah Chavez said end of June/July was a busy time for regulatory, and she inadvertently skipped a report from last month, which she apologized for.

- Sarah Chavez said that Intel had received several calls from one caller over a two-week period. All calls went through the regular security check, which entailed checking equipment and walking the fence line. Intel also received an email complaint, which did not go through the security check because it came in after the fact.
- Lane Kirkpatrick said he spoke with the person making the complaint and told her he would appreciate getting a call from her when she had a complaint, and he would go to her house to check it out. He also spoke with the other person who made a complaint, and she admitted that she was very sensitive to the air she breathed and the symptoms she experienced. He said he thought there was a difference in what and how people experienced the odors and concluded that the people who complained were honest about the triggers and were extraordinarily sensitive.
- Lynne Kinis added that terrain also made a difference. Some people lived in pockets where the air gathered and others didn't. She also repeated, for the record, that walking the fence line wouldn't convey anything negative with the new towers at 40 meters. Mike Williams said he disagreed. The towers were one set of emissions, but the scrubber stack height had not changed.
- Sarah Chavez said on June 29 Intel's Arizona site experienced a small leak in the nitrogen tri-fluoride line in the exhaust system of the production tool in their Sub FAB. They determined that the leak was in the tool's metal fitting and shut off the gas immediately. The Chandler fire department evaluated 43 people on site. Eleven of those were taken to area hospitals, nine were released that day, and two were kept overnight for observation and released the following day. The leak was limited to the area in the immediate vicinity of the tool and isolated and contained to that area. The Chandler fire dept. determined there were no other external leaks. Intel's Chandler site was investigating to determine the leak's cause. Ms. Chavez said that the New Mexico site had four of those same tools, which they audited to ensure there were no leaks.
- Dennis O'Mara said exposure to nitrogen tri-fluoride caused methemoglobinemia, which caused the hemoglobin to get altered on a molecular level and led to an overall reduced ability of the red blood cells to release oxygen to tissues. One of the symptoms of this condition was breathing problems, and he assumed that's what some of the people were experiencing during the accident. He said it sounded like a very, very dangerous situation. He also pointed out that the 911 emergency response was triggered by a plant employee, not an official.

- Sarah Chavez said she could not confirm Mr. O'Mara's comment because Intel's protocol was to pick up the phone on the floor, which connects directly to security. Security then activates the emergency response, including the full-time, trained onsite responders available for immediate treatment as well as the external emergency response. So, considering this protocol, it did not make sense to call external emergency response first, when the internal emergency response team were in a position to respond much quicker. She said eventually they had to activate external resources, including the ambulance.
- Roberta King said that she found it interesting that information about the Chandler accident came out at the same time a neighbor experienced the worse symptoms ever and called to complain. Her symptoms were different than what she had previously experienced and similar to symptoms experienced by people in Chandler.
- Dennis O'Mara added that oxygen was used to treat the symptoms of methemoglobinemia as well as injecting methylene blue intravenously to reverse the process. He said he looked at 10 initial news reports, and virtually all reports said nitrogen was the cause, and then eventually it became clear it was nitrogen tri-fluoride.

CEWG PLANNING

Stephen Littlejohn referred to the "CEWG Planning Highlights" handout and read through the highlights from the June meeting agenda item. In short, these highlights were:

1. Community trust remains important. Perceptions of the group vary. Some see it as a publicity front designed only to convince the community that Intel cares. Others see the CEWG as a group that has produced results. Some see the CEWG as a group of smart and committed people with many perspectives, while others feel that it is too narrow and does not properly include all the voices in the community. Some believe the Group is not critical enough, while others feel that it centers too much on community complaints.
2. The CEWG wants to be realistic about what it can and should do within its resources.
3. Members would like to study the current state of technology in abatement, monitoring, health, and safety, including greenhouse gasses, and to talk with Intel about what is possible, what is being used, and improvements that might be adopted.
4. Recognizing that science continuously improves knowledge, the Group wants to stay in touch with changes in emissions/standards science.
5. The Group would like to look into the possibility of expanding its mission to include such issues as monitoring technology, green technology, and local issues of concern such as water.
6. There is interest in engage the broader community by using focus groups, surveys, task groups, etc.

7. The ATSDR reports remain a serious concern, and the Group is feeling increasing urgency about receiving these reports.
8. The CEWG wants to complete current projects, including the HF modeling study and the Code Red study.
9. Several suggestions were made about how the group might change its way of working, including:
 - a. Use more group project work.
 - b. Conduct business through a variety of media (e.g., email, phone) in addition to face-to-face meetings. Gauge the number of meetings on the work that is going on.
 - c. Recruit more members and recruit more younger members.
 - d. Allow opportunities for the community to express their concerns.
 - e. Bring more information to the public on issues of which it may not be aware.

Mr. Littlejohn asked the group if they had anything to add to the list. Everyone agreed with Mr. Littlejohn's list.

- Dennis O'Mara commented that he would not assume that there wasn't anything the committee could have influence over that could lead to important changes. He cited CEWG's work on stack heights, which most likely cost Intel millions of dollars. So if the CEWG was able to play a large role in Intel's spending millions of dollars, then he was not sure there were any limitations on what the group could do. Stephen Littlejohn said that he didn't think people meant to imply that there were topics they could not discuss, but there were things they couldn't do because of limited funding. The CEWG could help form and participate in studies as well as study different topics to discuss seriously with Intel. John Bartlit added that although the CEWG had some influence at Intel, they did not have it with certain government elements, such as the federal congress, state legislature, and politics and politicians.
- Stephen Littlejohn said the group needed to focus on facilitation needs and qualifications. Intel would advertise the position in August, screening would occur in September, and selection in October. November and December would be orientation, and with the new facilitator attending meetings.

Mr. Littlejohn said he wanted to discuss communications, because it was connected to what the group wanted in a facilitator. He gave a summary of the CEWG's current communication methods. The CEWG had an electronic newsletter, Web site, and Facebook page. The CEWG did not get a lot of response from any of these mediums. Of the 70 people on the CEWG mailing list, about 30 people opened the newsletter, on average. The CEWG also advertised in newspapers, including the *Alibi*. Very few people came to meetings as a result of those ads but if they did not do it then they would not reach anyone. He asked the group to think about the

current way the CEWG communicated with the community and comment on what could be changed.

- Lane Kirkpatrick said it would be interesting to look at what had changed in the public perception of Intel over the years. What did the general public think now versus five or 10 years back? What were the current issues in the public view versus the past?
- Sarah Chavez mentioned that Liz Shipley spoke to the CEWG about something similar a year or two ago. Intel conducted several focus groups that looked at community perception of Intel.
- Stephen Littlejohn said the CEWG didn't have the resources to run a survey or hire a company to do it, but could do focus groups. They could hire a facilitator, recruit participants systematically, and hold it at the senior center. If they wanted a scientific broader community survey, the CEWG could ask Intel to run it, although members of the community might not believe the results.

Stephen Littlejohn said the CEWG put a big chunk of their budget into Web site and advertisements. How did they feel about that?

- Roberta King asked for updated CEWG contact information on the Web site that was downloadable or printable.
- Sarah Chavez said she liked the Web site because it was a repository for all CEWG documents and a good way to keep information easily accessible.
- Stephen Littlejohn said it was a good repository, but they were still not making full use of the Web site. They were not blogging, having threaded discussion, nor using it to facilitate dialogue. They could post a gallery of pictures. Currently it was being used as a static storage space. The CEWG paid a couple of hundred dollars a year for that space. He asked how they could make better use of Website.
- Hugh Church suggested putting the weekly agenda on Web site. Dennis O'Mara said they could recruit a younger person to be in charge of the Web site. Mr. Littlejohn said they could also recruit a facilitator with more advanced skills.
- Roberta King commented that she did not think it was outrageous for Intel to spend a couple hundred dollars a year on the CEWG Web site. She also asked how much she could count on the final document being posted. All the documents still say draft, and she did not know if it was approved and/or corrected. Mr. Littlejohn said all the documents

posted were approved, most were final and some were still in draft form. He said he would drop the “draft” from the file name if it was no longer relevant.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will drop the word “draft” from the file name of finalized documents.

- Stephen Littlejohn said he was responsible for updating both the Web site and Facebook page. The CEWG chose to start a Facebook page to reach a younger audience who tends to go there for everything (news, etc) rather than to a Web site. Dennis O’Mara and Sarah Chavez agreed with the Facebook strategy.
- Dennis O’Mara asked about the status of Intel’s “Dear Neighbor” letters. Sarah Chavez said that her understanding was that there was never a set schedule to these letters. They were sent only when important information needed to be shared. Intel internally debated how frequently to send the letters; they were concerned that if the letters were sent regularly, then they would end up as junk mail. Ms. Chavez suggested this could be a topic the CEWG discusses and advises Intel on how often to send “Dear Neighbor” letters.
- John Bartlit said everything on Web site had been approved or discussed previously by the CEWG. This was not true of Intel’s community letters. He said that if the “Dear Neighbor” letters were posted on the Web site, they would need to clarify this distinction.
- Sarah Chavez asked how much the CEWG spent on advertising. Mr. Littlejohn responded \$5,000 to \$6,000 per year. Each paper (The *ABQ Journal*, the *Alibi*, Rio Rancho paper) charged about \$150 a month; the *Corrales Comment* charged \$90. Ms. Chavez questioned the value of spending money on newspaper advertisements, since she did not recall anyone showing up to a meeting because they saw the ad.

Stephen Littlejohn asked the group what they wanted a facilitator to do.

Below is the compilation of responses: **What do you want facilitator to do?**

- Provide food
- Arrange meeting logistics
- Get to the key issues
- Be fair
- Maintain documentation
- Get to results
- Needs to have history of group. Avoid starting over. Build on past. Sensitivity to community stakeholders
- Keeping on task.
- How much technical background is required

<p>Filename: CEWG Draft Meeting Summary 07-17-13, v. 2. Approved: August 21, 2013 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013</p>

- Neutrality, impartially, fairness
 - Meeting facilitation skill
 - Group organizational ability
 - Balance between task and socioemotional work
 - Build on past; continuity and steady progress
 - Elicit ideas and perspectives from group
 - Take leadership in expanding, diversifying and developing the group and public participation
 - Publish articles for the newspaper (web site, etc?)
 - More than just an ad, indicate why issues are important. Use media for public education in understandable terms
- John Bartlit suggested that the new facilitator would need to acquire a background and history of the CEWG so they could avoid starting over, which could be done by reading the Meeting Summaries and past reports. That didn't mean any topic couldn't come up again, but they needed to build on past work.
 - Lane Kirkpatrick said the new facilitator would need to be sensitive to all the community stakeholders and their experiences.
 - Stephen Littlejohn said that they would need a facilitator who can structure the meeting in a way that balances between giving people voice and accomplishing tasks at each meeting.
 - John Bartlit brought up how much technical background was required. Lane Kirkpatrick said they would need to have some kind of ability to communicate and understand technology or to be a quick learn.
 - Roberta King said the new facilitator should read *Boiling Frogs* because it was the effort of a community group to work with Intel. John Bartlit also recommended it as a history. Ms. King said that over the last 30 years corporate rights have become much more powerful, and the facilitator should understand the larger corporate and political issues.
 - Lane Kirkpatrick said that the person would need to demonstrate strong facilitation skills
 - John Bartlit asked the group if Stephen Littlejohn was perceived as fair. Roberta King said she believed he was under the influence of who was paying the bills. Dennis O'Mara said he had no issues with Mr. Littlejohn. Lynne Kinis said that any issues she had had with Mr. Littlejohn she addressed directly with him, and those instances were rare. Lane

Kirkpatrick said that the CEWG accomplished more under Mr. Littlejohn's facilitation than under previous facilitators.

- Stephen Littlejohn said that research showed that a good facilitator needed to nurture both the tasks and the socioemotional needs of the group. They need to have some ability to joke around while guiding towards task accomplishments. Going too far in either direction, the group did not function well.
- John Bartlit said the facilitator should be able to build on the past. Stephen Littlejohn added someone who keeps the group from spinning but moving them forward or even in a more cyclical movement
- John Bartlit suggested the new facilitator have a role in expanding and developing the group.
- Stephen Littlejohn discussed the pros and cons of group size. In his opinion, right now the group was too small and therefore not stimulated enough. Robi Shields and, if Dennis O'Mara joins, would help stimulate things. On the other hand, if the CEWG grew to 15 to 20, then there would be less time to talk and express differing viewpoints. He said about 8 to 10 diverse participating people was a good number. Lane Kirkpatrick said the CEWG should reflect the diverse interests of stakeholders and the community.
- Mr. Littlejohn said there were two issues, one was the actual CEWG group and the other was public participation. For example, with the crystalline silica study, there was excellent public participation. If at regular meetings they had about 10 CEWG members and an additional 10 from the community that attended, that would be good.
- Lane Kirkpatrick said it was better if there was a smoking gun or serious issue for people to rally around. People needed something important to focus on if they were going to dedicate the time. Sarah Chavez said that if they conducted focus groups, then they could learn what the other community issues were. Mike Williams asked why they failed to get participation on the hydrogen fluoride project.
- Lynne Kinis suggested that it might be effective to have someone write an article for the *Corrales Comment* saying that the CEWG was trying to get a group together as a way to get people from the community to attend. So instead of an ad, write an article to explain to the community why it was important that they attend the meetings. Ms. Kinis added that she sat in on silica task force even though she didn't understand too much about what was going on. Dennis O'Mara said discussions in front of community members could begin with a brief explanation in simple terms.

- John Bartlit asked Mr. O'Mara how much his understanding had changed since he had been coming to CEWG meetings. Mr. O'Mara replied that he tended to compartmentalize topics and understood some of it to a degree.
- Stephen Littlejohn said the public could come to understand technical processes on a lay level, but they needed to get big picture. He said he learned a lot about many subjects, and what modeling did, for example, and how it did it. That's the kind of information they could put on the Web site and in newspapers.
- Sarah Chavez asked how to bring the new person up to speed on a topic without rehashing much of what had been discussed at length over time. How could they use the Web site to do this, perhaps develop a list of one-pagers or fact sheets that discussed things in lay terms. Stephen Littlejohn added that they could even do videos.
- Roberta King said she felt Dennis O'Mara's contribution was that he was a critical thinker who researched on his own to find answers, and he had enough of a background to discern what was phony and what was real. That was what we needed to be careful about.
- Lynne Kinis said that a lot of people in her community knew that she attended CEWG meetings and thanked her for it because they didn't want to step up to the plate.

LETTERS TO ATSDR

John Bartlit said that the CEWG was not getting the ATSDR report in a timely manner. The silica test report review was finished end June and then went into agency review. It might take as long to receive it as it took the interim 2009 report. He believed the slow process wasn't Peter Kowalski's fault but rather the result of a slow moving bureaucracy. Mr. Bartlit drafted a letter with two versions to Peter Kowalski to encourage their releasing the report. He suggested having meeting attendees sign then letter, and approaching Mayor Gasteyer, Jeff Radford, Pat Clauser, and Jim Tritten to sign also. Then expand the reach to have as many people in the community sign as possible as a way to exert community pressure to release the report. He said they could also send it to the NM congressional delegation to sign.

- Stephen Littlejohn said having physical signatures on the letter would take a lot of time. H said they could add a short notice in the newsletter saying if anyone was interested in signing to let them know.
- Sarah Chavez referred to version two, which included asking about both the crystalline silica report and the ATSDR report, and asked how comfortable the Corrales Village Council would be signing a letter that named both reports. The Corrales Village Council

was only involved in the silica report. Also, Senator Bingaman's office inquired about the ATSDR report and not the silica report. So how should they handle this? Dennis O'Mara said they could clarify and be specific about previous contact and keep both in the letter.

- Lane Kirkpatrick asked if there was anyone at the state level who would sign the letter. John Bartlit said that bureaucrats were not really big into signing things.
- Roberta King said that from the beginning of the NMED task force, the people who were concerned and wanting to do something about it were the ones whose health had been affected, and they were the ones with knowledge of the ATSDR. She didn't think going out into community to gather as many names as possible was a fair task. She said it sounded like they were trying to get all the names as possible to put on the letter. Many people were preoccupied with eating and foreclosures and didn't have time to deal with these issues. John Bartlit said Jeff Radford pushed the CEWG to do something. Ms. King said the signers should be the people involved.
- Lynne Kinis said she agreed with Roberta King, and added that many people didn't know about the ATSDR or CEWG, so they should have a brief explanation of both in the letter. Lane Kirkpatrick said it would be a good topic for an *Albuquerque Journal* editorial.

Stephen Littlejohn tested consensus.

- The first item was whether the group agreed, in principal, to send the letter. No CEWG members disagreed, and all community members present agreed, thus consensus was reached.
- The second issue was who to approach to sign the letter. Mike Williams said the letter should include signatures of people involved in the silica study, including the mayor. Lynne Kinis said they should ask Marcy Brandenburg, and she would ask her on behalf of the CEWG. The following proposal was put on the table: Include signatures from CEWG members and regular community meeting attendees (if they wished), certain community influentials like the mayor and newspaper editor, and those involved in silica study, and Marcy Brandenburg. No CEWG members disagreed, and all community members present agreed, thus consensus was reached.

Potential signees:

- CEWG members
- CWEG meeting attendees (optional)
- Mayors of Corrales and Rio Rancho
- Silica Task force

Filename: CEWG Draft Meeting Summary 07-17-13, v. 2. Approved: August 21, 2013

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013

- Jeff Radford
- Marcy Brandenburg

ACTION ITEM: Lynne Kinis will ask Marcy Brandenburg if she was willing to sign the letter to Peter Kowalski.

- The third issue was whether to use letter version 1, the narrow request (peer review silica report), or letter version 2, the broad request (peer review silica report, ATSDR report and Dept of Health report on pulmonary fibrosis). Consensus was reached on “more is better.”
- John Bartlit said he would add a section to the letter about contacting Senator Bingaman’s office last fall.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

MEETING ADJOURNED

DECISION SUMMARY

1. The CEWG agreed to send a letter to Peter Kowalski of the ATSDR asking when they would receive certain reports (mentioned below).
2. Letter signatories to include were: CEWG members and regular community meeting attendees (if they wished), certain community influentials like the mayor and newspaper editor, and those involved in silica study, and Marcy Brandenburg.
3. Send letter version 2, the broad request (peer review silica report, ATSDR report and Dept of Health report on pulmonary fibrosis).

NEXT MEETING

August 21, 2013, 5 to 7 p.m., Corrales Senior Center

Filename: CEWG Draft Meeting Summary 07-17-13, v. 2. Approved: August 21, 2013 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013
--