

CONSENSUS DECISIONS

Community Environmental Working Group (CEWG)

A compendium from August 2004 to the present

2019 Decisions

January, 2019: None

February, 2019: None

2018 Decisions

January, 2018: Agreed on finalization of the CEWG informational flyer.

February, 2018: Agreed on use of Citizens Protocol for development of sampling protocol with NM National Guard.

March, 2018: Agreed on CEWG priorities for 2018.

April, 2018: None

May, 2018: Agreed on email language to request information from NMDOH. Agreed on email language to request information from UNM professors of epidemiology. Agreed on email language to request information from Trout Unlimited of NM.

June, 2018: None

July, 2018: No meeting

August, 2018: Agreed to pursue creation of panel of experts for discussion of NMDOH ALS report. Agreed on language for communication with NM National Guard.

September, 2018: None

October, 2018: Agreed to reschedule November meeting. Agreed on discussion topics for future agenda items regarding Intel's NMED emission permit. Agreed on language of CEWG work report for outreach to Intel employees.

November, 2018: Agreed on initial questions and participants for panel of experts to discuss NMDOH ALS report.

December, 2018: Agreed that facilitator will forward emails to CEWG members from outside sources as they are received.

2017 Decisions

January, 2017: Agreed to ALS presentation. Agreed on a procedure to preserve documents on the website.

February, 2017: None

March, 2017: Agreed to send Department of Health representative, Heidi Krapfl, the February meeting summary with the ALS presentation and an introductory letter.

April, 2017:

- Agreed to send follow up to A. Kelleher about award proposal.
- Agreed to contact National Guard for presentation.
- Agreed to develop a handout for community outreach events.

May, 2017: Agreed on how to proceed with Sgt. Jackson's talk.

June, 2017: None

July, 2017: None

August, 2017: None

September, 2017: None

October, 2017: None

November, 2017: None

December, 2017: Agreed to develop a testing protocol to work with the National Guard to complete air quality monitoring in Corrales.

2016 Decisions

January, 2016: New Ad design for *Corrales Comment*

February, 2016: Agreed to place ATSDR questions on CEWG website.

March, 2016: Agreed to revise scope & content of letter to Intel; Agreed of length of annual report.

April, 2016: None

May, 2016: None

June, 2016: None

July, 2016: None

August, 2016: None

September, 2016:

- Agreed to only print out pending Action Items for meeting but keep complete list of pending and completed as one document.
- Agreed to keep MCS Booklet and decide whether to place at library in the future.

October, 2016

- Agreed to format of Dr. Smolinske talk regarding MCS
- Agreed on how to proceed with responses to Mike's Interesting Questions
- Agreed on how to proceed with HAPs reduction letter to Intel

November, 2016: None

December, 2016

- Agreed to read the letter from Dr. Fisher of Intel and have an email discussion about how or how not to respond to the letter.
- Approved final draft of 2016 Annual Report

2015 Decisions

January, 2015_ None

February, 2015

- CEWG members approved the revised draft of the 2014 Annual Report with these corrections..

March, 2015 None

Filename: 98b79286-1a1b-477c-bcc6-78b2892e3561

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Date Updated: February 21, 2011

April, 2015

- John Bartlit will contact Peter Kowalski about his having a conversation with the CEWG during the next CEWG meeting.
- The group agreed the document (Questions and Comments to ATSDR) was ready to send to Peter Kowalski, and that Mark Bennett should send it.

May, 2015 None

June, 2015 None

July, 2015 None

August, 2015 None

September, 2015 None

October, 2015

November, 2015 None

December, 2015: None

2014 Decisions

January, 2014 None

February, 2014

1. John Bartlit will contact Ryan Flynn, NMED and Barbara Toth, NMDOH to inform them of the CEWG's continued interest in the ATSDR report.

March, 2014

1. All agreed it was important to take appropriate action regarding NMED's releasing the ATSDR draft to Intel for assistance with comments, which was in breach of the agreed upon process.

April, 2014

- The group agreed that John Bartlit call Peter Kowalski to discuss the CEWG's concerns, as listed in the body of the meeting summary, around NMED's handling the draft report to Intel in violation of an agreed upon process.

May, 2014

- Mark Bennett will draft a CEWG short report of annual accomplishments for the June meeting.

Filename: 98b79286-1a1b-477c-bcc6-78b2892e3561

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Date Updated: February 21, 2011

- The CEWG will issue a two stage request to ATSDR: 1. Provide the draft report to the CEWG that was shared with NMED. If the answer is no, then make the second request; 2. Provide the draft report at the same time as the final report.
- The CEWG will invite Peter Kowalski to a CEWG meeting to present the final ATSDR report.

June, 2014

- The group agreed to changing the CEWG Accomplishments to an annual calendar cycle.

July, 2014

- All CEWG participants were very interested in further evolving the ideas on regulatory engineering presented at the meeting and moving forward.

August, 2014 None

September, 2014 None

October, 2014

- The group agreed on a process to prepare for the ATSDR final report release.

November, 2014 None

December, 2014 None

2013 Decisions

January, 2013

1. CEWG will invite NMED to hold their public Intel permit meeting at a CEWG meeting.
2. The CEWG will form a committee to investigate code red possibilities and Corrales's first responder involvement with Intel drills.

February, 2013

1. The CEWG will form a committee, with Hugh Church as the lead, to contact NMED to learn more information about the trailer. Other committee members are Mike Williams and Sarah Chavez.

March, 2013

None

April, 2013

1. CEWG members agreed to have an Intel tour instead of a meeting on May 15, contingent on Robi Shield's availability.

2. CEWG members agreed that Mr. Littlejohn should request a copy of the Corrales Water Task Force Report.

May, 2013

None

June, 2013

None

July, 2013

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).

August, 2013

1. The group agreed to make scoping current knowledge a focus for 2014.
2. The CEWG agreed to invite Jim Casciano to speak at a CEWG meeting.

September, 2013

1. The CEWG newsletter will be sent announcing NMED's 30-day comment period on Intel Title 5 permit.
2. The CEWG list of accomplishments will be sent to various locations and include a section that lists "actions in progress."

2012 Decisions

January 2012

3. Thom Little will explore the possibility of arranging a meeting between the Corrales Water Advisory Board and CEWG members.
4. The spikes subcommittee will reconvene to further their initial spikes proposal and attempt to fill in the blanks, where possible.

February 2012

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.”

March, 2012

The following process was approved for the spikes study:

1. The provisional level will be established.
2. The task force will be formed.
3. The task force will determine what data to use in consultation with Class One and ERM.
4. The task force will create a modeling protocol, using the following process:
 - a. AERMOD will be used as the modeling program.
 - b. The report format and author(s) will be determined at this stage (before modeling is done).
 - c. A first-cut trial will be done to test the model.
 - d. Data will be revised as needed and a second-cut trial done if desired.
 - e. The model will be refined based on first- and second-cut trials.
5. The modeling protocol will be reported to CEWG and community.
6. The actual modeling will be run.
7. The final report will be issued to the task force. Once the task force is satisfied with the report, it will be given to the CEWG. The CEWG will present the report at a public meeting and send it to the ATSDR and the Village Council.

April, 2012

1. Stephen Littlejohn will be the “keeper of the FAQs,” and the FAQs will be reviewed at each CEWG meeting. In addition, people could send FAQ suggestions via email.
2. Stephen Littlejohn will invite an expert to give a presentation on air sampling.
3. The Group will adopt the attached materials distribution proposal on a trial basis.

May, 2012

1. Intel presentations and CEWG presentations will be kept separate.

June, 2012

1. John Bartlit, Mike Williams and John Alsobrook will form a committee to work out the details in Mike Williams' proposal to present at the July CEWG meeting.

July, 2012

1. Mike Williams and John Alsobrook will proceed with the spikes study according to the attached proposal.

August, 2012

1. The CEW approved allocating \$2,000 to install AV equipment (a screen and projector) at the Corrales Senior Center, and \$3,000 to meet staffing needs of the HF study.
2. The Short Report was approved. The shorter footnote from 2008 will be used instead of the footnote in the draft.

September, 2012

1. The title of the Odor Response Protocol for Community Complaint will be changed to the Response Protocol for Community Complaint.
2. Sarah Chavez will represent Intel and if another member of the company wants to attend CEWG meetings, they are welcome to attend as a representative. Sarah Chavez will serve on the agenda committee.
3. The CEWG prepared the following statement regarding Lane Kirkpatrick's neighborhood survey: This survey is an informal neighbor survey that is not scientific, because of sample size and other factors, is not representative, and that any person has the opportunity to abstain from participating. Mr.

Kirkpatrick will say that he is a member of the CEWG, rather than representing the CEWG.

4. The newsletter editorial policy will include Stephen Littlejohn sending submissions to CEWG members. Then, CEWG members will determine whether or not the content meets publication criteria. Two members of the CEWG must object to the content and provide comments to prevent publication. These comments will be sent to the author, who may revise and resubmit. The entire review process will be discussed at CEWG meetings.

October, 2012

1. The group agreed to the topic priorities.
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.

November, 2012

1. The group agreed to send an invitation to NMED to send a representative to regularly attend CEWG meetings.

December, 2012

No meeting in December.

2011 Decisions

January 2011

1. CEWG members approved for publication an op-ed written by John Bartlit to educate the public about the CEWG and its work. The op-ed will not discuss health or short-term bursts, but will include a reference to an op-ed written by Edward Pineda and published in the *Corrales Comment* in January 2011.

February 2011

No meeting.

March 2011

Regarding the meeting of the STTF to discuss silica-testing results: (1) The meeting will be open to the public; (2) those who are not members or consultants to the STTF will be in an observer role and will not provide comment; (3) clear context and guidance is set on the purpose and nature of the meeting, and the information is preliminary and not to be made public until the final report was approved; (4) the draft will be marked “preliminary draft, not yet approved;” (5) a document trail will be established and careful notes taken on what is said and done at the meeting.

April 2011

1. Accepted the STTF report as complete.
2. Extended appreciation to STTF members for their volunteer time and considerable work in completing silica testing and the ensuring report.
3. Agreed to provide opportunities for more public dialogue around the silica testing report.

May 2011

1. A cover letter for the STTF report will be created.
2. The CEWG agreed to hold a panel on crystalline silica, silicosis, pulmonary fibrosis and other lung-related diseases, with epidemiologists, lung specialists, and the author of the state’ report on pulmonary fibrosis. Stephen Littlejohn, Hugh Church, and Lane Kirkpatrick will work together to refine the panel topics and panel participants.

June 2011

1. Agreed to proceed with an observation process similar to the STTF observations for scrubber testing.
2. Agreed to delay next steps on STTF report pending ATSDR review. If the latter takes more than 6 months, the Group may decide to discuss the issue again.
3. Agreed to ask the ATSDR if they wish to receive community comments and concerns as part of the peer review process of the STTF report.
4. Approved a cover letter for the STTF report.

July 2011

1. CEWG members approved in principle allowing Mr. Tritten to make presentations about the silica testing project to Corrales and other civic groups.
2. The Short Report to the Community was approved with changes.
3. The letter to the EPA regarding the 114 process was approved with changes.
4. The priority list of topics was approved with changes, to be reviewed again by email.

August 2011

1. The group agreed on the communication plan proposal and without bringing the item back for a second discussion. (See attached)
2. The group agreed to have Stephen Littlejohn and Edward Pineda develop a few proposals on ways to spend the discretionary money.

September 2011

1. The group agreed on the Silica FAQs revisions.
2. The CEWG agreed to cover *Rio Rancho Observer* ad costs in the budget.
3. The CEWG will add a new budget category called “Speakers and Workshops” and use discretionary funds to pay for this option.
4. The CEWG will ask the ATSDR to review the state’s report on pulmonary fibrosis. Then, after Dr. Samet gives his permission, the CEWG will use his report response for CEWG public outreach efforts.
5. John Bartlit’s draft ad will be put in the newsletter as an article and as a letter to the editor in local newspapers.
6. Stephen Littlejohn, Thom Little, and Bill Davidson will form a committee to develop a Facebook policy and revise the Web site policy.

October 2011

1. Stephen Littlejohn will contact John Alsobrook to see if he is interested in attending a meeting to discuss proposals to further disseminate information on the STTF report. The meeting would be either face-to-face or by teleconference. Mr. Littlejohn will write a bullet point article/ad to place in local newspapers, Web sites, and the CEWG newsletter.
2. Stephen Littlejohn will draft a high-level proposal of “next steps” on the Spikes issue and bring it back for discussion at the next meeting.
3. Stephen Littlejohn will draft a document to structure the discussion on the CEWG future for the next meeting.

November 2011

1. The Web Site Policy was approved by consensus as modified.
2. The Facebook Policy was approved by consensus as modified.
3. The Interim Editorial Policy was approved by consensus.
4. The group agreed to the following next steps on Spikes:
 - a. Ask Mike Williams and Ralph Williams to take leadership on the project;
 - b. Establish an in-person a working session to set the data parameters, allow the public to observe the meeting, consult with Sarah Chavez and Thom Little on the parameters around the data. Mike Williams and Ralph Williams would decide on the data to review;
 - c. Look at data and concentrations at the fenceline;
 - d. Discuss gaps in modeling or testing;
 - e. Report findings/recommendations for next steps to the CEWG at a public meeting; and
 - f. CEWG will decide on next steps following the recommendations.

December 2011

For next steps on the Spikes issue, Mike Williams and John Bartlit will investigate normalized emissions and present a plan on how to move forward at the January meeting.

2010 DecisionsDecember 2010

The agenda-setting process was approved as follows:

1. The agenda committee will consist of one Intel/CEWG member, one non-Intel/ CEWG member, the CEWG Chair, and the facilitator. The committee will continue to meet by telephone approximately two weeks before the meeting. Others may be invited to participate in an agenda committee meeting if needed for special purposes, such as to advise on technical matters, for example.
2. Time will be allocated in the last 30 minutes of the meeting to discuss additional topics.
3. The EHS report will be allocated 15 minutes at the beginning of each meeting. Discussion will be limited to content issues as opposed to issues of form. If there is little to discuss, the next agenda item will be moved to immediately. When the EHS report needs further discussion, it will be returned to in the meeting's last 30 minutes. All EHS format suggestions will be communicated to Thom Little separately outside the meeting or visited later in the meeting, time permitting.
4. Major topics requiring careful consideration will be put on the agenda for at least two separate meetings. The first discussion will be an exploration of the topic, and the second will address more substantive outcomes. The topic will be continued at additional meetings as necessary.
5. A new column will be added to the agenda indicating why each discussion item was placed

on the agenda (e.g., priority topic, request, ongoing discussion, timely topic, etc.)

6. Edward Pineda was appointed to serve as the non-Intel/CEWG member on the agenda committee, and Thom Little was appointed as the Intel/CEWG member.

CEWG publicity:

7. The draft letter to the editor thanking Mayor Gasteyer for his work on behalf of the Silica Testing Task Force was approved to send.

November 2010

1. On handling how the CEWG should be involved in Intel's response to the EPA 114 report, the following process was approved. Intel will send out a written EPA 114 follow up report to the CEWG a week before meetings. Any comments, suggestions or questions on the EPA 114 follow up report will be briefly addressed at the meeting. It was noted that there was a trade off between having the most up-to-date information in the follow up report and enough time to review it in advance of the meeting.
2. The CEWG agreed to use information contained in the EPA 114 report and Intel's response letter to discuss relevant and important issues. The first discussion will revolve round scrubbers. Other issues addressed in the EPA 114 report that advance the CEWG's work also may be discussed at a later time.

October 2010

None indicated.

September 2010

None indicated:

August 2010

1. The 2010 CEWG Short Report to the Community was approved.
2. Research and Polling will be invited to make a presentation at a future CEWG meeting regarding the results of their community focus group on stack heights at Intel.

July 2010

1. Once consensus is reached, it can only be overturned under compelling circumstances. New objections or contrary points of view will not be sufficient to overturn a previous consensus decision. Anyone can raise a "compelling circumstance" for discussion, but if two or more CEWG members object to reconsideration, the decision cannot be reconsidered.
2. The CEWG will not reconsider the silica testing funding proposal at this time.
3. The Silica Testing Task Force (STTF) was approved. The ATSDR follow up committee will be suspended until the final ATSDR report is released. The STTF will pick up where the ATSDR follow up committee left off and to (a) discuss and arrange Durr

testing before 2010 end, (b) seek approval of the silica testing and funding proposals, and (c) hire the management agency.

4. The Silica Testing Task Force was delegated the authority to decide how CEWG decisions and input review would be done for the 2010 stage of silica testing.

June 2010

None indicated.

May 2010

In regards to changes at Intel concerning environmental issues, the CEWG:

1. Endorsed the replacement of all remaining Durr units with Munters in 2010 to achieve full redundancy.
2. Recommended that stacks be separated to the extent possible.
3. Stated concerns about equipment safety, including reliability, personnel training, and timely correction action processes.
4. Reiterated earlier recommendation that stacks be between 38 and 43 meters.
5. Recommended against increasing stack velocity by coning the stacks or by use of a fan.
6. Agreed in principle to test for silica emissions from Durr units before they are removed, along with testing for silica emissions on the Munters units. The consensus in principle gave permission to the ATSDR follow-up committee to examine the specific details involved with testing Durr units and using the Citizen Protocol.

April 2010

None indicated.

March 2010

1. CEWG will move forward with testing crystalline silica using the Citizen Protocol as a methodology to undertake the testing (Option 1).
2. CEWG will hold a community meeting to discuss the silica testing process.

February 2010

1. The CEWG agreed to send a letter of appreciation to the EPA for its role in safeguarding the Clean Air Act. The letter would acknowledge the roles of various groups and was contingent on final language.

January 2010

1. The CEWG agreed to announce their work on crystalline silica testing in an ad in the *Corrales Comment*. The ad will refer readers to Web sites that contain more in depth

information on crystalline silica testing. Consensus was reached on a draft text of the ad with the suggested revisions.

2009 Decisions

December 2009

None indicated.

November 2009

1. The group will move forward with crystalline silica testing, assuming funding is available.
2. The group will pursue diverting funds from certain types of monitoring at Intel and applying those funds towards crystalline silica testing. This decision was reached with the understanding that many caveats had to be worked out, including getting NMED's approval and Intel's potential restrictions on how the money could be used.

October 2009

None indicated.

September 2009

None indicated.

August 2009

1. The approved "CEWG Short Report to the Community" will be distributed via e-mail to the expanded e-mail list as well as placed on the CEWG Web site.

July 2009

1. The "CEWG Short Report to the Community" was approved.
2. The group will draft a letter to John Painter, Intel site manager, regarding a Hazardous Waste Inspection Report by NMED wherein Intel was cited with a number of violations.

June 2009

No formal meeting held. Informational meeting only.

May 2009

None indicated.

April 2009

1. "Non-facilitated" meetings will be used as an opportunity to present information on a variety of topics. The first of these meetings will be in June 2009.

March 2009

1. The group will submit comments on the ATSDR report to ATSDR, as written by CEWG member Mike Williams. The comments will be submitted with a cover letter signed by the John Bartlit, CEWG Acting Chair. Mike Williams will have his name and credentials included in the comments. The names of CEWG members present will also be included with the comments. CEWG Intel members submitted a caveat to this consensus decision as follows: Intel CEWG members reserve the right to abstain from the comments because Intel will be submitting its own technical comments.
2. The group agreed to move forward with ATSDR issues rather than waiting for the ATSDR final report, since that report may not be available for some time. An ATSDR follow up committee will be formed to study the issues.

February 2009

None indicated.

January 2009

None indicated.

2008 DecisionsDecember 2008

1. The Citizen Protocol draft was approved.

November 2008

1. The CEWG communication policy was approved.
2. Consensus was reached on the following Citizen Protocol language:
 - a. Intel must approve each proposed test. Approval cannot be withdrawn after contracting with a vendor.
 - b. This applied only to testing done on Intel property.
 - c. Intel must provide a reason to deny testing.
 - d. Where CEWG could not answer documentation questions, they would indicate to Intel that they did not have that information and the vendor would provide it instead.
 - e. The CEWG must review operational capacity before approving a test, assuming the document language was clarified and the revised version approved by the group.
 - f. The group agreed to maintain the process listed in the Citizen Protocol: “Upon receiving the report, the CEWG will post the draft on the CEWG Web site.”

October 2008

1. The Stack Heights Primer was approved with suggested changes and a distribution process was agreed on.

September 2008

1. Regarding CEWG decisions, when a decision is made, the Meeting Summary must list the reasons for the decision. Dissenting views must also be listed, along with dissenter names and reasons for dissenting. This process was decided on because it allows the CEWG to make decisions by consensus, while acknowledging the good reasons of others who object.
2. The CEWG will not change its name because: a name change would be confusing and lead to logistical difficulties; the name already meets one definition of “community”; a change could erode the purpose of the Citizen Protocol; and legal requirements of using Intel’s name and or logo are uncertain.
3. Suggested additions to the Citizen Protocol will be discussed by the CEWG. The CEWG will request a meeting with Intel attorneys, if necessary, after this discussion. The reason for this decision was to move forward expeditiously on changes in the draft Citizen Protocol to address Intel concerns.
4. The CEWG letter to Intel management regarding the stack height decision will be attached to the Stack Height Report.

August 2008

1. The group agreed to writing and publishing a short article entitled “Stack Height 101” or “Primer” that provides basic information on stack heights and refers readers to a Web site address with more detailed educational information.
2. The CEWG will send a “thank you” e-mail to Dave Bergeron for his two years of service as recorder for CEWG meetings.

July 2008

1. The CEWG’s Annual Report was approved with the changes discussed in the meeting and with the stipulation that agreement on specific language will be achieved through e-mail.

June 2008

1. Several improvements will be made to the Web site, including:
 - a. Include a standard footer in all documents indicating the file name, version number, author/presenter, date, to whom presented, page numbers, and “approved by” plus date of approval. The facilitator will be the gatekeeper for this process.
 - b. Remove “Draft” from meeting summaries that are already approved.
 - c. Ensure file names include the year and month a document was posted on the site.

- d. Ensure file names are consistent with the meeting date.
 - e. Redesign the format on the Web site as identified in the Meeting Summary.
 - f. Format all documents in Times New Roman font.
 - g. Mark editing changes from one version to the next with light gray highlighter, not color.
 - h. Format PowerPoint documents in clearly readable form.
2. The CEWG will send a message to Intel stating that continuing concerns about community and environmental consequences of the stack height had been aired at the meeting, and refer to the Meeting Summary for reference.
 3. The CEWG will issue a report on the stack height issue called: “Determining Stack Height at Intel: A Joint Summary of Common Ground and Differing Views.”

May 2008

None indicated.

April 2008

1. The CEWG will request two meetings with Intel management in order to discuss Intel’s decision to not take the CEWG’s recommendation to raise the stack heights to at least 38.2 meters, choosing 30 meters instead. In the first meeting, the CEWG technical team of Mike Williams, Hugh Church, Edward Pineda and John Bartlit will meet as soon as possible with Intel management to discuss technical issues and the CEWG’s stack height recommendations. For the second meeting, Intel management will be invited to attend the May CEWG meeting to discuss their decision with the general public.

March 2008

None indicated.

February 2008

Consensus was reached on the following items regarding CEWG’s stack height recommendations:

1. Stack heights: The CEWG is willing to support the stack heights sub-committee’s recommendation of raising stack heights to at least 38.2 meters; after public discussion the CEWG prefers 40 meters because it will have an even greater impact on plume concentrations.
2. Improvements in the future: Intel should use sound approved engineering practices toward the goals of reducing emissions at the source, improving abatement and increasing dispersion.

3. Modeling: The CEWG should continue to use and refine modeling as a tool to further reduce ground level concentrations of emissions, not only from Munters oxidizers, but also from cooling towers, scrubbers and Durr units.
4. Aesthetics: At the stack height levels being recommended—38.2 to 40 meters—reduced concentration should supersede aesthetics.
5. CEWG Advertisement: The facilitator will draft a statement about CEWG's stack height recommendation to include in the meeting advertisement and send it to the group for review.

January 2008

1. The CEWG will recommend a RTO stack height before the February deadline based on the use of meteorological data contained within the current model. Other options may be considered after the February meeting.
2. A volunteer or nominee for Acting Vice-Chair will be approved by group consensus.
3. Public Comment will be placed on the agenda at the beginning of the meeting to ensure the public will have the opportunity to comment at every meeting

2007 Decisions

December 2007

- 1 The facilitator will be allowed to appoint an Acting Chair, if needed, in the event of the current Acting Chair's absence.

November 2007

1. A CEWG sub-committee will be formed to study Intel stack heights and develop a stack height recommendation.

October 2007

None indicated.

September 2007

The following items on CEWG meeting advertisements were agreed to:

1. Delete the picture so as to allow for larger print and more efficient use of space.
2. The facilitator will produce the ad's copy, which will include highlights from the previous meeting and the important topics to be covered in the upcoming meeting.
3. The draft copy will be sent to everyone present at the meetings for their review and comments with a set time in which to respond.

4. After changes are made, the draft then goes to Intel's Community Relations Manager for publication.

August 2007

1. The group agreed to create communication guidelines for e-mail dialogues.
2. The CEWG will revisit the topic of "water" in a couple years time.

July 2007

1. The annual Short Report to the Community was approved with the assumption that there would be no corrections to the revised draft.
2. An initial Citizen Protocol pilot test will be performed on silica emissions and using independent funding.

June 2007

None indicated.

May 2007

No meeting held in May.

April 2007

None indicated.

March 2007

None indicated.

February 2007

1. The EPA response to the letter sent by the CEWG regarding major and minor source permits should be evaluated by a subgroup within the CEWG.

January 2007

1. Hard copies of group e-mails will no longer be distributed to the group.

2006 Decisions

December 2006

None indicated.

November 2006

None indicated.

October 2006

None indicated.

September 2006

No meeting held in September.

August 2006

1. The group selected amorphous/crystalline silica measurement for the potential Citizen Protocol pilot project, because it is a complex, labor-intensive test making it a good candidate to test the methodology, and crystalline silica has a significant potential health risk to the community.
2. A four-person protocol team will be appointed to develop the methodology for the Citizen Protocol. This team will be made up of CEWG members and the public.

July 2006

1. The CEWG Accomplishments Report was approved, with Frank Gallegos reviewing it one more time for accuracy.
2. The group will distribute the CEWG Accomplishments Report by publishing it in the *Corrales Comment*; putting copies in the libraries; and placing an electronic copy on the CEWG Web site.
3. The group agreed to address the first three topics in their prioritization list: 1) cooling towers; 2) water issues (quality and quantity) and; 3) emergency response.
4. The group will operate in an informal manner and make decisions by consensus rather than following a formal procedure such as Roberts Rules of Order.

June 2006

On the CEWG Accomplishment Report:

1. The group agreed to push back approval of the CEWG Accomplishments Report in order to give sufficient time to review and comment on.
2. The group agreed that an accomplishment report should be published every year and the report should run from July to July.
3. The group also agreed to use the executive summary as the main report with the detailed list as an appendix.

May 2006

1. The group will remove the Intel logo and replace it with a statement such as “Striving for continuous environmental improvement of Intel’s emissions and other environmental improvements.” Potential statements to use will be collected and sent to the group for review.

April 2006

1. The CEWG will request NMED to conduct a comparison of previous air emission modeling at Intel.
2. The group approved a zone map for NMED to use to identify the locations of Intel odor complaint reports.

March 2006

Meeting summary missing

February 2006

None indicated.

January 2006

None indicated.

2005 Decisions

December 2005

None indicated.

November 2005

1. The group agreed to send a statement to Intel CEO Paul Otellini suggesting that Intel make environmental performance an Intel value.

October 2005

None indicated.

September 2005

None indicated.

August 2005

None indicated.

July 2005

None indicated.

June 2005

None indicated.

May 2005

None indicated.

April 2005

None indicated.

March 2005

None indicated.

February 2005

None indicated.

January 2005

The group agreed to pursue three opportunities for improvement at Intel:

1. Better public information about the emergency response programs.
2. Better public notification in an emergency.
3. Improved wind data and predictions of the movement of chemical emissions in an emergency.

2004 Decisions

December 2004

None indicated.

November 2004

1. The CEWG will pursue these issues in more depth:
 - a. Feasibility of redundant thermal oxidizers.
 - b. Reduction of non-abated VOCs from isopropyl alcohol use.
 - c. Finding a way to tell the public the percentage of full capacity at which the plant is operated.
 - d. Distribution of emissions information to the public.

October 2004

1. The CEWG will study the pros and cons of installing additional thermal oxidizers

September 2004

1. John Bartlit will continue as the Working Group's Acting Chair.
2. The draft Meeting Summary will be sent via e-mail to members
3. Members will review the draft summary and return their comments by the deadline.
4. Changes will be made and the Meeting Summary will be posted prior to the next meeting.

August 2004

1. The public will be encouraged to attend CEWG meetings and allowed to comment on each agenda topic.
2. Written comments will be accepted.
3. Meeting agendas and summaries will be posted on the Web site.
4. The group would like to use some form of consensus decision making.
5. The group agreed to meet once a month on the third Wednesday, from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.