Air Working Group
Meeting Notes from October 15, 2009

Attendees: Cameron Cova, John Janson, Bryce Bird, Mick Crandall, Teri Newell, Reed Soper, Matt Sibul, John Thomas, Linda Hansen, Marc Heileson, Kathy Van Dame, Ann Floor, Michelle Hofmann

Absent: Roger Borgenicht

After introductions, the group discussed that the meeting was intended to recognize that the original AWG is stepping back and giving the responsibility of the AWG to the new members, with one exception, Cameron, who will continue contributing as an AWG member into the future. Several of the original AWG members commented that they would like to stay involved/informed with this effort and may attend some or all of the meetings.

The AWG members discussed the structure of the AWG with a total of 8 members, 2 co-coveners and 1 facilitator. Cameron and Reed volunteered to serve as co-coveners and John T. as facilitator.

It was suggested that the first few meetings should be informational to get everyone up to speed with the history of the AWG and to discuss issues around air quality monitoring and mitigation. Cameron identified three topic areas that need to be addressed:

1. Availability/types of monitors
2. Filter technologies
3. Health effects

Teri reminded the group that there is $1m to establish and conduct a monitoring program and that there is $3.1m available for air quality mitigation. The air quality mitigation program has identified 5 schools that are candidates for air filter installation and maintenance. The Granite School District needs to approve this activity.

Other topics discussed:

What can we take and apply from the EIS? Reed will review and lead the group in a discussion at the next meeting.

What did Las Vegas do and are there any lessons learned from that effort? Mark was going to follow up with a contact.

Do we know any filtration experts? It was suggested that the EPA has some guidance.

How to deal with outdoor recreation activities at the schools with the thought that education of the issues would be important.

AQ differences between NEPA measurements and health effects as different.

Non-AWG members attending the meetings and there was consensus that others can attend and that the added knowledge/expertise would benefit the AWG effort.