

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

"Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel"

Date: August 15, 2007
Time: 5:00-7:00 p.m.
Location: Your Place Or Mine

Members Attending

John Bartlit, Acting Chair
Edward Pineda, Rio Rancho Resident
Teresa Fleming, Corporate Relations Manager

Sara Chavez, EHS Department, Intel
Mike Williams, NM Clean Air & Water

Technical Support Staff

Andrew Moen, Environmental Eng, Intel
Frank Gallegos, EHS Manager

Richard DeWeese, Site Emergency
Manager, Intel

Public

Roberta King, Corrales resident
Jay Stimmel, Interested Citizen

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Domenici Littlejohn, Inc.

David Bergeron, recorder

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft July 18, 2007 Meeting Summary
- Action Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- This month's newspaper ad
- Short Report to the Community
- Citizen Protocol pilot test prospectus
- Emergency Response Report
- Draft report on water discussions

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS:

John Bartlit stated the mission – to make environmental improvements by reducing emissions at Intel and produce meaningful community dialog to achieve that end. He then had the attendees introduce themselves.

Sarah Chavez will be supporting community environmental working group from an EHS standpoint. Teresa Fleming will continue to be public affairs point of contact. Heath Foott applied for global EHS job at Intel and was accepted for the job. He will be supporting all Intel as a safety expert. Frank Gallegos and Andrew Moen will continue to attend the CEWG meetings.

Edward Pineda is no longer with Rio Rancho utilities commission; his term has expired.

Mr. Bartlit asked for comments on the agenda and the meeting summary. There were no comments and both were accepted.

Citizen Protocol pilot test update

Stephen Littlejohn stated that the main task this month was to prepare a cost proposal in order to develop a budget.

- Andrew Moen suggested getting help on the technical part of the estimate from an environmental consulting firm or environmental lab such as Environmental Resource Management (ERM), an Intel contractor. A consulting firm or laboratory could provide estimates that would help the process. Mr. Littlejohn used his own experience to develop the management side of the estimate. He included a contingency to cover unknowns.

- The results of those efforts are as follows:

Technical	\$50,000 (based on estimate from ERM)
Management	\$6,000
Contingency	\$20,000
Total cost estimate:	\$76,000

- Mr. Littlejohn sent this estimate to several folks but received little response. Mike Williams thought the management figure was a bit low, but if it is, the contingency should cover additional unknown costs. Mr. Littlejohn said he needs feedback right away on the pilot test, the prospectus itself, or the estimate as the next part of the process is to contact the US Conflict Resolution Institute.
- Mr. Pineda agreed with adding the contingency, but he was concerned with the budget being made public. His fear was that potential contractors would price their proposals to match the budget rather than bid actual costs. Mr. Littlejohn pointed out that some request for proposals (RFPs) included the budget numbers in order to let potential bidders understand what maximum funding was available.
- Mr. Pineda asked at what point the budget numbers would become CEWG confidential. Mr. Littlejohn emphasized that all of the proceedings of the CEWG were public information and that the cost estimate would appear in the meeting summary, which goes out to everyone. Mr. Pineda then suggested that the RFP should contain a maximum budget amount.
- John Bartlit said the technical part of the work is what we know about most and where we have the greatest experience. The contracting and management portion of the task is where we need help – how it is managed, how it is contracted, how it is reported, how it is investigated. The management task is where the greatest potential error is in the cost estimate. He went on to say that it could matter who performs these tasks. We might get funding from the U.S. Environmental Conflict Resolution Institute, but they could also be involved as managers. If that were to happen, it could change the cost of the effort. We need to document the basis of estimate as best we can.
- Mr. Littlejohn provided a footnote in the prospectus about the source of the technical estimate, and broke down the management function by estimated hours and costs. This provides the basis of estimate to everyone.
- Andrew Moen offered that by identifying the scope of the effort, i.e., the number and kind of specific tests that it would allow a comparison between potential bidder's proposals. This would help alleviate the concern that Mr. Pineda raised.

- Mr. Williams raised a concern about how potential bidders would cost spiked samples. Mr. Moen replied that the laboratory that will run the tests will bid a number of samples to be tested. It will not matter whether the samples are spiked or not. Mr. Williams then asked whether the management agency would be responsible for procuring the spiked samples. Teresa Fleming asked whether the topic of spiked samples was addressed in the Citizen's Protocol. Mr. Littlejohn responded that the Protocol requires blind tests, but that the implementation is not addressed per se.
- Mr. Bartlit asked that the term "spiked samples" be defined. Mr. Williams clarified that it was not actually "spiked" sample or a sample where something was added, but simply one in which the chemical components were known.
- Mr. Pineda asked whether it made sense to ask for additional sample testing at a per sample unit price. There is always the possibility of problems or issues with the samples and they might need to be run again. Mr. Littlejohn said he thought those details will be taken care of in the RFP process, the real issues at hand was how much funding will be required to pay for the tasks. He went on to ask whether the cost estimate was sufficient or did it need to be increased.
- Ms Fleming asked who generates the synthetic samples and how are they generated? Are those costs included in this cost estimate? Mr. Littlejohn responded that we need money to pay for all the required data.
- Mr. Bartlit opined that the funding agency didn't need to know the specific amount required at this time. They wanted to know whether the group needed \$10K, \$100K, or \$200K. Based on that, there is no meaningful difference between \$76K and \$100K.
- Mr. Pineda suggested that we ask for \$200K to ensure the group has sufficient funds to accomplish the task. Mr. Bartlit said he did not see any basis for asking for \$200K. The more solid the basis of estimate, the more credibility the group would have.
- Mr. Williams asked whether Intel had any experience with developing synthetic samples. Mr. Moen responded that he did not, but he thought that most of the labs would have that capability.
- Ms Fleming asked whether receipt of the funding would require any legal standing by the CEWG. Mr. Littlejohn said there were three issues that he needed to bring up with the U.S. Environmental Conflict Resolution Institute: funding, legal status or fiscal agent, and a legal review. Mr. Bartlit said the Institute might be able to provide or answer any or all of those challenges.

Email Dialogues

Mr. Bartlit asked for comments on the recent email dialogues. There have been email discussions on two topics: the report ad and redundant thermal oxidizers. Mr. Littlejohn said the intention is to see how far the group might get on these topics using an email dialogue and to prepare everyone for a discussion at a future meeting. There is an active on-going discussion about the report ad and there are a few comments on redundant thermal oxidizers.

- Mr. Pineda started the discussion by suggesting that all participants should be respectful of all participants and avoid personal attacks. The group would have a more productive discussion if everyone were more respectful of each other. Mr. Littlejohn asked whether

everyone was in favor of establishing some communication guidelines similar to those used in the live meetings. Mr. Pineda agreed that the guidelines need to be established.

- Mr. Bartlit thought that guidelines would be received by the email community as restrictive. The goal is to be open. He offered that those folks that were not being respectful tended to reduce the effectiveness of their arguments, so let them. He went on to say that dialogue by the "golden rule" tended to produce more productive dialogue, but restrictions might reduce the dialogue.
- Ms Fleming agreed with Mr. Pineda that communication guidelines should be established, because she felt her privacy had been violated in last month's exchange.
- Mr. Pineda asked about a discussion of the thermal oxidizers. Mr. Littlejohn asked for continued comments using email dialogue on the redundancy issue of the thermal oxidizers. Mr. Pineda advanced the idea that Intel should be willing to invest in redundant oxidizers in order to protect the community from harmful emissions.
- Mr. Bartlit suggested that the group engage in an email dialogue on communications guidelines to determine what should be put in place. Mr. Littlejohn took the action to start that email discussion.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

EVANS RESPONSE AND CEWG TRANSPARENCY

Mr. Littlejohn introduced the discussion by reviewing recommendations by Fred Marsh to have George Evans perform the testing for the pilot project. Mr. Littlejohn invited Mr. Evans to comment on the Citizen Protocol, but Mr. Evans declined. Subsequently, the Group invited Mr. Evans to present his views at a CEWG meeting, particularly in the area of monitoring and modeling. Again, Mr. Evans declined, but did offer to meet individually with anyone, one on one. This is a new dynamic for the CEWG. The CEWG has an ethic of openness, so private meetings would be very different for the group. The topic was added to the agenda to formulate a response to Mr. Evans' offer.

- Mr. Bartlit pointed out that people who attend a meeting tend to hear different things than other people attending the same meeting. He has written numerous summaries of meetings that are challenged later by people that were in attendance at the same meeting. If there was a private meeting with Mr. Evans, the same thing would likely happen. The discussion would then be about who said what, instead of the topic at hand.
- Mr. Bartlit suggested that the group might formulate questions and present them to Mr. Evans to answer. It might also be possible to record the conversation with Mr. Evans, but Mr. Bartlit did not particularly like this option.
- Mr. Pineda recommended never attending a meeting alone. He suggested that the group ask whether Mr. Evans would be willing to meet with two people.
- Mr. Williams suggested that one person could meet with Mr. Evans, write a summary of the meeting, then have Mr. Evans approve the summary, and after his approval, the summary would be distributed to the group. Mr. Pineda said that Mr. Evans needed to know that the discussion would be made public to all the members of the CEWG and the CEWG distribution list.
- Mr. Littlejohn summarized the proposal. The group would take Mr. Evans up on his offer to meet with someone from the group and this person would present questions that

had been formulated by the group. The person would take notes during the meeting and develop a summary that would be presented to Mr. Evans for approval. Once the summary was approved, it would be distributed to the CEWG. If the report is not approved, it would not be distributed.

- Mr. Williams expressed a concern that he did not know enough about the topic to formulate the questions. He did not want that lack of information to limit the conversation with Mr. Evans.
- Mr. Gallegos asked whether the proposal was still a one on one meeting, with the associated pitfalls. It is important for Mr. Evans to know that although this is a one on one meeting, it is still an open dialogue with the whole group.
- Mr. Bartlit offered another ground rule. The discussion is not about employment issues, it is about environmental monitoring aspects. Mr. Williams expanded on this by asking what did Mr. Evans feel were the deficiencies in the monitoring, what was done, and what was not done?
- Mr. Pineda asked whether Mr. Evans might be under some legal restriction on what he might be able to say. Why was Mr. Evans unwilling to attend a CEWG meeting? Mr. Littlejohn responded that if the group wanted him to, he could ask those questions; however, Mr. Evans had made a very specific offer. Mr. Littlejohn felt that it was better to address Mr. Evans' offer, either accept it or not, and under what conditions. Mr. Pineda suggested a counter offer: in order to maintain the openness of the CEWG, we need to have two people meet with Mr. Evans.
- Mr. Williams disagreed with the necessity of having two people. If Mr. Evans agrees to the written summary of the meeting, then that is sufficient. If he doesn't, two people would not help anyway. If the group requires that two people be present, it is saying "we don't trust you". That is the wrong message to send.
- Mr. Pineda asked who would represent the CEWG at the meeting. Mr. Bartlit recommended Mr. Williams as an obvious choice because of his background in modeling. Mr. Williams has won several distinguished performance awards at Los Alamos. Mr. Williams suggested that Hugh Church would be as good a choice, as Mr. Church has just as strong a background in modeling. Mr. Littlejohn pointed out that Mr. Williams was in attendance and Mr. Church was not, so Mr. Williams was the better choice.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will contact George Evans about the Group's suggestion.

EMERGENCY RESPONSE

Mr. Pineda provided an overview of the findings of the committee on emergency response. The members of the committee include Edward. Pineda, Gordon Ross, Heath Foott, and Stephen Littlejohn as facilitator.

- The task force met with Monte Roberts and Sandra Davison at the Sandoval County Emergency Communication Center, which is co-located with the Rio Rancho Police Department.
- Sandoval County uses a computerized emergency notification system called Code Red. Code Red requires a database of telephone numbers utilized by the 911 emergency system. The database is purchased by the county and is updated every month. It includes

both residences and businesses. People can opt out of the Code Red system. A description of the Code Red system can be found at the website:
<http://www.coderedweb.com/>.

- The system was implemented and came on line in May of 2007. It has already been utilized once, when phone service to Jemez Valley was lost. The Code Red system was used as an alternative system for emergency communications.
- The county issues passwords to designated people that allow them to post messages on the system. Anyone can view the website, but only people with the passwords can post messages. Messages can be posted from any computer using their passwords.
- The automated system will notify people of the emergency and the necessary actions to be taken. The system is run by Mr. --- and Ms Davidson and their staff. They decide when the emergency messages are posted and they formulate the messages. The system keeps a record of number called and the percentages of numbers connected. In the Jemez Valley emergency, the system reached 28 percent of the homes. This relatively low number was due to the fact that Jemez Valley is a resort area, and many homes are not occupied. The system can resend the message if it does not reach enough of the population the first time.
- In the case of emergency at Intel, the Intel emergency coordinator would contact the county emergency coordinator and the notification would be then activate Code Red. Mr. Pineda expressed a concern that the Code Red system is a county system and is meant for very serious emergencies.
- Intel could subscribe to the Code Red system, but they would have to provide their own database. Only government agencies can purchase the 911 database. Mr. Pineda strongly recommended that Intel develop a system like Code Red so that they could notify people in the surround area anytime there was an event that might affect the community, such as abatement equipment being taken offline.
- The regional emergency communications center does not have an emergency evacuation plan. Evacuation plans are the responsibility of each municipality.
- The Sandoval County Code Red system does not reach everyone in the immediate area of Intel. If there is an emergency, people not covered by the Code Red system would not be notified. Intel would need its own system to notify everyone in the surrounding community.

Richard DeWeese, an environmental engineer and site emergency manager for Intel provided an overview of the Intel emergency response plan focused primarily on their emergency notification system.

- Intel Corporation has an Intel notification system that is implemented globally at every Intel site. Within the system locally, there is a programmed autodial notification for the Intel Emergency Operations Center. The system allows the command staff at the operations center to bring necessary resources (both internal and external) to bear on any emergency event.
- There is also a system in place that is part of a six-step general response protocol that allows Intel to activate or escalate the emergency to external agencies having authority over the Intel site. Rio Rancho is the first in the chain of command in the authority over

the site. Sandoval County has the actual authority, but because of a mutual aid agreement, Rio Rancho is the primary responder. This is the same hierarchy for emergency management used throughout the United States – first is the city or municipality, then the county, then the state, and if necessary, the federal government.

- There is a very good relationship between Intel and Rio Rancho and in the event of an emergency, the two would work in a unified command structure.
- All emergency management operates under the National Incident Management System (NIMS). It is a one response program throughout the U.S. and the world.
- The Intel auto-notification does not have the authority to contact individuals in the community directly. Intel spends on the order of \$1M per year maintaining the auto-notification system that is used internally.
- Mr. Bartlit asked if Mr. DeWeese knew how much the Sandoval County's Code Red System cost. Mr. DeWeese had no knowledge of what Sandoval County paid for the system, but the entry level cost for Code Red started at \$25K.
- Mr. Pineda emphasized the need for Intel to have a system that can warn people in the community about less than emergency events, such as loss of abatement equipment or emissions releases. This is necessary for the community to be able to protect itself. Mr. Pineda pointed out that simply because Intel was under the authority of Rio Rancho or Sandoval County in an emergency does not mean that it can wash its hands of any responsibility. Intel can be held legally liable for anything that happens because of an emergency situation at the Intel site.
- Ms Fleming pointed out that Mr. DeWeese cannot speak for any of the other authorities. He was at the meeting to present the Intel emergency response plan. To get the broader perspective, representatives from each of the agencies need to be present in the form of a panel discussion. Mr. Pineda agreed that the group needed to convene a panel discussion.
- Mr. DeWeese stated the federal government set up the regulations regarding emergency response and the state is responsible for enforcing them. As a private company, Intel must comply with the regulations. In the event of an emergency within Intel, Intel is civilly responsible, but from the criminal standpoint, he (Mr. DeWeese) is responsible. He said he would not hide anything, just because Intel gave him a job, nor would Intel want him to. Mr. DeWeese emphasized that he is required to go through the hierarchy outlined in the regulations.
- Mr. DeWeese outlined what constituted an emergency. These include chemical spills, life-safety system alarms, or any emergency that is called in to the command center. Anyone working at Intel, is trained to respond to an identified emergency. People are trained to call in the emergency, evacuate the area, provide security, and provide the details of who, what, when, where, and why.
- In addition to the human factor, there are the life safety systems, including gas detection and facility management system with automated detection points that provide automated response to security. Security is manned 24/7/365. Security will contact the initial responders, the responders will take responsibility for the event, verify the incident, then take the appropriate steps to mitigate the event to a safe state.

- Within the response plan, there is considerable documented programming. There is an emergency response and contingency plan, a regulatory compliance document driven by the EPA, and OSHA regulations outlined in the 1910 series regulations.
- Mr. Littlejohn pointed out that Mr. DeWeese was providing information as part of the Emergency Response Committee's report and because of time constraints the discussion needed to be curtailed. The committee report was to prepare the group to decide next steps and there has been a consensus that a panel discussion of the topic was desired.
- Mr. Pineda stated that he felt very comfortable that Intel was well prepared to take care of emergencies within the plant and ensure the safety of Intel personnel. He asked "what about the people outside the fence". This should be the question posed to the future panel members.
- Mr. Williams said he understood that Intel was constrained by law to comply with all the regulations during an emergency. For lower level events, would Intel be willing to notify people that voluntarily put themselves on a contact list?
- Ms Fleming asked what constituted "lower level events".
- Roberta King told the group that she had just received a letter from Sandoval County describing the Code Red notification system being discussed. Sandoval County appeared to be far ahead of other government agencies in providing a notification system.
- Mr. Bartlit pointed out that knowing what constituted an emergency or a lower level event was a challenge. Too many notifications would be counterproductive because people would start to ignore the warnings. Defining what conditions that required notification was a non-trivial task.
- Mr. Littlejohn asked everyone to start compiling questions that could be presented to an Emergency Response panel. Everyone agreed that the panel should be scheduled soon. Mr. Littlejohn suggested one possibility was to walk through a critical incident at Intel from beginning to end. He will request other ideas via the email distribution list.
- Mr. Bartlit suggested the panel be made up of the same group that met with the CEWG before: Rio Rancho, Sandoval County, and Corrales as well as Intel.
- Mr. Pineda insisted that Intel provide a complete answer first, prior to going forward with the panel. Mr. Littlejohn took the action to get that information. Mr. Bartlit suggested that perhaps Mr. Pineda could formulate a list of questions for Intel to answer.
- Mr. Williams expressed a concern that the emergency response panel would cover what happened during an emergency as defined by the regulations. In the health business, there is a big gray area where no one is sure what happens. Is it possible that a voluntary system could be established to supplement the traditional emergency response system and provide notification of events that fall in the gray areas.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will check back with the CEWG by email to begin developing a panel.

OUTCOME OF WATER DISCUSSIONS

Mr. Littlejohn recalled from the last meeting that the group wanted to have some kind of closing statement with regard to the water discussions--not necessarily conclusions, but something that

helped to summarize what had been discussed. Mr. Littlejohn and Mr. Bartlit put together a short report on water discussions and presented it to the group for approval. The report was circulated prior to the meeting via email.

- Mr. Pineda pointed out that it was difficult to draw any conclusions from the panel discussions. The panel members expressed their opinions, but there were considerable differences of opinions expressed.
- The report uses the language of useful information rather than conclusions.
- Changes were suggested by the group and incorporated into the report. The final report will be distributed via email.
- The group agreed that the topic should be revisited in a couple of years.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Ms Chavez gave an overview of the EHS report.

- Production is still at 76 percent.
- Quarterly testing concluded on the 15th.
- There have been no meetings with regulators in the previous month.
- Ms Chavez pointed out that there is a community information line that people can call to get information. The list of site events in the EHS report is available on the information line. Events include such things as scheduled maintenance on the oxidizers, other equipment on site that might cause diesel odors, applying landscaping chemicals, etc.
- Mr Bartlit asked whether there was any record of how many calls had been received. Ms Chavez was unaware if that information was tracked.
- Mr. Williams asked whether the information was also on a website. Ms Fleming said that it was not.
- Mr. Pineda asked how effective the line was. Ms Fleming said the line was simply a recording, but when people perceived something happening at Intel they generally called security. When a call is received it is sent to the emergency response center. Every time there is a call, a response team is dispatched to investigate the area and the equipment. This has been the standard procedure for some time, but now it is being explicitly stated in the EHS report. Ms Fleming then proceeded to give examples from the site activity report. In addition to the response team investigation, wind data is also collected for each report.
- Mr. Pineda asked whether there was ever a case where Intel found something that was not as it should be. Ms Fleming responded in the affirmative. Last month there were three callers that reported odors that directly correlated with the abatement equipment being down for maintenance. That information was included in the EHS report.
- Mr. Stimmel asked how long it took the response team to respond. Ms Fleming responded that a team was always on site, even after hours.
- Mr. Littlejohn asked whether the response teams carried sniffing equipment with them. Mr. Gallegos said the human nose is more sensitive than the equipment.

Return to Email Dialogue Communication Guidelines

Mr. Littlejohn asked what the group wanted to do about email dialogue communication guidelines.

- The consensus was to discuss communication guidelines via an email dialogue and get the communities feelings and ideas. Mr. Pineda suggested that the discussion be approached in a positive manner by providing the advantages of diplomatic exchanges.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will initiate a community email dialogue on possible guidelines.

Other Items

Mr Stimmel asked about whether the report ad and the redundant RTOs were going to be on the next month's agenda.

- Mr. Littlejohn explained that there would continue to be email discussions of the topics and a decision would be made by the group on when to bring the discussion to a live meeting. There are several competing agenda topics that have to be covered.
- Mr. Bartlit offered the opportunity for the New Mexico Environmental Department (NMED) Air Quality Bureau to make comments in the email dialogues.
- Mr. Pineda expressed a concern that there was only one person from the community at the meeting.

Mr. Littlejohn then adjourned the meeting.

NEXT MEETING

- September 19, 2007, 5 PM at Your Place or Mine.

Upcoming Agenda Topics:

- CEWG report ad
- Emergency response panel
- RTO redundancy
- Citizen protocol and pilot test
- Permit issues
- USATSDR report on health effects
- Abatement efficiency
- Intel presentation on new chemical processes
- Intel presentation on ISO 14,000