

MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

"Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel"

Date: July 16, 2008
Time: 5:00-7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Flying Star, Hospitality Room

Members Attending

John Bartlit, Acting Chair
Sarah Chavez, EHS Department, Intel
Mike Williams, NM Clean Air & Water

Hugh Church, American Lung Association
Edward Pineda, Rio Rancho resident
Teresa Fleming, Intel Public Affairs

Technical Support Staff

Andrew Moen
Carrie Freeman

Public

Roberta King, Corrales resident
Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident
Jay Stimmel, interested citizen
Zoe Masterson (granddaughter of Lynne Kinis)
John Alsobrook, Candidate for District 4

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, DLI Communication Consultants David Bergeron, recorder

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft June 18, 2008 Meeting Summary
- EHS Activity Report
- Email – CEWG Action Item from June Meeting
- Ad copy for July
- Action-Item Progress Report
- Draft Short Report to the Community

AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements
- NMED and Public Engagement
- Annual Report
- Educational Website Materials on Stack Height

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_7-16-08 v 4
Prepared or presented by: Stephen Littlejohn
Prepared for: CEWG
Date prepared or presented: August 20, 2008

Approved: CEWG 8-20-08

- Additional Business
- Adjourn

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS:

John Bartlit opened the meeting and stated the CEWG's mission is to improve dialogue and seek continuous environmental improvement. After introductions, John Bartlit asked if there were comments about the agenda, and there were none. Mr. Bartlit asked for comments on the draft summary from the previous meeting. Mr. Littlejohn pointed out that Edward Pineda's name was left off the summary, and this has been corrected. Later, upon his arrival, Ms. King introduced John Alsobrook, Candidate for District 4, Corrales. Because he is running for the district that adjoins Intel, she had invited him to attend.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Lynn Kinis asked about the difference between versions 11 & 12 of the stack height report. Mr. Littlejohn said that version 12 has a table of contents on the title page. He also said there could be some pagination differences. Mr. Bartlit added that the section headings are the same as the previous report.

NMED AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Mr. Littlejohn introduced this item by reminding the group that it has been on the agenda since the March meeting when the group expressed interest in having NMED make a presentation on its public engagement process. A broader issue may be involved: public engagement in general, and the role of the NMED and what it can and cannot do. This led to the idea of having a panel give a presentation. The intent in this meeting is to discuss what that panel might cover, who might be on the panel and some of the questions the panel might address.

- Mr. Bartlit offered some possibilities for what the panel could address. One is public mechanisms that agencies use for public involvement. Another area the panel could investigate is the NMED, its authorities, its funding, what NMED can and cannot do, and its relationship with EPA.
- Edward Pineda suggested that the panel find someone who could give the origin and history of environment protection and help identify different ways the environment can be protected (e.g., by law, by regulation, voluntarily) and identify the benefits and accomplishments of those different ways. He suggested identifying the elements of a successful environmental protection program. He also suggested that the person from NMED explain to whom the agency is responsible and what are their lines of reporting. He feels NMED is more concerned about industry and companies than protecting the public health.
- Mr. Bartlit asked if NMED should be on the panel (if they would agree to it) or whether the CEWG should decide not to have NMED on the panel.

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_7-16-08 v 4

Approved: CEWG 8-20-08

Prepared or presented by: Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 20, 2008

- Mr. Pineda suggested the panel should address the key elements that make an environmental protection program successful. Lynne Kinis agreed with Mr. Pineda, especially in the area of defining the elements of a successful environmental program. She would also ask what NMED's responsibility is to the populace. She pointed out that NMED has a broad scope of responsibility, but she was not interested in all areas they cover. Her interest is in the issues associated with Intel.
- Mr. Bartlit said that CEWG panels in the past produced information that the group thought was worth having. The CEWG set the agenda and gave specific questions to the panels before hand. He also agreed that it should be applicable to the concerns of the CEWG.
- Mr. Pineda stated that NMED's Environmental Improvement Board (EIB) is charged by the state legislature with developing, improving, reviewing, and revising policy. The CEWG's main concern is how the public can get into that process. State or federal regulators should feel that environmental protection programs are so beneficial that they should commit to finding ways to get the public involved.
- Hugh Church asked if the CEWG's panel should intersect with the Department of Health. Ms. Kinis said Mr. Church hit the nail on the head. This whole situation did not come about just because the neighborhood was angry. It was because health issues sparked the neighbors to unite and try to get Intel to be community friendly. Mr. Bartlit agreed there is a lot to be learned about the relationship between NMED and the Health Department.
- Roberta King felt the panel should include an impartial independent expert who does not have ties to regulatory or government agencies or corporations. She thought that the Environmental Improvement Board was supposed to keep track of what was going on, but she does not have the opinion that it is doing so. She felt the board does the Governor's bidding. She stated that they are politically appointed, and the CEWG needs to get someone who is out of the political arena.
- Mr. Bartlit said there are several aspects to the presentation. One is to learn about the process. Ms. King stated that we have learned how the system is by the process of trying to work in it. Mr. Bartlit asked if she was proposing that instead of a panel, the CEWG should decide what changes in laws or in the board should be made. He asked how the CEWG could bring change to NMED. Ms. King said she believes that people on EIB start out with good intentions but in the process, they are caught up in the system; for their own survival, they have to go along with the system.
- Mr. Pineda said that getting an impartial expert is interesting challenge. That person needs to be someone who is compensated for effort and time. Some countries have created an ombudsman in charge of the environment who draws a salary.

- Ms. King suggested that those who are most effective at explaining the process are investigative reporters on a newspaper or magazine who are concerned about a situation and who investigate it.
- Mr. Bartlit suggested as a panelist Letty Belin, who is an environmental attorney whom he knows well. She works out of Santa Fe and to Mr. Bartlit's knowledge has not been involved at all with Intel. She has a lot of experience with public engagement issues. She is a citizen activist lawyer who works for environmental groups such as NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water and Oil Conservation Division regulations. She works on laws that allow good public engagement. Mr. Littlejohn asked whether she could talk about types of public engagement and the role and mission of NMED, but Mr. Bartlit said he was not sure about this. She could give some background on regulation and environmental protection. Mr. Bartlit said Ms. Belin would also know about lawsuits. She could talk about regulation vs. litigation. He said he did not know if she would be willing to work with the CEWG.
- Several other individuals were listed. These include attorneys like Burnett and Meikeljohn, a public engagement person like Ric Richardson, a reporter such as Jeff Radford, a public policy person such as Paul Biderman, consultants such as someone from Parametrics Environmental Consulting (Taschek). Mr. Pineda suggested a college professor who teaches environmental science, and he suggested that the Environmental Resolution Agency might have someone who could help with this effort. Mr. Littlejohn said the Center for Environmental Conflict Resolution has a corps of process experts. Many of them live in New Mexico and the organization would be happy to provide us their list of people who live locally.
- Teresa Fleming said she thought it was mentioned earlier that there should be someone from NMED and someone from the Health Department. Mr. Bartlit said they may or may not be willing to do that, but could be added to the list.
- Mr. Bartlit suggested that CEWG should avoid having a panelist with history with Intel and asked if there was general agreement on this. Ms. King said she liked the idea of avoiding those people and instead having speakers who look at things from a different angle. Mr. Bartlit cautioned the group not to assume that NMED would come. Ms. Kinis said that anyone who comes from NMED has their hands tied. She would not want to put someone on the spot.
- Mr. Pineda felt the panel should be divided into two sessions. One session would be experts not directly related to this conflict, who would define the elements and procedures needed for good environmental protection. Then in a second session, NMED can say how they fit in those procedures.
- Mr. Bartlit said agency financing would be an issue. Mr. Pineda agreed that financing was important.

- Mr. Bartlit said it sounded to him like the group was in agreement that it should be someone other than NMED.
- Mike Williams asked who decides what is a “good” environmental program. In response, Mr. Bartlit told a personal story about a Russian who asked him how one found out about public meetings and when told it was published in the newspaper with time and location, the Russian asked how one got into the building. The point is that even when we think we have it bad here, we are better off than much of the world. Mr. Williams added that in many countries information about emissions would not be available to the public. Mr. Pineda said that in many countries in Latin America before a plant can be built, they are required by law to develop by certified experts an environmental assessment of the plant. The agency has the authority to reject projects that cannot explain how they will mitigate the negative environmental impacts.
- Mr. Williams felt that the topic was getting too big for the panel to address. Mr. Bartlit said the topic could be narrowed to reviewing the current laws and regulations related to NMED air quality work.
- Mr. Pineda wanted to add ways in which the public could be successful in getting new regulations and modifying existing ones to protect the people and the environment. Mr. Bartlit replied that the roots are there and they have been around for fifteen to twenty years. It takes time and lawyers, but the means for influence do exist. It is very difficult and always will be. Mr. Pineda felt that the NMED is influenced by the regulatory agencies and the Governor. Ms. King added that lobbyists also influence NMED. Mr. Bartlit says this is a universal and in some ways unsolvable problem because the process is so cumbersome and difficult.
- **Mr. Littlejohn summarized the topics for the panel as follows: (1) Current law and regulations related to the air quality function of the NMED and (2) public engagement processes, including public influence and public recourse.**
- Mr. Pineda suggested finding a good reporter or an environmental lawyer who would consider writing an article. “What is good and what is not good about NMED”. Ms. King said that article would have to be written for some other venue for the Associated Press to pick up and put in the newspapers across the country because the Albuquerque Journal will not print that article.
- Mr. Bartlit asked Jay Stimmel as a citizen to learn what he could learn about the NMED’s interest, willingness, ability to participate in such a panel. Mr. Littlejohn said he thought the group had agreed that it does not want to involve someone who has history with the Intel situation.
- Mr. Littlejohn suggested that he and Mr. Bartlit confer and put together something that is focused and clear and send it out. It would include a possible focus for the panel, possible people for the panel and questions for the panel.

ACTION ITEM: Mr. Littlejohn and Mr. Bartlit will produce a proposal for the panel and send this to the CEWG by email for comment and possible approval.

ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Bartlit said he put most of the report together from comments made at meetings this last year. Mr. Littlejohn went through the meeting summaries and pulled out topics. Bartlit said that report is meant to be a summary of what the CEWG has accomplished and that he envisioned the whole report being about the length of the draft (one page). As a draft it certainly can be changed, but he said he did not envision writing five pages of text.

The following discussion is organized by section of report addressed:

Title: Community Environmental Working Group: Accomplishments

- Hugh Church raised an issue with the title, saying that not everything in the report is an accomplishment yet.
- Ms. King agreed and said that CEWG did not have anything to do with the purchase of the Munters units. Intel did this at their discretion because all other Intel factories use Munters. However, Mr. Pineda felt like CEWG put pressure on Intel about redundancy for a number of years.
- Mr. Bartlit asked the Intel representatives if the group had anything to do with the decision to purchase the redundant Munters. Ms. Chavez said that having oxidizers is company policy, but they could have decided to stay with Durr units instead of the Munters. Because of the liability and the success of the other sites with Munters units, Intel decided to go with these. Effective abatement has been part of the feedback from the CEWG. Intel made the decision in part because the Munters units have proven to be better.
- Ms. King asked if she was correct that the Rio Rancho site is the first to have thermal oxidizers and that it did so because of the pressure the Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water put on Intel. Ms. Chavez said she could not remember the history and does not know if any other site had a Durr unit. When Intel started this in the 1993-1994 timeframe the Rio Rancho plant was one of the first sites to install thermal oxidizers. Then when Intel started looking to keep all sites minor source listed, they went through a process of evaluating suppliers, which is typical of what Intel does with all of its equipment. For whatever reasons (and she stated she was not part of that process), Munters was chosen over Durr. Mr. Bartlit said everyone was in agreement that reliability and effectiveness of pollution controls were the reason Munters were adopted.
- Mr. Bartlit said the accomplishments matter, and we do not want to fight over who gets credit. We do not care how it comes about. We can say that credit for these accomplishments involves many people. In previous years, the report has given credit to Intel or corporate financial aspects, budgets, CEWG, Corrales residents, Clean Air & Water, SWAP, etc. Ms Fleming said there had been a lot of push-back in previous years

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_7-16-08 v 4

Approved: CEWG 8-20-08

Prepared or presented by: Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 20, 2008

from some of the organizations being listed in the CEWG report. Mr. Littlejohn said that the wording acknowledge that there are many sources of these improvements without giving specific names.

- Mr. Bartlit reaffirmed that accomplishments are all that matter. Activities and efforts are necessary, but they are not sufficient. Only accomplishments are sufficient. Accomplishments mean reductions and he stated that he has consistently argued, and will continue to argue, against accounting for the hours CEWG spends. That is the road to bureaucracy
- Mr. Williams said it bothered him that it appeared that CEWG might be taking full credit for everything.
- Ms. Kinis said the word *community* should be eliminated from the name of the CEWG. As a member of the community, she says she refuses to be used for "PR" by Intel.
- Ms. King said that what Mr. Bartlit called an accomplishment is different from what those who live in the community feel is an accomplishment. The group cannot just accept Intel's report and say, "That is the way it is." She said the group is part of Intel's bureaucracy. There are just as many people getting sick and dying as have been happening for twenty years. It is getting worse.
- Mr. Bartlit asked Ms. King what items she believes should be deleted. Ms. King said the word *accomplishments* should be deleted. She also said that she did not think that there had ever been real communication from the public on what they feel are the real issues.

Note at top of report: Accomplishments in this report that go beyond the law—that is, steps that agencies cannot require—are marked with an arrow.

- Mr. Bartlit commented that the bullets highlighted with an arrow, there was no regulatory requirement or authority to compel these changes. They were done in relation to the CEWG.
- Mr. Pineda said that the word *agencies* should be defined. It was suggested that it should read "environmental and health regulatory agencies," and the group agreed.
- Mr. Alsobrook suggested that the wording on the previous comments should be changed to say that the regulations don't currently compel Intel to make the changes. Regulations can be changed. The group agreed that it should read "under current law".

New, improved pollution controls (thermal oxidizers) were purchased by Intel.

- ***The new units (brand name: Munters) have a record of better reliability, less downtime.***
- ***A redundant (backup) \$2 million unit was added, a first step long sought by some citizens.***
- ***Units are scheduled for operation by end of 2008.***

- Mr. Pineda questioned the phrasing of the second bullet. He did not feel that 'a redundant unit' accurately described how many RTO's there are. Ms. Chavez explained

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_7-16-08 v 4

Approved: CEWG 8-20-08

Prepared or presented by: Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 20, 2008

that the original plan was to purchase one Munters, and then a second was added to provide redundancy in the event that one of the other goes down. [as corrected by email] The second unit is redundant because it is not needed for regular operations. Mr. Littlejohn suggested changing the second arrow bolded text to read “Two new, improved pollution controls (thermal oxidizers) were purchased by Intel. One will operate full time and one will serve as redundant backup.”

- Ms. King felt that the third bullet under the third arrow should be changed to read, “Units are not yet in operation, but are scheduled to be by the end of 2008.” She felt it important that people realize that they have another six months to breath what they are breathing. Ms. Chavez said that there are no untreated emissions right now. Intel has all solvent emissions – all VOC emissions – routed to the two existing Durr units.
- Ms. King asked about downtime. Ms. Chavez said that although there is no redundancy currently, VOC emissions are treated today. Mr. Pineda agreed with Ms. King in that the public may think that there is nothing currently treating emissions. Some clarification is needed to say that currently there are two units that are treating emissions, but that they will later be replaced by the Munters. Ms. King said this information should be specific.

The stack height was raised on the new units, a step to improve air quality.

- *After closely detailed study, the CEWG recommended a height of 38.2 meters or 40 meters*
- *The height was raised from 23.2 meters, the height of many old stacks, to a 30-meter height.*
- *The differing positions (CEWG’s and Intel’s) are detailed in a joint report entitled: **Determining Stack Height at Intel: A Joint Summary of Common Ground and Differing Views.** The nature of the report – jointly reporting differing views – is a new step in better understanding public issues.*
 - Ms. Kinis stated that the statement that this is “a new step in better understanding public issues” should be removed. She says Intel disregarded the information that the committee recommended. They made the stack height 30 meters, which is more detrimental in the end. She reiterated her demand that the word *community* be removed from the name of the group because Intel is not hearing or listening to public complaints about illness.
 - Ms. Kinis also questioned the phrase “a step to improve air quality.” She asked that it be removed as an improvement had not been accomplished. Mr. Bartlit suggested changing it to read “an effort to improve air quality,” but Ms Kinis reiterated her request to remove the statement, because she felt the public would interpret the words to mean that a real improvement in air quality had been made. Mr. Williams said the phrase means it is a step to improve air quality relative to the original proposal, not a step to improve over existing air quality. He felt the phrase should be taken out. The group agreed to rewrite the sentence as “The designed stack height was raised on the new units.”

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_7-16-08 v 4

Approved: CEWG 8-20-08

Prepared or presented by: Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 20, 2008

- Mr. Bartlit said that the words “the next step” is meant to refer to jointly reporting differing views and only that. Ms. King said that differing views has not solved the problem. Mr. Bartlit said that it only says “a new step in communicating.” Ms. King said the CEWG is continually spinning its wheels and getting nowhere because the group continues to work to benefit Intel, and she disagreed with calling the report better communication.
- Mr. Bartlit asked if it would be acceptable to change the word understanding to “communicating” or to “better describing.” Mr. Pineda asked whether Ms. Kinis and Ms. King would accept just changing the word “describing” and keeping the bullet in the body of the report. Ms. Kinis said no. She feels the last part of the statement which refers to “a new step in better understanding public issues” must be deleted. She feels the public was not considered or heard and it is not any kind of positive move in communication.
- Mr. Pineda proposed this entire bullet be moved to the bottom of the report as a footnote. Mr. Williams disagreed and said it is important to see the Intel view and the CEWG’s opinion specifically stated in the text. Mr. Pineda asked Ms. Kinis if she could accept the remaining three lines if that part were deleted. Ms. Kinis said yes. Mr. Bartlit said that by removing that part of the sentence, it is no longer grammatically correct but that he could live with the change if it the grammar were made correct. Mr. Bartlit would prefer that some language that addresses the concept of “a new step” be included, but he accepts the other changes.
- Mr. Pineda asked if he is correct in understanding that the short report came from a review of the CEWG meeting summaries. He suggested that maybe more time should be spent reviewing the summaries to be sure they accurately reflect what was discussed. If there is something in the report that is inaccurate, it is because the CEWG has not been careful enough in approving the meeting summaries. The group should be more critical.
- Mr. Littlejohn said that the group might be able to work out the language of the third arrow, third bullet through email if there were consensus on everything else. He polled the members of the CEWG, and everyone agreed to the report with the stipulation that they could reach consensus on the above language through email and contingent upon the following changes:

First line: “Accomplishments in this report that go beyond the law – that is, steps that environmental and health regulatory agencies cannot currently require”

On the new units: the first line: Two units have been purchased, one will be full time in operation and one will be redundant. [as corrected by email] Language will be added stating that currently the emissions are being treated by two Durr units. Language will be added to say that the new units are not in operation but are scheduled to be operational by the end of 2008.

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_7-16-08 v 4

Approved: CEWG 8-20-08

Prepared or presented by: Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 20, 2008

Language will be added to say "The design stack height was raised on the new thermal oxidizer units".

At the bottom of the document, language will be added expanding credit for the accomplishments beyond the CEWG without mentioning specific names.

- Ms. Kinis requested that the Short Report to the Community not be published until the issue of the name of this group is settled. She said she had been asking for that for many months. Mr. Pineda suggested that be the first item for the next meeting. Mr. Bartlit said that the name of the group now, as of this report, is what is on the report. He continued that it is a topic the group wants to take up further and the name can be changed, but it will not be a retroactive name change. It cannot be, so he sees no reason not to proceed. If the name is changed, the next report will reflect that.
- Mr. Littlejohn asked if the CEWG agrees with Mr. Bartlit's rationale for proceeding with the report using the CEWG name. There were no objections to this. The differences will be worked out via email, and then the report will be published immediately.
- Mr. Pineda said that there are people in the community who should be allowed to state their opposition.

FOLLOW-UP ON STACK HEIGHT REPORT

- Mr. Littlejohn reviewed the handout listing the things accomplished by email in the last month. These include: (1) Stack height report completed, (2) reply to Fred Marsh's statement on stack height, (3) email to Intel management about continuing stack height concerns, (4) consultation with management about commitment to Citizen Protocol, (5) email exchange regarding ideas for educational materials on stack height for the website, (6) draft annual report, (7) email to distribution list on changes in downtime reporting format.
- Mr. Pineda asked if there had been a response from Intel to the email expressing continued concerns over stack height. They should respond to show that they take our concerns seriously.
- Mr. Littlejohn suggested that the group concentrate on leftover stack height issues, primarily the educational materials on the website.
- Ms. Chavez said that Mr. Gallegos had a conversation regarding Citizen Protocol with the CS Manager and the Factory Manager and overall from the manager's standpoint, there is agreement with the idea of the Citizen Protocol. There is concern about what type of emissions would be tested, particularly related to what is regulated and what protocol methods would be used. Also ensuring the use of a certified consultant is also a concern. That is specifically addressed in the protocol, but the approved standard method may need to be looked at. However, because silica is not a part of Intel's permit, further discussion is needed to determine if this should be the first thing to be tested. Management needs to determine whether there is an approved EPA methodology for

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_7-16-08 v 4

Approved: CEWG 8-20-08

Prepared or presented by: Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 20, 2008

testing silica. Intel's attorney will review for legal risks because there is no precedent. Ms. Fleming agreed that there is no precedent.

- Mr. Littlejohn reminded the group that management's position on the Citizen Protocol relates to the open letter that CEWG wanted to put in the *Corrales Comment*, and the Group wanted to approach Jeff Radford on this as quickly as possible.
- Mr. Bartlit said that Intel's position on the Citizen Protocol must be in writing. Ms. Chavez said she would relay this to Mr. Gallegos. She added that item 8, as written, could not be left in the open letter if it were to be published now. That language would have to be changed because, although Intel agrees with the idea, there is still the concern with silica being the first test. Ms. Chavez asked whether everything could be left the same except identifying silica as the pilot test. Mr. Littlejohn said this change could be made, but that Radford's article, to which the open letter responds, focused on crystalline silica, so Mr. Bartlit felt that reference to silica should be included. Specifically, the point is that if non-Intel funding can be found, crystalline silica will be tested once more in Intel's new Munters units, but that contracting and testing would be done under the Citizen Protocol, that is to say, not under the control of Intel. We are currently seeking a statement that Intel supports this decision.
- Mr. Bartlit said there could be a qualification added stating that crystalline silica will be tested assuming there is a standardized, approved EPA test for it. That is Intel's concern and it is a legitimate concern. If there is not a standardized test, we are all set back because the previous testing done by Intel also would not have been done by a certified method.
- Ms. Kinis asked if Intel would determine which stacks would be tested. Ms. Chavez answered no. The concern is ensuring the testing method is a certified method. The concern is in having an experimental test done on the stacks. Intel wants a proven, reliable testing method for whatever is going to be tested. Mr. Bartlit said that everyone wants that.
- Mr. Williams said that he is worried that there is no regulation on silica emissions and it is quite possible that the EPA will not have a testing methodology for it. If such a test is not required, then companies are in compliance with the law. Ms. Chavez said the concern is not that it is an EPA method, but a certified method. That is why more homework needs to be done on this issue. Intel wants to be assured that such testing would not be experimental, but conducted according to an industrial hygiene standard that will lead to valid results.
- Mr. Pineda asks that Intel provide a written answer to the question of whether and under what conditions they will support the testing. This idea to work under a Citizen Protocol was introduced a year ago. The selection of the silica was made several meetings ago. Why did Intel not tell CEWG they had a problem with that? Ms. Chavez said they had been sidetracked with other issues.

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_7-16-08 v 4

Approved: CEWG 8-20-08

Prepared or presented by: Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 20, 2008

- Mr. Bartlit asked if it was possible to use the same test Intel used before. There is a protocol for that somewhere. Ms. Chavez said she would look at that.
- Mr. Bartlit said that the longer CEWG waits after the first editorial by Radford, the less relevant the open letter becomes. He said if the issue can be settled by email in the next few days, this would be beneficial. Mr. Bartlit suggested using language similar to “testing by previous method used” or by another standardized test.
- Mr. Littlejohn said that discussion would continue by email.

ACTION ITEMS:

- **Ms. Chavez will ask Mr. Gallegos for a written response to the Citizen Protocol.**
- **Ms. Chavez will ask whether management approve using the same silica test Intel used for the Citizen Protocol.**

EHS REPORT

- Ms. Chavez said there was nothing significant to report on the EHS report. Construction continues on the site with cranes. One neighbor complained about noise. Intel went back to the old method of reporting and included the emissions.

OTHER ITEMS

- Mr. Littlejohn reported that Frank Gallegos did find documentation on community opinions related to stack height. That documentation in the form of an email is a part of the handouts for this meeting.
- Mr. Littlejohn said another issue to be addressed is how to put together the section of the website which will be designed to help the public learn more about environmental issues related to stack height. He said his assumption is that the group wants to continue to work on that issue. We will continue discussing this by email.
- A handout lists ideas regarding education on stack height. This is the current list of things to include on the website:
 - There was general agreement to include the report concerning stack height at Intel.
 - A primer on stack height, concentrations and contaminants
 - Bartlit’s column on air dispersion modeling which could be used as an introductory piece followed by a brief explanation about the role modeling plays in stack height analysis
 - The three modeling reports from the December meeting.
 - There may be other relevant information from the December meeting summary that could be also included.

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_7-16-08 v 4
 Prepared or presented by: Stephen Littlejohn
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: August 20, 2008

Approved: CEWG 8-20-08

- Rationale for Continuous Environmental Improvement – that is a general statement supporting the mission of CEWG and section for the public to post questions. This would make the website somewhat interactive.
- Mr. Pineda asked if Ms. Chavez would give a progress report on the installation of the new RTO's. Ms. Chavez took that as an action item for the next meeting.
- Ms. King recommends that the group study the history of how this group got named, why it started. Fred Marsh referred to it in his email.
- Ms. Chavez said the website has been changed to the format discussed last month. She requested feedback on the website.

ACTION ITEM: Ms Chavez will provide a status report on the installation of the new Munters units at the next meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING:

August 20, 2008, 5 PM at the Flying Star

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_7-16-08 v 4
Prepared or presented by: Stephen Littlejohn
Prepared for: CEWG
Date prepared or presented: August 20, 2008

Approved: CEWG 8-20-08