

MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: January 21, 2009
Time: 5:00-7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Flying Star Restaurant

Members Attending

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

Hugh Church, American Lung Association
Carrie Freeman, Intel
Edward Pineda, Rio Rancho

Technical Support Staff

Frank Gallegos, Intel
Andrew Moen, Intel

Public

Roberta King, Corrales resident
Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident

Jay Stimmel, Interested citizen

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator, DLI Communication Consultants CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary December 17, 2008
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- Ad Copy for January
- Draft Prioritized List of Topics
- Information on Silica
- Silica Questions
- Intel Response Flow Chart
- Thoughts on shifting testing resources
- Intel air Permit Testing Requirements
- CEWG costs
- Article from *Corrales Comment*, 1/10/09

AGENDA (as modified)

- Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements
- Preparing for ATSDR report
- Planning Silica Discussion

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_1-21-09 v. 4.doc
18-09

Approved: CEWG, 2-

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: February 20, 2009

- Shifting Resources from Testing to Environmental Improvement
- CEWG cost cutting
- Adjourn

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

John Bartlit opened the meeting by stating the CEWG mission, which is to work towards environmental improvements and improve communication. Participants introduced themselves.

- Stephen Littlejohn explained the unusual circumstances of the day's meeting and apologized for its inconvenience. The Flying Star double booked the hospitality meeting room for January 21, 2009. In the spirit of cooperation, Mr. Littlejohn agreed to meeting in the dining area.
- Stephen Littlejohn introduced two additional items to the agenda. The first was that the ATSDR was ready to submit their report and would hold a public meeting on February 10 and 11. He suggested discussing this new agenda item after the public comment so CEWG could strategize what to do as a group. The second item to add to the agenda was recent cutbacks at Intel reduced CEWG's budget by \$6,000. The group would have to discuss reducing expenses to meet the new budget. Mr. Littlejohn said that Carrie Freeman would lead this discussion when she arrived after 6 p.m., and asked that this item be moved into the 6:10 spot. Subsequent agenda items would be pushed back, but he said the goal was to address all the agenda items in this meeting.
- John Bartlit asked if there were any other revisions to the agenda. Edward Pineda said he was impressed with new U.S. President and Vice President and their wives providing a day of community service. He suggested that CEWG craft a message to send to the new administration in Washington, DC, outlining the group's history of service to the community and their commitment to providing that service in the future. This message could ask the EPA to embrace CEWG's mission of continuous environmental improvement to the community. Mr. Pineda suggested adding a discussion of this idea to agenda. Barring any objections, Mr. Littlejohn suggested adding this agenda item to the last half hour of the meeting.
- John Bartlit asked if there were any comments or revisions to December's Meeting Summary. There were none.

Announcements

John Bartlit asked the group if there were any announcements.

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_1-21-09 v. 4.doc
18-09

Approved: CEWG, 2-

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: February 20, 2009

- Stephen Littlejohn announced that the NMED Air Quality Bureau would hold a public meeting on January 22 at the Corrales Community Center located at 4324 Corrales Road in Corrales to discuss Intel's technical permit revision for the installation and operation of a wastewater treatment unit. The meeting would begin at 7:00 p.m. and end no later than 9:30 p.m.
- Roberta King said that the ATSDR meetings would be held on Tuesday, February 10 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. and on Wednesday, February 11 at 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. at the Inn in Rio Rancho.

ATSDR REPORT

Stephen Littlejohn asked if there were anything special CEWG needed to do as a group to prepare for the ATSDR meeting.

- Edward Pineda asked if anyone was supposed to get an advanced copy of the ATSDR report. Roberta King said that no one was supposed to get an advance copy. Pineda also suggested that the group should have representatives present at the meeting. All CEWG members indicated that they planned to attend.
- John Bartlit suggested making a public comment at the meeting stating the group's existence, mission, and interest in the report. The purpose would be to more formally present CEWG to ATSDR and the public.
- Edward Pineda suggested that in regards to preparations, group members who attended the ATSDR meeting should ask questions that clarified the study to make sure it was understood and to ensure the ATSDR was fulfilling its mission and commitment to the community. He suggested pressing ATSDR for a clear conclusion and how to move forward in searching for solutions to the environmental problems.
- Roberta King clarified that no one in the public knew what was in the report and that it would not be made public until February 10. The reason why it was not available was because it had to pass it through other government agencies for fact checking.
- Mike Williams suggested that CEWG make a statement highlighting that CEWG was interested in environmental action not required by law but might give more health protection. The difference between what regulations could do versus other kinds of action should be emphasized. John Bartlit agreed that this was an important point to emphasize.

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_1-21-09 v. 4.doc
18-09

Approved: CEWG, 2-

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: February 20, 2009

- Stephen Littlejohn summarized the ATSDR discussion as follows. The group agreed that CEWG should have representation at the ATSDR meeting on February 10 and 11. It would be desirable for someone to make an announcement on behalf of the CEWG stating the group's mission. CEWG members attending the meeting should listen for the extent to which ATSDR is fulfilling its mission to the community and listen for items not required by law that must be achieved through other means, such as the CEWG.
- Hugh Church asked if anyone had a copy of the dossier submitted to ATSDR that alerted them to the environmental problem. Mr. Littlejohn referred him to the January 10 Corrales Comment article in the meeting handouts that listed more detailed background information. Roberta King added that the ATSDR responded to any group who petitioned them with an environmental problem that needed attention. She outlined the history of how Marcy Brandenburg, of Corrales Residents Clean Air and Water, initiated the study, gathered information on the issue and submitted a dossier on the environmental effects of Intel operations on the community. ATSDR was impressed with the dossier and decided to look further into the case. Their job was to assess the submitted information, investigate facts and evaluate the problem to see if there is a correlation.
- Discussion transpired on whether or not the ATSDR had the capacity to make the correlation between Intel emissions and its impact on public health. Edward Pineda understood that they did not have the capacity to make the correlations. John Bartlit said that they would do the best they could with the tools they had; it was imperfect and limited.
- Lynne Kinis responded to Hugh Church's question by saying Marcy Brandenburg was the only person who had an exact copy of the dossier submitted to ATSDR. She said information on health effects was highlighted, with resident interviews and evidence submitted by about 600 residents.
- Edward Pineda asked if it were possible to tape the meeting. Roberta King said that it was a public meeting and therefore anyone could tape it. She said she would tape it.
- John Bartlit offered to draft a CEWG fact sheet to hand out at the ATSDR meeting, and he would run it by the individuals in attendance at the CEWG meeting for their feedback and input. He would include the point about the group's work going beyond regulation. The group did not object, and Mr. Bartlit took on the task.

ACTION ITEM:

- John Bartlit would draft a CEWG fact sheet to hand out at the ATSDR meeting would run it by the individuals in attendance at the CEWG meeting for feedback and input.

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_1-21-09 v. 4.doc
18-09

Approved: CEWG, 2-

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: February 20, 2009

PLANNING SILICA DISCUSSION

Stephen Littlejohn began the discussion by reminding the group that one of their priorities was to study the silica issue. The group was able to gather good information on silica but was not able to assemble a panel at this point. He explained that the goal of the group at this meeting was to plan how to best organize a discussion on silica. One of the challenges was to decide how to organize the information for cogency and coherence. He referred to bullet points for discussion listed on the agenda. He also referred to two tools in the packet: 1. A handout listing silica information the group possessed. 2. A handout listing original questions drafted for a potential Lovelace panel discussion.

- John Bartlit asked if the information requested from Intel discussed at the last meeting was added to the list. Stephen Littlejohn said that it was with the exception of two Web sites on silica and household products. He did not include those Web sites because it was not the group's primary focus, but he would provide those Web sites should anyone want them.
- John Bartlit suggested an approach that looked at what was known and what was not known and added that there might be some connection between silica and ATSDR report. Stephen Littlejohn asked the group how they would go about analyzing what was known and where the gaps were. Mr. Bartlit suggested that the gaps might have been identified in the ATSDR report. Mike Williams said he had some ideas on where the gaps were, which might include the difference between air emissions and mining materials (fine particles).
- Edward Pineda recommended that CEWG ask the ATSDR, depending on the report's helpfulness, for advice on how to improve their understanding of crystalline silicate effects, including guidance on where to find some of the answers. John Bartlit pointed out that CEWG already received background silica materials from ATSDR.
- Edward Pineda suggested the possibility of ATSDR silica experts sitting on a CEWG silica panel. John Bartlit said it was possible to ask and the group could decide whether or not to ask them after the ATSDR report was presented to the public. He also mentioned a study in Islip, New York. Stephen Littlejohn said that while it did not work out with forming a panel of experts from Lovelace, CEWG could form a panel with other experts.
- Roberta King asked if Stephen Littlejohn had a chance to look deeper into the Islip study and its relevance to Rio Rancho/Corrales. Mr. Littlejohn said that he did not read through it. Lynne Kinis asked what, besides silica, they were studying in Islip. Mr. Littlejohn said he did not have that information. Mr. Bartlit said since the report came from the ATSDR, the group could try to learn more about it before the February meeting.

- Roberta King asked what “available from Stephen Littlejohn” written on the handout meant. Mr. Littlejohn responded that he had documents in hard copy form in his office, and he also had some items in PDF form.
- John Bartlit said that while some reports, like the 15-page report, were relatively easy to copy, others, such as the 188-page report, were more difficult to copy. Mr. Littlejohn said that smaller reports could be scanned and e-mailed. He asked the group to consider what was the most productive and efficient way to distribute and process the large quantity of information. Would having everyone in the group read every document be the most efficient process? John Bartlit said that everyone reading every document was not the most efficient way. Lynne Kinis disagreed and asked how the group would be able to have a discussion when not everyone was privy to the information. Mr. Bartlit replied that it might be difficult for some people to have the time to read over 500 pages, and he clarified that he had no objection to everyone in the group reading through all the documents should they want to. He just wanted to emphasize it would be difficult and not efficient.
- Sarah Chavez suggested coming up with a document checklist that listed what information the group wanted to collect from the documents. Then individuals would be assigned a document to read and collect that information. She pointed out that Mike Williams followed this process recently and searched through a document and summarized the relevant information. Everyone would be free to read through the documents on his or her own, but this was one way to streamline the process. Stephen Littlejohn said that, as Lynne Kinis and Roberta King both suggested, all the documents could be distributed to everyone also.
- Edward Pineda asked Mike Williams and Hugh Church if they knew of other silica information sources available in certain industries—glass manufacturing, for example—where workers might be exposed to silica particulates. Mike Williams responded that some of that information should be in the ATSDR report, but glass making did not really deal with crystalline silica.
- Stephen Littlejohn proposed taking a three-pronged approach to the issue: 1. Review the ATSDR report released in February to see how they looked at silica. Assign an individual or small committee to go through the documents to see if CEWG questions were answered. Where there were no answers would be considered a gap that needed to be filled, and 2. Make the documents available for everyone to read, should they want to. A person would have to e-mail Stephen Littlejohn to arrange how to get copies. 3. At the next available agenda slot, individuals could report their findings and the group could decide on next step specifics.

- John Bartlit said that Mr. Littlejohn's proposal was reasonable. He went on to remind the group of the history. CEWG sent questions to EPA who passed them on to ATSDR. In response, ATSDR sent the documents to CEWG rather than answer the questions directly. Mr. Bartlit suspected that ATSDR might have done this because the answers to the questions were not clearly present. Finding the answers was complicated because of the many factors involved; ATSDR were the experts and even they could not find the answers. He warned the group that after reading the documents they might not find clear answers to the questions, either. He clarified that he did not object to reading through documents to answer the questions, but it might be very difficult to find the answers.
- Stephen Littlejohn summarized group's options. They could follow his suggested approach or they could revisit the discussion at the next meeting based on the ATSDR report findings. He suggested that the ATSDR findings might affect the current questions and there was the potential that these questions might not be appropriate or additional questions were needed. After considering the ATSDR findings, CEWG might be able to refocus their questions and resend them to ATSDR. There were many possibilities for how the group could proceed. Mr. Littlejohn asked the group, considering all the options, for their preference.
- John Bartlit suggested assigning the shorter reports to individuals at this meeting. He emphasized that he was not resistant to distributing and using all the information, but that the task was enormous and it was difficult to gather and analyze all the data. People with far more resources—degrees in epidemiology, money—were bogged down by the task because it was time consuming and costly, and he did not want to do something that was undoable but he would be happy for people to try.
- Mike Williams pointed out that two tasks were being discussed. 1. Reading through the documents and trying to analyze the information to find answers and, 2. Looking through and analyzing the documents and for relevant information. The latter was not so difficult compared to the former, he said.
- Stephen Littlejohn said that after the documents were analyzed the group could decide next steps and asked if they would like to make assignments tonight. Mike Williams said that he would look at the documents he had not looked at yet.
- Hugh Church asked if the focus on silica would distract the group from looking at other chemicals that might be a problem. Roberta King pointed out that the group and community was focused on chemical rather than particulate matter and if they had asked questions on particulate matter years ago they might have gotten somewhere. She also inquired whether the link to the EPA report was based on local studies. Mike Williams replied that there were local studies but not with any microprocessor manufacturer.

- Stephen Littlejohn asked if anyone else would like to volunteer reading through the documents. John Bartlit volunteered to look at shorter documents. Edward Pineda offered to help also but only after February. Mr. Littlejohn suggested tasking Mike Williams with looking through specific documents and having him report back on the extent to which they provided information related to CEWG's questions. Anyone else who would like to read through the documents could e-mail Mr. Littlejohn the documents they would like to read and he would arrange to get them to them.
- Hugh Church said a document on performance standards and air pollution was handed out at the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County air quality control meeting he attended last week. He agreed to look closely at this document to see if it might be useful to the CEWG.
- Mike Williams said that maybe the CEWG was on the wrong track and perhaps focusing too much on silica. Roberta King said that stationary sources of silica—and Intel was certainly a stationary source—might be an important factor as opposed to other sources.

ACTION ITEM:

- Mike Williams will review the silica documents and report back on the extent to which they addressed CEWG questions.
- John Bartlit will review shorter documents and report back on the extent to which they addressed CEWG questions.

SHIFTING RESOURCES FROM TESTING TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT

Stephen Littlejohn referred the group to “shifting resources” handouts by John Bartlit and Sarah Chavez included in the packet that refer to the issue of.

- John Bartlit explained his handout “Additional Thoughts on Shifting Testing Resources.” His idea was to agree ahead of time on a specific reduction in testing requirements for a specific time period that would save a specific amount of money. All parties would agree ahead of time on how the savings would be spent. It might be used for an environmental improvement project, for example. If the group did not agree then they would not move forward.
- Sarah Chavez explained her chart, “Intel Air Permit Compliance Testing Requirements”, which was a table that showed the ongoing testing being done for the Intel Air Permit and its costs. Edward Pineda asked for clarification on this idea, and asked whether or not it would be a violation of the permit. Sarah Chavez said that the permit had conditions to request reduced testing and did not require a permit revision but rather a request to the

department. Mr. Pineda said he would be opposed to any permit change that reduced testing unless it was publicly stated that the money would be invested into the community. The community should not sacrifice for Intel to save money, said Mr. Pineda. The money saved would have to be put into the health of the community; it could not be a wish list but a verifiable application. John Bartlit said that this was exactly what he was trying to say with his idea. Ms. Chavez said that Intel had been doing testing for eight years and no one believed the data. If the testing was doing little to protect the community, what was the point of the testing?

- Lynne Kinis said she thought RTO testing was done within the stack and asked Sarah Chavez for clarification on the equipment that was being moved. Sarah Chavez responded that the testing equipment was located in a trailer and therefore external. It was moved to the stack area for testing, and testing was done with a sample from the stack. Ms. Kinis said that the community was led to believe that the equipment was monitoring all the time at the top of the stacks. Ms. Chavez said that Intel did not monitor continuously at the stacks, only for a two-week period at a time or as required at each stack.
- Lynne Kinis commented that John Bartlit's intention and his idea was "terrific," but she would not agree to it unless there was a firm agreement or commitment.
- Edward Pineda was concerned with CEWG starting any efforts to reduce testing. He reminded the group that Intel's permit allowed them to calculate and modify emissions by emission factors. The revisions submitted are based on stack testing results. People here have said that Intel's NMED permit was soft and permissive. He asked CEWG to be careful and not weaken the permit. Sarah Chavez clarified that stack testing at Intel was used to validate the emission standards and the emission factors were based on testing with the tool. That was an important distinction.

CEWG COSTS

Stephen Littlejohn introduced the next item on the agenda and referred the group to a handout called "CEWG Costs."

- Carrie Freeman said that due to the economic situation in the world and its impact at Intel (Intel was closing 5 factories worldwide), employees had been asked to reduce costs. The budget for CEWG was approximately \$30,000 a year, and they were being asked to reduce it to \$24,000 a year. The group would have to decide how they might make those cuts in cost.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group to look over the handout to identify how to save money. The handout included a section on "comments," which captured an earlier conversation between Mr. Littlejohn, Mr. Bartlit and Ms. Freeman on possible ways to reduce costs. Ideas were to eliminate the catering and find a lower cost or no-cost facility. Ms. Freeman

had some contacts in the community and might be able to find a cheaper facility. Another idea was to reduce travel reimbursement to group members who travel from Los Alamos. Photocopying could be done at Intel, which would save some money. They considered having an Intel employee record the meetings, but that idea was dismissed because it made a bad political statement and also because of technicality issues. The group could reduce the number of meetings, and the handout offered two scenarios: reducing the meetings to 10 a year or to eight a year.

- John Bartlit said that Mike Williams drove a Prius and they were willing to forego some travel costs. Stephen Littlejohn said that with reducing meetings, the facilitator costs was not reduced proportionally because of the work between meetings. Also, he explained that Intel allocated \$30,000 to him in a purchase order, and he paid the bills with that money. The difference was his reimbursement.
- Mike Williams asked what would happen if the meetings were reduced to nine a year. Stephen Littlejohn said that the reduction in costs would be somewhere in between the eight and 10 meetings. The group could have two meetings per quarter or five meetings every six months. Mr. Williams said he would be happy to eliminate catering and halve the travel reimbursement. With that, finding a low cost/no cost facility, and reducing the meetings to nine a year, the new budget might be met.
- Edward Pineda said that some people were lost in the discussion and suggested going over the handout item by item.
- Stephen Littlejohn said that the noise in the restaurant was making it very difficult to hear everyone. He asked the group if they wanted to end the meeting early and pick up this agenda item next month. CEWG did not have to pay for this and next month's meeting, which gave the group time to decide.
- Edward Pineda suggested pondering the handout and possible cuts and e-mail to Mr. Littlejohn suggestions for reductions. He asked the group to remember that the community was going to suffer from the cutbacks, so if the number of meetings were reduced perhaps they could be made a little bit longer in time.
- Stephen Littlejohn said he would send an e-mail the next day requesting feedback on cuts along with any other creative ideas. The group would pick up the other agenda items at the next meeting. He asked the group if that was acceptable and the group replied, "Yes." Mr. Littlejohn again apologized, and said that after six calls made by the Flying Star, he finally agreed to give up the room in the spirit of being flexible. And he was sorry he did it. He had no idea it would be this loud in the restaurant. The group did accomplish some things today, and he appreciated everyone's patience with this difficult situation.

ACTION ITEM:

- Stephen Littlejohn will e-mail the group immediately requesting their feedback on cuts along with any other creative ideas on how to deal with the budget reduction.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING

February 18, 2009, 5 P.M. at the Corrales Flying Star Hospitality Room

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_1-21-09 v. 4.doc
18-09

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: February 20, 2009

Approved: CEWG, 2-