
MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: February 18, 2009
Time: 5:00-7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Flying Star Restaurant

Members Attending

John Bartlit, Acting Chair	Hugh Church, American Lung Association
Sarah Chavez, EHS Department, Intel	Carrie Freeman, Intel
Mike Williams, NM Clean Air & Water	Edward Pineda, Rio Rancho

Technical Support Staff

Frank Gallegos, Intel
Andrew Moen, Intel
Hannah Fox, Intel Intern

Public

Roberta King, Corrales resident	Judy Hemphill, Corrales resident
Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident	

Facilitator

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

HANDOUTS

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Draft Agenda▪ Draft Meeting Summary January 21, 2008▪ Action-Item Progress Report▪ EHS Activity Report▪ This month’s newspaper ad▪ Intel Response Flow Chart▪ Appendix A: ATSDR Report▪ CEWG Statement for ATSDR | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Meeting▪ Intel Environmental Regulatory Agencies▪ ATSDR letter to NMED▪ Mike Williams Comments to ATSDR Report▪ John Bartlit’s article on synergism for the Los Alamos Monitor |
|---|--|

AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements
- Intel Odor Notification Response Process
- ATSDR Report

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_2-18-09 v. 4.doc	Approved: 3/18/09
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn	
Prepared for: CEWG	
Date prepared or presented: March 18, 2009	

- Additional Business
- Adjourn

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

John Bartlit opened the meeting by stating the CEWG mission, to work towards environmental improvements and improved dialogue. Participants introduced themselves.

There were no comments on the agenda. The group commended the recorder CJ Ondek for an excellent summary in light of the noise level of the previous meeting. The Meeting Summary was approved as distributed.

Announcements

John Bartlit asked the group if there were any announcements. There weren't any. Stephen Littlejohn reminded the group that next month's meeting location will change to the Corrales Senior Center. The Corrales Senior Center is located in the same complex as the Corrales Community Center, near the police station and village council rooms, across from the bank. Mr. Littlejohn reminded the group that there would be no food served so the group might want to bring a snack. He would send an e-mail to ask the group if they want to coordinate bringing cookies. John Bartlit asked if bringing a brown bag were acceptable. Everyone agreed as long as the food was not noisy.

Public Comments

John Bartlit opened the floor for public comments. There weren't any.

INTEL ODOR NOTIFICATION RESPONSE PROCESS

- Carrie Freeman developed a handout to accompany this agenda item and used it to structure the discussion. Ms. Freeman explained that the "Intel Odor Response Protocol for External Notifications" process began in 2003, and a community information line accompanied the protocol, with the phone number being: 893-3359. Site activity was updated regularly, and activities included things that could be smelled, heard or seen. Ms. Freeman said that the process was revised as per comments made by the CEWG. Some residents mentioned that they did not like the response they received when they called Intel security. In the autumn Intel received feedback that residents wanted to request immediate call back or site visits at the location where they smelled the odor. Ms. Freeman reminded the group that the first step in the process still was for people to call the main Intel phone number, which was available 24 hours a day seven days a week, at 893-7000.
- Edward Pineda wondered why the word "odor" was in the protocol's title since complaints include more than odors. Carrie Freeman responded that the process had been revised since the handout was developed to include noise and odors. She also pointed out that other sources of complaints were responded to differently. Mr. Pineda suggested that the word "odor" be replaced by "environmental complaints." Ms. Freeman commented that was

good feedback. Frank Gallegos reminded the group that this procedure was not written for the public but for Intel security.

- Carrie Freeman explained that depending on what the complaint was, there were specific protocols for who was engaged on the site level; it was different for different types of responses. Ms. Freeman continued to outline the process as follows. Intel security received the information and contacted site security to see if any abatement systems were in bypass. Next, security contacted first responders. These people were highly certified and responded to all events onsite. These individuals investigated the complaint, walked the fence line and recorded atmospheric conditions, which way the wind was blowing, for example. Security also knew about other things on site not related to the manufacturing process that might cause potential odors, for example, roofing maintenance, solvent work or spraying herbicide. One of the things updated based on CEWG feedback was the dispatch process. Callers could request Intel security to contact Ms. Freeman or Mr. Gallegos, and they would be notified and return the call immediately. Otherwise, Intel security would contact the environmental health and safety on-call engineers if anything were down, and the call would be returned the next business day.
- Edward Pineda asked if the team was instructed that in the event of life-threatening situations to wait to call back the next day. Ms. Freeman said absolutely not. Under life-threatening situations a different process was triggered, which included 24/7 dedicated emergency responders and notifying the appropriate external agencies immediately. Mr. Pineda asked if someone were walking on nearby trails and collapsed from a heart attack would Intel help that person. Ms. Freeman reiterated that they had certified emergency responders who could be dispatched. Ms. Freeman explained that, under regular concerns, if Intel were to receive a phone call at 9 p.m. in the evening, she would get the report e-mailed to her as soon as it was completed, but she would wait until the next business day to respond.
- Ms. Freeman directed the group to the backside of the handout. She read through the list of environmental conditions to investigate immediately, included the following:
 - Abatement equipment operational status
 - Emergency generators kick in (for instance, sometimes there are site power bumps, and in these cases the emergency generators kick in)
 - Fire pump testing
 - Testing of the boiler diesel fuel delivery system
 - Internal reports of odors that were recorded on this day
 - Incidents involving the water/waste treatment systems
 - Incidents that would have impacted cooling tower emissions/odors
 - Incidents related to gases or chemicals
 - Activities on the Site Activities Matrix, facility maintenance or construction types of activities
 - Hot work permits on site as of date

- Wind directions and speed.
- John Bartlit asked to what extent employees were trained to report odors. Ms. Freeman responded that employees were very well trained to report overwhelming odors immediately, and this was part of Intel's safety culture. Ms. Freeman said that although it was not included in the handout, Intel runs drills regularly. Frank Gallegos said that Intel had 13 dedicated responders—meaning that was all they did—and another 100 who were certified to respond during shifts. Ms. Freeman went through a list of first responder certifications: hazardous steam control, compressed liquefied gas safety, spill response and clean up procedures, decontamination procedures, fire safety, respirator safety, evacuation training, advanced chemical safety, medical first responder, control of hazardous energies, hazwalker and confined space, which are FEMA certifications. Mr. Bartlit asked if first responders were the ones who entered hazmat competitions. Ms. Freeman said yes.
- Edward Pineda asked if the first responders were as superb outside fence as inside the fence. Carrie Freeman said that they were all EMT certified emergency responders. Mr. Pineda asked if they would be able to respond to ALL environmental risks, like liquid nitrogen tanks bursting and diesel tanks exploding, for example. Sarah Chavez asked Mr. Pineda to clarify if he were asking whether or not the first responders would respond to incidents outside the fence. Mr. Pineda clarified that he wanted to know if they were trained on anything that could happen in the plant, as well as outside the plant, and he was trying to get assurance for the community that they could respond to anything outside fence with equal efficiency and capability. Frank Gallegos said that local authorities, such as the fire department, were contacted at that point, and first responders would work with local authorities outside the fence. Intel had an emergency response protocol and they did drills and held tabletop meetings with local response organizations. Mr. Pineda asked at what point emergency responders started thinking about evacuation. In response, Ms. Freeman directed the group to the bottom of the handout, "NM Site ERT Priorities." "People" were first on the list, environment second, and property was third. Mr. Pineda suggested that to be better in tune with the community, Intel should have an evacuation plan for the community in the event of a massive cloud of toxic gas.
- Mr. Pineda said that evacuation could be looked at later this year as an agenda item. Mr. Bartlit said that this topic was covered several times before and if the group were to discuss it again information gathered from prior meetings could be distributed for the group's information. The point was to add to the discussion and not start at the beginning again.
- Lynne Kinis commented on the response process. She said she agreed with Mr. Pineda. Although Intel's in-house response was perfect, the handout didn't say how the community would be signaled in the event of a chemical cloud or leak. As for local authorities, she did not think Corrales had a hazmat team. Chief Tobin from Rio Rancho police had not been aware of the chemicals kept at Intel's plant. She did not think Intel had a viable procedure of notifying the community in the event of danger. Ms. Kinis said she did not trust that

Intel's first priority was the community's safety, even though she was registered with red alert. She suggested, in regards to the front side of the handout, that security people answering the phone have some kind of in-house training. They sounded annoyed when she phoned and pressed to have specific personnel return the call, and they did not know the names of Intel staff to communicate with.

- John Bartlit suggested Ms. Kinis conduct a test by calling security. Frank Gallegos agreed. Mr. Bartlit proposed redistributing Sandoval County's emergency information. Ms. Kinis said the county process wasn't good enough or fast enough. Mr. Bartlit asked if it was worth doing. Ms. Kinis said she had to pray that Intel cared enough about the community to contact an outside entity to notify the community and provide key information such as wind direction. Intel evacuated the plant in the past without letting any entity know. Carrie Freeman said that the last couple of times the plant was evacuated due to power outages and problems with PNM and not for environmental reasons. Because the lights were out, they had to evacuate for safety reasons. The backup generators started and critical systems were triggered. Mr. Pineda said that until the emergency generators started, production was in a precarious position. Ms. Freeman responded that in the 12 years that she had worked in manufacturing, all evacuations were because of power outages. Frank Gallegos said that he also only experienced evacuations due to power outages since working at Intel. Mr. Gallegos also updated the group on a meeting with Chief Tobin. Since his conversation with Ms. Kinis, Chief Tobin had visited Intel, met with the emergency teams, participated in a tabletop meeting and walked the site. Intel continued to dialog with him. Mr. Gallegos thanked Ms. Kinis for instigating the meeting and apologized for not inviting CEWG to the meeting with Chief Tobin. Ms. Kinis said she pushed for Chief Tobin to get involved because not knowing which chemicals were on site jeopardized the safety of his manpower. They needed to know so they did not walk blindly into a dangerous situation.
- Stephen Littlejohn said he heard two suggestions in the discussion. The first was to continue improving security training in two areas: how to speak to callers properly and politely—the public relations factor—and how to follow up in a timely manner according to policy. The second suggestion was to create a flow chart that clearly showed the procedure for alerting the proper authorities and the community in the event of a dangerous situation.
- John Bartlit made two suggestions. The first was to have Lynne Kinis conduct a test phone call to security and the second was to have a tabletop exercise with community emergency responders with CEWG present to observe. Mr. Littlejohn said he thought CEWG had been invited in the past. Mr. Bartlit and Sarah Chavez said that was only for a plant tour.

ACTION ITEM:

- Lynne Kinis would place a field test call to Intel security between now and the next meeting and report back on the results. Frank Gallegos did not want to be informed on when this call would take place and said that Ms. Kinis could create the scenario.

- Stephen Littlejohn said Ms. Freeman should report back to the CEWG if there are any changes to the Intel Odor Response Protocol for External Notifications based on the current discussion, so it could be listed in the annual report. He also restated the group's apparent interest in linking community notification into the chart. Mr. Littlejohn confirmed with Frank Gallegos that Intel's director of security would not know about Ms. Kinis's field test phone call. Mr. Gallegos said he would let him know afterwards. Ms. Kinis would take notes on the call and report back the results.

ATSDR REPORT

- Stephen Littlejohn oriented the group on the ATSDR report agenda item, saying that the discussion was structured in two parts. Part one was a general discussion based on the ideas from the previous meeting, and part two addressed specifically the five questions listed on page two of the agenda. Appendix A in the ATSDR report summarized the report and was included as a discussion aid. The comment period ends April 3, 2009.
- Edward Pineda commented that it took more than two years for the ATSDR report to be completed and released, and that it was written very carefully. The ATSDR explained their mission in the report and said they were not regulators and did not enforce permits. Mr. Pineda asked the group if they thought the report was a realistic scientific assessment or an avoidance technique, especially in reference to the ATSDR claim that the data was not suitable to infer health implications. He pointed out that the FTIR data was only over a 10-week period, and meteorological information was only for one year, 2003, and that was not enough. More recent and complete weather information was needed for the next time. He appreciated that the ATSDR report indicated limitations on health assessments due to the data's shortcomings, pointed out weaknesses in the data, and offered recommendations on ways to improve the data. He suggested using the ATSDR report as a resource for furthering CEWG's work, and felt the recommendations for improving data were especially useful. He suggested the ATSDR might be able to advise the group on data collection in the future.
- Mike Williams said he also was struck by their focusing on only 10 weeks of FTIR data. Sarah Chavez added that although ATSDR looked at both data sets, they chose to focus on Intel's data only. John Bartlit asked if they gave a reason for this choice. Edward Pineda said that the report emphasized that it was wrong to use two different standards of equipment, two different locations and two different research teams. To improve data collection there must be only one team of people and equipment, and they should be moved around to different locations.
- Mike Williams said that his primary concern with the report analysis was that it focused on one chunk of data and other important elements such as modeling and fine particles were not examined. There was a comment in the report about silica that he believed was incorrect. The comment said that crystalline silica was not formed until after a the

temperature reached of 800, degrees centigrade but his research indicated it was formed after 750 degrees centigrade, which was what Intel operated at. John Bartlit asked if these comments were in Mr. Williams' report. Mr. Williams said yes. Mr. Bartlit suggested sending Mr. Williams' comments to ATSDR, and there were various ways to do this by the April 3 deadline. Mr. Bartlit also said that Jeff Radford asked for a copy of Mike Williams' comments. Roberta King agreed to take these comments to Jeff Radford.

ACTION ITEM:

- Roberta King will take Mike Williams's ATSDR report comments to Jeff Radford.
- Mike Williams said the information collected in the report's tables raised many questions. For instance, with regards to hydrogen chloride in Table 2 on page 26, the mean of what was detected was 13.4, and the maximum at one hour was .63, almost 20 times lower. Mr. Williams interpreted these figures as meaning that the data captured only one three-minute spike, because the maximum one-hour should be much higher than the mean. Hydrogen fluoride offered another example, with the mean detects at 46 micrograms per cubic meter and the concern value at 16.7. The time frame was not indicated. In the screen modeling there were 46 parts per billion as opposed to 46 micrograms per cubic meter, with conversion to 41. In his opinion, these poor detection levels raised a flag for further investigation, perhaps on par with crystalline silica. John Bartlit said that Mr. Williams' comments underscored the need to investigate multiple chemicals, and the CEWG might want to think about shifting monitoring money to other chemicals. Stephen Littlejohn verified if Mr. Williams meant that potential issues embedded in the report's data warranted future investigation. Mr. Williams agreed and added that the nitric acid numbers also concerned him. The maximum measurement listed was 138, with a short-term acute value at 86. This case warranted further investigation.
- Frank Gallegos asked if Mr. Williams was going to send his comments to ATSDR as an individual or from the CEWG. John Bartlit said that would depend on whether or not CEWG agreed with Mr. Williams' comments. Otherwise, Mr. Williams would send it from the New Mexico Citizen's for Clean Air and Water. He suggested that because the information was so technical, the group might considering following the stack heights approach and gather together experts like Mike Williams and Ralph Williams for a useful discussion.
- Mike Williams said he wanted more time to examine the ATSDR report and complete his comments for discussion at CEWG's March meeting. Stephen Littlejohn proposed that Mike Williams complete the draft of his analysis for distribution to the group. It could appear on the agenda for the March meeting, and the group could decide whether or not they wanted to submit it to the ATSDR as CEWG's official comment. Mr. Littlejohn asked if there were any objections. Roberta King asked why Mr. Williams couldn't submit his comments on his own. She personally objected to the group controlling or restricting his

comments. If the group wanted to add to and revise his comments and submit it from the group that was different. Mr. Bartlit said Mr. Williams' comments were on behalf of New Mexico Clean Air and Water and they would be submitted regardless. Mr. Williams assured Ms. King that he would not be restricted by anyone and his comments would be submitted uncensored.

- Edward Pineda said that there was an opportunity for CEWG to demonstrate interest, concern and action by endorsing Mike Williams' comments. John Bartlit suggested contacting Mr. Williams with any comments before the March meeting so they could be incorporated before the meeting.
- Hugh Church said that he had a technical addition to paragraph 3 in Mike's draft. He read the paragraph and said that the CEWG had recommended a higher stack height that Intel chose to ignore, but that removing rain caps from boiler stacks enabled an effective added plume height caused by the removal of cap-suppressed buoyancy and momentum effects. The added plume height provides a significant reduction in ground level concentrations where people are.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if anyone in the group objected to Mike Williams circulating his comments to the group for discussion at the March meeting. There were no objections. He then ask if the group would like to form a small study group with Frank Gallegos, Mike Williams, Ralph Williams, and other appropriate people to compile CEWG's official comments and prepare for additional CEWG work relevant to the ATSDR report. John Bartlit asked if it could be a virtual group, since it might be easier to get Ralph Williams to read an e-mail than to attend a meeting. Edward Pineda agreed and suggested the group be the same as the stack height modeling task group that met in Corrales library. Anyone who wanted to participate could. Mr. Bartlit was concerned about man-hours. Mr. Pineda said that this task force would meet beyond the April 3 deadline to plan CEWG's activities. Mr. Littlejohn clarified that Mr. Pineda's suggestion did not refer to compiling CEWG's official comment to ATSDR but to preparing CEWG's future work and would occur after the next meeting. Carrie Freeman said the Intel personnel in the study group should be experts on the topic at hand, and these people might not be the same experts on the stack heights committee. Sarah Chavez said that Ralph Williams was a modeling expert and not a testing expert. The group agreed that the committee should consist of the appropriate experts.
- Roberta King asked for clarification on the Intel stack heights issue, in particular, the actual stack heights agreed to and implemented. Mike Williams said that stack heights went from 23 to 30 meters and that 23 meters was used for the stack height modeling. Sarah clarified that the Durr stacks were at various heights, but that the foundation for the Munter stacks was built for 30-meter stacks and that the Munter stacks are being built at 30 meters. The group suggested that in order to avoid confusion in the future, a follow up stack height summary should be compiled for reference. Sarah Chavez agreed to draft this summary.

ACTION ITEM:

- Sarah Chavez will draft a stack heights summary sheet listing the various units and their stack heights.

- Lynne Kinis commented that she was encouraged by the ATSDR report because the primary data came from Intel, and the report concluded that further investigation was warranted and emissions needed to be reduced even further. The ATSDR report substantiated the community's claims and raised the possibility that the statistics given to NMED and ATSDR were questionable. The report, she believed, pointed in the right direction.

- Sarah Chavez said that the ATSDR report did not look sufficiently at modeling data. Modeling and monitoring data must be integrated since both were needed to arrive at a more complete picture. One method could not be relied on solely over another. Mike Williams added that three things actually needed to be integrated: emissions, modeling and measurements. Carrie Freeman said that Intel was carrying out a technical review and might share some of the same concerns on how the data was used. Edward Pineda asked that CEWG receive a copy of Intel's comments. Frank Gallegos reminded the group that since it was a public response period, various groups and individuals would be sending comments. Stephen Littlejohn asked Intel personnel if they would commit to sending Intel's comments to the CEWG. Frank Gallegos said he would take the request back to Intel but he was not authorized to make that commitment. Mr. Pineda emphasized that CEWG members just wanted to be informed. Mr. Gallegos said public comments were public information by nature. Roberta King reminded the group that anyone in the community who was interested and concerned could comment as part of the public, and since it was public information it could be requested through the Freedom of Information Act.

- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group to look at the five questions listed on page two of the agenda and share any thoughts on these questions.

- John Bartlit said that he believed Mike Williams' comments, Appendix A, and his paper on synergism were ideas that were strongly related and should be considered as such. Mike Williams suggested that the ATSDR report might help the group acquire funding for future monitoring. Stephen Littlejohn agreed, adding that since the report supports further investigation it might be persuasive in getting funding. Mr. Bartlit said there is a group in Carolina affiliated with the EPA that might have money for these kinds of projects. Edward Pineda said that thorough planning and preparation would need to be done to acquire funding. He suggested learning the lingo of the new US administration and relating CEWG projects to their green programs in order to tap into new funding sources. He also wondered if funding for the Citizen Protocol might be obtained from this source.

- Roberta King said it seemed to her that the CEWG had a tendency to put current work on the back burner when something seemingly more urgent came up. She said that while all the issues were important, CEWG had been trying to act on silica and particulates but it kept getting delayed for other issues. Mike Williams said that having ATSDR discuss crystalline silica might make it easier for the CEWG to move forward in their work, and they might even get advice on how to structure their approach to crystalline silica. Mr. Littlejohn reminded the group that crystalline silica was still one of the high priority topics along with the Citizens Protocol and FTIR discussions. ATSDR was an item that had to be dealt with when it became available. He was pleased to hear the group relating the ATSDR report back to the high priority topics, and emphasized that the group should not drop high priority items.
- John Bartlit mentioned three items for future consideration. First, the ATSDR report meeting raised the issue of synergism. He distributed an article he had written previously on synergism, which Barbara Rockwell had said was very useful for educational purposes, and proposed it be placed on the CEWG Web site. Second, he suggested adding a link or reference on the Web site to the EPA and ATSDR information on synergism. Third, he said he was exploring how to get a link on the CEWG Web site to the presentation given by Dr. Lourdes Rosales-Guevara to UNM doctors, which then could be accessed by any doctor.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if anyone objected to settling Mr. Bartlit's three proposals by e-mail so it would not have to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting. Carrie Freeman asked if ATSDR was going to post Dr. Guervera's presentation on their Web site. Mr. Bartlit said he did not know but whatever link they could use would be helpful.
- Mike Williams reminded the group that he was still working on reading through the silica documents—hundreds of pages—and John Bartlit was reading through the shorter items.
- Edward Pineda asked for clarification on the reference on page 49 (electronic version) or 42 (hard copy) to Intel's partnership with NM. He asked what "NM" meant? Did it refer to the State or to NMED?

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

- Sarah Chavez reported on the EHS Activity Report. First quarter VOC testing for the four thermal oxidizers was due to take place 2/20 through 2/24. It would be the first time to test the new Munters units, which officially began operating in January. Intel met with the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority—the first of what will be regular quarterly meetings—and NMED conducted a site tour.
- Edward Pineda asked for notes on the Water Authority meeting or a verbal report on what transpired at the meeting. Sarah Chavez said the discussion typically revolved around record keeping requirements such as tracking, diagrams, and upcoming changes on waste

water systems. Mr. Pineda said he was interested in the ammonia wastewater treatment limits and monitoring and said that Ms. Chavez could let him know at the next meeting.

- Sarah Chavez continued with the EHS report. Site events included ongoing construction and a site power bump resulting in the diesel generators coming on. Reporting was normal regulatory reporting. One neighbor called three times regarding an abnormal smell while walking along the walking trail. Mr. Pineda said if he were to live close to Intel he'd be curious about sniffing epoxy, which is dangerous and being used on the roof during construction. He asked if any precautions were being taken to avoid affecting the neighbors. Frank Gallegos said he had checked the activities on the roof because he had noticed the smell. Any chemical brought on site has to be reviewed and hazards identified. Mr. Pineda said epoxy was more dangerous to the workers than the neighbors. Mr. Gallegos said that workers did not have respirators and the work plan did not call for respirators. Mr. Pineda said that epoxy was a fire hazard. Mr. Gallegos said it was a fire hazard until it dried. Epoxy had a honey-like texture and was used to patch the roof.
- Lynne Kinis asked Intel to verify if, for the past 3 months, they had any downtime on any Munters or Durr units. Sarah Chavez said there had been no downtimes.
- John Bartlit said that he had three corrections to the list of handouts on the meeting agenda: Add Mike Williams' ATSDR comments handout; add Mr. Bartlit's article on synergism; and delete "and response" from the "ATSDR letter to NMED." Littlejohn said these corrections would be reflected in the meeting summary. Mr. Pineda asked if there was going to be an NMED response and said he would like to see it.
- Mr. Pineda said he appreciated the handout "Environmental Regulatory Agencies." He clarified that CEWG was not only concerned with air but water, soil, and humans. It was good to see the other agencies that regulated Intel. Sarah Chavez said that the agencies listed were environmental regulators only; others such as OSHA were not included. Roberta King and Edward Pineda asked that Ms. Chavez reference a date on the handout. Ms. Chavez agreed. Mr. Littlejohn asked Mr. Pineda to send Ms. Chavez an e-mail asking for the specific information he wanted on the Bernalillo Water Authority. Mr. Pineda asked what sampling and monitoring limits for the ammonia waste stream were listed on the permit. Ms. Chavez said that water permits were different than air permits. For the water permit Intel had a single site outfall and all monitoring and compliance were at that outfall. For the ammonia treatment system, ammonia was not a regulated pollutant. The permit had limits for hydrogen fluoride, which was a part of the waste stream, so Intel would have to meet those limits, and the monitoring would not have to change because it was not a new pollutant. However, the ammonia amount would have to be negotiated because ammonia affects the treatment system's ability to operate. She reiterated that it was not a permit requirement but a negotiation to say how much the treatment plant could handle. Frank Gallegos said that Intel needed to operate within their permit levels.

- Roberta King asked where the Albuquerque Waste Water Treatment permit details could be accessed. Sarah Chavez said she was not sure if it was available online anywhere right now but she would work to make a copy available. It was currently being revised and renegotiated so it might be best to wait until the revised version was completed. Ms. King said she would like to see both the current and the revised versions, if possible. Ms. Chavez said that the permit was revised every five years.
- John Bartlit pointed out the dates on the Environmental Regulatory Agency handout, and said that these dates outlined the history of the environmental movement.
- Roberta King asked to be given a report on the quarterly meetings with the Albuquerque Water Authority. Sarah Chavez responded that she wasn't sure there was a document but she would inquire about it. Ms. King pressed that these meetings should be documented and available. Frank Gallegos said they were standard operating procedure meetings the Water Authority had with all its customers to review waste streams or issues that might have come up. Ms. King asked whom the Water Authority was responsible to. Sarah Chavez said the Environmental Protection Agency.

Action Item:

- Sarah Chavez will find out how and where to access Water Authority quarterly meeting documents.
- Ms. King asked for more information on the NMED site tour and asked that more information be included in the EHS Activity report, such as who attended and what they did. Mr. Pineda asked that CEWG be informed on when the next site tour takes place so they could attend also. Carrie Freeman said there was a possibility one might be coming up in the near future. Jeff Radford asked for a general site tour sometime in the next few months, and it could be discussed at the next meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING

March 18, 2009, 5 P.M. at the Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.