

MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: March 18, 2009
Time: 5:00-7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Senior Center

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

Andrew Moen, Intel

Public

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

Jay Stimmel, Interested citizen
Pat Clauser, Corrales resident

Facilitator

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

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary February 18, 2009
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- This month's newspaper ad
- Mike Williams' Draft Comments to ATSDR
- Fred Marsh's comments to ATSDR

AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements
- ATSDR Report
- Planning Unfunded Meetings
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_3-18-09 v. 3.doc
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
Prepared for: CEWG
Date prepared or presented: April 6, 2009

Approved: 4/15/09

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

John Bartlit opened the meeting by stating the CEWG mission, which was to work towards environmental improvements and improved communication. This meeting was the first held at the Corrales Senior Center. Participants introduced themselves. The agenda was approved as written. The Meeting Summary was approved as written except for changing the date from February 19 to February 18.

Announcements

Stephen Littlejohn said he supplied cookies for this evening's meeting and asked if anyone were interested in volunteering to bring cookies for the April meeting. John Bartlit volunteered.

ACTION ITEMS:

- John Bartlit will supply cookies for the April meeting and is open to suggestions on what kind to bring.

Public Comments

- Roberta King commended Sarah Chavez for listing at the bottom of a document its exact file name because it allowed for easy document access and retrieval. She was referring to the technical permit revision documents, which Ms. Chavez had e-mailed earlier in the day. These documents were the 2009 emission factor updates on the boilers, which were submitted to NMED on February 12 and March 13, 2009. Ms. Chavez confirmed that she sent the e-mail to the larger distribution list. Ms. Chavez also confirmed that the Sematech Guidelines document was not updated but was always sent with permit revision updates.

Complaint Response Process

- Lynne Kinis reported on the complaint-process field test, in which she called Intel with a "real" complaint about a burning rubber smell leaving an acid taste in the mouth. At the first number she called, she was asked her name and problem and was then transferred to the "command center." The command center asked her the same questions: name and problem. Ms. Kinis told the command center that she wanted a report on the odor, but she did not ask for someone to come to the odor site. Frank Gallegos later phoned her regarding the complaint. Ms. Kinis said she did not understand the necessity of calling the first phone number and asked why she could not call the "command center" directly. In the event of a "real" emergency, calling the first number wasted time, especially when the same information was collected during both calls. Ms. Kinis suggested calling the "command center" first. She also said that being told someone was walking the fence line and having the response team give a "weather report" did little to satisfy a complaint. Air modeling showed the plume traveled downward, so it was important for someone to "automatically" come down to the area of the complaint, especially in Zone 1. To have

someone say that they did not smell anything at the fence line was irritating and frustrating and did not really address the complaint. Carrie Freeman said that Intel could not change the phone number because it was the standard number for security, but they may be able to change the process so the caller would not have to repeat their information.

- Lynne Kinis said she specifically reported a “burning rubber” smell, yet on the EHS report it was listed as a “burning” smell. She emphasized the importance of security communicating the “exact” complaint and description of the smell.
- Edward Pineda asked if people in the security chain and command center had overlapping instructions, be it a terrorist call or prank, because it seemed like they had stock answers listed on cards read to people phoning in complaints. He hoped that security could be more human and believable in their responses. Carrie Freeman responded that security was trained to go through an intensive checklist, and it took about an hour and a half for people to investigate the perimeter. Sometimes they found odors, and sometimes those odors were not associated with the complaint.
- John Bartlit asked Carrie Freeman if it were possible for CEWG to review the security checklist and make suggestions. Ms. Freeman said that was part of what she did during the February CEWG meeting; she did not go over the list sequentially, but she did report 8 or 9 things on the list. She said she was open to going over it chronologically and in more detail.
- Edward Pineda reminded the group that the ATSDR recommended improving the complaint-response process.
- Lynne Kinis asked Carrie Freeman if Intel would send Frank Gallegos or Ms. Freeman to investigate an odor if the person making the complaint requested someone to visit the odor site. Ms. Freeman answered yes and said the response would be immediate, which was the purpose of 24/7 security. The problem with calling someone’s personal phone number was that the message might get stuck in voice mail. Ms. Kinis asked again if she had requested someone to come to her home that night, would someone have come. Ms. Freeman said that was the purpose of the test. If security called her with the complaint, she would have come to Ms. Kinis’s home. Ms. Kinis said she did not request someone to visit because it was late.
- John Bartlit suggested that wind direction be included on the checklist for site visits outside of the Intel perimeter. Edward Pineda added that since the wind changed so quickly, the checklist should include a time. Carrie Freeman said wind direction was noted in 5-minute increments. Hugh Church noted that location was connected to wind, so location should be noted as well.

- Lynne Kinis said she would follow up the first test call with another test call, as Frank Gallegos asked her to. Stephen Littlejohn asked to be informed about the follow up for a future agenda item.
- Roberta King asked if the caller could request to be connected directly to the command center without having to give any information. Carrie Freeman responded that she did not know, but she suspected security at the first number needed to listen to the complaint to decide whether or not to send the call to the command center. She said she might phone herself to see what would happen.
- Roberta King said that she spoke with Susan Weiss, who said the smells this week on the walking path “were just awful.” Ms. Weiss told her that she called in with complaints several times and noted exactly where she was on the path, which way the wind was blowing and how it changed. Ms. King asked where Intel got the wind report. Carrie Freeman said that they got the wind report from two different places: the tower on the south side and from the person walking the fence line, which was more subjective. Ms. King said that the way the wind blew on the path might be different, and it was important to be aware of that.

ATSDR REPORT

- Stephen Littlejohn introduced the topic by asking the group if they wanted to produce and submit comments on the ATSDR report, and if so, how they would choose to do so. One option was for CEWG to adopt Mike Williams’ comments as the CEWG comments, and there were other options as well. The group also needed to discuss next steps on moving forward with CEWG’s creating an ATSDR study group.
- Edward Pineda said that Mike Williams was the expert on modeling and emissions and recommended that after reviewing and discussing his comments CEWG should adopt them to send to ATSDR. CEWG’s adoption would add value to the comments, since CEWG members represented various stakeholders and the public. He also suggested naming the CEWG members and listing the experts who had the ability to thoroughly evaluate and validate the comments.
- John Bartlit said that the group needed to decide on the comments first. He also said that the comments could list both CEWG and New Mexico Citizens for Clean Air and Water. Edward Pineda said that the comments were important because the group was beginning a new chapter of trying to resolve problems and future chapters included testing and collecting significant data.

- Mr. Bartlit said that CEWG member descriptions were listed on the Web site, so comments could be sent referencing the Web site for more information, and Lynne Kinis and Roberta King's names could be added, if they so choose.
- Roberta King said she thought the group was "making too big a deal" over responding to the ATSDR report. ATSDR wanted comments from multiple sources—the public and anyone else involved with the situation. She proposed the group decide what to say, authorize Mike Williams to write it, list the members that approved of what was written, and then submit the comments.
- Sarah Chavez said she agreed with Ms. King and was concerned that Mike Williams' comments as adopted by CEWG might contradict or disagree with Intel's technical comments. Since two Intel staff members were also CEWG members, she was concerned with how it might appear if Intel submitted comments that differed or contradicted CEWG's comments.
- Roberta King said that her biggest complaint about CEWG was that they felt everything had to be acceptable to both Intel and the group. She did not see why the "community environmental working group" needed to depend on Intel's approval. If Intel employees felt they had to be loyal to Intel, then they did not have to sign the comments or they could insert a disclaimer. Ms. King also asked if Intel employees were CEWG members or simply liaisons. Mr. Bartlit confirmed that two Intel employees were CEWG members.
- Edward Pineda said he was not recommending that CEWG "unanimously" agree with Mike Williams' comments. He suggested the group agree through consensus, which he described as follows: all objections were considered, discussed and noted until the group agreed to end discussion.
- Stephen Littlejohn further explained the meaning of consensus, which occurred when everyone agreed not to block the decision. Consensus did NOT mean that everyone was in agreement with all aspects of the decision, rather, the group judged it was the best they could do at that point in time given what they knew. The way to handle a situation where people did not agree but also did not want to stand in the way of moving forward was to have them "stand outside consensus." Those individuals could say they did not want their names included in the consensus, which would be recorded in the Meeting Summary.
- John Bartlit added that differences among the group would be recorded in the Meeting Summary, which was available to ATSDR and which they read. The differences did not need to be recorded with the comments. He encouraged the group not to spend time on speculating what might or might not happen with Intel's comments, since Intel did have

time to review and remark on Mike Williams' draft. If Intel "felt that something was wildly bizarre we'd have heard about by now." Sarah Chavez essentially agreed with Mr. Bartlit but felt there were things that might be said differently. Mr. Bartlit responded that saying something differently was not necessarily an inconsistency and "not a showstopper." Ms. Chavez agreed that it was "not a showstopper" but was compelled to state the point anyway because it was important to note since they may have to come back later and revoke consensus. Mr. Bartlit said that he was willing to state in CEWG's comments that Intel would send their own comments.

- Mike Williams said it sounded like the issue was time difference. Until Intel completed their analysis, it was hard for Intel CEWG members to agree with his comments when they did not know Intel's comments. He suggested adding a disclaimer stating that the comments were acceptable but more information needed to be developed. Mr. Bartlit said they could include a time line with the comments and highlight the date.
- Lynne Kinis reminded the group that they had to decide now since the deadline for submitting comments was April 3. She suggested that the CEWG review Mike Williams' comments and if the Intel members did not agree they could abstain and submit their own comments. John Bartlit reiterated that it was important to emphasize the timing/history and state the date that Mr. Williams' comments were available for review. Sarah Chavez said she was involved in forming Intel's comments, too.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group to consider the pros and cons of CEWG's not submitting comments. Edward Pineda said that not submitting comments would make CEWG look like they did not care enough or know enough to form an opinion. CEWG risked the potential perception that the group was not dealing with substantial issues. Mr. Pineda added the danger of leaving an impression that CEWG was not independent from Intel, and Intel had the power to tell them what to do or say. John Bartlit agreed with Mr. Pineda. Mike Williams said he was trying to solicit guidance from ATSDR on future action, and his comments would hold more weight if they came from the group rather than an individual.
 - Hugh Church said he was in favor of and willing to sign the comments. He pointed out that Mr. Williams had dedicated a lot of time and effort to studying the issues and writing the comments. He said the comments made sense to him. Mr. Church said the only other option was for each individual to write and send their comments separately, and that really wasn't an option.
- Carrie Freeman agreed with Mr. Pineda. Intel was not finished with their analysis and wouldn't finish until the last minute. She said she wasn't sure how Intel CEWG members should handle this, whether they should abstain or post a disclaimer. Edward Pineda suggested the Intel CEWG members state they would give priority to Intel's comments, which would be made known by April 2. Hugh Church said listing Intel's

name with CEWG might give people the impression that they were the same organization. John Bartlit pointed out an interesting dynamic. Mr. Williams wrote his comments well before Intel wrote their comments, so if CEWG adopted Mr. Williams' comments they could not be accused of following Intel. In fact, CEWG would be demonstrating independence from Intel.

- Stephen Littlejohn summarized the discussion. He heard strong support for CEWG's sending comments to ATSDR. He tested consensus on the following questions: 1. Should CEWG submit comments to ATSDR? 2. Should CEWG adopt Mike Williams' comments? He asked the group for feedback.
 - Edward Pineda said CEWG's not sending the comments as a group would be like admitting they were unable and unwilling to take responsibility and were dependent on Intel. He said the group would be downgrading itself. Mr. Bartlit agreed and stated he was proud that CEWG was ahead of Intel on submitting the comments.
 - Stephen Littlejohn said he did not hear any objections and asked the Intel CEWG members if they would like to submit a caveat to the consensus related to the fact that Intel will be submitting its own set of comments. John Bartlit reminded the group that the date itself was a caveat. Sarah Chavez said that she wanted a caveat to state that Intel CEWG members reserved the right to decide to abstain from the comments because Intel was submitting their own technical comments.
 - Stephen Littlejohn next asked the group if anyone objected to question 2: Should the group adopt Mike Williams' comments? Edward Pineda said absolutely. He also proposed sending a letter from the acting chair with a list of the people participating in the meeting. Mr. Littlejohn said that this second point addressed question 3, which was how the group should actually submit the comments. Mr. Littlejohn said that it appeared the group had consensus on question 2, adopting Mr. Williams' comments.
 - Roberta King said that she did not know what the changes were on Mr. Williams' comments and asked the group how they could vote if they were unfamiliar with the changes. Carrie Freeman asked if anyone had given Mike Williams feedback on his comments. Mike Williams said both Hugh Church and John Bartlit provided him with feedback. Ms. Freeman said she thought it was important to have some kind of collective feedback even though Mr. Williams did most of the writing.
- Mike Williams walked the group through changes made to his draft, and the group suggested a variety of technical refinements. Stephen Littlejohn asked Mr. Williams to e-

mail him the updated draft so he could send it out to the group. He also asked that any technical suggestions be sent directly to Mr. Williams.

ACTION ITEM:

- Mike Williams will e-mail Stephen Littlejohn the updated draft.
- Stephen Littlejohn will send the updated draft vial e-mail to the group.
- Technical suggestion on the draft should be sent directly to Mr. Williams.
- John Bartlit asked the group if they approved of Intel's discussing Mr. Williams comments with him on the condition he did not change anything. The group approved.
- Edward Pineda and Roberta King suggested Mr. Williams add a revision date to the revised document.
- Sarah Chavez said she was not clear on what "modeling" Mr. Williams was referring to on the first page, second paragraph. She asked that he specify the modeling with a footnote. Mr. Williams agreed.
- Hugh Church asked if people would know what "PGMEA" stood for and asked for a footnote to clarify this term.
- Roberta King asked that the word "draft" be removed from the document.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group question 3: How do we send the comments? Did they want to include a cover letter, acknowledge authorship, or attach bios of the group? Edward Pineda suggested acknowledging authorship, indicating adoption by consensus, adding a caveat for Intel representatives, and including a cover letter with the signature of the acting chair rather than having everyone sign the document. Stephen Littlejohn summarized the suggestions as follows: List the author, indicate the comments were adopted by consensus at the meeting, include the signature of the acting chair, and add a caveat as follows: Intel representatives wish to acknowledge that Intel will submit their own comments, which may or may not be consistent with CEWG comments. Both Ms. Freeman and Ms. Chavez agreed with the wording of the caveat. Mr. Littlejohn said that the caveat addressed Ms. Chavez's concern about dual membership and the two organizations would produce separate documents that may or may not be consistent.
- Roberta King asked who would sign the document. John Bartlit said he would sign as the acting chair. Ms. King said that she did not think it appropriate for Mr. Bartlit to include the NM Clean Water and Air credential because it had nothing to do with his role at the CEWG. Mr. Bartlit said he had no intention of including it. Ms. King also suggested deleting Mike Williams' address. Mr. Williams agreed.

- Stephen Littlejohn reminded the group about including Mike Williams’ credentials. Roberta King asked Mr. Williams about his credentials. Mr. Williams said he was a PhD in engineering. She next asked Mr. Bartlit his credentials. Mr. Bartlit said he was a PhD in chemical engineering. She suggested he include his credentials with his signature. He responded that he would only list “acting chair”. Ms. King said credentials were important to note because they showed expertise. Hugh Church said the Web site could be referred to for more details. Mr. Pineda asked for Mr. Littlejohn’s advice. Mr. Littlejohn said that he was a facilitator and not a group member, and the facilitator should not be making those decisions.
- Stephen Littlejohn summarized the discussion as follows. Mike Williams’ name and credential—PhD in Engineering—would be included on the comments. John Bartlit would sign a cover letter as acting chair and would not list his other credentials. Mr. Littlejohn asked the group if they agreed so far. No one disagreed. He then asked the group if they wanted to list the names of the people present at the meeting. Lynne Kinis said she did not want her name included on the list since she could respond with her own comments. Sarah Chavez said ATSDR knew who they were and what they did; she did not see the value of listing individual names. She proposed using “CEWG” and referencing the Web site for more information. Roberta King said the CEWG Web site included documents that individuals rather than the CEWG wrote previously, and that CEWG membership changed so often it was important to list the names. She was not aware of group members names being clearly listed anywhere on the Web site. She believed it was important to list individual names.
- Edward Pineda suggested listing the names in attendance. Mr. Pineda said he was sorry members of the public did not want to list their names and reminded the group that the decision to submit Mike Williams’ comments was achieved with the participation of regular attendees, including members of the public, and not just a “handful of people in a dark corner somewhere.” John Bartlit proposed listing the six CEWG members present at the meeting: John Bartlit, Mike Williams, Edward Pineda, Hugh Church, Sarah Chavez and Carrie Freeman. He also reminded the group that the discussion record was available on the Web site.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group if they would agree to his working together with John Bartlit to draft a letter. The group agreed. He asked the group if they would like to see a draft of the letter. Everyone said “no.” Mr. Littlejohn clarified that his role would be editorial and suggestive and the letter would include Mr. Bartlit’s signature and list the members in attendance.

ACTION ITEM:

- John Bartlit and Stephen Littlejohn will work together to draft a cover letter to ATSDR along with Mike Williams’ comments

- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group how they would like next steps to proceed in regard to the ATSDR report. Did they want to form a committee to look at how to follow up on the ATSDR report? Edward Pineda said yes. Everyone seemed to agree. John Bartlit reminded the group to remain aware of the CEWG priority list of topics and not to get sidetracked with the ATSDR committee. There was overlap between CEWG priorities and the ATSDR report, and perhaps it was important to identify that overlap to keep the focus. Sarah Chavez commented that the ATSDR was currently in draft form and asked if it was valuable to work on it now since it will most likely be changed after comments were received. Mike Williams said he would not want to work on anything until the report was finalized. Ms. Chavez pointed out that might take six or nine months. Edward Pineda agreed with Mr. Williams. He said it might take six months to plan testing and was worried that if they waited too long they would not be able to raise the money.
- Judy Hemphill asked if the ATSDR report recommended testing agencies do the testing. John Bartlit said ATSDR recommended testing but they did not say by whom. Ms. Hemphill asked if testing was the responsibility of regulatory agencies, such as NMED. Mr. Bartlit said that the report did not mandate who should do the testing, and CEWG had no control over NMED. Carrie Freeman said that ATSDR was not an enforcing or regulatory agency and could not force NMED to take action. Ms. Hemphill asked if the function of CEWG was to push for action to implement the recommendations. She said as a citizen she was not prepared to wait a year for the next step to occur. Mr. Littlejohn acknowledged that this was the question on the table at the moment, and the tension point was between wasting time and delay. Sarah Chavez said that the ATSDR report did not specify what kind of testing, and Mike Williams' recommended ATSDR suggest more specific testing.
- Mike Williams read from the section on page 42 of the ATSDR report. The section stated ATSDR recommended that public health and environmental agencies explore the possibility of additional testing, sampling and monitoring. In addition, it recommended that Intel NM consider conducting additional analysis of thermal oxidizers for buildup of crystalline silica.
- John Bartlit said that testing for crystalline silica was also a CEWG goal. Mr. Bartlit suggested making a chart of CEWG priorities before the ATSDR report was released and compare it to ATSDR report recommendations to find consistencies, differences and overlap. He suggested aligning priorities that were important to both.
- Edward Pineda recalled the CEWG priority list of topics in circulation several meetings ago. He reminded the group that ATSDR was low on the list because no one knew when the report would be released. However, ATSDR was originally a high priority topic, he said, because it related to the community's health, and CEWG's work could really make a difference in this area. He recommended that ATSDR move up again on the list of

priorities. Stephen Littlejohn added that there were three priority groupings, first, second, and 'other items'. ATSDR was on the 'other item' list until the report became available. Once it became available, it moved up in priority and on to the agenda. He suggested reviewing the priority lists at a future meeting.

- John Bartlit said that the group was facing a constant dilemma. Priorities could be revised, but the group would be diverted from previous priorities. Either way there was a legitimate complaint and loss. Mr. Bartlit suggested finding issues that were on both the CEWG priority list and on ATSDR's recommendations.
- Stephen Littlejohn said the group was confronting a timing issue. He said that he heard general agreement among the group to follow up on the ATSDR report. On one side there was concern that putting energy into the report now, before it was finalized, might be a waste of time because the report could change based on public comments. The final report might be different. On the other side there was concern that the urgency was great enough to warrant working on it now, and that waiting would delay progress. Mr. Littlejohn asked if anyone in the group had any insight to help settle the issue.
 - Roberta King said that the group should look at recommendations on the report pertinent to the group's priorities.
 - Sarah Chavez said she liked Mr. Bartlit's suggestion of examining specific ATSDR recommendations to see where they correlated and fit with CEWG priorities. She also said that focusing on the whole report might be too time consuming, but some of the ATSDR recommendations were fairly easy to implement and would not take a lot of time.
 - Stephen Littlejohn reiterated the suggestions as follows: look at the ATSDR report recommendations, themes, and issues, but do not get absorbed in the details.
 - Edward Pineda said that in the meantime the group could look for financing to support testing. He suggested contacting the EPA to explore possibilities.
 - Judy Hemphill said she agreed with Mr. Pineda. Instead of waiting, she wanted to know if crystalline silica was an issue. The community would feel more comfortable knowing the testing results.
- Mr. Bartlit reminded the group that a possibility for funding was to shift some of Intel's money away from monitoring things not so important to the community and apply it to crystalline silica testing. The money could go through the Citizen Protocol. Receiving a large grant from the EPA would be difficult.

- Judy Hemphill said she wouldn't mind Intel's paying for the testing as long as CEWG chose the organization to conduct the testing.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked about forming a study group to read through the ATSDR report and make suggestions on CEWG next steps. In previous meetings, the group discussed forming a committee with stack height committee members plus one representative from Intel and anyone else who wanted to join. Mr. Littlejohn reiterated that the group agreed to look at the ATSDR report recommendations, themes, and issues, but not get absorbed in the details, since these might change in the final report. Crystalline silica and monitoring was an issue, and there were simple and clear recommendations. So the group could look at these things immediately and not have to wait until the final report was released, and move forward with developing CEWG action steps. Mr. Littlejohn suggested addressing the 'when and how to tackle these issues' through e-mail.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

- Lynne Kinis said that the EHS report MUST include the number of pounds during downtime. Sarah Chavez apologized for the oversight and walked the group through the EHS report. There were few site activities, and because it was spring they had weed control. Both quarterly and annual permit requirements were fulfilled.
- Carrie Freeman said that Intel received four calls from neighbors that were NOT captured in the EHS report because the calls occurred only last week. Except for the Munters unit downtime, all the other equipment as up and running during the period. Sarah Chavez said that wind should be noted along with the location of where the wind was noted (at Intel, for example).
- Edward Pineda asked about the Munters downtime. Sarah Chavez said the two Munters units began operation in January. When one unit failed, the other unit was supposed to turn on. This downtime happened when the technicians were switching from one mode to another. A bypass damper did not operate correctly, which might have caused solvent emissions to exit the system unabated. Technicians were not certain, but it was possible that airflow escaped untreated for approximately 90 minutes, although both units were in operation. Mr. Pineda asked what controlled the operation of the damper, computer, manual, electrical. Ms. Chavez responded that it was a combination. Mr. Pineda asked if Intel believed it might happen again. Ms. Chavez responded no.
- Lynne Kinis asked in that kind of situation could the switch be made manually to redundant RTO. Sarah Chavez said she would have to ask. Ms. Kinis said that Intel always responded that everything was working fine when reports of different odors were sent in, but the odors were still there. The way she heard this report was similar. The odors were still present with everything in working order. She felt Intel was dismissive of the problem.

- Judy Hemphill expressed great frustration and anger with the report. She said she stopped reporting odors because the way the reports were written: “The machines are functioning, the wind is coming from a certain direction, and no odors were smelled.” The reports did little to satisfy her concerns. She smelled an odor; it felt acidic on her face. She did not want someone at Intel walking the perimeter when the air came out of stack and blew downhill away from the perimeter. She said someone should come to her house and smell it.
- Carrie Freeman said that the odor protocol was recently revised, and Intel was open to discussing new ways to doing things. She said that even though this issue was discussed at length at the last meeting, perhaps it should be on the agenda for the next meeting. Edward Pineda also suggested putting the issue on the agenda for the next meeting because it needed to be taken seriously. Ms. Freeman said Intel did take it seriously and asked to work together to develop good suggestions.
- Stephen Littlejohn proposed calling the agenda item “Suggestions for Change.” The group had heard the problems, the complaints, and now they could specifically discuss making improvements.
- Sarah Chavez confirmed again that she would add the amount of pollutants to the EHS activity report, update the current version, and e-mail it to everyone. Ms. Chavez also confirmed that currently 2 Munters and 2 Durrs units were in operation.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING

April 15, 2009, 5 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.