# MEETING SUMMARY
**Community Environmental Working Group**

***"Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel"***

**Date:** May 20, 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
Frank Gallegos, Intel

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

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

**HANDOUTS**
- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary April 15, 2009
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- May newspaper ad
- Review of EPA an NIOSH Crystalline Silica Papers (Williams and Bartlit)
- 2008 Corporate Social Responsibility Report Summary

**AGENDA**
- Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements
- Crystalline Silica Discussion
- Planning the June Meeting
- Complaint-Response Process: Next Steps
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

**WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

John Bartlit opened the meeting by stating the CEWG mission, which was to work towards, reducing chemical emissions, making environmental improvements and improving community dialogue. Participants introduced themselves. The meeting agenda was approved as written.

Meeting Summary—Revisions and Approval

- John Bartlit called for comments on the Meeting Summary. Edward Pineda asked that government officials, in this case the mayor of Corrales, be named explicitly in the Meeting Summary. John Bartlit asked that the Meeting Summary list the name of the mayor and town when he or she is first mentioned, and then list once more as the dialog continued.

- Hugh Church pointed out, in response to Roberta King's comment in the April 15th Meeting Summary that meeting summaries were not posted on the CEWG Web Site, that the Web site actually did have an up-to-date posting of meeting summaries. Ms. King responded that they were not there when she made the comment, but now they were. Mr. Church continued that members were not listed and asked if Teresa Fleming was still the contact, because she was listed as a contact on the Web site. Sarah Chavez said that Ms. Fleming was no longer the contact and she would update the contact name.

- Sarah Chavez said she had a comment concerning a particular section and would e-mail it to Stephen Littlejohn to make the adjustments.

- Hugh Church asked if the group was going to discuss the monitoring station. Mike Williams said that the intention was to introduce the topic but not discuss it in depth. Roberta King reminded the group that they had to wait to discuss the topic until the Village of Corrales made some decisions about location. Edward Pineda asked for clarification on what kind of station it was, a monitoring station or weather station. Sarah Chavez said that it was a weather station that monitored some pollutants. Hugh Church said it was an NMED monitoring station, and NMED was responsible for the station. The group agreed to call it an Air Quality Monitoring Station with Atmospheric/Weather capabilities. Mr. Church said that the NMED Web site could be checked for accuracy.

Announcements

- Edward Pineda said that the White House had an Office of Public Engagement, which was tasked to encourage the public to provide solutions to problems and note the suggestions. He suggested the CEWG let the Office of Public Engagement know of their activities, since they may be able to provide assistance with their work in the future.

- Carrie Freeman announced that Intel published their 2008 Corporate Social Responsibility Report, which included their external environmental reporting. The report was 108 pages and was posted online. The report was not specific to New Mexico, although Ms. Freeman said that information about New Mexico would be added at a later date. Frank Gallegos said he would update the New Mexico portion. Ms. Freeman passed around summaries of the report to the group.

- Carrie Freeman also announced she accepted a new job at Intel as the corporate sustainability manager and would no longer be supporting the CEWG and the New Mexico site. She would be working on Intel's corporate sustainability efforts. Frank Gallegos would replace Ms. Freeman on the CEWG beginning with the June meeting, and Loretta Liello would replace her in the neighbor perspective.

- John Bartlit expressed his thanks to Ms. Freeman for her work on behalf of the CEWG and welcomed her to any CEWG meetings in the future.

Public Comment

Edward Pineda said he was concerned that the budget reduction was affecting CEWG's productivity. He believed that while the measure perhaps was necessary from a fiscal point of view, it was counterproductive in the overall relationship between Intel and the community. For instance, with the non-facilitated meetings, group members may subconsciously skip meetings because they did not think the meetings worthy of attending. He also pointed out that Intel said that the environment and the community was one of their top priorities so he did not understand why the CEWG budget was reduced. John Bartlit said his bottom line was whether or not the group reduced emissions and the progress made over time. Meetings could be reduced as long as the group continued to reduce emissions. Frank Gallegos said Mr. Pineda's point was well taken and he would inform Intel management about Mr. Pineda and Mr. Bartlit's comments and ask them to revisit the issue again.

**CRYSTALLINE SILICA DISCUSSION**

Stephen Littlejohn explained that the crystalline silica discussion would follow a new process. Mike Williams and John Bartlit, who agreed to analyze the crystalline silica documents, would have a conversation about their findings. Mr. Williams would give a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Bartlit would add to the presentation, and the group would act as listeners. Mr. Williams' presentation was called, "Review of EPA and NIOSH Crystalline Silica Papers" (a copy of the PowerPoint is attached). The group would join in the conversation when the presentation finished. Group members received a copy of the PowerPoint presentation as a handout.

The conversation below is organized to correspond with the presented slides.

*Slide 2:*

Mike Williams introduced his objectives, which were to analyze information contained in the EPA and NIOSH crystalline silica reports, evaluate the risk associated with crystalline silica exposure in ambient air, and describe the health effects of silica exposure. John Bartlit commented that crystalline silica information from all sources was important to consider—the story was the sum of all the points. He asked Mr. Williams to clarify the terms "risk" and "health effects." Mr. Williams responded that the goal was to get an idea of crystalline silica exposure on health effects, and risk was the probability of health effects.

*Slide 3:*
Mike Williams said that the EPA documents examined the difference between crystalline silica and amorphous silica on health effects. Crystalline silica was considered a human carcinogen, while amorphous silica was not, according to the collected data. John Bartlit asked if there was a difference between crystalline silica formed by fracturing—beating, grinding, drilling, pounding—and crystalline silica formed by a chemical reaction, such as the kind that occurred at Intel. Mr. Williams responded that the studies of mines indicated there was a difference. Freshly fractured crystalline silica had more health consequences than older crystalline silica. Mr. Williams said that the data were almost all related to crystalline silica formed by fracturing or from mining activities, and he was not aware of any data that referred to crystalline silica formed by a gaseous precursor, such as at Intel.

*Slide 4:*
Mike Williams said that the most obvious effect of crystalline silica exposure was silicosis, and data showed the longer it was breathed the more damaging it was to the health. To set an acceptable level for an annual average, length of time had to be considered. The longer crystalline silica was inhaled, the higher the probability lungs would be damaged by silicosis. Silicosis was only one of the health effects that could occur from inhaling crystalline silica over time. Based on studies of miners, NIOSH—National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health—estimated that 1 microgram per cubic meter ($ug/m^3$) over a miner's working lifetime was the level at which damage or silicosis might occur, depending on a person's sensitivity. Mr. Williams converted this amount to apply to the general population. The first conversion was to change the 5-day per week (workplace) to 7 days a week (community). The second conversion concerned workers who only worked part of the day, but because they inhaled more air due to workplace exertion, the factor used was 10\20. In other words, an average person in a 24-hour day would breathe twice as much as the miner during an 8-hour workday. The factor was one half.

John Bartlit asked if these were the same methods of calculations that EPA and NIOSH used. Mike Williams said that NIOSH mostly focused on workers, so they wouldn't make this type of calculation. He got this information from an EPA document, because the EPA was worried about meeting the ambient standard for crystalline silica. The 1 $ug/m^3$ corresponded to how much crystalline silica was breathed in a lifetime or 70 years. So based on data obtained from mining studies, 5 $ug/m^3$ was the estimated risk level. Mr. Williams said it was important to

remember that miners were not the general population. The occupational standard for fine particles was 15 ug/$m^3$, while 1 ug/$m^3$ was usually used for ambient standards.

John Bartlit asked if there was an ambient air quality standard for crystalline silica. Mike Williams answered no, although there were occupational health standards. The reasons were partially because these data had to be worked through over time and the EPA hadn't done that yet, and partially because the EPA decided that, from the current data, they didn't need to regulate crystalline silica because other standards were more important.

*Slide 5:*
Mike Williams explained that ambient exposure referred to general population exposure. In the case of the gold mining study in South Africa, the subjects were healthy white males—apartheid standards. Mining also tended to have larger particles with freshly broken surfaces, which did not necessarily apply to Intel. However, in average cities, Mr. Williams said it was fairly common to find silica as 10% of the total particulate. Miners had to break through quartz to get to the gold, and quartz was the most common form of crystalline silica. Gold was often embedded in the quartz. John Bartlit explained that all mining broke up rocks. Hugh Church added that quartz was the most abundant mineral in the crust of the earth. Mr. Williams said coal mining was different because it was more related to sedimentary rock. Other dust levels were also high in the mines. The study sample included 2,235 miners who were tracked while they worked and after quitting working. If they developed silicosis they were compensated. Autopsies were performed on the sample after death. Mr. Williams commented that the sample was good but small in terms of an epidemiological study, which usually had hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of people in the sample. Sample quantity was important because for some toxic materials, a tenth of a percent of the sample may be really sensitive to the material, more so than the general population. A tenth of a percent of this sample was only 2 people, which was not statistically significant. The other point Mr. Williams made was that that sensitive miners would have quit and not worked their whole life in the mines; the community didn't have the choice of quitting.

*Slide 6:*
Mike Williams made several conclusions on ambient levels. The first conclusion was that silica content was usually less than 10% of total fine particles concentrations, as per several EPA studies. Most of the silica in a city environment was crystalline silica because it consisted mostly of ground up quartz. Silica particle sizes were relatively large since they were created by mechanical processes such as grinding versus chemical processes, which created a gaseous form. General urban areas appeared to be protected by EPA ambient standards. Mr. Williams thought this conclusion was reasonable because some communities had high silica levels but not much silicosis. Mr. Williams said that he did not know if these conclusions—particularly the particle size—applied to the effects of silica formed from a gas. He noted that Intel's risk assessment used 60 ug/$m^3$ as a safe level, and earlier he had indicated 5 ug/$m^3$ was the safe level for miners.

John Bartlit asked why the numbers were different. Mike Williams suggested that Intel's risk assessment used the workplace numbers but didn't adjust them for the longer period of time and the differences between the working environment and the general environment. Also, they didn't look at as much detail as the EPA did.

Hugh Church if the relatively large particles were bigger than two and a half microns. Mike Williams said yes, and they may even be bigger.

*Slide 7:*
Mike Williams presented the NIOSH conclusions. NIOSH had difficulty measuring crystalline silica concentrations below 50 ug/$m^3$, and according to NIOSH, the 50 ug/$m^3$ workplace standard might not be protective of worker's health. A better number was difficult to find because of the trouble measuring at lower levels. Several micrograms were needed for measuring, and when this amount was gathered from the atmosphere through a filter the result was a clog, which interfered with measuring. John Bartlit asked if this conclusion held any relevance to CEWG. Mr. Williams responded that while they could collect a large fraction of silica, whether they could get enough crystalline silica was not as clear. Working at the stack top would result in higher concentrations, but measuring in the community to try to discern crystalline silica exposure would be a difficult chore. Mr. Bartlit said that the amounts of crystalline silica and the particle size coming from a chemical reaction was what they could learn from measuring at the stack top. Little information was known about these issues, so what information they could collect would be important and useful.

Mr. Williams continued that the 50 ug/$m^3$ number produced a 10% to 30% risk of silicosis over 45 years of work, and that corresponded to an ambient standard of 11 ug/$m^3$ for 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, for 70 years, also a 10 to 30 % risk of silicosis, which was considered relatively high risk.

*Slide 8:*
Other health effects seen in animal studies were an enhanced risk of TB, autoimmune disease and chronic bronchitis, although Mr. Williams did not see anything in the studies about risk levels.

*Slide 9:*
Mike Williams addressed the findings relative to Intel's environment. Estimates of fine particles from RTO were approximately 1.5 ug/$m^3$ total fine particles, most of which was likely silica, although that had to be proven. The Intel risk assessment put the total silica emissions at .15ug/$m^3$. He did not know why these numbers differed.

Sarah Chavez asked if the results were based on ground level concentrations, and pointed out that the RTO model conducted by Ralph Williams was looking at fine particles while the risk assessment looked only at silica.

Mike Williams confirmed that the risk assessment looked at silica only, the results were ground level concentrations, and the emission rates of both models were comparable. He said the background crystalline silica was some fraction of the fine particle total concentrations and 7.3 ug/$m^3$, which set the total fine particle background around Intel at 11.8 ug/$m^3$.

Frank Gallegos asked for an explanation of "background." Mike Williams said that background meant that there were no major sources of silica associated with specific point sources. Some fraction of the background might include crystalline silica, but he didn't know how much.

*Slide 10:*
Mike Williams said that assuming 1% of Intel's silica emissions were crystalline and 10% of the background fine particles were crystalline silica, the calculation would be .745 ug/$m^3$ crystalline/fine particle concentrations. He arrived at this number as follows: Damage levels for miners were 5.1 ug/$m^3$, but translating the occupation health number to the general health must include an uncertainly factor, which was 1/10 of the 5.1 ug/$m^3$ or .51 ug/$m^3$. His calculation of .745 ug/$m^3$ was higher than the .51 745 ug/$m^3$, the damage number for the general population based on the miners studies, and he pointed out that the vast bulk of crystalline silica most likely came from the background. This number suggested some level of concern. Hugh Church said that more crystalline silica might be coming from the Munters than the Durrs units.

*Slide 11:*
Mike Williams said the fine particles were already estimated to be above the World Health Organization (WHO) adverse level of 10 ug/$m^3$. Comparatively, the EPA's adverse level was 15 ug/$m^3$. Therefore the 11.8 ug/$m^3$ was a level of concern to WHO but not to the EPA.

*Slide 12:*
Mike Williams cited two other major studies of miners. One study in South Dakota gave about 60% lower levels of concern--there were arguments about interpreting x-rays in that case. The other study in Canada indicated that Canadian miners seemed exposed to higher levels—60% higher—with less health effects. He also said that fine particle estimated concentrations used emissions that were somewhat too high. He lastly reminded the group that modeling always involved some uncertainties.

*Comments*

- Group members commented on the presentation. Edward Pineda said there was not enough silica testing and data and hoped the Citizen Protocol would be used to gather data. He said that the damage to the lungs was cumulative; once the fine particles entered the lungs it just accumulated and never came out. Mike Williams agreed and said the health effects depended on how much was in the lungs and not when the fine particles entered. He reminded the group that silica was relatively insoluble. Amorphous silica

could be dissolved to some extent, and that was one of the differences between the two silicas.

- Edward Pineda said that the health industry might have tests to see what's in the lungs and how much percentage of breathing capacity was lost. He pointed out two standards, one for workers in the industry, including Intel, protected by OSHA, and one for the community, which had far fewer protections. He believed that workers were better protected in general than "someone who lives beyond the fence, because the person beyond the fence does not have a company that is concerned with keeping him protected and avoiding law suits. The person is on his own. The worker has protection of the patron." Mike Williams said that miners also had much higher levels of exposure, and NIOSH, which was the same as OSHA, set the standards for workers. Residents didn't have those standards. Mr. Williams emphasized that he was not referring to Intel, but to miners, who were exposed to much higher concentrations and didn't have the dilution that the general population had.

- Roberta King asked for exact identification of the risk assessment referred to in the presentation. Sarah Chavez said that it was the ERM assessment but did not remember the exact date. It was the second risk assessment completed, and it was a final document.

- Judy Hemphill asked if the ERM was done before the current processes were in place and if Intel had risk assessment data on the current processes. Sarah Chavez answered that Intel did not have a risk assessment on the current processes, but noted that Intel's use of silica had been going down significantly since the ERM risk assessment. She shared that information with the CEWG about a year ago. Edward Pineda asked for the proof. Ms. Chavez said the data was based on chemical use. Silica came from hexamethyl disilazane (HMDS), a specific chemical used in the process that was vented to RTO causing the silica to form. Intel's use of hexamethyl disilazane had decreased significantly, which meant less silica in the emissions. Mr. Pineda asked that this information be sent to the community. Ms. Chavez said the information was shared with NMED and CEWG, but she would update the document and release it to the community. She ascertained Intel previously used approximately 10 or 15 tons a year but was currently using less than 5 tons, approximately. She wasn't sure of the exact numbers but said it was significant.

- John Bartlit said this information should be included in the annual report. Edward Pineda said that the number was a calculated number and not based on testing. Sarah Chavez responded that it was not a calculated number but based on actual usage and the amount of the chemical purchased. Intel was required to keep records of this information and report it to NMED. She would document this information in a report to the group.

- John Bartlit affirmed that the CEWG stack testing for crystalline silica was still a goal.

- Sarah Chavez responded that the quarterly emissions report was reported to NMED, and the calculation was communicated in the quarterly report and available through NMED and Intel. The quarterly report was sent to CEWG in the past but that hadn't been done in a while. Mr. Littlejohn asked if it could be distributed with the meeting materials to the community. Ms. Chavez said she did not see why not and would summarize the specific use of HMDS in one document. Edward Pineda reminded the group that the community did not get any information from NMED and asked that Ms. Chavez send the information directly to the community.

  **ACTION ITEM**: Sarah Chavez will create a document that summarizes the specific use of HMDS at Intel and shows the decrease in purchase over time. She will also look into reinstating sending quarterly emissions reports to CEWG.

- Roberta King asked if the silica summary was included in the most recent NMED open house and other discussions. Sarah Chavez said no. Mike Williams said they talked about it in the stack heights committee.

- Frank Gallegos asked Mike Williams to confirm that the current background numbers that would still be over the damage levels if the Intel portion was cut. Mr. Williams confirmed this and said his assumptions were pessimistic.

- John Bartlit made two summation points: 1. The level of crystalline silica in the community couldn't be measures because with the current technology the numbers would be below detectable, measurable levels. 2. Information gathered from the stacks would still be useful, including the quantity and particle size.

- Roberta King asked for clarification on the breakdown of hexamethyl disilazane into silica, and whether there was any indication if it was crystalline or amorphous. Sarah Chavez said that Intel's testing showed that less than 1% of it was crystalline silica, but it was below detection, and the detection limit was less than 1%. Ms. King said she would like to see an exact explanation of the kind of testing Intel used to get the facts and figures that supported this conclusion. John Bartlit said it was a NIOSH test. Ms. Chavez said the information could be provided in writing since it was provided to NMED.

  **ACTION ITEM**: Sarah Chavez will find information on Intel testing and send it to Stephen Littlejohn, who will in turn send it to Roberta King.

- Stephen Littlejohn acknowledged the importance of crystalline silica as an issue and said it would continue to be a topic for CEWG, especially with the ATSDR committee who will follow up with testing and the Citizen's Protocol. He thanked Mike Williams and John Bartlit for their hard work in reading and interpreting the documents and creating the presentation.

- Frank Gallegos added that the presentation helped the group to understand what the 1% meant.

- Roberta King said she tried to get hard copies of the crystalline silica documents included in the list created by Stephen Littlejohn, but was not getting any response. Mr. Littlejohn said he would research the issue and report to Ms. King the best way to get copies.

**ACTION ITEM**: Stephen Littlejohn said he would research how to get hard copies and send a report to Ms. King.

**PLANNING THE JUNE MEETING**

Stephen Littlejohn reminded the group that the CEWG June meeting would not have a facilitator and recorder present. The June meeting presented an opportunity to explore a new format that did not need a meeting summary. In the previous meeting, the group decided to use the June meeting for information and background material presentations and brainstormed a list of possible topics. The next step was for the group to choose the topics and decide on the format.

- John Bartlit said that he didn't think the meeting should proceed as when facilitator and recorder were present. For example, reviewing the May Meeting Summary would not be useful since the recorder would not be present, which meant approving the May Meeting Summary would happen at the July meeting. Mr. Littlejohn confirmed that the July meeting would pick up where the May meeting left off.

- Edward Pineda said that the group needed a presiding officer and timekeeper to keep the meeting moving and to remind attendees of the golden rule, respect each other as they respect you. He noted that the acting chair often filled this role. One option was to have John Bartlit in this role as acting chair, and the group agreed.

- Edward Pineda said they also needed to create an agenda. Sarah Chavez commented that Harry Hunsacker was retiring July 1, so it was important to have him give his presentation before then. She reminded the group that Mr. Hunsacker talked at a meeting in 2007 about a statistical analysis of the community FTIR monitoring conducted by Intel. He tried to understand statistically, based on collected data, whether wind direction

had a synergistic effect or if it correlated with the chemicals present at the same time. He completed his inquiry and issued a report. He could return to the CEWG and present what he had learned in terms of the community. The presentation could last 30 minutes, including a question and answer session. John Bartlit asked if the group wanted to hear this presentation. Most attendees said yes. Roberta King asked that he put his PowerPoint presentation in a handout format.

- Judy Hemphill asked about a nitric acid and hydrochloric acid (HCl ) discussion. Mike Williams said that topic was in the ATSDR report as an item of concern. Ms. Hemphill said she'd like to have a discussion on that topic because she noticed over the last few months a distinct change in the discharge coming out of Intel. It was a strong burning that burned the throat, nasal passages, and skin even before there was an odor. John Bartlit said that the discussion needed to be structured. Sarah Chavez said that Intel was in the process of conducting the annual scrubber testing, which also tested for HCl. She suggested waiting to have the discussion to include the most recent testing data. The test results might be available in August. Ms. Hemphill said she was fine with holding off on the discussion until August.

- Frank Gallegos added to the agenda an update on the Intel odor/complaint task force and needed at least 30 minutes, including discussion.

- Hugh Church asked where he could find Harry Hunsacker's earlier CEWG presentation. Sarah Chavez said it was posted online.

- Judy Hemphill asked for an update on the NMED monitoring station. Lynne Kinis said they had to wait until Mayor Gasteyer of Corrales reported on where to locate it. Stephen Littlejohn said the group would need to find someone to report on the topic. Sarah Chavez said that NMED might send someone to give an update to CEWG and elicit feedback. John Bartlit reminded the group that the June meeting was about information gathering rather than decision-making.

- Edward Pineda reminded the group that NMED welcomed recommendations from CEWG on locating the monitoring station, and the group should offer NMED their best scientific knowledge and recommendations for a location. He emphasized that CEWG should contribute.

- Roberta King said Mr. Pineda was "jumping the gun" since Corrales Mayor Phillip Gasteyer volunteered the land, but the challenge was finding a suitable location within the constraints of zoning laws. The Village of Corrales had to locate suitable land on municipal property or the conservancy, first.

- Stephen Littlejohn said asked the group if they wanted to take the issue up in June knowing they couldn't make any clear recommendations. Judy Hemphill said she just wanted to hear a status report. Edward Pineda said that in his experience, sometimes because of zoning a less than ideal location was chosen that might not work well. Because of this, he suggested revisiting the topic in June. Mr. Littlejohn acknowledged the topic was time sensitive and asked the group how they would like to proceed on finding someone to give a report. Roberta King suggested someone contact NMED and the mayor of Corrales for a status report. Hugh Church said he would contact a person in the air quality bureau at NMED to see if she could provide information. No one volunteered to contact the Corrales mayor.

  **ACTION ITEM: Hugh Church will contact someone at the Air Quality Bureau about the status of the monitoring station.**

- Carrie Freeman told the group the topic "Carbon Footprint Reduction Goals" was addressed in the Sustainability Summary handed out earlier in the meeting and could therefore be scratched off the June topic list.

- John Bartlit asked Andrew Moen if he had heard any news about the NMED report. Mr. Moen said he had heard nothing, but he would let Mr. Bartlit know as soon as he did.

- John Bartlit asked Sarah Chavez about the stack height summary. Lynne Kinis commented that they had talked about that topic enough. Stephen Littlejohn said Roberta King requested the topic because it was unclear what stacks were in place in the past, present and in the future, and what the actual height was. Edward Pineda said that he requested a stack height status that addressed how many were built and in operation. Roberta King said she was under the impression Sarah Chavez was going to write that information in a summary and distribute it to the group. Sarah Chavez said she could provide that information.

- Sarah Chavez asked for clarification on what kind of rain cap update was desired. Edward Pineda reminded the group that they wanted to quantify the benefit of rain cap removal. Stephen Littlejohn said there was an item on the beneficial effects of removing rain caps pending review by Ralph Williams. It was a summary written by Mike Williams. He asked Ms. Chavez if she thought she could get that document by the June meeting. Ms. Chavez said yes. Mr. Littlejohn proposed sending an e-mail to the group summarizing topics for the June meeting and stating that John Bartlit would be the meeting convener/coordinator, as well as a Web reference for Harry Hunsacker's report.

- John Bartlit asked about an ad for June. Stephen Littlejohn asked the group their opinion on the ad and whether or not they wanted to advertise the June meeting to the public

since it was not a regular meeting. Edward Pineda said he though the group might be deviating unintentionally from the process since the ads were supposed to go through a consensus. Mr. Littlejohn said he sent the ad to everyone to review. Roberta King said that it was listed on the Web site that the group met every third Wednesday of the month. It was important to maintain consistency or inform the public on the change. Judy Hemphill said to state in the ad that it would be an informational session and not a regular business meeting. The group liked that idea. Mr. Littlejohn said he would draft an ad that stated the June meeting would be informational and not a regular business meeting and send it to the group for review.

**ACTION ITEM**: Stephen Littlejohn will send an e-mail to the group summarizing topics for the June meeting and stating that John Bartlit would be the meeting convener/coordinator. He will also send a Web reference for Harry Hunsacker's report.

**COMPLAINT RESPONSE PROCESS: NEXT STEPS**

- Judy Hemphill reported on last month's field tests. Basically, she said that the complaint process did not work. Frank Gallegos did come to her home because she paged him and he was close enough to get to the area quickly. She said it took at least 10 minutes to call in and talk to somebody, with luck. Rick Aragon, a security man, came to her house an hour and a half after a call, and of course then he didn't smell anything. She was willing to be patient because Frank Gallegos explained he had a task force in place to find answers; she would continue to call in complaints.

- Frank Gallegos said he was trying to adjust the complaint response protocol because the evening process was not working. He said the task force would come up with a new process, and he wanted it to be as effective as possible. When he was at Ms. Hemphill's house he smelled the discharge.

- Judy Hemphill explained that there were two distinct discharges. Usually it was an acidic discharge that burned the throat, sinuses and skin. It was very unpleasant and seeped into the house. The burning ash smell tended to happen on Saturday nights and sometimes Sunday. The acidic discharge occurred whenever the wind was blowing. It was especially bad Monday night.

- Frank Gallegos asked Ms. Hemphill to continue calling so there would be a record they could chart with a description of the smell. This information would help with the task force report. He was confident they could identify the problem, see where it was coming from and deal with it, but it would take time to see the patterns.

- Judy Hemphill said the ash discharge seemed to be constant on the weekends and wondered if something different occurred at Intel then. John Bartlit said biocides were acidic and in the cooling tower. Carrie Freeman said that was on an automatic feed system and not likely.

- Frank Gallegos said he walked the perimeter with the emergency response manager and explained to him about wind direction and that the emergency response team needed to walk the land according to wind direction. The team executed this change and as a result they began to smell some odors.

- Edward Pineda said that they needed to consider two things: 1. Have people camp in the areas where the odors occurred; he would volunteer. 2. Use a canister to catch the odor. The challenge was to catch the odor and have more than one opinion.

- Judy Hemphill said more people were calling in, which would help Frank Gallegos with data collection. Carrie Freeman said only two people responded to odors. The zone changed because the other person called in from different locations. The third person called about a noise.

- Lynne Kinis pointed out a repeat issue. Sometimes there was an odor and sometimes there was not even though she had a physical reaction. Her eyes burned, yet she did not call, and neither did the people who had been experiencing the discomfort over the last five to six years. People in the community had given up and didn't call anymore. The number of calls should be a flag

- Stephen Littlejohn summarized that the next step was for Frank Gallegos to report in June on the task force. He asked the CEWG and the community to think about what additional steps they should take on this issue.

**EHS REPORT**

- Sarah Chavez gave the EHS report. She said Intel was doing quarterly testing. She suggested a topic for June might be the downtime incurred during the transition form one Munters unit to another. There would always be 8 minutes of downtime at the beginning and end when transitioning from one unit to another because that's how long it took the damper to open and close—it was like a burp. She would talk about this in more detail in June, if the group wanted.

- Roberta King asked if Intel was affected by the power outage on Friday. Carrie Freeman said she thought it occurred on Saturday, since that's when it happened at her house. Ms. Chavez said she did not see anything but she would check.

- Carrie Freeman wanted the group to note that sometimes Intel got concerned e-mails from the community, and the emergency response team did not walk the perimeter for e-mails complaints.

- Hugh Church asked about the probability of fugitive emissions. Judy Hemphill said that the discharge was continuous and strong and therefore had to be coming from the stacks. Frank Gallegos said there were occasional rogue odors, and the task force would look at everything, identify potential sources, keep a log of complaints, and create a matrix that looked at all the collected data.

- John Bartlit asked if Intel had any trained smellers. Frank Gallegos said it was a problem. Five people may smell the same thing but describe it differently. They used to have someone trained but she was not with Intel anymore.

- Mike Williams said he was concerned with wind directions and it might be possible to use a LIDAR, which looked at fine particles emissions and worked best with RTOs. LIDAR was an instrument that sent signals, and light bounced back to plot where the emissions were going. Mr. Williams agreed to write a summary of LIDAR for the June meeting. Stephen Littlejohn said he would add it to the list.

- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group how they liked the small meeting room. Everyone seemed to prefer it because it was easier to hear and it was cozy. Mr. Littlejohn said they would keep using it.

**ACTION ITEM**: Mike Williams will write a summary about LIDAR for the June meeting.

**MEETING ADJOURNED**

**NEXT MEETING**

Next regular meeting: July 15, 2009, 5 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.

Note: A non-facilitated informational meeting will be held on June 17, at 5:00 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center.