MEETING SUMMARY
Community Environmental Working Group

"Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel"

Date: October 21, 2009
Time: 5:00–7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Senior Center

Members Attending
John Bartlit, Acting Chair
Sarah Chavez, EHS Department, Intel
Hugh Church, American Lung Association
Thom Little, Intel
Mike Williams, NM Clean Air & Water

Intel Staff
Frank Gallegos, Intel

Public
Roberta King, Corrales resident
Jay Stimmel, Interested citizen
Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident
Anthea Forsyth, Albuquerque resident

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

HANDOUTS
- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary September 16, 2009
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- October newspaper ad
- Production Variability Update
- Management Response to Hazardous Waste Letter
- Structured Methods of Improvement
- Crystalline Silica Testing: Advantages, Disadvantages, and Key Questions
- History of the Citizen Protocol
- John Bartlit Column: "An Impartial Study is a Risk to All"
- John Bartlit e-mail: "Thoughts about Silica Testing"

AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, and Brief Items
- Silica Testing
- Structured Methods of Improvement at Intel
- Newsweek's Green Ratings
- Production Variability Report
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND BRIEF ITEMS

John Bartlit opened the meeting by stating the CEWG mission, which was to work towards continuous environmental improvements and improved community dialogue. Introductions were made.

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

Stephen Littlejohn said that Anthea Forsyth was coming to make a public comment but did not know when she would arrive.

Meeting Summary—Revisions and Approval

Sarah Chavez said that in the discussion about wastewater, it was said that HCl was treated but it should read HF instead. She said she would e-mail Stephen Littlejohn with the exact change and location in the minutes.

Status Report-Baseline Modeling

Mike Williams said he owed a page of writing to Sarah Chavez for a handout on the topic. The handout would be distributed to the group for discussion in November.

Monitoring Station—Quick Discussion

John Bartlit gave the status on the monitoring station. The monitoring station was removed from Rio Rancho and might have been placed in Corrales was moved to the Four Corners area instead, and the Air Quality Bureau has no funding to get a replacement. He asked the group how they would like to proceed on the topic. Mike Williams said he would like to see fine particle monitoring done in the area. Hugh Church said that the nearest Albuquerque monitoring stations—one on Coors Road and one on Second Street—did sampling. Mr. Bartlit asked if they should try to get some of the Albuquerque data. Hugh Church said he would check with the person in charge of the city monitoring if the CEWG could access the data. Stephen Littlejohn said he would put the item back on the agenda for next month.

ACTION ITEM:

Hugh Church will check with the person in charge of the Albuquerque city monitoring to see if the CEWG could access the data from the Coors Road and Second Street monitoring stations.

SILICA TESTING

John Bartlit said that the group needed to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of silica testing under the Citizen Protocol and then decide how to proceed on this item.

- Stephen Littlejohn called the group's attention to two handouts about silica testing: 1) "Crystalline Silica Testing: Advantages, Disadvantages, and Key Questions for Using the Citizen Protocol," and 2: "History of Citizen Protocol." This latter handout, version 16, had been updated but not sent out to the group yet. All the 2009 comments were added to version 16. Version 15 ended with the date 12/19/08.

- Additionally, John Bartlit reported on his action item to contact ATSDR to check on the possibility of their funding the silica testing. He e-mailed Peter Kowalski on Sept. 24, 2009, and on October 1 Mr. Kowalski responded to Mr. Bartlit saying he was working on a response to his request. Mr. Bartlit said he had not heard anything since, and he would wait a while longer before sending a reminder e-mail.

- Hugh Church added that he had contacted the American Lung Association (ALA) about grant money for silica testing. He attended the ALANM monthly Board meeting, where it was suggested he contact Professor Arden Cope of BYU, a former ALA of Utah board member and an expert on health effects from air pollution. He contacted Professor Cope and asked for suggestions on where to pursue funding. Professor Cope said it was the "plant's responsibility" to supply funding. Mr. Church mentioned the community distrust of the "plant." Professor Cope said he was not a monitoring expert and suggested he call a colleague Professor Dilbert Etah. Mr. Church researched Mr. Etah's background, and it seemed Mr. Etah would be more appropriate to contact later project forming in the process.

- John Bartlit said Jeff Radford raised the question at the last meeting about the safety of amorphous silica. Mr. Bartlit believed this question should be resolved in advance of testing to alleviate arguments about the data's meaning after the fact. He wanted the group to progress in understanding the issue and not get stuck in arguing about the data's meaning. Mike Williams suggested asking this question: if amorphous silica and crystalline silica were converted similarly to get ambient exposure, how would that ambient exposure compare to the fine particle standards? By applying occupational health data to an ambient context and asking whether the level was near the fine particle standard, the need to address amorphous silica separately might be eliminated.

- Another issue Mr. Williams raised was what to do if the crystalline silica test results were ambiguous—the reading was good but there was uncertainty around its meaning. He suggested agreeing ahead of time—before the testing would be done—on the level of concern, the level of safety, and level in between in the grey area. If these three parameters were identified and set ahead of time, arguing about the data's meaning could be

eliminated. Mr. Bartlit said that these levels could be agreed upon either through the CEWG, the ATSDR committee, or even through e-mail.

- Stephen Littlejohn said that, strictly following the Citizen Protocol, the CEWG should establish a protocol task force that consists of community members, CEWG, Intel, and any experts recommended by CEWG to establish criterion levels. CEWG would have to take official action to appoint the ATSDR committee to constitute the protocol task force.

- Hugh Church stated that he thought amorphous silica was not as hazardous as crystalline, and this point had been addressed in previous meetings. Mike Williams said the literature indicated the effects (rather than the threshold) were more severe with crystalline silica. He believed that the amorphous silica was going to follow closer to fine particle standards. Occupational health standards already were established for amorphous silica but ambient standards were not established for either silica. Sarah Chavez said that the Citizen Protocol could specify testing for both crystalline and amorphous silicas.

- Roberta King asked if the group had established whether or not there were accepted health hazard guidelines as far as quantity for either kind of silica. Mike Williams said there were not any standards yet in the general ambient environment, but there were established occupational—workplace— standards. Ms. King asked how the group could come to an agreement ahead of time on acceptable levels when no bono fide amounts had been established. Mike Williams said that the occupational health standards were converted to ambient standards applying to people in the community, using a specific factor to correct for differences. A challenge is that different researchers might use different factors. Another question or grey area to consider was whether to attribute the effects of crystalline silica solely to Intel emissions, or, figure in the other sources of crystalline silica in the community, such as gravel mining and road dust. Most of these sources, he surmised, were larger than fine particles, but since robust numbers on crystalline silica associated with other sources did not exist, an answer would be hard to pin down. Sarah Chavez asked if the values established in the California study differentiated between particle sizes. Mr. Williams said he did not think so but would have to check.

- John Bartlit said the group would learn many useful things by going through the process of choosing upper, lower and in-between limits, since they would find out how people viewed these levels and what could be done to minimize the difference. Roberta King said that people in the community who had been breathing the air noticed the difference, and it was getting worse. She said it seemed that the community's experience was being disqualified, and she would not trust any levels established by a committee. Furthermore, she did not trust how information was calculated using models. The result would be manipulated to achieve the outcome desired by industry. Mike Williams said one reason to do the testing was to find out what was producing the effects, even if it was only one component.

- Lynne Kinis said that looking at one component was setting up a backdoor escape hatch for the major producer. If the condition was set up where Intel was not the major responsible party—"and they were"—then it was not worth the effort. Any community similar to Corrales did not suffer the same kinds of illness merely from construction and dirt roads. She did not want Intel to say, at the end of the study, that they were not the only producers of crystalline silica. John Bartlit said that the purpose of using the Citizen Protocol was to deal with potential problems ahead of time so Intel could not refute responsibility. The reason for moving forward with testing under the Citizen Protocol was because the community demanded impartial and independent crystalline silica testing, and because the ATSDR recommended more crystalline silica testing.

- Stephen Littlejohn summarized the discussion. If the group decided the disadvantages outweighed the advantages of testing, then people might ask why the CEWG did not follow through on requests from the community and ATSDR. If the group thought the advantages outweighed the disadvantages, and testing was pursued, then people might not trust the results, or the results might be too ambiguous. That was the dilemma, but the group needed to come to a decision on whether or not to test, or at the very least, to agree to continue the discussion.

- Roberta King commented that she would not trust the results as objective when limits were set ahead of time. John Bartlit said that the results would be what they were regardless of whether or not limits were set. Lynne Kinis asked what the purpose of the limits was. Mike Williams responded that part of it was to answer questions within the protocol, one of which was what to do with the data. Ms. Kinis asked if they could test to see how much amorphous/crystalline silica was produced without setting levels. Mr. Williams said that they could, but the protocol specifically asked to address the question of what to do with the data. Ms. King asked how they could decide what to do with the data when they did not know what the results were. Mr. Williams said that deciding limits after getting the results compromised objectivity because opinions could change after the results came in. Mr. Bartlit said to keep in mind that there were still other chemicals to consider, so if the outcome were below level it would not end the discussion.

- Stephen Littlejohn surveyed the group as to whether they were thumbs up, thumbs down, or thumbs sideways—meaning continue talking—about testing silica. Mike Williams said he would rather devote his time to baseline modeling, but he would like to see the data, too. He was sideways; the enormous workload daunted him. Thom Little said he was all for it. Hugh Church asked why the group was concentrating on crystalline silica versus other chemicals. John Bartlit said it was because the citizens wanted crystalline silica testing, as did the ATSDR. Mr. Church asked what made the citizens decide that crystalline silica was the culprit. Roberta King said they believed it affected their lungs. Mr. Church said it was only a belief; it might be something else. Ms. King said that the nodules found in her dog's lungs indicated crystalline silica. Mr. Church gave thumbs

across. Sarah Chavez said thumbs up since she would like to resolve the issue. Mr. Bartlit said he was daunted by the immense workload, especially fundraising, but the ATSDR and the pressure from citizens weighed heavily on him. If the CEWG did not test, questions would be raised as to why. He believed they had to do everything possible in advance to minimize areas of disagreements. His preference was to get money from Intel, which would reduce the time spent on fundraising. He wanted to make as much progress as possible, in both reducing emissions and community dialogue. He gave more thumbs up than down or sideways. Mr. Littlejohn said that the group did not reach consensus but that there were no "nos." Since they ran out of time, the group would come back to this item at the end of the meeting.

STRUCTURED METHODS OF IMPROVEMENT AT INTEL

- Thom Little presented a high-level overview of Intel's structured method of problem solving, which they used to help get to the root cause of a problem; he also wanted to show that Intel had a culture of problem solving. The handout, "Structured Methods of Improvement at Intel" served as the framework for his presentation (See attached). Mr. Little said Intel used primarily 3 methodologies of structured problem solving: 7-Step; TapRoot; and 5 Whys. The 7-Step was a circular process outlined on page 4 of the handout, which came from the beginning of an online course taught at Intel to primarily managers, engineers, and some technicians, and went as follows: 1. Define the problem; 2. Document the current situation; 3. Identify the causes; 4. Develop solutions; 5. Implement solutions; 6. Standardize solutions (across all sites if it was a common problem); and 7. Determine next steps. Mr. Little explained that many of the courses at Intel were now taught online rather than in a classroom. Page 5 was a reprint of a simple example of how to apply the 7 Step process to a problem.

- Page 6 looked at TapRoot, a method that had fallen out of favor at Intel. Page 7 addressed the 5 Whys, which was a process of questioning things 5 times until the true cause of the problem was revealed. Page 8 provided an example of asking "why" 5 times. Mr. Little said he used the 5 Whys often, and it was used for human-related mistakes in his factory in California.

- Pages 9, 10, and 11 of the presentation focused on training and showed the culture of problem solving at Intel. Roberta King asked for a definition of Intel University. Mr. Little responded that it was a list of classes available to Intel employees worldwide. Most of the classes were Web-based but some had instructors in a classroom setting. Sarah Chavez explained that Intel University was also a training tracking system. John Bartlit asked about the length of a Web-based course. Ms. Chavez said most were 30 minutes to an hour.

- Page 11 showed a picture of training statistics. Mr. Little explained that Lean Manufacturing was a methodology devised by Toyota used for continuous improvement.

Frank Gallegos said that in New Mexico, everyone under John Painter had to take Lean training, which was a weeklong class.

- Roberta King asked if there were any course for Intel contractors. Frank Gallegos said that all contractors had to enroll in a half-day course on general requirements at Intel. Thom Little said that Intel had "procedures" that contractors needed to follow to fulfill their jobs.

NEWSWEEK'S GREEN RATINGS

- John Bartlit introduced the topic, the *Newsweek* green ratings of corporations. Intel came in number 4 overall. Mr. Bartlit wondered what this rating meant for the work of CEWG. It seemed that there was the possibility to find environmental areas where Intel was not strong, and the latter was a place to look for areas of improvement. He also wanted to examine the report and look at the methodology to see how the results were configured. He said the article was pertinent to CEWG's mission, and the CEWG could offer suggestions on how Intel should respond to the article, either internally or publically.

- Stephen Littlejohn created a handout summary of the article for the group to use as a reference. Lynne Kinis said she wanted to know where the numbers came from. Thom Little said he believed that the data was compiled independently from public sources. Mr. Littlejohn said some of the information came from the Toxic Release Inventory, which was compiled by the Environmental Protection Agency. Ms. Kinis said that the ATSDR report was based on information received from Intel, and the reason why crystalline silica jumped out was that the statistics were old. She believed that the numbers were provided directly by Intel, and therefore the green rating was worthless in her eyes. Thom Little said that Intel's lowest score of the three areas examined was in environmental impact, which was about emissions. He said that the way Intel worked was to strive for improvements and ask how to do it better. He believed Intel would hard to improve environmental impact.

- Roberta King quoted the following from *Newsweek*'s Web site, which explained how the scores were calculated:

  "The Environmental Impact Score, based on data compiled by Trucost, is a comprehensive and standardized quantitative performance measurement that captures the total cost of all environmental impacts of a corporation's global operations. Over 700 variables are summarized in the EIS. This figure is normalized against a company's annual revenues, so that companies of all sizes and industries can be compared.

  "The Green Policies Score, derived from data collected by KLD, reflects an analytical assessment of a company's environmental policies and performance. Its scoring model captures best-in-class policies, programs and initiatives, as well as regulatory infractions, lawsuits and community impacts, among other indicators.

"The Reputation Score is based on an opinion survey of corporate social responsibility (CSR) professionals, academics and other environmental experts who subscribe to CorporateRegister.com. CEOs or high-ranking officials in all companies on the Newsweek 500 list were also invited to participate.

"The opinion survey, which was done exclusively for *Newsweek*, went out to 13,000 CorporateRegister.com users, of whom 6,600 are located in the U.S. and 6,400 are based internationally. Of those surveyed, 4,500 were identified as "sector specialists"—those having a specific working knowledge of environmental issues within their industry—and were only asked to score their sector peers. Additionally, CEOs or high-ranking officials in all companies on the *Newsweek* 500 list were invited to participate. CEO scores were given a weight of "3," sector specialists a weight of "2," and other participants a weight of "1." Any scores given to a company by its own employees were disregarded: CorporateRegister.com uses a number of measures to verify user identification and details.

"The survey asked respondents to rate companies as "leaders" or "laggards" in five key "green" areas: green performance, commitment, communications, track record and ambassadors.

There were a total of 808 respondents or a six percent response rate, a far higher response than is typical of most public opinion polls reported in the media."

- Ms. King said based on who responded to the surveys—CEO—the ranking was meaningless. John Bartlit clarified the only thing of value to the CEWG was emissions, and he agreed with Ms. King that the opinion of CEOs about Intel was not valuable to the CEWG. Ms. King said she believed in this light the green ranking was "utterly ridiculous" and devoid of meaning.

- Stephen Littlejohn added that the reputation score was weighted 10%, the policy score was weighted 45%, and the environmental impact score was 45%. He also noted that the technology sector consisted of many different kinds firms, some not in manufacturing and therefore non-polluters. The factories with emissions ranked lower on the environmental impact score.

- Roberta King read two letters to the editor of *Newsweek* written by Corrales residents Barbara Rockwell and Martha Egan, respectively,. The first letter she read was written by Martha Egan:

  "Dear Editor:

"Living downwind from Intel's Rio Rancho, New Mexico, plant, I find *Newsweek*'s naming Intel a "green" corporation ludicrous. Compliant state and federal regulators allow Intel to "calculate" rather than measure its tons of hazardous and toxic air emissions. Intel's own consultant, TRC, reports that Intel releases carbon tetrachloride, hydrofluoric acid, nitric acid, fluor-phosgene and other known carcinogens in quantities many times above safe levels.

"Sincerely,

"Martha J. Egan
Village of Corrales Representative
EPA Toxic Air Pollutant Task Force 2002-2004"

- Ms. King next read the following letter written by Barbara Rockwell:
  "Dear Editor:

  "Intel Corporation's behavior in the communities where it makes its chips is far from green. In New Mexico, Arizona and Oregon, community protest groups have formed in response to the toxic emissions the people in Intel neighborhoods are forced to breathe. In Corrales, New Mexico, there have been three deaths from pulmonary fibrosis among individuals living close to the plant.

  "While it's commendable that Intel is producing a chip that uses less energy and thus contributes less to greenhouse warming, any "green" award should certainly take into account the toxicity of the emissions being vented into the environment and doing real harm to real people.

  "Barbara Rockwell, Author of 'Boiling Frogs – Intel vs. the Village,' I-Universe, 2005"

Stephen Littlejohn asked the group if they had any comments or wanted to take any action. There were no comments.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Additional Public Comments

- Anthea Forsyth, who had not arrived during the public comments section, read the following public comment to the group:
  "Good evening. My name is Anthea Forsyth. Thank you for allowing me to speak to you all.

  "I was a resident of Corrales for a year 2006-07. I moved to the NE Heights after that, and that is where I currently reside. In all the time I lived in Corrales, I knew of the

existence of Intel, and heard stories about the chemical exposure leaking out into the community. It never affected me, but things changed on Saturday evening, September 26, 2009.

"I met Lynne Kinis at the Sunflower Market to assist her with a craft fair. We set up just inside the door of the supermarket. After about 20 minutes, I noticed my mouth becoming dry and I was coughing slightly. However, after about an hour, it became so bad; I was coughing constantly and had to leave Lynne and go home.

"I felt a bit better by the next day, and met friends for brunch in the Nob Hill area. After about 4:00 p.m. that day, I started to cough, and my larynx and esophagus were burning. I became quite alarmed and disgusted that these ailments were back. For the next few days, I experienced extreme coughing, constant phlegm in the chest, and lung area, aches and pains, headaches, lethargy and general extreme malaise. The difference this time, I felt was a TERRIBLE burning in my chest, and shortness of breath. I knew I was not suffering from allergies, as this was feeling I had never felt before. Even though I am reluctant to go anywhere near Corrales for the time being, I still feel the effects of my exposure three weeks after. I find that simply going to the movies produces a coughing attack due I am sure to recycled air conditioning that irritates my throat.

"Thank God for Lynne, she helped me track the events of the last few weeks. I must say in the beginning I could not believe that I had been poisoned by the Intel emissions. But I do now. I did not smell anything different either in Corrales or anywhere else. I have been trained in voice-over techniques and, due to my ongoing respiratory challenges, this is affecting my employment potential.

"I never realized how strongly the emissions could affect a person. I know that Lynne comes to meetings and works very diligently with your group to improve the air quality in Corrales. She is the person who explained to me why I was shaving these reactions. I am middle-aged and in good health and if it has affected me badly, how would it affect a young child or old person? Yet, I was slammed by choosing to go into a particular area for a total of an hour and a half. This is very frightening to me.

"From what I gather, when the chemicals are released, there is ONLY a calculation made about how much it is being emitted. If this is true, it is appalling. Surely, Intel does not set out to poison the community so what is going on? For such a huge corporation, why is the data not exact? As residents of the communities around Intel, surely, we deserve clean air to breathe.

"I appreciate your giving me the time to express my concerns, fears and description of my ailments due to Intel. I implore you to find the source of this poison and eliminate it from your process.

"Thank you."

- Ms. Forsyth asked if someone would follow up on her comments. Thom Little said he would follow up with her. Roberta King invited her to get on the e-mail distribution list.

  ACTION ITEM:

  Thom Little will follow up on Anthea Forsyth comments about Intel emissions making her ill on September 26, 2009.

- Lynne Kinis added that the primary question Ms. Forsyth wanted answered was what was the chemical substance she had ingested that left her so compromised over time. She asked if the group was going to have a budgetary discussion, and to add the following suggestions to that discussion: 1. Discuss adding the approximate cost of renting an RV for two weekends and parking it near her clubhouse so CEWG members could experience the effects of Intel emissions; and 2. Judy Hemphill found on the Internet a machine that cleans a 24 X 24 foot area of chemicals. Put one of these machines in the homes of community members compromised—meaning their immune system was hit hard by the emissions. The cost of the machine was $600 dollars. John Bartlit said, as he understood it, the CEWG budget was $30,000 dollars and they could spend it anyway they wanted, including these machines. (He thanked Sarah Chavez for the delicious cookies.) Stephen Littlejohn said all ideas were welcome during the budgetary discussion, and Ms. Kinis's suggestions would be added to that discussion.

- Lynne Kinis said *Corrales Comment* ran an article written by Jeff Radford on October 10, 2009, saying that 1-heptanethiol was "sort of" unregulated. Mike Williams said it was unregulated as far as emissions were concerned but there was a state ambient standard. Ms. Kinis continued quoting the article: "It was known to produce the following symptoms in humans: Irritation of eyes, skin, nose, throat, lassitude, cyanosis, increased respiration, drowsiness, nausea, and vomiting." The article mentioned the emissions peaks on August 7/8, the skunk smell, and the burnt hydraulic odor. Lynne commented that her own throat felt like she had "a drink of acid." Her throat was not sore, like with a virus or bacteria, but felt like a chemical burn. Ms. Kinis said the article went on to mention that in 1993/94, when EEP "permeated the valley," Intel officials denied responsibility for the odors until the plant manager's wife began complaining. Then Intel investigated the problem, found the culprit compound, and discontinued using it. When Intel officials opened up a vial of EEP in a conference room, several of the invited villagers were stricken with sudden headaches. [EEP chemical is identified in Mr. Radford's article.] Ms. Kinis implied that if Intel could do something about the problem in 1993-94, they could do something now. She said that many people in the community were compromised and

calling in with complaints, and the EHS report said only 4 people called in; she knew more than 4 people had called and she could name them.

- Thom Little said he counted the letter from Joy Tschawuschian as coming from only one person and did not add in the two other names at the bottom of the letter. Adding in those two extra names raised the number of complaints from 4 to 6. He said this oversight was his error, not an intended manipulation of facts, and it could be corrected on record.

- Roberta King said she was asked by the three members of the community to read this letter written to Thom Little at Intel. She read the letter as follows:
  "Thom,

  "I know you're new here... You probably haven't had time to review years of history from 1989 until now. We are serious about what's happening to us. Get ready for what's going to happen in this community in the future because there are people too sick to send in reports. We, and others are livid that rather than improving the situation, things have become worse with this new technology. There is continued damage to the health of residents on an almost "daily/nightly" basis plus damage already done to our health in the past.

  "Since I last reported, the skin on my eyelids is peeling. All around the eyes it is inflamed a burning since the last exposure. Neighbors are coughing, skin on hands burning and itching, heaviness of breathing noticed also sinus and nausea problems and it's not the swine flu. At 8:52 p. m. today I stepped outside to turn off the water and started coughing until I got back into the house. This is in no way tolerable for us and it wouldn't be for you or anyone in your company.

  "Please understand that the new chemicals that are being used up there are causing illnesses as serious as we had in the 1990s. Vision is blurred, eyes are burning and skin is peeling off the eyelids. One breath of the toxic air causes choking, coughing and in Patricia's case gasping for air. The toxins collect in her west side patio and in her house. With me it settles all around my property and comes in the house. This morning my eyes were swollen shut and inflamed. I could hardly see. Each day my vision seems to be getting worse. Bunny lives at the top of Pueblo Los Cerros and gets blasted there (read the attached report).

  "The processes and chemicals your company is now using are drastically deteriorating air quality downwind and downhill from your facility. There was a period of time when we were happy not to have had to report, so you can see the dramatic change that has occurred in this air shed in the last several weeks.

  "We need help and we need it now. Who's going to be effective in bringing this about?

Although serious damage has already been done, we have a right to live here and not be more injured. This level of toxicity in intolerable, action needs to be taken now and we will continue to report to Intel and NMED until something is done.

"Please call us with your solutions.

"Joy Tschawuschian, 898-4519
"Patricia Stribling, 898-6230
"Bunny Lawrence, 890-3924"

- Hugh Church said that the letter underscored why he had asked why they were focusing on silica when there was this acute problem that had accelerated over the last two months. Lynne Kinis said that the emissions problem was worsening two-fold: there was no odor and it seemed to be a 24/7 blanket. Previously, irritations had occurred during spikes, and then it was gone. Over the last couple months it appeared to be a constant, and it has affected many more people than who have phoned in with complaints. She said it was so bad a couple days ago she had to use a wet and dry towel over her face to get from her house to the garage. Mike Williams said that 1-heptanethiol really smelled. Ms. Kinis said that she was not identifying the chemical, but whatever it was was deadly and that it was on its way to becoming a superfund site fast.

- Stephen Littlejohn told Thom Little about Frank Gallegos' task force looking into the odor/contaminant complaint process and asked him to put in on the agenda on an ongoing basis.

- Ms. Kinis said she had called in on the 13th and did not mention an odor but a burning in her throat and esophagus. She was making this strong statement because lack of odor made it more dangerous for the community. The odor warned them not to go out; without the odor there was no warning and they were victims of the effects.

- Stephen Littlejohn said that the group would continue the discussion on whether or not to commit to silica testing. The ATSDR committee decided not to meet after the meeting. Corrections needed to be made to the EHS report as indicated in the "Public Comment" section.

- Thom Little said that Jeff Radford had contacted him for a tour of the Intel facility, and Mr. Little offered the group to join the tour. He would send an e-mail with the date and details of the tour, which would focus on the manufacturing space. John Bartlit suggested conducting the tour during testing. Sarah Chavez said that was a good idea, and testing was scheduled from November 12 through December 15.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Sarah Chavez and Thom Little will correct the EHS report as discussed.
- Thom Little will e-mail the group with the date and details of the Jeff Radford tour of Intel.

EHS Report
Sarah Chavez said nothing out of the ordinary was on the EHS report, but she did want to add that Intel had submitted the modeling to NMED for 1-heptane thiol, and they were in compliance with the standard. They could discuss this issue at the next meeting.

PRODUCTION VARIABILITY REPORT
Moved to a later meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING
November 18, 2009, 5 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.