

MEETING SUMMARY**Community Environmental Working Group*****"Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel"***

Date: March 16, 2011
Time: 5:00–7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Senior Center

Members Attending

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

Thom Little, Intel
 Hugh Church, American Lung Assc. of NM
 Edward Pineda, Rio Rancho resident
 Lane Kirkpatrick, Corrales resident

Non-Members Attending

Roberta King, Corrales resident
 Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident
 Frank Gallegos, Intel
 Jami Grindatto, Intel
 Larry Alei, Intel
 Richard Elder, Corrales resident

Christine Steiner, Corrales resident
 Andrea Zurawski, Corrales resident
 Tom Mann, Corrales resident
 Charles Inciendio, Corrales resident
 Jim Tritten, Corrales resident

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary January 19, 2010
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- March Newspaper Ad
- Intel report on EPA 114 follow-up process
- *Corrales Comment* March 6 article
- Edward Pineda's *Corrales Comment* op-ed
- John Bartlit's *Albuquerque Journal* op-ed piece
- Excerpt from EPA 114 letter regarding scrubber efficiency testing
- CEWG Consensus Decisions
- CEWG Meeting Process Handbook

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 3-16-11, v. 4
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: April 26, 2011

Approved: April 20, 2011

PROPOSED AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items
- EHS Report
- Silica Testing Update
- EPA 114 Follow Up
- CEWG Involvement in Scrubber Efficiency Testing
- Permit Revision
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND BRIEF ITEMS

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

Stephen Littlejohn described the CEWG for the new people in the room. The CEWG, he said, is a community group that maintained high quality community dialogue for the purpose of environmental improvement as related to Intel. The group runs according to an agenda, and the last half hour is for additional business that emerges during the meeting. Everyone is welcome to speak during any of the agenda items. He also pointed out the public comment section on the agenda and asked that everyone speak with respect.

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

Edward Pineda said they should delay the 5:30 pm agenda item until Jim Tritten arrived. Stephen Littlejohn confirmed that Jim Tritten would be coming to the meeting.

Meeting Summary (January 19th, 2011)—Revisions and Approval

Edward Pineda asked if it were possible to code documents to find topics quicker. Stephen Littlejohn said that we have an index and a list of consensus decisions to help navigate meeting summaries.

Announcements

- John Bartlit said that the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) report on health effects in the area related to Intel has not been released yet. The ATSDR is a federal agency affiliated with the Centers for Disease Control (CDC).
- John Bartlit updated the group on the status of his op-ed. He confirmed that he waited for Edward Pineda's article, which included information on the EPA's concerns, to appear in the *Corrales Comment* so he could refer to it in his op-ed. He said he submitted his op-ed to the *Albuquerque Journal*, the *Rio Rancho Observer* and the *Corrales Comment*. The *Journal* asked him to edit his op-ed to 650 words, which he did. The op-ed was published on March 7, 2011, with a cartoon. He said he wrote his op-ed to include two pieces of information: 1. There were people who disagreed. However, the *Journal* edited these two points out of his

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 3-16-11, v. 4

Approved: April 20, 2011

Prepared or presented by: CJ Odek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: April 26, 2011

article, Mr. Bartlit said, and that as far as he knew, neither the *Rio Rancho Observer* nor the *Corrales Comment* published his piece.

- Stephen Littlejohn reminded the group that it wanted to see a draft website policy before deciding on whether to move forward with an independent site. He said that the website policy would be a future agenda item. He also mentioned that he and Mr. Bartlit discussed diversifying CEWG membership, since new members of the community had begun to engage more with the CEWG, including members of the Corrales Village Council. Mr. Littlejohn said the CEWG did not have a policy on membership or leadership yet. Lynne Kinis asked who discussed changing CEWG membership. Mr. Littlejohn said he discussed it with John Bartlit and also with Edward Pineda, and they all agreed it was time to make it a formal agenda item.
- Thom Little referred to the CEWG Web site for past meeting summaries and other documents. Stephen Littlejohn said the link was:
<http://www.intel.com/community/newmexico/cewg.htm>. He mentioned that the link was listed in the meeting advertisement.
- Edward Pineda said that he was pleased that on March 28, Intel would have another meeting to discuss the permit. Jami Grindatto said the meeting would be facilitated and documented so attendees could get the information on permit changes. Lynne Kinis said that the upset and concerned people at the permit meeting should serve as a flag to Intel that they need to have a question and answer meeting with the community.

EHS REPORT

Thom Little discussed the February EHS report. Three oxidizer downtimes were recorded on 1/26/11, 1/27/11, and 2/3/11. He explained that “unabated downtime” meant that released emissions did not go through pollution control equipment—the thermal oxidizers. On January 26, a bearing failed on an oxidizer fan, which caused the downtime, and on the 27th maintenance had to be done on the unit resulting in additional downtime. Mr. Little explained that the Munters units would replace the Durr units by June in order to have full redundancy, which meant that when a unit went down, there would be a backup. Mr. Little said that on February 3, the Munters went down due to freezing temperatures. The damper valve that rerouted the air for redundancy was frozen in place.

John Bartlit clarified that “bypass” meant unabated emissions “bypassed” pollution control equipment and were released into the atmosphere. Edward Pineda said that the EHS report should use the term “unabated emissions” instead of “bypass.” Mr. Little agreed to make the change. Thom Little agreed to use the term “unabated emissions” instead of “bypass” in the EHS report.

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 3-16-11, v. 4
Prepared or presented by: CJ Odek & Stephen Littlejohn
Prepared for: CEWG
Date prepared or presented: April 26, 2011

Approved: April 20, 2011

- Thom Little clarified that when a unit is in “redundancy,” the emissions are getting burned and there are no unabated emissions. He said that Intel has a goal to always operate in redundancy, which was why they are replacing the Durrs units.
- Edward Pineda said two things could happen that would result in unabated emissions, despite the redundancy: a power failure and a natural gas shut down. Mr. Little confirmed Mr. Pineda’s point.
- Richard Elder asked if bypasses were in violation of Intel’s permit, and if the permit required redundancy. Sarah Chavez responded “no” to both questions and said Intel was required to report when equipment was down. Mr. Elder asked if Intel had to account for VOCs. Ms. Chavez said that Intel used an estimate based on previous stack testing and reported downtime in Intel’s regular VOC emissions reports. She said that Intel was regulated by total VOCs and not by individual chemicals. Edward Pineda explained that Intel’s permit was based on a yearly rollover average limit and not a daily or weekly limit, and so there would be no violations in a short-lived event.
- Thom Little discussed the March EHS report. On February 9 and 16, Munters units were down for preventive maintenance; there was redundancy and therefore no unabated emissions were released. On February 17, a proximity switch failed on a Munters unit resulting in down time. Again, there was redundancy and no unabated emissions were released. Andrea Zurawski asked if chemicals were still being released but in smaller quantities when emissions were abated. Thom Little said that was correct.
- Lane Kirkpatrick said there was a lot of concern around spikes and odor in the community and wanted to make sure that these matters were discussed and dealt with in a responsible way.
- Roberta King asked how many Munters are in redundancy. Thom Little said three units are in redundancy and the others redundant units are currently being constructed.

SILICA TESTING UPDATE

Jim Tritten, the Chair of the Silica Testing Task Force, read as follows from his submitted text: “The NIOSH laboratory results of silica sampling conducted at Intel’s Rio Rancho site in December 2010 were transmitted to and received by the Chair of the Silica Testing Task Force (STTF) on Monday afternoon, March 14, 2011. In accordance with procedures approved by the STTF last year, the results were provided Tuesday morning March 15, 2011, to Mike Williams, a consultant to the STTF, and to Kurt Parker, at ERM, for preparation of an analytical report based upon those results. It is my understanding that ERM previously provided to Mr. Williams their data on February 17, 2011. It is now necessary to assess both aspects of the raw data into one coherent picture and to craft a report. Each piece that we now have without the other half does not present a clear or total picture of the

sampling results. We are going to have to wait until the assessment is completed before we can move forward.

"When Mike Williams and ERM have completed their work, their draft report will be transmitted to me and I will ensure that it is presented to the STTF where it will be reviewed for completeness, accuracy, and thoroughness. I have asked ERM and Mr. Williams for an estimate of how long it will take to do their work." Mr. Williams interjected that he would complete it by Monday morning. Mr. Tritten said Kurt Parker also said he should have something in a week.

Mr. Tritten continued: "I have also asked whether ERM intends to attend the STTF meeting in person where the report will be presented, and if not, I will make arrangements for a meeting location that will permit their participation via teleconference. I also assume that we need a meeting place that has the appropriate audiovisual support that I assume will be required to view PowerPoint slides and Excel worksheets on a large screen." Mr. Tritten asked the CEWG to find a room to meet in that has the required AV support. Stephen Littlejohn and John Bartlit agreed.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will find a setting for the STTF meeting that has the appropriate AV support, including teleconference capabilities.

Mr. Tritten resumed: "If there are any questions about the results, the STTF will clear these up before final approval of the report by the STTF. Upon approval of the report by the STTF, the report and all raw data results will be presented to the CEWG. It is our understanding that upon acceptance of the report by the CEWG, the CEWG will address all requests for copies of the report and the raw data results. I have notified all members of the public and press that have contacted me that the results are in and that analytic work is in progress.

"I would like to request guidance from the CEWG as to how to handle the participation of the general public at the next STTF meeting. It will be at that meeting that we first address the draft report and sampling results. This meeting will occur prior to any formal release of the report and results to the CEWG. The public has been invited to all meetings of the STTF in the past. The issue is complicated and I request clear guidance in writing: are STTF meetings during which draft reports and sampling results that have not been accepted by either the STTF or the CEWG to be open to the general public?

"Again to remind everyone, it is my intention to resign as the Chair of the STTF once the CEWG has accepted the final report and sampling results – in order to force a discussion of the role, if any, that the CEWG wants the STTF to play in the future and to allow all parties to consider who should be the chair for that mission. I will consult with the mayor and ask if he wants me to remain on the STTF, if one is to exist, for the next round of activities. I want to reiterate that my pending resignation should not be interpreted in any other way other than living up to the conditions under which I accepted the Chair of the STTF – for this cycle of activities only."

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 3-16-11, v. 4
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: April 26, 2011

Approved: April 20, 2011

- John Bartlit clarified that the members of the STTF are Pat Clauser, John Alsobrook and Jim Tritten, all nominated by the mayor, as well as Edward Pineda, Hugh Church and Thom Little. The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)—the experts in crystalline silica testing—was the laboratory that produced the testing results. Having NIOSH involvement was a major accomplishment for the CEWG, Mr. Bartlit emphasized. Stephen Littlejohn explained that the testing was done according to the Citizen Protocol, which was designed to do testing at arm's length from all stakeholder groups, including Intel.
- Edward Pineda asked whether the meeting to discuss the testing results should be open to the public. He said all meetings of the CEWG and by derivation any task forces designated by the CEWG are open to the public. Also, in the state of NM, there was a law around open meetings. He said maybe there should be two meetings: an informational meeting for questions and answers and an executive meeting to make decisions.

Stephen Littlejohn reminded that once the reports are approved by the STTF and transmitted to the CEWG they become public, and, according to the Citizen Protocol, the CEWG is obligated to hold public dialogues about the results, so there would be plenty of opportunity for public dialogue and discussion. He explained the dilemma: The lab results are not yet examined by the STTF, and no one has seen the consultant's report, therefore difficulties with the data may yet have to be resolved. If this process happens in private—because the data does not go public until approved—then there may be the perception of privacy and back room dealings, which the CEWG wants to avoid. On the other hand if the meeting is public, it's tantamount to releasing the data prematurely before it's been vetted. He opened the floor for discussion,

- John Bartlit said he viewed openness more important than the information getting in to the public prematurely. Trust and openness was his priority. He suggested taking some steps to limit the dissemination of information, such as collecting all handouts at the meeting's end.
- Edward Pineda suggested dividing the meeting into portions. He said perhaps they could mark any documents as "preliminary" or "unapproved". He also agreed that openness was important. Lane Kirkpatrick said it was important to have a solid documentation trail behind all review discussions to counter any misinformation.
- Roberta King asked for clarification on the data and the people involved. Mike Williams said he received both the NIOSH and ERM reports. Sarah Chavez said Kurt Parker was with ERM in Colorado and was Intel's testing consultant. Bill Guyten was the ERM staff person who usually did the testing for Intel. Ms. King asked why the person who did testing was not the person conferring on the results. Thom Little said there were about 8 technicians from ERM involved in the testing, and since Kurt Parker was the senior staff person, he took the role of analyzing the results and then transmitting his information to Mike Williams. Then, NIOSH submitted the lab results to Peter Kowalski at ATSDR, who sent the results to Jim Tritten, who in turn sent the data to Mike Williams and to ERM.

- Sarah Chavez clarified that ATSDR received the lab data but not the corresponding field sampling data. They have only partial results. In order to come up with a valid report and analysis, you need both pieces of data. ATSDR only had one piece of data. Edward Pineda asked for clarification on ERM's report. Sarah Chavez said the ERM report to Mr. Williams was a compilation of all the field data collected at the time of the sampling.
- Jim Tritten clarified that there will be two reports. Both Mr. Williams and ERM were each writing a report. Then, Mr. Williams and ERM would work to merge their reports into one report to present to the STTF. When the STTF was satisfied with the merged report, then the STTF would take ownership of that report. He said the STTF would make sure that the report is written in a way that the average person could understand.
- John Bartlit said he would like to have an experiment in community dialogue, where all attendees would be on their word of honor to abide by the rules. Lane Kirkpatrick said that, under that scenario, the meeting would have to be properly facilitated and have enough time for discussion.
- Richard Elder commented that when a group had to come to consensus, inviting everyone into the process could become sloppy. He suggested inviting people to observe what went on in the meeting but not to participate directly. Trying to educate the public on all the technical data might be inviting a task that could not be achieved within a reasonable time frame. Roberta King said she liked the idea to mark the data as preliminary.
- John Bartlit said he believed that lay people who attended the open meeting would begin to trust the experts and their abilities and knowledge from just listening to the dialogue. Edward Pineda said that they should emphasize that the STTF operated according to Robert's Rules of Order rather than the open, consensus style of the CEWG.
- Edward Pineda asked how to handle the press. Roberta King said they should come and listen and learn.
- Lane Kirkpatrick said he liked the idea of inviting the public and having rules, but there had to be broader public dialogue on the topic. Thom Little suggested holding another meeting for full commentary from the public. Stephen Littlejohn reminded that according to the Citizen Protocol, the CEWG was obligated to hold public dialogues.
- Lynne Kinis said she and Roberta King attended the STTF meetings, where a lot of the information was technical, and they just sat and listened. She did not think it was a good idea to eliminate people from being present at the meeting. Roberta King said she saw a difference between inviting people and holding an open meeting.

- Edward Pineda said the task force was composed of technocrats and suggested inviting Roberta King and Lynne Kinis to join to have at least some members of the public on board. Jim Tritten said he was a member of the public, too. Stephen Littlejohn said the next stage was to decide what the STTF's role would be in the future.

Stephen Littlejohn tested consensus on the following proposal:

1. The meeting will be announced as public.
2. Those who are not members or consultants to the STTF will be in an observer role and will not provide comment.
3. Very clear context and guidance is set about the nature and purpose of the meeting and this is preliminary and not to be made public beyond those in the room until the final report is approved.
4. The drafts distributed will be marked "preliminary draft, not yet approved"
5. A document trail will be established and careful notes taken on what is said and done at the meeting.

CONSENSUS DECISION: The proposal was adopted by consensus.

EPA 114 FOLLOW-UP

Sarah Chavez provided an overview of the EPA 114 report. EPA region 6 sent a letter to Intel NM in Jan 2009 requesting documentation, and then followed up with an on-site inspection in Dec. 2009. In Oct. 2010 the EPA issued a 114-inspection report where they identified areas of non-compliance and concern at Intel. EPA and Intel met to discuss how Intel would proceed with addressing the identified areas of concern, and they agreed to first focus on scrubber removal efficiencies and testing. Each month Intel gave an update at the CEWG meetings on this process. Ms. Chavez reported that between February and March, Intel gave EPA a testing protocol, and then EPA requested more information. On March 3 Intel sent the EPA a draft test report that followed a specific procedure and included specific information. After EPA reviewed this draft, they would provide comments to Intel to finalize the testing plan. Ms. Chavez said the goal was to align with Intel's annual testing of scrubbers that took place in the second quarter.

- Ms. Chavez said an area of concern brought up in a CEWG meeting was to eliminate the BAC units from the permit. Intel used BAC units as a VOC abatement device in the mid-90s. Since they did not work well, Intel stopped using BAC units, however, they remained on the permit. In the technical permit revision meeting in January, Intel asked NMED to remove BAC unit-language from the permit. NMED issued the technical permit revision on 2/24/11 and had removed the BAC units from the permit.
- Lane Kirkpatrick asked to what degree were scrubbers part of the spikes, odors and fugitive emissions versus other sources of these emissions, and how did Intel deal with them. Sarah Chavez said odors did not get regulated, but Intel had an odor task force in the past to try to

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 3-16-11, v. 4
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: April 26, 2011

Approved: April 20, 2011

minimize odors. As far as any other types of emissions, Intel had scrubbers, thermal oxidizes and fugitive emissions sources, which were accounted for in reporting to the state. Scrubbers had redundancy, so there was not any downtime of unabated emissions. She said Intel was required to test scrubbers every year for 8 hours using FID, and they had been doing that for 10 years. Intel tested scrubbers at different times of the year at different times of the day. The scrubber system served the entire factory, and the bank of scrubbers operated as a system, so each scrubber was tested for 8 hours, leading to a longer period of time for testing. As a result, she said, Intel had a large amount of data and a good sense of what came out of the scrubbers. So far, they had not found anything of concern. For the EPA protocol, Intel recommended testing scrubbers for a longer period of time—2 to 4 weeks of testing. Mr. Kirkpatrick said he was trying to understand the spikes and exposures people experienced. Ms. Chavez responded that part of what Mr. Little did was to correlate downtime to neighbor complaints. She said they had not been able to find a direct correlation. Mike Williams said that they did find one correlation with Mercaptan. Thom Little said that since then they created a system to eliminate the odor from Mercaptan, including routing the air through carbon filters before it reached the scrubbers.

- Jami Grindatto asked what Mr. Kirkpatrick meant by spikes. Lane Kirkpatrick said a spike was a short burst not covered under the permit that had high VOCs concentration or potentially toxic emissions. Mr. Grindatto and Ms. Chavez said Intel did not have spikes. Mr. Little said that years of data over weeks at a time showed that Intel did not have spikes. He said when a Durrs went down and emissions were released unabated, he did not find a correlation of complaints. He collected all the complaints and call times and put this information in a database. Still, he could not find a correlation. Ms. Chavez said that Intel tested during downtimes over the years, and that data also was not conclusive.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked Ms. Chavez to clarify the EPA's concern. Ms. Chavez said the EPA had concerns around the frequency of monitoring the abatement equipment on a continuous basis.
- Lynne Kinis said Thom Little had reported a while back that had it not been for a neighbor calling so frequently with complaints, Intel would not have known that a damper was not shut. The resulting emissions affected a resident who called Intel to complain, which made Intel check more thoroughly. The person assigned to checking the equipment was reading a computer not knowing the computer was malfunctioning. Ms. Kinis said that Mr. Kirkpatrick and the community were concerned that there was insufficient monitoring backup. Thom Little recalled the event, which was around the raising the scrubber's pH to help reduce the Mercaptan odor. One of the units went below a recommended level, but the appropriate levels were not specified yet, so the technician did not question the level. The alarms were not set, and they had to go back and rethink how to address it. He said that the CEWG helped with that process.

- Lane Kirkpatrick suggested devoting time to educating the community and seeking the best understanding and continuous improvement so people can become more comfortable with living around the plant. He suggested looking at communication. He also said that the permit identified areas that weren't being addressed, and he wanted to make sure that these items were being looked at.
- Edward Pineda said that part of the solution was for Intel to accept the fact that spikes existed, and then knowing the systems of control Intel had in place to prevent the spikes. He defined a spike as an emission of short duration but high concentration that affects the health. Mr. Pineda said spikes needed to be studied more, and one of the reasons spikes existed was that Intel's permit was not enforceable enough.
- John Bartlit said to learn more about the EPA 114 report, people could reference Edward Pineda's article published in the *Corrales Comment*. Also, the CEWG had addressed spikes a number of times in the past, and these discussions could be found in past meeting summaries. He suggested reviewing the CEWG's past discussion of spikes first before starting another discussion again on spikes.

CEWG INVOLVEMENT IN SCRUBBER EFFICIENCY TESTING

Stephen Littlejohn asked how the CEWG members wanted to become involved in Intel's scrubber efficiency testing.

- Edward Pineda suggested sending witnesses to observe the testing as they had done with the silica testing. John Bartlit said Intel solicited the CEWG's participation in the testing. Thom Little said Intel thought that having observers during the silica testing added value to the testing process, and they wanted to try it again with scrubber testing. Thom Little and Sarah Chavez said they would take leadership with organizing the observers if there is an interest.

ACTION ITEM: Thom Little and Sarah Chavez will take leadership with organizing the observers during scrubber testing.

- John Bartlit asked if there was a specific EPA procedure test-method that Intel planned to follow. Sarah Chavez said the CEWG could have a copy of the entire test plan once it was approved by EPA. The test Intel proposed to use was EPA method 320, an FTIR method, which was listed in Intel's current permit. Edward Pineda asked if Intel needed NMED approval. Ms. Chavez said Intel did not necessarily need NMED approval since it was an EPA request, but Intel would work with NMED.

PERMIT REVISION

Stephen Littlejohn opened the floor for follow-up discussion on the permit revision meeting in

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 3-16-11, v. 4
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: April 26, 2011

Approved: April 20, 2011

February. He mentioned that Intel would have a second permit revision meeting, which would be facilitated, on March 28 from 6 pm to 8 pm at the Corrales Senior Center.

- Edward Pineda said he appreciated that Intel agreed to have a second meeting on the permit revision, and the first meeting showed that the community still had a lot of questions. He said that the first meeting was not a waste of time. He reminded that if anyone wanted NMED to consider their questions or concerns on the permit, they had to follow NMED's procedure for submitting comments, which was to write and send comments to the NMED.
- Lynne Kinis said she was very concerned and unhappy with the fact that because some Intel members could not attend the February CEWG meeting, it was cancelled two days before it was to occur. She said it was shades of the earlier task force, when NMED canceled the meeting two hours before it was to occur because they got results from a particular test that Intel was culpable in poisoning the neighbors. She said the CEWG meeting was the third Wednesday of every month, and there were other Intel personnel who could have represented the CEWG Intel members who could not attend the meeting. She said she did not appreciate that Intel ran the meeting. In the past, when two non-Intel people could not attend, the meeting was still held. She said the community came out in mass at the permit revision meeting and expressed themselves from their hearts, and the way to quell any forward motion was to cancel the CEWG meeting.
- Richard Elder said he changed personal plans to attend the February CEWG meeting, and was frustrated that it was canceled. He said that in his past work as an environmental manager, his company never cancelled a community meeting. When he attended the permit meeting, he was surprised at the community's opinion and reaction towards Intel. Showing up to a cancelled meeting helped him understand why the community was mad, because it didn't seem like Intel cared. He said an organization could tell people it cared but actions spoke a lot louder. He had written an email to someone on Intel's Web page expressing his frustration with the cancelled meeting and was disappointed to not get a response. This kind of behavior is not doing Intel any favors, he said.
- Turning to Lynne Kinis, Jami Grindatto said that "you were at the meeting, you did not help, and Eduardo you did not help, but there were some comments made at the meeting that were threatening" and Intel cancelled the meeting for the sake of safety. He said questions asked by some CEWG members and participants—questions that they already knew the answer to—created uncertainty in the other people, escalating the meeting to the point where threatening comments were made. He said he was disappointed because at past permit meetings Intel staff was able to discuss the permit. They never needed a facilitator nor did they need security. He said Intel would never hold a permit revision meeting without a facilitator again. He said that for the STTF meeting, the CEWG discussed having an open meeting and asking attendees to follow an honor code; he hoped everyone in the room would

follow that code, because clearly it did not work at the permit revision meeting.

- Andrea Zurawski said she thought the permit meeting was a participatory community open house meeting, and not a straight informative meeting. Jami Grindatto responded that she was right, and Intel would take the responsibility for not clearly communicating the nature of the meeting. He said having a facilitator might help in the future.
- Stephen Littlejohn said he could not attend the permit meeting, but in retrospect could see the process was not well designed. He said the meeting needed a process whereby Intel first explained the permit, and then the community could ask questions. Jami Grindatto apologized for not having a facilitator present to facilitate a good dialogue.
- Christine Steiner commented that it was her assumption that the CEWG could have met whether Intel attended or not, but it was the CEWG's decision to hold or not hold the meeting. Jami Grindatto said he asked Stephen Littlejohn to cancel the meeting. Stephen Littlejohn responded that he would have stood up for the group to meet if he was convinced it was a frivolous request. He said he took it as a request because the CEWG has repeatedly confirmed its desire to be independent from Intel. He also said he was convinced that the highest principle to follow was personal safety, and at first he was fairly resistant about canceling the meeting, but Mr. Grindatto convinced him that personal safety was an issue.
- Lynne Kinis asked Mr. Grindatto why she was partly to blame. Mr. Grindatto responded that he was disappointed that she had asked questions that were already answered in previous CEWG meetings. Ms. Kinis said she wanted to set the record straight, and that the new people present needed to know. Stephen Littlejohn said that lessons were learned from that meeting, and he would rather look forward than backward.
- Edward Pineda said he heard a comment at the meeting that could have been interpreted as a security threat, and it was understandable why the CEWG meeting was cancelled. He said that having many new community members attend the permit meeting reinforced the need for an informational meeting where neighbors could ask questions. Jami Grindatto agreed and emphasized Intel was ill prepared because past permit meetings were very different. He apologized for not handling the meeting well, and said he was committed to holding a better meeting in the future with a facilitator and a recorder who would produce a report for each meeting. Stephen Littlejohn said that he would not act as facilitator for Intel meetings since he served the CEWG and wanted to stay at arm's length from Intel.
- Lynne Kinis said a lesson learned was the need to have a meeting with open questions, where Intel would just be in a listening role. Roberta King said she was surprised to see so many new neighbors at the permit meeting, and she heard that they came because they received a

letter in the mail inviting them to attend and express their concern. She said many residents of Corrales were concerned about health issues, and came to see if there was a correlation with Intel and health issues. She wanted to know how it was determined who received letters. Jami Grindatto said Intel contracted Adelante, a nonprofit, to send the letters to everyone in Corrales and within a one-mile radius of Intel.

- Andrea Zurawski again asked about an increase in VOC emissions under the permit revision. Sarah Chavez responded that she did not know how the VOCs would exactly increase because production would vary, but Intel did not ask to increase the VOC emission limit in the permit for the site. Ms. Chavez said that Intel could add equipment without increasing the limit because Intel was always looking for ways to reduce emissions and energy use and add newer technologies. Even though their permit limits were established in 1994, that approach has allowed them to add more equipment and stay within the permit limits.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING

April 20, 2011, 5 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.

CONSENSUS DECISIONS:

Consensus was reached on the following parameters to use in the STTF meeting that discussed the crystalline silica testing results:

1. The meeting will be open to the public.
2. Those who are not members or consultants to the STTF will be in an observer role and will not provide comment.
3. Clear context and guidance is set on the purpose and nature of the meeting, and the information is preliminary and not to be made public until the final report was approved.
4. The drafts will be marked "preliminary draft, not yet approved"
5. A document trail will be established and careful notes taken on what is said and done at the meeting.

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 3-16-11, v. 4
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
Prepared for: CEWG
Date prepared or presented: April 26, 2011

Approved: April 20, 2011