

MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: June 15, 2011
Time: 5:00–7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Senior Center

Members Attending

Thom Little, Intel
 Mike Williams, NMCCAW
 Edward Pineda, resident of Rio Rancho

Hugh Church, American Lung Assoc.
 Sarah Chavez, Intel EHS
 John Bartlit, NMCCAW

Non-Members Attending

Roberta King, resident of Corrales
 Heath Foott, Intel EHS
 Frank Gallegos, Intel EHS

Jami Grindatto, Intel Corporate Affairs
 Bill Davidson, Intel Corporate Affairs

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

Ricky Hill, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary, May 18, 2011
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Reports
- This month’s newspaper ad
- Intel reports on EPA 114 follow-up process, scrubber removal efficiencies
- Draft cover letter for STTF report
- Draft FAQs
- Draft topics priority summary
- AP Story about Chandler, AZ from Jami

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 06-15-11, v. 4 Prepared or presented by: Ricky Hill & Stephen Littlejohn Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: July 28, 2011	Approved: 7-20-11
---	-------------------

PROPOSED AGENDA

- Working Group Mission
- Introductions
- Agenda—revisions and approval
- Meeting Summary—revisions and approval
- Update on STTF report
- Report on next-steps feedback
- Upcoming annual report
- Other announcements
- Public Comment
- STTF Test Report—Next Steps
- 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.

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

Stephen Littlejohn presented the agenda. Edward Pineda recommended that a brief summary of an event at Chandler AZ be addressed. Thom Little said that the summary of the Chandler event could be done early on in the meeting.

Meeting Summary (May 18, 2011)—Revisions and Approval

Roberta King corrected the spelling of Jane Dahlgren's name.

Summary of STTF Report Distribution to Date

Stephen Littlejohn said that he got an email from Jeff Radford with several comments about the report, but told Mr. Radford that these comments should be communicated to the CEWG. Edward Pineda suggested that any changes should be held until peer review of STTF report is done. Stephen Littlejohn noted that this was already on the agenda.

Annual Report

John Bartlit said that the annual report appears every July, and that this year a draft will be prepared and emailed out one week before the meeting. The draft of the report will be presented at the July meeting. Edward Pineda asked if the report is prepared by John Bartlit and Stephen Littlejohn. John Bartlit replied that the draft report will be prepared by the two of them. Edward Pineda suggested that there be a list of what is included in the annual report. John Bartlit replied that the annual report is meant to highlight group accomplishments, and can include both improvements in emissions and communication. Edward Pineda expressed concern about the annual report not giving due credit to individual members. Stephen Littlejohn said standard language would be included giving everyone credit for accomplishments.

ACTION ITEM: John Bartlit and Stephen Littlejohn will prepare and send out a draft annual

report prior to the next meeting.

Other Announcements/ Public Comment

Heath Foott said that he would be covering for Frank Gallegos as EHS manager at Intel while Frank is on sabbatical for two and a half months.

EHS REPORT

Thom Little said that construction cranes are currently noticeable, which is the construction of the Munters. Munters number two was taken offline because it had dropped below temperature due to clogged combustion air filter. John Bartlit asked if there was a redundant unit. Thom Little replied that yes, it tripped a bypass valve, and a downtime report was submitted for 1.25 hours. Two calls from neighbors were made. The wind was blowing from the west, from 291, at about 13 miles per hour. Thom Little received an email from this resident and worked with the engineers to see if there were any signs of equipment being down. He tried to work with this resident to see if they could characterize the odor. The resident could say what it was *not* like, but was not able to directly identify it. The second resident reported that they detected a burned coffee odor that was strong, but it didn't last. Thom Little said they went through the engineering parameters and went up on top of CUB building to see if they could detect anything. Nothing was detected.

- Edward Pineda asked for a list of abbreviations. Thom Little said that he provided a list of abbreviations that was contained within the Activity Report.
- Roberta King asked the location of the Munters unit that went offline. Thom Little said it was on the east side of the Fab building. Sarah Chavez responded that the location was West of the CUB building.
- Edward Pineda asked if the plot plan for the stacks was up to date. She said that it was included in the permit application.
- Thom Little noted that the Explore Intel.com website was live. He also said that the emission points with emission IDs are available on the website. He explained that numbers on the permit correspond to locations of the Munters stacks.
- John Bartlit said that the smoke from the Arizona fires caused spikes caused by air dispersion parameters. He would like to talk about this in addition to the general topic of air dispersion in general.

Thom Little yielded his time to Jami Grindatto to address the event at the Chandler Intel site. Jami Grindatto said that seven Intel employees were injured in the flash fire. Of the seven, three were treated on site and released. The other four were admitted to the hospital but released that

day. The cause for fire is still under investigation, but the Chandler Fire Department gave Intel a June 22nd due date for an incident report. Jami Grindatto stressed that safety is important and that Intel cares about employees being treated well and having their needs responded to.

- John Bartlit asked if petroleum based products were burned. Jami Grindatto replied that they were burned in a contained room, but the fire was extinguished before the fire department showed up.
- Mike Williams asked if it was a flash fire. Jami Grindatto replied it was both a fire and explosion. Edward Pineda said that he read something that the incident had been changed from a flash to explosion. Jami Grindatto said it would be characterized as one or the other based on the outcome of investigation.
- Thom Little asked if there were any other questions about the Chandler incident. Edward Pineda asked if an event like this could happen in Rio Rancho in the future. Jami Grindatto replied that industrial accidents can happen, but the Chandler site hasn't had an incident like this in 15 years. He said that safety concerns are at the front of Intel's attention. Four fire departments were dispatched to the site of the incident, and the response was almost overkill, but that all of the resources available are put out.
- Hugh Church asked when the Chandler incident happened. Jami Grindatto replied that the incident happened last Tuesday at 2pm. John Bartlit noted that the report would be complete by June 22nd.
- Edward Pineda acknowledged that the evacuation of the plant was a precaution, but wanted to know if it worked as Intel expected it to. Jami Grindatto replied that it did work, that Fab 22 and Fab 23 were both evacuated and that the room was still sealed.
- John Bartlit asked if it was hours or days before the FABS were back online. Jami Grindatto replied that they remained on during the evacuation.
- Roberta King asked if silane was in those rooms. Jami Grindatto said no.

ACTION ITEM: Thom said he would send out a revised plot plan to anyone who wanted one.

Munters Construction

Thom Little said this report was not disseminated to CEWG in advance because he just got the updated information today. Stephen will distribute it later. June 2011 was supposed to be the completed construction timeline, but Intel experienced over 170 hours of delay due primarily to wind. The community is most interested in when the units will be ready. They will all be turned

on and operational by July 12th.

Beyond weather, there were also design issues related to the Munters having to be attached to existing structures. The south Munters were using existing structures, so the design work took longer to adapt. Duct routing required special steel and lifts because the roofs had to be penetrated by bolts. Thom Little said that the construction had to ensure that the Fabs weren't penetrated and that reinforcement of areas for taller stacks had to be secure.

- John Bartlit asked if the construction company would be working 24 hours a day if it wasn't for wind, etc. Thom Little said no, but that the crew starts at 7am. Intel can't hold them on-site and wait for wind to die down.
- John Bartlit asked if this was both the stacks and RTOs. Thom Little said yes. He said that up until today, this only affected the eastern stacks, but that because of safety issues that need to be worked through, such as size of crane, velocity of air to avoid bypass, all stacks were impacted. Thom Little noted that on July 12th there will be redundancy, and the three original stacks will be at 30 meters. He will have a solid data to give the group by the end of this week.
- John Bartlit asked if there was anything useful the group could do to get data from the stacks. Sarah Chavez asked what kind of data that would be. John Bartlit replied that he didn't know. Mike Williams said it would be difficult to collect ambient data. Edward Pineda said that all data must be tested, per the contract. Thom Little noted that testing quarter starts on July 13th, and that the Munters testing schedule is being modified to look at the raised stacks first.
- Edward Pineda said the unit can't be fired while the stacks are under construction. Sarah Chavez and Thom Little both confirmed that this is true.
- Edward Pineda asked if the increase from 30 to 40 meters required reinforcement. Thom Little said yes.
- Mike Williams said that ambient testing requires extensive monitoring, and that the CEWG isn't set up to do that.
- Roberta King asked if Munters 1,2,3 were on the west. Thom Little and Sarah Chavez confirmed that they are west of the CUB. Roberta King asked if they were the ones in the past who had computer glitches in the drafts opening and closing. Thom Little said that there was a prior report of an improperly entered code which caused the bypass to open twice when it wasn't supposed to. Roberta King asked if the new ones at 40 meters were the ones that were being discussed about being functional on the 12th. Thom confirmed

that these were the ones in question, and that all seven would be functional on July 12th.

- John Bartlit asked if all the Durr units are still functional. Sarah Chavez said they would be offline by the 12th.

EPA 114

Sarah Chavez said that on June 2nd an updated draft test plan was submitted. A couple of months ago a draft test plan was submitted, and that it was updated per EPA's request. The EPA is currently in the review process, and Sarah is hoping to have a meeting before Frank Gallegos goes on sabbatical so they can hash items out.

- John Bartlit said there is still a question of whether community members would be observing these tests. Stephen Littlejohn noted that the Group has not yet talked about how to do this. Edward Pineda volunteered to witness the tests. Thom Little and Sarah Chavez said that they haven't scheduled anything because there isn't a date set for testing. Stephen Littlejohn asked that once a date and method were determined, if CEWG members could work out a protocol for observing. Sarah Chavez replied that two weeks of testing on each of the factories would happen, between 6 to 8 weeks, and that 24 hour a day overnight testing would occur. Different times for observations could be arranged.
- John Bartlit asked if NMED would observe. Sarah Chavez said she didn't know because it wasn't their request; it was the EPAs. Edward Pineda said that the STTF needed to be activated. Sarah Chavez said that prior to the silica sampling, the STTF had an educational session about the type of testing and equipment used, and that this was an important part of the process. Thom Little said that a field trip before the testing would be important as well, to show how data is collected and processed so that people truly understand what is going on. It may not need to have a specific committee reengaged, procedures might not need to be modified, but would allow times to be decided upon. Thom Little said that his only concern is safety and proprietary information that may be present on the site. Stephen Littlejohn said he is hearing general agreement about having a similar process for the scrubber testing and suggested that Thom Little bring in a proposal for this process.
- John Bartlit asked if ATSDR knows about the scrubber testing. Frank Gallegos said that he didn't know. John Bartlit noted that the separation of agencies is troubling. Frank Gallegos said that ATSDR is aware of the EPA report. John Bartlit suggested that Intel let Peter Kowalski (ATSDR) know that this testing will be going on.

CONSENSUS: Without objection, the CEWG agreed that an observation process similar to the STTF observations be used on scrubber testing and that Thom will present a proposal about how this will work.

ACTION ITEM: Thom Little said that he will work with Frank Gallegos to inform the ATSDR that the scrubber testing will occur.

ACTION ITEM: Thom Little will draft a proposal for scrubber-testing observations.

STTF Report—Next Steps

ATSDR Peer Review

John Bartlit presented a proposal that next steps be postponed pending completion of the ATSDR peer review of the STTF report. This review would provide more data and information on which to base further action, information that is far removed from New Mexico politics and geography. He suggested as well that maybe comments/concerns/questions that have been brought up within CEWG can be sent to the review board, so that the panel can be aware of the concerns within the community.

- Thom Little said that by sharing the FAQs and comments, the review board could use their report to answer any of the questions the community may have. John Bartlit said that if we can get them to, just have the board review the information. Stephen Littlejohn asked if John Bartlit had an idea of how this would work. John Bartlit replied that FAQs were a good starting point, that they are already receiving the emails and they should ask what the reviewers would like from the working group. John Bartlit said he wants to put as many questions out there and get as many answers as possible.
- Edward Pineda said that there should be a division between answering Fred Marsh and Marcy Brandenburg's concerns. Fred Marsh is a scientist and knows his stuff, and Marcy though not a scientist has a community perspective. ATSDR should be used for technical information, but not political information. The FAQs need to be more complete, factual, and realistic. Community has some questions that are not very favorable to the current FAQs that are out there. Edward Pineda said that FAQs can often be viewed as a way for companies to avoid responding to a community.
- Mike Williams said the CEWG should only wait for ATSDR to comment until a certain point perhaps six months, and then if we haven't heard anything, go from there. John Bartlit proposed letting ATSDR know if that is what is decided.
- Thom Little agreed, saying six months sounds reasonable to wait, but the FAQ is the first time this conversation is being taken up and is a dynamic document. As questions pop up, they should be included and responded to. It is a living, breathing document and can be added to over time, as long as the first draft has consensus over the content.

Stephen Littlejohn asked if anyone objects to sending comments and critique to the ATSDR. Edward Pineda said the group should send it piecemeal, as comments come in. Stephen Littlejohn asked the group how they thought it should be done. Thom Little said it might be best sent from Stephen Littlejohn, as the facilitator. John Bartlit said that the group should propose this action. Stephen Littlejohn agreed and said he would ask and respond accordingly.

Consensus: Without objection, the Group agreed that next steps are delayed until ATSDR peer review is complete. If this takes more than 6 months, the Group may decide to discuss the issue again.

Consensus: Without objection, the Group will ask the ATSDR if they wish to receive community comments and concerns as part of the peer review process, and if so to send these to Peter Kowalski.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will contact Peter Kowalski.

STTF Report Cover Letter

Thom Little said that the draft cover letter provides a summary of what is contained in the 500+ page report. The letter would allow a reader to see the major findings in a short bullet list. Thom Little summarized the draft. (See draft letter.) The basic point is that the crystalline silica levels are well below any provisional level that would indicate health hazards.

- Edward Pineda said he wanted Mike Williams to address the points because he was the lead author. Mr. Williams explained that the provisional levels within the report were dealing with protective levels that outline the effects on miners and were considered safe levels, or a level at or above which additional examination would have been warranted.
- Edward Pineda said that the last bullet says “crystalline silica health hazard,” and asked if that was correct. Mike Williams said yes.
- Thom Little said that anyone who looks at Appendix G in the report can see what production levels and HMDS levels were before, during, and after this test was conducted. John Bartlit said that a lot of these bullets were due to Edward Pineda’s input.
- Edward Pineda proposed another footnote. Before people read the report, they will read this cover letter. Edward Pineda said that a footnote dealing with acronyms should be included in the report. Stephen Littlejohn said that this could go right after ATSDR in the first line, and it would say “refer to list of acronyms in the report.”

Roberta King asked if this letter is accompanying the large report. Stephen Littlejohn said it would be the very first page of the body of the report. Sarah Chavez noted that the full report is

the body of the report plus appendices. She suggested that the cover letter would accompany both.

Edward said that the reference to the STTF should say the “full STTF.”

Consensus: Without objection, the letter was approved with noted changes.

Roberta King had a question about signatures. Stephen Littlejohn replied that the cover letter would be signed only by the CEWG. The report itself is signed by the members of the STTF. Thom Little suggested that this be clarified in the signature on the cover letter.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will revised the cover letter and send to the Group.

Frequently Asked Questions

Stephen Littlejohn proposed that Group discuss the draft FAQs page by page.

- Mike Williams said there was only one reference within the document to the temperature at which crystalline silica is formed. Thom Little said a citation is needed to reference the formation for crystalline silica from lower temperatures, which was found in a specific paper. John Bartlit said the ATSDR draft report could be referenced as well. Thom Little said that the ATSDR report referenced the same number as the previously mentioned paper. Edward Pineda said that the complete title of ATSDR’s report should be referenced. Hugh Church then asked what the issue of crystalline silica being created directly was. Mike Williams said that the important thing is how much was found and at what temperatures, and the report doesn’t clarify. He said that they are looking to see if crystalline silica was found at all, but not if it went through amorphous first. Thom Little said that the key take away from Fred’s comments is that the report needs to cite that crystalline silica can form independent from amorphous silica, and lower than temperatures that NIOSH has published.
- Edward Pineda said that the group needs to be careful not to jump the gun, and that changes can still happen after the ATSDR peer review is received. He noted that the FAQs are important here to address the Marsh and Brandenburg emails.
- Thom Little said that when he looks at these FAQ documents as something to add to, and they can be modified. Nothing is set in stone and if answers can be modified, or questions can be added.
- Mike Williams said he had a problem with number 11, because a lot of it was written from sampling items that he didn’t have a lot to do with. Thom Little said that the information specifically notes that it is made from sampling data. John Bartlit noted that

this point could be made more clear. Mike Williams said that it reads like the report was written by him, but this isn't entirely true. John Bartlit said that the analysis that Mike Williams did in this report was already laid out and agreed to before it was even written. Thom Little asked if Mike Williams would feel okay about rewriting this analysis. Mike Williams said that he would be glad to do that. John Bartlit asked if NIOSH knew how the data was going to be analyzed, reported, and disseminated. Thom Little said yes. Mike Williams said that equations and calculations were agreed upon beforehand.

- Jami Grindatto suggested that leading with the process and how the report was written was a good structuring technique. Hugh Church asked who the consolidator of the report was. Thom Little said that presenting *how* the report was written is a way of clarifying this information, as well as clarifying *who* the report was reviewed by.
- Jami Grindatto had two recommendations. First, the paragraph doesn't need to be rewritten, it only needs to refer to other sections in a report. It should highlight the process, but leave details to the report. Second, yes/no questions could be reframed as how/why questions. Edward Pineda said that it was important to highlight the fact that Intel did not have access to this information. John Bartlit said that a lot of time was sent on making sure that the testing results did not affect the sampling results. Thom Little suggested looking at number nine, saying "how were" instead of "were." Sarah Chavez suggested item number seven, "how did" instead of "did."
- Edward Pineda said that words in STTF should be capitalized. John Bartlit said the number of years on question 13 needs to be filled in. John Bartlit asked if Rosa Key-Schwartz should have a title. Thom Little said she is a PhD, so that should be added. Thom Little said that number 17 needed clarification, but didn't remember what he was wanting to clarify. Sarah Chavez said that it was something about a permit that needed to clarification, but she didn't remember the exact wording. Thom Little said he would submit those clarifications.
- Edward Pineda said that Fred Marsh's comments might be worth looking into related to the terms "purchased" and "used" in regard to HMDS. Thom Little said that there is a parenthetical statement he has that can help clarify that point.
- John Bartlit read a new FAQ dealing with the fact that amorphous silica was not tested directly. Because of the material in the filter, what is usually done was not done in the process. Mike Williams said that because the filter was glass, it essentially is amorphous silica and can't be tested. Edward Pineda asked if there was a difference between testing and analysis. Stephen Littlejohn said that it was more the difference between *sampling* and analysis, than *testing* and analysis.

- John Bartlit said that instead of the testing, NIOSH recommended weighing each of the filters to see what kind of particulate was on it. Hugh Church asked if each filter was weighed before. Mike Williams and Thom Little both said yes. Sarah Chavez said that this amorphous silica can be estimated through particulate, and this should be noted immediately so it is not lost in the information of the report. Edward Pineda asked if the group knew there was amorphous silica to begin with. Thom Little said yes, it was always assumed.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if there were any more added items. Thom Little asked if the process was to send edited items to Stephen Littlejohn. Stephen Littlejohn said yes, that he would compile the edits/changes and send them out.
- Edward Pineda suggested working on another draft, distributing it, and asking for feedback from the larger mailing list. Sarah Chavez said a note should be made about the fact that it is a document up for edits. Thom Little agreed with this idea, and that next time the document could be approved as ready to post on the website.
- Stephen Littlejohn said that the next draft would be submitted for approval for publication.
- Roberta King said that the footer needs to be changed so that it has the proper version number on it, and that the file number on the attachment be corrected. Stephen Littlejohn said that he would correct it.

ACTION ITEM: Mike Williams will revise this draft based on input from others.

Topics Rating

Stephen Littlejohn explained the list of topics and asked the Group to discuss these. He said that he would be sending out a list to rate for priority.

- John Bartlit said that a topic that hasn't been discussed recently is budget and communication, or how to use our money for improved public communication in trying to reach more people, more cheaply, faster and more flexibly. Thom Little said that CEWG needs to be doing Facebook and Twitter. If you want concerned citizens to look, you can attach your Facebook link to other sites and drive traffic to your site. If a person is on an Intel site, they can be directed to the CEWG site. Thom Little said that Facebook works as a good place to dump links. Fifty to one hundred dollars can be used to advertise to all people in Albuquerque's Facebook, so they know what is going on. The initial startup is free, and the reach is dependent upon how much money you want to spend. The past year has been monumental in accomplishment and the more people who

can hear about it the better.

- Edward Pineda agrees that it will be good, modern and productive, but asked Jami Grindatto to increase the budget to cover these costs. Edward Pineda asked if Stephen Littlejohn knew if the group's budget was being spent entirely. Stephen Littlejohn said that if this topic surfaces as high priority, then it can be discussed in more detail. Jami Grindatto said that he was open for increasing budget with justification and that the startup costs are relatively low to no cost.
- Stephen Littlejohn said he priced out a website for about \$320 a year on Squarespace, and the website should be lumped together as public communication along with Facebook, Twitter, and print advertisements.
- John Bartlit said that spikes should be discussed. These are changes in emissions or differences in air dispersion parameters. He said that Lane Kirkpatrick has raised the issues of spikes again, and that the air dispersion has not been discussed in detail, and that it should happen. John Bartlit suggested that Mike Williams make calculations about variability in air dispersion to show what causes in spikes. John Bartlit proposes that Mike Williams could make generalized calculations on the impact of ground level concentrations.
- Stephen Littlejohn said that his panel on lung disease needs to be ranked among the other topics. Hugh Church said that he talked to Donna Upson, she didn't say "no" to being part of the panel.
- Thom Little noted that hydrogen fluoride (HF) should be brought up, asked if it had a ranking.
- Stephen Littlejohn said he would send a form with all of the topics with a place to rate them high, medium, or low priority and then compile the results. Stephen Littlejohn said that he would have a comment box on the form.
- Thom Little asked if there was interest in emergency preparedness and response. Edward Pineda said yes, especially considering what happened in Chandler. Sarah Chavez said there was community complaint, but that is not the same thing. Stephen Littlejohn asked if the group should talk about the Chandler incident, Jami Grindatto said it wasn't a bad idea to look over the report. Edward Pineda noted that emergency response has been done in the past, Stephen Littlejohn said it has been done twice already.
- John Bartlit said that there is a disparity in how much various topics have been talked

about in the past. Sarah Chavez said that the topic index is a good reference point to see how much discussion and information has already occurred. Thom Little said that ideas might come from the topic index.

Stephen Littlejohn said that he is going out of town on June 20th and back on July 2nd, but he would be available via email and business would not be interrupted. He said things might be a bit later than usual, but everything would get done.

Announcement: Thom Little said that June 28th had an opportunity to present to the Corrales council, and a request for someone from CEWG to come speak from 6:30-7:00. John said that he would be happy to do it.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, July 20, 2011

DECISIONS:

1. An observation process similar to the STTF observations will be used on scrubber testing. Thom will present a proposal for doing it.
2. Next steps on the STTF Report will be delayed until the ATSDR peer review is complete. If this takes more than 6 months, the Group may decide to discuss the issue again.
3. Ask the ATSDR if they wish to receive community comments and concerns as part of the peer review process, and if so send these to Peter Kowalski.
4. The cover letter to the STTF report was approved with changes.