

MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: July 20, 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. in NM
 Edward Pineda, Rio Rancho resident

Non-Members Attending

Roberta King, Corrales resident
 Brad Buck, *Rio Rancho Observer*

Bill Davidson, Intel
 Heath Foott, Intel
 Brian Rashap, Intel

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary June 15, 2011
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- July Newspaper Ad
- Draft Short Report to the Community
- Intel report on EPA 114 follow-up process
- Revised draft FAQs
- Topics priority survey
- Draft letter to EPA
- Media reports and articles, as available
- STTF Chair Presentation to Village Council

PROPOSED AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items
- EHS Report
- Annual Report
- Silica FAQs
- EPA 114 Update
- Topic Priorities
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_07-20-11-1, v. 3, v. 3

Approved: 8-17-11

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 21, 2011

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 asked to add two new items for discussion onto the evening's agenda: 1. A short letter from CEWG to the EPA; and 2. CEWG approval for Jim Tritten to present to civic groups on the Silica Testing Task Force (STTF) results. The group agreed to the additions.

Meeting Summary (June 20, 2011)—Revisions and Approval

Edward Pineda said he was referred to only as a resident on the June Meeting Summary, and it should read "Resident of Rio Rancho." Stephen Littlejohn said he would make the change on the June Meeting Summary.

Silica Testing Report at Corrales Village Council on July 19, 2011

John Bartlit said that he attended Jim Tritten's STTF presentation to the Corrales Village Council. The presentation was supposed to be 30 minutes but was shortened to 10 minutes. Mr. Bartlit said he was asked by Mayor Gasteyer to comment on how the CEWG approved and released the report, and he spoke for about a minute and a half. No one asked questions. Copies of the presentation slides were handed out to attendees, Mr. Bartlit reported.

RTO Redundancy Status Report and Possible Field Trip

Thom Little announced that full redundancy was achieved on Intel's site on July 12. In addition, all the 7 Munters units were installed with 40 meter stacks and were 100% operational. All the Durrs units had been removed from operation. Mr. Little acknowledged that the CEWG drove the changes and pushed Intel to raise the stacks to 40 meters. He offered a field trip to Intel to view the changes, and asked the group to propose a date for the field trip. He was uncertain about the maximum number of people that could attend the field trip. John Bartlit thanked Intel for the progress.

Other Announcements/ Public Comment

Thom Little introduced Brian Rashap, Intel's new Corporate Services Site Manager. He said that Mr. Rashap had replaced John Painter, who relocated to Oregon in December 2010. Mr. Rashap reported on his background. He said had been with Intel for 16 years, with 15 of those years spent in New Mexico and one year in Oregon. He worked previously as manager on the engineering and production teams.

Edward Pineda said he saw in the paper a notice for a new permit revision at Intel and asked why the CEWG did not receive advance notice of this revision. Sarah Chavez responded that she forgot to give advance notice to CEWG and apologized to the group. She said Intel sent a permit

modification at the end of June regarding the ammonia treatment system, which was used to remove ammonia from the wastewater before it was sent to the Albuquerque treatment center. When the ammonia was removed, Ms. Chavez said, it generated ammonia emissions in addition to the NOCS and CO emissions. The unit was permitted a couple years ago but only installed this year. Intel learned that they needed to adjust the operating temperature to make it more efficient and to further reduce emissions. Because the temperature was written into the permit, they had to modify the permit to include the new temperature range. She emphasized that the only change Intel was seeking was to the line: “The system must operate at xx temperature.”

Roberta King said the permit revision was posted in the lobby of the Village Office. Sarah Chavez said they did not post the notice since it was not required for this kind of permit. She continued that the agency used the same template for all notices so it may have been the notice from a previous permit revision. NMED required that the technical permit revision notice be placed in two places in the newspaper, but that for this particular technical permit revision, Intel did not need to post it, Ms. Chavez said. Also, the Village of Corrales, municipalities, counties, and tribes received a notice of the permit revision, for a total of 8 local government agencies.

EHS REPORT

Thom Little reviewed the EHS Report. On June 11, he said, a Durr unit went into bypass for 8 hours due to a flame detector fault. Next there were planned downtimes with the three original Munters units to raise their stacks an extra 10 meters. Rather than shutting down all three units at the same time, Mr. Little said Intel alternated downtime to allow for continual abatement. Two units operated while one was shut down, which meant that the system remained in redundant mode.

Edward Pineda recommended saying “increased stack heights” on the EHS Report, and Roberta King suggested saying, “increased stack heights to 40 meters.” Thom Little agreed to make the change. Stephen Littlejohn said he would distribute the revised EHS Report to the group.

- ACTION ITEMS:**
1. Thom Little will change the EHS report to read, “increased stack heights to 40 meters”.
 2. Stephen Littlejohn will distribute the revised EHS Report to the group.

Thom Little reported that on June 16th, Intel received a complaint about a “skunky odor” at 3:30 am; however, the call was not made until 2:00 pm the next day, so Mr. Little was only able to check historical systems data, which showed that the system was operating according to specifications. On July 8, a neighbor phoned complaining about a tar odor. Mr. Little said he drove to the neighborhood to investigate and found a nearby neighbor was hot tarring his roof.

Roberta King asked why the reports listed under the “Monitoring Underway or Completed This

Month” section were not also sent to EPA Region 6 in addition to NMED. Mr. Little responded that the listed tests were done quarterly and were part of the permit requirement. He said that EPA did not request these test results. Sarah Chavez added that part of the initial EPA request was for Intel to send stack testing; they had never asked them to continue to send current testing data. She said she or Heath Foott would contact the EPA to ask if they would like Intel to send them current testing data.

ACTION ITEM: Sarah Chavez or Heath Foott will contact the EPA to ask if they would like Intel to send current testing data.

PRESENTATIONS TO CIVIC GROUPS

Stephen Littlejohn explained that Jim Tritten was seeking the CEWG’s approval to make presentations about the STTF to civic groups in Corrales, such as the Kiwanis. A copy of his PowerPoint presentation was included in the handouts for review. Mr. Littlejohn asked the group to review the presentation later, but to approve Mr. Tritten’s request in principle. Suggested changes to the presentation could be communicated directly to Mr. Tritten or to Mr. Littlejohn. Mr. Tritten would then send revised versions of the presentation to the CEWG for review.

John Bartlit thought it was a good idea and said he would ask to add a comment about the CEWG’s work not ending with the testing but would continue to push for environmental improvements. Bill Davidson suggested including in the presentation information about how the CEWG received the report from the STTF and distributed it to the public.

Robert King asked why Mr. Tritten needed to get the CEWG’s permission to present to civic groups, and she also wanted to know who initiated the presentations. Stephen Littlejohn responded that Mr. Tritten wanted to give these presentations, and he would ask Mr. Tritten to inform the CEWG about when he gives a presentation and to whom. Mike Williams added that he appreciated Mr. Tritten’s efforts to expand the distribution of information. Some CEWG members encouraged Mr. Tritten to make presentations beyond Corrales. Thom Little added that a core value of the CEWG was to improve and widen dialogue, and Mr. Tritten’s efforts were along that line.

CONSENSUS: CEWG members approved in principle and appreciated Mr. Tritten’s efforts to widen the dialogue and present to civic groups STTF report. CEWG members will send any content suggestions directly to Mr. Tritten, and we will ask him to send us any changes he makes for our information.

ANNUAL REPORT

John Bartlit said the CEWG Short Report to the Community was written every year in July. He and Mr. Littlejohn made a list of group accomplishments for the year with a focus on the CEWG

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_07-20-11-1, v. 3, v. 3

Approved: 8-17-11

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 21, 2011

mission. The report followed a similar format from year to year, and they tried to keep it to one page. Mr. Bartlit then read through the highlights of the report, including raising the stack heights; reaching redundancy; silica testing; and the EPA 114 letter. The following suggestions were made under the heading “Environmental Improvements”:

- Edward Pineda suggested adding “ongoing” to bullet 4 of the EPA 114 letter.
- Hugh Church suggested adding the following to the end of bullet 3: “..., during the four test dates”
- Roberta King suggested adding in the number of Munters units to bullet 1: “4 new Munters RTOs....”
- Thom Little added in parentheses after “...elimination of older Durr units (that lacked redundancy)”
- Second bullet as follows: “Completed raising the height of stacks from 30 meters to 40 meters on 7 Munters units”

Under the heading “Communication and Process Actions”

- John Bartlit said they forgot to list one of the major accomplishments, preparing the 500-page STTF report. The report would be peer-reviewed by the ATSDR and national experts. This point would be added as a fifth bullet.

Stephen Littlejohn said he would revise the document and send it out via e-mail and get a quick approval at next meeting.

CONSENSUS: The group agreed to the suggested draft revisions.

ACTION ITEM: Mr. Littlejohn will revise the draft and email it to the group for their review. Mr. Littlejohn will also ensure the report’s footer has the correct dates in a consistent format.

SILICA FAQs

The group provided the following comment on the draft STTF FAQs handout. A general overall comment was to make sure that the items were numbered correctly.

Page 1:

Number 3: Mike Williams said that amorphous silica was not measured by the STTF. Total particulates were measured, and particulates were assumed to be amorphous silica rather than crystalline silica. Sarah Chavez said the question was relevant to the testing done for crystalline silica. John Bartlit said they had to explain what was done. Stephen Littlejohn asked for a volunteer to rewrite this item. Thom Little volunteered and said he would add a new bullet: “How were emissions of crystalline silica measured in the silica testing project?” Next he would

rewrite the FAQ on amorphous silica. John Bartlit suggested using the word “determined” rather than “measured”. Mike Williams suggested “bounded” since they knew an upper limit.

ACTION ITEM: Thom Little will rewrite Page 1, Item 3: “How were the emissions of amorphous silica measured in the silica testing project?”

Page 2:

Number 4: Sarah Chavez made the following editorial comment: Take out “degree” to make it consistent throughout the item. Use “F” instead.

Number 5: John Bartlit said this item reflected only one answer, and an additional aspect of it was the particulate on the filters, which was not addressed. Mr. Bartlit volunteered to expand this item to include his comment.

ACTION ITEM: John Bartlit will expand Item 5.

Page 3:

Regarding the paragraph on the top of Page 3, Edward Pineda suggested adding “within specified limits” to the second sentence to read: “...maintain hourly average temperatures within specified limits for each unit.”

Number 11: This item was replaced with text written by Mike Williams that addressed how the testing was performed and the process in which the STTF report was written. Sarah Chavez asked to add a new bullet to the end saying that the report was reviewed by the STTF and then sent to the CEWG where it was approved. John Bartlit commented that it should state in the introductory paragraph that the bulleted actions were done “in chronological order.”

Number 10: Mike Williams said he was the only person considered to be a “community consultant.” Edward Pineda said the report talked about “two consultants,” and suggested that someone verify that there was no contradiction between the FAQs and the report. Stephen Littlejohn suggested adding the following for clarity: “A draft was then given to the STTF...”

Roberta King said that the community had been expressing the concern that ERM was an Intel contractor. Their distrust was due to “the fact that it sounded like nobody who had anything to do with Intel knew anything about the report until after the community consultant” reviewed it. She said that was not what she had read in the report. Mike Williams clarified that ERM got the lab results at the same time he did, and Mr. Williams wrote his analysis on the results and gave them to Mr. Parker and Mr. Tritten. John Bartlit reminded that Mr. Parker was told not to give the analytical reports to Intel until after the STTF reviewed and approved the report.

Sarah Chavez suggested clarifying that ERM received the information. Stephen Littlejohn said

he would add the following: “Intel contractor ERM received the information, but Intel did not until after it was approved by the CEWG.”

Page 4:

Number 13: Fill in the correct number of years where it says “xx years”.

Number 15: Add a period at the end of the sentence.

Number 16: Sarah Chavez suggested adding a sentence about the test being designed so that the collection time was long enough to ensure collection of an adequate sample. Mike Williams said to clarify about the CEWG provisional level. Ms. Chavez said the main point of her comment was to acknowledge sampling time.

ACTION ITEM: Sarah Chavez will rework number 16.

Stephen Littlejohn said he would make the suggested revisions and send it out to the group for review, and reminded the group that it was an ongoing document that would be constantly added to and reworked.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will revise the FAQs as per the suggestions and send it out via email for review.

EPA 114 UPDATE

Sarah Chavez said Intel had a phone meeting with the EPA’s Debbie Ford on June 24 to ask the status on the revised test plan Intel had submitted on June 2. The EPA said they had not yet reviewed the plan but would contact Intel when the review was completed. Edward Pineda asked why the CEWG was not more involved in this process and more informed on the basics of Intel’s proposed testing. Ms. Chavez said that Intel did not change the basic premise of its plan since the initial letter from the EPA in November 2010. The test on the scrubbers would be a standard EPA test, and EPA requested that Intel provide more information on their test plan. The EPA prescribed to Intel the testing format, and Intel had to submit a test plan according to the EPA’s specifications, Ms. Chavez said. The EPA would approve a test plan when they were satisfied that the plan met their specifications. Ms. Chavez said she did not see room for CEWG participation at this point; once a test plan was approved and implemented, then the CEWG would serve as witnesses to the testing, as discussed previously.

Mr. Pineda asked that Intel provide the CEWG with the basic principles of the test plan once it was approved. Thom Little reminded the group that at the meeting in November, they agreed the CEWG would not be involved in the process but would receive monthly updates instead and serve as witnesses when the actual testing took place. Stephen Littlejohn added that since EPA 114 was on the agenda monthly, the group would learn when the test plan was approved.

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_07-20-11-1, v. 3, v. 3

Approved: 8-17-11

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 21, 2011

Roberta King said, in regards to transparency, she would like to know the specifics of what the EPA was asking Intel to do with the testing. She said there seemed to be a discrepancy, and the information should be available for people to see that discrepancy. Sarah Chavez replied that there was not a discrepancy but the EPA asked Intel to provide additional information. She believed copies of the scrubber and response letters—which comprised all the written documentation on the issue—were already provided to the CEWG. Stephen Littlejohn said he would check previous meeting handouts.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will check previous meeting summaries to learn if copies of the scrubber and response letters between Intel and the EPA were distributed to the CEWG.

Edward Pineda requested that when the time came for the CEWG to serve as witnesses to the testing, Intel give an orientation or training on the testing details. Sarah Chavez confirmed that was the intent. John Bartlit said that the EPA 114 and follow up testing issue was discussed in detail by the CEWG previously, and details of the discussions could be found in past meeting summaries. He also reminded that community members had stressed that EPA 114 was an issue between Intel and the EPA, and the CEWG's involvement was unwarranted. He said the CEWG should not reinvent past agreements. Stephen Littlejohn confirmed Mr. Bartlit's point and reminded everyone that the monthly updates were the compromise. Thom Little said once a test plan was solidified, then witnesses would be educated on the test process.

Draft Letter to the EPA

Stephen Littlejohn asked the group to approve a draft letter from CEWG to EPA asking them to send a progress report on the Intel issue. Edward Pineda suggested that the letter express some sentiment of appreciation at the EPA's efforts. Roberta King said that the last sentence in the second paragraph seemed misplaced. Stephen Littlejohn suggested moving this sentence up to become the second sentence in the paragraph. Hugh Church suggested deleting the word "Rio Rancho." The revised paragraph read as follows:

"We are very much aware of the EPA 114 process taking place at Intel. Residents who live near the Intel plan appreciate these concerns and actions by the EPA.

We are writing now to see if you might be able to send us a brief progress report.

Thank you for your consideration."

CONSENSUS: The CEWG approved the letter to the EPA with the above changes.

TOPICS PRIORITIES

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_07-20-11-1, v. 3, v. 3

Approved: 8-17-11

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 21, 2011

Stephen Littlejohn referred to the handout “Topics Priority Analysis”. He said only 4 people responded to his call to ranking the topics. He reminded that a ranking of “1” was the lowest, while a ranking of “3” was the highest. Edward Pineda said naming the groups “1, 2, and 3” on the handout was confusing since the ranking groups were named “1, 2, 3”, and Group 1 had the topics that received the highest ranking of “3”. Stephen Littlejohn renamed the groups listed in the handout as “A, B, and C.”

Mr. Littlejohn asked if anyone objected to the topics listed in Group C on the handout. Edward Pineda wanted to move bullet 4, “Community complaint process”, and bullet 13, “Toxicology” to Group A. Mr. Littlejohn asked if anyone objected to moving “Community complaint process” to Group A. John Bartlit said if there were ideas or proposals to talk about, he would advocate moving an item to Group A. He did not want to reiterate old topics unless there was something new to discuss. Mr. Pineda said his problem with issues that were already discussed was that they were not resolved. Mr. Bartlit said change the bullet to “Create new proposals...” Thom Little said to “tell me what’s broken. The people who use the system get immediate response.”

Stephen Littlejohn suggested a bullet reading “New ideas and proposals regarding....”, about items that have already been discussed. Several group members suggested adding a subsection under Group A with the above qualification and moving the two bullets from C there. Mr. Littlejohn suggested the following category to list under Group A: “New ideas and proposals regarding items now in Group C.”

Sarah Chavez said that Group A was “priority”, meaning this was where the group was going to spend its time and effort. She asked if this topic was really a priority. Thom Little said that if someone wanted to resurrect a topic, then to come with a proposal that was new and unique, and then it would fall under Group A.

CONSENSUS: The group agreed to adopt the above new approach.

Edward Pineda said he recommended moving several Group C items to Group B. He said these items could remain in Group C under the new approach.

Stephen Littlejohn asked for opinions on the topics listed under Group A, highest priority. Edward Pineda said the top priority items should be fewer and more focused, and suggested moving “Monitoring data, shifting testing resources, and focus groups” to Group B. Mike Williams asked for clarification on “monitoring data.” Mr. Littlejohn said it referred to community monitoring data and weather stations that had been moved out of the area; he said he would rename it “Community station monitoring.” Mr. Pineda said “in that case to leave it in Group A.” Sarah Chavez said she saw “shifting testing resources” (bullet 4) as part of the Citizen Protocol (bullet 2) and therefore it should remain in Group A. No one disagreed.

Mr. Littlejohn asked for opinions regarding the bullets under Group B. Mr. Pineda said he would like to see management dialogue as an annual event. John Bartlit said a previous visit by Intel management (with John Painter and Ann Kelleher) was criticized. Thom Little said the criticism was because the visit was impromptu and displaced other important topics from the evening's discussion.

Mike Williams said baseline modeling was important to gauge how things improved over time. Sarah Chavez replied that they had to use Intel staff testing data, which the community did not believe. She asked the value of the exercise if there was no trust. Mr. Williams asked how could they track continuous improvement. Thom Little said they needed to address the concern around community trust, and they had to have a discussion of the available data and sketch out a vision with the problems and limitations at hand. Ms. Chavez said Intel had data for many different projects based on different specifications. Mr. Littlejohn observed that there was a lot to talk about on the topic, and the group never had a chance to talk about it in depth. Mr. Bartlit said the issue could also be addressed from an emissions point of view. Ms. Chavez said she would not stand in the way of moving this item to Group A, but they needed a concrete proposal to talk about the issue. John Bartlit liked that idea for all issue discussions.

Regarding the item "Chandler Report" in Group B, the group agreed to move it to Group A upon its release to the public by the Arizona investigating agency responsible for the public release of the report.

Mr. Littlejohn asked about the item "chemical changes at Intel." Mr. Bartlit asked what the relationship of this item was to baseline monitoring. Sarah Chavez said it could be part of the baseline monitoring bullet. Mike Williams asked how they could ensure another 1 heptanethiol problem, which released unpleasant fumes into the community, would not occur. Ms. Chavez said that the only way they could forecast chemical changes was through the permit change process. Mr. Pineda said that if they waited for the permit process, they could encounter another chaotic public meeting. Thom Little summarized two parts to this item discussion: 1. Modeling chemicals used in the manufacturing process; and 2. Notifying the public about using new chemicals. He suggested adding this topic to Group A. No one objected.

Stephen Littlejohn asked about moving "lung disease panel" to Group A. The idea for this item emerged from an article on lung disease in a journal as written by a local scientist. Edward Pineda commented that the CEWG should respond to the pulmonary fibrosis study released by DOH, also a bullet under Group B. Mr. Littlejohn asked if this item should be moved to Group A. John Bartlit cautioned against having too many items in Group A. Mr. Littlejohn reminded everyone the handout was a useful tool for meetings, and he would revise the handout according to the discussion and send it out to the group to review in an e-mail.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will revise the handout and send the revised version

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_07-20-11-1, v. 3, v. 3

Approved: 8-17-11

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 21, 2011

to the group via e-mail to review.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING

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

DECISION SUMMARY:

1. CEWG members approved in principle allowing Mr. Tritten to make presentations about the silica testing project to Corrales and other civic groups.
2. The Short Report to the Community was approved with changes.
3. The letter to the EPA regarding the 114 process was approved with changes.
4. The priority list of topics was approved with changes, to be reviewed again by email.

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_07-20-11-1, v. 3, v. 3

Approved: 8-17-11

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: August 21, 2011