

MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: September 21, 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

Thom Little, Intel
 Hugh Church, American Lung Assc. of NM

Non-Members Attending

Roberta King, Corrales resident
 Bill Davidson, Intel

Facilitator

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

HANDOUTS

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary August 17, 2011
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- September Newspaper Ad
- Intel report on EPA 114 follow-up process
- Revised draft FAQs
- CEWG draft budget
- NM Dept. of Health report on pulmonary fibrosis in Corrales
- Jonathan Samet’s review of the Department of Health Report
- Samet’s credentials
- Draft ad, “Work on Intel Air Issues Brings Good Results”
- Media reports and articles, as available

PROPOSED AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items
- EHS Report and 114 Update
- Silica FAQs
- CEWG Budget
- NM Dept. of Health Report on Pulmonary Fibrosis
- Continuing to Get the Word Out
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_09-21-11, v. 3
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: October 11, 2011

Approved: 10/19/11

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND BRIEF ITEMS

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

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

John Bartlit said he was hesitant to make any significant decisions at the evening's meeting because three CEWG members were absent. Thom Little asked if the group would be able to make a decision around the FAQs. Stephen Littlejohn said the FAQs had been discussed so often and members had a chance to respond by email, so he did not think it was an issue. The CEWG members present agreed.

Meeting Summary (August 17, 2011)—Revisions and Approval

Roberta King gave Stephen a list of corrections to the August Meeting Summary and said she had a problem with page 11, specifically the third bullet with Thom Little's comments about Jeff Radford writing that "ERM did the testing." She said she thoroughly read Mr. Radford's articles and never read that particular point. She asked Mr. Little to document where he read that point in Mr. Radford's articles. Mr. Little said that the Meeting Summary most likely paraphrased what he had said, so he would like to go back and listen to the tape. Mr. Littlejohn reminded the group that the Meeting Summary should reflect what the person meant to say. Stephen Littlejohn said he would get the recording of that section for Thom Little to hear and interpret. Mr. Littlejohn said he would incorporate Ms. King's corrections on the August Meeting Summary.

Spikes Discussion Update

Thom Little reported that the "spikes" team met at Lane Kirkpatrick's office. Mike Williams could not attend the meeting but provided information for the group to discuss. Mr. Little said the group developed a problem statement: "What is the likelihood that Intel emissions result in spikes that potentially impact health or well being." They also developed a definition of a spike and key questions such as why do we care about spikes; what were the factors influencing spike conditions; what evidence did previous studies provide on spikes; and what data was missing. In addition, he said the group developed a process for moving forward. Stephen Littlejohn said that the "spikes" topic would be on the agenda for October.

Field Trip to Intel

Thom Little stated the proposed date for a field trip to Intel as Thursday, October 20, 1 to 4 pm. During that time frame Intel would be conducting VOC sampling. He said he could change the date to October 19, which was the same date as the next meeting. The field trip would be organized more like a tour rather than an open house. The tour would start with a safety discussion first. John Bartlit asked if Mr. Little had checked with the Corrales mayor on the

date. Mr. Little replied that he did not. Mr. Littlejohn said that he had told the Corrales group that Mr. Little would let them know of the date. Mr. Little agreed to follow up with the Corrales group. Mr. Littlejohn asked if they could announce the tour to the public via the CEWG newsletter. Mr. Little said yes, but they would have to cap the number of people.

ACTION ITEM: Thom Little will contact the group from Corrales to inform them of the Intel tour date.

Communication Plan

- Stephen Littlejohn said that the communication plan was being implemented. There is a new Web site and newsletter; however there are problems with the Facebook page. Bill Davidson asked the group to come up with social media objectives for the CEWG Facebook page before they launched it. Things to consider include: What to post on Facebook, how often to monitor activities, and who will do it. He said Intel allowed all critical views on their Facebook page, unless the views were threatening or slanderous. He asked the CEWG to consider how to handle negative comments and any intended and unintended consequences.
- Hugh Church asked if there are any proprietary issues to consider with Facebook. Thom Little said no; it was more a matter of how to referee certain situations on Facebook, which was used differently than a Web site. He reminded that on Facebook, people could put in swearwords or negative posts while a Web site was used mainly to post information. He asked the CEWG to create a Facebook policy.
- Roberta King asked if the Facebook page could begin with a statement of purpose. Thom Little said yes, having that information up front would be a way to start, but sometimes people did not want to play by the rules. Ms. King asked if her Web address would be made public if she visited the Facebook page. Bill Davidson responded that anyone could visit Facebook anonymously. Mr. Littlejohn said the Facebook page was up but not activated, and the group could look at it.
- Roberta King said that she received the newsletter but did not know who else received the newsletter. She asked if that was on purpose. Mr. Littlejohn said Constant Contact's format was such that they distributed the newsletter with only the recipient's e-mail listed. Bill Davidson said that was the standard format for newsletter distribution. Ms. King asked about how meeting summary corrections would be handled and how she could get e-mails to all attendees. Mr. Littlejohn said that process would not change; the newsletter substituted for the general distribution or for announcements, but that the meeting summary procedure would remain the same. He said that with Constant Contact people had the advantage of unsubscribing or subscribing to the list. He said the other benefits were that the newsletter looked sharp, and it was good branding.

- Roberta King said she had trouble printing out the newsletter document. Mr. Littlejohn said there should not be a problem but would investigate the matter.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will investigate possible difficulties printing the newsletter.

EHS REPORT

Thom Little said that with all Munters downtimes over the last month the emissions were abated. Now that they had redundancy, Intel was no longer required to send equipment downtime notifications to the state because the emissions were abated.

- Roberta King said that because of past computer glitches, she questioned how Intel could claim redundancy. Thom Little said that Intel had the data to show to NMED that the emissions load was transferred to another unit when a unit was down. John Bartlit clarified that if both units were down, then Intel was required to submit a downtime notification to NMED. Ms. King asked what kind of data Intel had that showed redundancy was working. Mr. Little responded they had data on two key measures—temperature and the bypass valve, which closed off the units and transferred the emissions. If the temperature was above or below a certain range that showed that Intel was not doing it correctly.
- John Bartlit suggested rather than saying “the unit had a redundant unit,” Mr. Little meant to say that “a redundant unit was operating.” He said these were two different statements, and perhaps this is what Ms. King was referring to. Mr. Little responded that both units operated simultaneously and shared the load, and what Ms. King was referring to was not “believing” Intel’s claim of redundancy. Ms. King said she did not “believe” because it seemed every time a new Munters was installed, there were some glitches that Intel was not aware of until residents complained.
- Stephen Littlejohn summarized that Ms. King’s concern was that while there was a second unit providing redundancy, she was not assured that it was working properly because of incidents that occurred in the past when it did not work properly. Mr. Little, on the other hand, was saying that Intel had no evidence of malfunctions in the redundant unit based on the data Intel collected.
- Thom Little asked if there was another way to clearly write about redundancy on the EHS reports. Mr. Bartlit suggested: “No unabated emissions; redundant equipment operating.”

- Thom Little also noted that Intel had received several calls from one person on odor complaints, which were listed in the EHS report. Intel's command center called Mr. Little within 5 to 10 minutes of the calls, and he responded when possible. He noted that he was the Intel personnel pegged to visit the offsite complaint locations. He also said that there seemed to be a gap in the command center's recording that the neighbor did not ask for follow up when she says she did. Mr. Little said that he would work to close this gap.
- Roberta King asked for identification of the area making up Zone 2. Thom Little said that Zone 2 incorporated the area in which Ms. King lived.

114 UPDATE

Thom Little reported that the EPA had yet to review Intel's draft testing plan submitted on 6/2/11. John Bartlit reminded that the CEWG sent an e-mail expressing interest in the draft test plan, and the e-mail was responded to in a general way.

SILICA FAQs

- Stephen Littlejohn referred to the Silica FAQs draft handout and asked the group to review minor changes listed in bold as follows:
 - FAQ 2: "HMDS"
 - FAQ 3: Spell out "Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)"; revise to "relationship of chemical releases to illness in Corrales"; and add the ATSDR Web site.
 - FAQ 8: Sarah Chavez made the following edits: change "substantial amounts of particulate matter" to "NIOSH weighed and reported particulate matter..."; change to "The major source of particulate matter...".
 - FAQ 19: The following was added in by Sarah Chavez to clarify ERM's relationship with Intel: "ERM started work with Intel in 2002 on the risk assessment, which was complete in 2005. ERM did not perform any stack sampling at that time. ERM started sampling, testing and analysis of Intel's air emissions in 2007 to comply with state and federal regulatory requirements."

In addition, John Bartlit made the following two new changes:

- FAQ 6: Insert chart entitled "HMDS Usage at Intel, October to December 2010" at the end of Item 6. This chart was part of Jim Tritten's PowerPoint presentation to the community;
- FAQ 14: Capitalize "Intel."

Mr. Littlejohn asked the group if they agreed to these FAQ changes.

CONSENSUS: The group agreed on the FAQ revisions.

- Roberta King asked about FAQ 19 and whether the “sampling, testing, and analysis of Intel’s air emissions” was done before 2007. Thom Little said it was done but by different consultants. Ms. King said that previously, Ms. Chavez had listed the order of three different companies doing the sampling. She asked if they were the ones doing the sampling before 2007. Stephen Littlejohn said that ERM was working on the risk assessment with Intel before 2007. Ms. King said that the statement inserted into FAQ 19 did not sound correct. Mr. Littlejohn suggested Ms. King contact Ms. Chavez for clarification.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn will send the final FAQs to the group as well as to the ATSDR.

- Roberta King asked if the corrected version of Jim Tritten’s presentation to the Village Council was available in an electronic format. In the corrected version, Thom Little changed “HDMS” to “HMDS” and gave hard copies out at the Village presentation.

ACTION ITEM: Stephen Littlejohn said he would follow up on Ms. King’s question.

CEWG BUDGET

Stephen Littlejohn said two questions needed to be addressed:

1. How to use the discretionary funds.
 2. Should the CEWG request more money, and if so, for what purpose.
- Mr. Littlejohn said over \$3,000 was left in the budget. Suggestions on how to use the money included: purchasing a computer for the use of community members who do not have computer access; sponsoring community workshops and educational forums; and paying speakers to make presentations; supporting various forms of monitoring in the community; and fund some aspect of the Citizen Protocol.
 - Ms. King said that purchasing a computer was a waste of money since people could go to the public library to use computers.
 - Bill Davidson said that the previous budget did not include *Rio Rancho Observer* ad costs, so he proposed to use the existing budget to cover the smaller ads starting next year. Stephen Littlejohn estimated the *Albuquerque Journal* ads cost \$1,896 per year, and he thought the *Rio Rancho Observer* was similar in cost. Bill Davison agreed to send Mr. Littlejohn the *Observer* ad costs. John Bartlit reminded that the CEWG could ask for more money if they had a good reason. Mr. Littlejohn asked if anyone disagreed with Mr. Davison’s proposal.

CONSENSUS: The group agreed to cover *Rio Rancho Observer* ad costs in the budget.

ACTION ITEM: Bill Davidson will send Stephen Littlejohn *Rio Rancho Observer* ad costs for the year.

- Roberta King asked about Senior Center rental costs. Mr. Littlejohn said the CEWG paid the community rate of \$10 an hour @ 3 hours a month; \$30 a month @ \$12 months equaled \$360/year.
- Mr. Littlejohn asked how the group felt about purchasing a computer. Thom Little expressed an interest in community education options—sponsoring workshops and paying speakers to make presentations. He said both were good ways to report to the community on special topics. Past CEWG meetings on special topics were usually well attended; for example, the meetings on supercritical CO₂, the EPA announcement, and the crystalline silica report all had strong attendance. John Bartlit agreed that this was a good option because while monitoring was useful, it required lots more funding than what was in the discretionary monies. He felt the amount was appropriate to use for workshop honorariums.
- Stephen Littlejohn proposed moving *Rio Rancho Observer* ad costs to the Communication portion of the budget, and adding a new category of budget called “Speakers and Workshops.” Thus the discretionary funds would be used for community education.

CONSENSUS: The group agreed to add a new budget category called “Speakers and Workshops” and to use discretionary funds to pay for this option.

- Stephen Littlejohn pointed out that no one seemed interested in the computer option except for Edward Pineda, who was not at the meeting. Thom Little said that if printing was ever an issue for the CEWG, he was happy to do it at Intel.

NM DEPT. OF HEALTH REPORT ON PULMONARY FIBROSIS

- Hugh Church reported that in August he came across an item on global health affiliated with Dr. Jonathan Samet, who was formerly at the University of New Mexico doing epidemiological work. Mr. Church sent Dr. Samet a copy of the NM Dept. of Health Report on Pulmonary Fibrosis to review. Dr. Samet responded with the following comments: “NMED did a good job of working up the potential cluster. The finding that many cases were initially misclassified is not surprising. As you know, I carried out one of largest epidemiological studies on the etiology of idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis [IPF] and did not find much. I’m not aware of any agent that could cause an apparent cluster of IPF vs. hypersensitivity and pneumonitis. Also hard to relate to fugitive emissions to the

Intel plant.”

- Mr. Church said he wrote back to Dr. Samet about the agent HMDS, which fed into Intel burners and could produce crystalline silica. Dr. Samet said he would look at HMDS but has yet to respond with his analysis.
- John Bartlit said he found interesting background information on Dr. Samet, including his being appointed by President Obama as the National Cancer Advisory Board.
- Mr. Church said that at Mr. Bartlit’s suggestion, he sent an e-mail to Dr. Samet requesting permission to use his Dept. of Health report response for CEWG public outreach efforts. After Dr. Samet did not reply, Mr. Church called his office and learned that he was in Europe.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group for next steps. John Bartlit suggested sending Dr. Samet’s response to ATSDR after he gave his permission. Mr. Bartlit also suggested formally asking ATSDR to review and comment on the report. Mr. Littlejohn asked the group if they agreed with Mr. Bartlit’s suggestions as well as using Dr. Samet’s report response on the Web site and in the newsletter.

CONSENSUS: The group agreed on next steps outlined next.

- Mr. Littlejohn summarized next steps as follows: Ask the ATSDR to review the report; then after the CEWG received Dr. Samet’s permission, send his response to ATSDR, post it on the Web site, and put it in the newsletter.
- Roberta King asked if anyone had ever given the complete list of chemicals used by Intel to the public health people so that they could at least be aware of what Intel was using. She said that a big part of the health problems had to do with the immune system’s ability to stave off toxins. She pointed out that many of the chemicals on Intel’s list affected the central nervous system. Also, the biggest problem with the medical field today was that they did not have proper training on chemical reactions or environmental reactions, she said. “They can’t find what they aren’t looking for.” She thought it was time to alert healthcare providers—and that was part of ATSDR’s task—about the consequences of these environmental factors. Mike Williams said he thought the problem was more fundamental—the information was not there, and studies have not yet been done on the effects of certain chemical agents on health.

CONTINUING TO GET THE WORD OUT

<p>Filename: CEWG_Meeting_Summary_09-21-11, v. 3, v. 3 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: October 11, 2011</p>	<p>Approved: 10/19/11</p>
---	---------------------------

- The group discussed what next steps to take to publicize the CEWG and its work products. John Bartlit introduced an ad he drafted whose purpose was to advertise the CEWG and their work as well as new electronic channels of communication and to get new people to look at the CEWG Web site. The draft listed the CEWG's major achievements for the year as well as important reports from federal and state agencies. The draft then extended an invitation to participate in the CEWG's work. Mr. Bartlit suggested publishing the ad in newspapers to get the word out. Thom Little said, as written, it might be better suited for the e-newsletter since it was so long. Bill Davidson said it could be published as a letter to the editor or an article.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if anyone objected to the two proposals: put it as an article in the newsletter and write it as a letter to the editor. No one objected.

CONSENSUS: The group agreed on the above proposed suggestions.

- Stephen Littlejohn raised the Facebook issue. He asked for volunteers to form a group and work on Facebook policy. Most members expressed that they were not interested in Facebook. Bill Davidson, Thom Little, and Stephen Littlejohn volunteered to develop the CEWG's Facebook policy and bring it back to the group for approval. The policy would include a recommendation for who would monitor the Facebook page and Web site. Mr. Littlejohn expanded the group's task to look at the draft Web site policy.

CONSENSUS: The group agreed on the Facebook volunteers and their assigned tasks.

ACTION ITEM: Bill Davidson, Thom Little, and Stephen Littlejohn will develop the CEWG's Facebook policy and finalize the Web site policy.

- Roberta King said she would like to receive an electronic version of Jim Tritten's presentation so that she could format it to two slides a page. Ms. King said that the documents were in pdf format and locked in so she could not make the changes herself. Mr. Littlejohn said that was purposeful, but he could send her a PowerPoint version so she could format it accordingly. Ms. King asked if Mr. Littlejohn found Jim Tritten's observation log from December. Mr. Littlejohn said he would look for it and send it to her.
- John Bartlit asked if they could post Mr. Tritten's presentation on the Web site. Mr. Littlejohn said they could as long as Mr. Tritten gave them permission.
- Ms. King asked when the CEWG would officially finalize the STTP report. John Bartlit said the document was complete. Ms. King asked where the report was housed. Mr. Littlejohn said it was on the Web site, in the libraries, and Ms. King received a personal

copy of the report. Ms. King said the report did not include Mr. Tritten's observation log. Mr. Bartlit said that whether or not Mr. Tritten handed in his observation report did not change the report as it was written.

- Ms. King asked if Mr. Tritten's e-mail sent on December 7 and read like a detailed observation log would be attached to the report. Mr. Bartlit said no. Mr. Littlejohn said things could always be added but as far as he knew the report was approved by the STTF and accepted by the CEWG as complete without Mr. Tritten's e-mail. Mr. Littlejohn added that when the CEWG talked about next steps, they agreed to do a Frequently Asked Questions to try to answer lingering issues. The second follow up was to take action on further testing. He reminded that the group decided to postpone taking any action until they heard from the ATSDR.
- Ms. King said she was concerned about the STTF minutes. Because she was not a member of the committee, she was not quite sure what the final approved minutes actually said. When she downloaded the minutes, she could not understand what actually happened at the meetings. If the STTF was an entity of the CEWG, then the CEWG should make sure that the information put out by the STTF makes sense, Ms. Kings said. John Bartlit said that STTF meetings were run according to Roberts' Rules of Order and as such were different from CEWG meeting summaries. Ms. King said the minutes did not state what was approved. Mr. Bartlit replied that the motions were there to check approval. Mr. Littlejohn said he usually took the minutes, although he was not at that particular meeting.

ACTION ITEMS: Stephen Littlejohn will send Roberta King an electronic version of Jim Tritten's presentation to the community in a PowerPoint format. Littlejohn will also look for Jim Tritten's email regarding test witnessing from December and send to Ms. King.

- Stephen Littlejohn said that he had forgotten to mention during the budget discussion the possibility of allocating \$1,000 to move all the CEWG documents from the Intel Web site to the new CEWG Web site. The CEWG would have to hire someone to migrate the documents. This person would not need permission from Intel to do the work. Mr. Littlejohn said he had moved 2011 meeting summaries to the new site, but that was it. He asked the group for their approval.
- Mr. Bartlit asked if the new Web site had visit metric capability. Thom Little mentioned that Google offered a Web site metric service, and he would send Mr. Littlejohn the link.
- Roberta King said she was having challenges printing out rosters from the Web site. She was also having problems printing out the CEWG newsletter.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING

October 19, 2011, 5 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

1. The group agreed on the Silica FAQs revisions.
2. The CEWG agreed to cover *Rio Rancho Observer* ad costs in the budget.
3. The CEWG will add a new budget category called “Speakers and Workshops” and use discretionary funds to pay for this option.
4. The CEWG will ask the ATSDR to review the state’s report on pulmonary fibrosis. Then, after Dr. Samet gives his permission, the CEWG will use his report response for CEWG public outreach efforts.
5. John Bartlit’s draft ad will be put in the newsletter as an article and as a letter to the editor in local newspapers.
6. Stephen Littlejohn, Thom Little, and Bill Davidson will form a committee to develop a Facebook policy and revise the Web site policy.