

## MEETING SUMMARY

### Community Environmental Working Group

---

#### *“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”*

**Date:** June 19, 2013  
**Time:** 5:00–7:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Corrales Senior Center

#### **Members Attending**

John Bartlit, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water  
 Hugh Church, American Lung Assc. in NM

Sarah Chavez, Intel  
 Lane Kirkpatrick, Corrales Resident  
 Robi Shields, Rio Rancho Resident

#### **Non-Members Attending**

Roberta King, Corrales resident  
 Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident  
 Natasha Martell, Intel

Dennis O’Mara, Corrales resident  
 Jeff Radford, *Corrales Comment*

#### **Facilitator**

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

---

#### **HANDOUTS**

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary April and May, 2013
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Reports
- Media reports and articles, as available
- Draft of CEWG accomplishments
- “Dawn Nears for Smart Regulation”
- “Path to Efficiency is Invention”

#### **PROPOSED AGENDA**

- Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items
- EHS Report, EPA 114 and Permit Updates
- Intel Tour Reflections
- Code Red Report
- CEWG Planning
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

<p>Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 6-19-13, v. 4. Approved: July 17, 2013          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Stephen Littlejohn          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013</p>
--

**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

No comments.

Meeting Summaries (April and May)—Revisions and Approval

No comments.

HF Modeling Update

Stephen Littlejohn said Paul Wade of Class One, an Intel consultant, wrote a modeling protocol and Mike Williams had agreed with it. John Bartlit added that Mr. Wade's draft protocol followed the proscribed requirements of NMED Air Quality Bureau, and therefore the EPA, and was consistent with modeling parameters. Mike Williams examined and evaluated the input parameters and concluded they were the parameters he would have used.

- Sarah Chavez said that the basis of the draft protocol was Intel's Air Quality Permit Modeling protocol, which had already been approved by NMED. John Bartlit said that Class One wrote the protocol at his suggestion, since Paul Wade did this kind of work all the time, and Mr. Williams was too busy.
- Stephen Littlejohn said this modeling project was a larger study of spikes, which the group was interested in the last couple years. Spikes referred to short-term peaks of about one hour, in this case. Hydrogen fluoride (HF) was the target chemical, chosen because the ATSDR expressed concern for and interest in HF in their interim report in 2009.

Update on Regulatory Engineering

John Bartlit said he met with the president of NM Tech in Socorro about his regulatory engineering idea and to discuss potential research projects. Engineers worked to make processes more efficient, and the regulatory system needed to be made more efficient. What clicked in his mind was that for years Intel's permit required that the RTO temperature be a certain value. If it went outside that value, Intel was required to report it to NMED. Then Intel would also report about it at a CEWG meeting. He said that this could be done with one computer chip in an instant and eliminate the man-hours of work. In addition, Intel spends half a million dollars a year on quarterly testing that always gives the same results. He suggested putting a portion of that half a million dollars to better use. Regulatory engineering could make the regulator process more useful, less expensive, and faster. He cautioned that this was a long-term project. He said that NM Tech was interested, as was Dave Martin, former head of NMED and current head of the state's Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, as well as Jim Casciano at

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 6-19-13, v. 4. Approved: July 17, 2013

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013

Intel. The most logical place to start was on a research project involving NM Tech and anyone else.

- John Bartlit referred to columns he wrote that were included in the meeting handouts. “Dawn Nears for Smart Regulation” was about the fusion energy lobbying group recommending that fusion energy regulations be developed alongside the technology. This was a shift from the past where the technology was developed first and regulations later. The other idea in the column was about onboard diagnostics (OBD) that are currently found in cars. This same idea could be applied to regulations. Tools, computers, chips could be built to plug into the equipment to diagnose the problem. Industry was getting more efficient and faster, but the regulatory industry was still decades behind.
- Lane Kirkpatrick added a third option—sensory technology called Tunable Diode Laser (TDL) Technology that measured certain gases. This technology allowed real time monitoring. Why do half a million dollars in quarterly stack testing when continuous monitoring can be used to pull information and do exactly as told? John Bartlit added that his column “Path to Efficiency is Invention” was about the same thing. Mr. Kirkpatrick said ASI, Emerson Process Management; Spectro-Sensors were examples of companies that had this technology.
- Lane Kirkpatrick asked Sarah Chavez if she had heard of this technology. Ms. Chavez said Intel had looked at real time monitoring about 10 or 15 years ago. It was more expensive than the stack testing back then. John Bartlit said learning something new was more valuable than just spending lots of money to get the same data.
- Stephen Littlejohn said this was an example of a new topic that the CEWG could take up that had good potential for group.

#### Other Announcements

None.

#### Public Comment

- Jeff Radford asked why the ATSDR was taking so long to put out a final report. His assumption was that during the interim period there was a negotiation occurring between Intel and ATSDR/ EPA on the final report. He asked if Intel could confirm whether there was some negotiation between the two that might be reflected in the final report. Sarah Chavez responded that the last conversation she was aware of between Intel and ATSDR was when Thom Little was working with ATSDR on silica testing. She did not know of any contact since.

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 6-19-13, v. 4. Approved: July 17, 2013

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013

- John Bartlit confirmed that ATSDR was not a regulatory body but the EPA was. Mr. Bartlit gave a history of ATSDR contact. He said the CEWG contacted Senator Jeff Bingaman, who contacted the ATSDR to ask when the report would be completed, and the ATSDR said it would come out in spring 2013. Mr. Bartlit said he followed up with an email to Peter Kowalski on May 2, and Mr. Kowalski replied with an email on May 15 saying that the ATSDR peer review of the CEWG silica report should be completed by the end of June and the ATSDR's final report would then placed in agency clearance. Mr. Bartlit suspected that ATSDR would not release the peer review before the final report, and agency clearance could take a long time. He recommended the CEWG ask Mayor Gasteyer, Pat Clauser, John Alsobrook, and Jim Tritten to write to ask ATSDR to release the peer review when it was completed (which should be end of June)
- Lynne Kinis said she had heard from several sources that Intel engineers were being asked if they preferred to move to either Oregon or Arizona. She asked if Intel planned on closing or downsizing the Rio Rancho office. Natasha Martell replied that Intel's business was very stable, and there were no announcements of closing or transition. If there were, Intel would have to report that to the state first, and this had not happened.

#### **EHS REPORT, OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS, EPA 114 UPDATE**

Sarah Chavez said there was no news from the EPA on the 114 Update. Intel had been waiting two years. Onsite construction activity was ongoing, and Intel sent routine report documentation to agencies with the exception of the Hazardous Waste Bureau report for waste disposal regarding the February General Exhaust Duct Collapse. Intel received two phone calls from zone 2 on the night of the 12 and early morning the 13, but these would be included on next month's EHS report.

- Lane Kirkpatrick asked about Intel's complaint protocol. Sarah Chavez said the protocol was that people walked the site perimeter, checked all the systems, and logged weather conditions.
- Lynne Kinis said that in reference to CEWG accomplishment draft document statement, "Intel established an odor team to investigate reported odors", from the perspective of the community investigating odors did not mean just walking the fence line. The community was aware of weather patterns and air and smell pockets. The community had asked for years for someone to investigate, and with Thom Little gone she didn't think this statement was accurate. Sarah Chavez said the odor team referenced here was different. John Bartlit added that it was true Thom Little volunteered to do certain things such as night visits and sampling. When he moved away, this capacity went away as well. Mr., Bartlit suggested there be an item in the accomplishments about Thom Little's proposed service, which was a direct result of CEWG activities.
- Lane Kirkpatrick said people worked 24 hours a day at Intel, and he did not understand why Intel couldn't send someone in a short period of time to check out a complaint. Sarah Chavez said part of the issue was that detection limits of a piece of equipment did not correlate. They could not take a sample at 5 or 10 minutes with test levels that someone might smell, but

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 6-19-13, v. 4. Approved: July 17, 2013

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013

would have to take a 24-hour sample for someone to smell. The other issue they found was that everyone had a different level of smell sensitivity.

- John Bartlit suggested that Intel call Lane Kirkpatrick within certain hours to check out a complaint. Sarah Chavez said she would look into that if Mr. Kirkpatrick agreed, which he did.
- Roberta King said she thought corporations were responsible only up to the fence line and nothing beyond. Lane Kirkpatrick said that was OSHA standards. John Bartlit said that corporations had to meet standards outside the fence line. Ms. King said she thought the issue was more about what a person experienced physically versus smelling an odor. Stephen Littlejohn said odor was a code word for a broader class—odor and contaminant complaints. Odors might not signal that something was wrong, but what couldn't be smelled could be a problem.
- Lynne Kinis asked if the CEWG was going to comment on the “Accomplishments” draft, because she took issue with several statements that weren't absolutely accurate. Stephen Littlejohn said they were not going to discuss the draft tonight, but there would be time to comment before it was final.

**ACTION ITEM:** Sarah Chavez will see if it is possible for the command center to contact Lane Kirkpatrick to check out complaints.

## **INTEL TOUR REFLECTIONS**

No comment

## **CODE RED UPDATE**

Dennis O'Mara reviewed the Code Red committee actions and process. The committee met in March with the Sandoval County Assistant Chief for Emergency Management and in April with the Corrales Fire and Police Chiefs. They were supposed to meet with Rio Rancho emergency services on June 18, but the date was changed to July 2. After they complete the Rio Rancho meeting, they will set a meeting with Intel and then write a report to the CEWG on their findings.

- Mr. O'Mara said the committee was impressed that everyone they had spoken with had a good handle on the issues, worked closely together to coordinate, and were constantly improving and updating their systems. Corrales communicated to the community via a flyer that discussed the code red system and encouraged people to sign on, update information, and enroll cell phones and email. They learned that most landline phone numbers were automatically enrolled in Code Red. Overall, they were impressed and encouraged with their findings.
- Lynne Kinis said she mentioned to the Corrales folks that her community did not get notices that went out with waste removal, because waste removal was managed by the

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 6-19-13, v. 4. Approved: July 17, 2013

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013

management company. Thus, the community most likely to be effected did not receive the flyers.

- John Bartlit asked Mr. O'Mara if he saw any national emergency guidelines in his research. Mr. O'Mara said he did not but would inquire. Roberta King said her line was charged 51 cents for emergency notification.
- Lane Kirkpatrick said it would be interesting to relate the lack of coordination at the Cerro Grande fire with the improved emergency coordination. He added there was room for improvement around public awareness.

### **CEWG PLANNING**

Stephen Littlejohn announced that he would be leaving as facilitator at the end of the year, and Intel had to recruit a new facilitator. He said it was a perfect time for the group to decide their future step and directions. He had been facilitator for seven years, and fresh facilitation leadership could be a shot in the arm for the group. He also noticed that the CEWG did not have any substantive accomplishments over the last two years, and there were 24 up through 2011. The CEWG seemed to have stalled as a group. Currently the group was waiting on some things, like the ATSDR, and working on other things like HF modeling, but there hadn't been much happening in terms of accomplishments over the last couple of years.

He said he also noticed that the CEWG kept returning to the same basic topics, yet several potential new topics have emerged that the group could do something with like regulatory engineering, Intel's green technology initiative, how abatement and monitoring science and technology had changed. Now was the time to look at the mission, what the group wanted to accomplish, and how they wanted to work. Did they want to change the meeting format? These questions would lead to their deciding what they wanted in a facilitator.

The new facilitator planning timetable was as follows:

- June: Discuss the CEWG's future
- July: Determine facilitation needs and recommend qualifications and scope of work
- August: Intel advertises the facilitator position
- September: Intel screens applicants.
- October: Intel and CEWG committee interviews finalists and makes hiring recommendations
- November: New facilitator orientation/training
- December: New facilitator orientation/training
- January: New facilitator beings

Mr. Littlejohn said he wanted to focus the group tonight to discuss the CEWG's future direction. He called attention to the draft list of CEWG accomplishments and emphasized that these were

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 6-19-13, v. 4. Approved: July 17, 2013

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013

not strictly CEWG accomplishments, but other members of the public, organizations, agencies, and Intel were partially responsible for these accomplishments. However, they were all items that came up on the agenda, and CEWG discussions gave impetus to change. He said the list showed that the CEWG was working and making accomplishments.

Mr. Littlejohn asked the group to brainstorm on the following question: *What could the CEWG realistically accomplish in the future?* “Realistic” was the operative word.

- Lane Kirkpatrick said there was another side to accomplishments. He felt a legitimate accomplishment was a community feeling that they did not need to be so concerned about something anymore. The CEWG had studied crystalline silica and the outcome put some community members at ease. Mr. Kirkpatrick added sensor technologies, regulatory engineering, and shifting modeling money to areas of greater impact as topics that all held great potential for the CEWG.
- Hugh Church said that some members of the community believed that the CEWG was a cheering squad for Intel. Was this a public conclusion based on evidence or a feeling that nothing was accomplished for the community?
- Mr. Littlejohn read the CEWG mission statement: “To achieve continuous environmental improvement at Intel and improved public dialogue.” Dennis O’Mara suggested changing the mission statement from “at” to “by”.
- Robi Shields suggested finding technology that existed for continuous monitoring—something on the low end of the scale to prove the concept and justify the time and expense. Mr. Bartlit added that could be a research topic with NM Tech.
- Lane Kirkpatrick suggested CEWG become a thought leader in guiding research around smart technology. Mr. Shields said Intel already had half that infrastructure built.
- Sarah Chavez said she was concerned about data. Intel paid for and conducted testing to collect data but no one believed the results. She said she did not disagree with the idea of monitoring, but the community did not believe Intel’s data anyway, so what would be the point? Monitoring would have to be done by an outside regulatory agency. Robi Shields responded that it was better to have data than not have it. Ms. Chavez said that Intel had 12 years of testing data and conducted RTO testing for two weeks every quarter every year. Intel operated 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and the operations and production people did not know when testing was happening. Ms. Chavez emphasized that the CEWG needed to realize that the community would not trust the data.

- Mr. Littlejohn added that this was the same tree the CEWG was running around over the last few years. The discussion needed to shift to what CEWG could accomplish.
- Lynne Kinis said there was one catch and that was real time. She said she would believe a chip sending information rather than a technology studied and reported on by a company. She said she would believe data from a chip that was put into place, programmed to detect five compounds, for example, and then transmitted the information to NMED. Dennis O'Mara said the question was 'whose chip is it? Is it NMED's chip or Intel's chip?' Either way, Intel's technicians would still have to install and work with it.

Stephen Littlejohn said the group created the Citizen's Protocol but could not get it funded because the CEWG was not a tax-exempt organization. The CEWG conducted crystalline silica testing following as much as they could from the Citizen's Protocol; Intel funded the study, but the CEWG sent the results to NIOSH and ATSDR peer review to increase the trust level. He asked: "What can we do about this issue? Do you want to keep coming back month after month on the same topic—we need more data? Where do you want to go with this?" He urged the CEWG to get out of the repetitive cycle and suggested the group look at other things to do, such as research new technologies, regulatory emissions, or sensor monitoring, and then make recommendations to Intel.

- Dennis O'Mara said the CEWG's first and foremost task should be to press Intel to find the right technology to eliminate emissions altogether. Stephen Littlejohn asked how the CEWG should apply pressure. He used CEWG's work on stack heights as an example. Mr. O'Mara said the CEWG could go out and find the technology, present it to Intel and ask them to implement it. He believed science would eventually find the solution, but until then Intel still spewed out dangerous emissions. Sarah Chavez said it was important to understand whether or not there were problems with the current emissions.
- Lane Kirkpatrick asked if the CEWG was at the point of diminishing returns. The CEWG needed to sit back and look at big picture to see what could be done.
- Roberta King said she was reminded of mining accidents where the companies knew the equipment/machinery was faulty, but because money was the bottom line they never replaced the equipment. Accidents happened because they did nothing about it. It depended on who the corporation was reporting to whether safety issues were being adhered to. Ms. King said Intel and all corporations were under the influence of ALEC (American Legislative Exchange Committee), and we didn't know enough about ALEC. She was concerned that people might have heard about ALEC but did not know the whole story. Nothing would change with this group around, Ms. King said.

- Natasha Martell said that from her experience attending these meetings over the last six months, the CEWG has been stuck in a repetitive cycle. Intel's intent has always been transparency and collaboration. But she saw a lot of heads shaking in the group, so it was obvious there was a lack of trust in that statement. What work could we be successful in accomplishing if there was no trust?
- Lane Kirkpatrick said he's seen data on climate changes and it was getting really scary. It would be nice to have the CEWG focus on making a contribution to climate change that involved Intel. Mr. Church reminded the group that Intel's permit considers the plant's greenhouse gas emissions as a major source.

Below is the list compiled from this discussion.

### **What could the CEWG realistically accomplish in the future?**

- Organize the community to get ATSDR reports
- Complete studies on issues of concern
- Survey sensor technologies and what's possible now
- Ascertain whether the CEWG has actually accomplished anything positive to/for the public
- Find a technology that could monitor CO
- Be a thought leader in guiding research by universities and other groups (e.g. smart regulation)
- Continuous monitoring technologies and regulatory implications
- Press Intel to improve its abatement technologies to eliminate emissions problems
- Determine realistically what can be done

Stephen Littlejohn asked the CEWG to rank three activities—not topics—that the CEWG could and should undertake on in 2014. The results are listed below:

### **Please rank three activities that the CEWG should and could undertake on in 2014.**

- Research project at NM Tech on smart monitoring technology
- Consider remote sensing outside Intel's fence
- Research Intel's green technologies
- Get to the bottom of how ALEC got started, when, under what circumstances
- Identify one or more abatement technologies that Intel could employ to eliminate the burning of VOCs and releasing byproducts into environment
- Environmental study on local issues of concern, e.g., climate change or water or fire
- Engage the broader community through surveys, focus groups, etc
- Follow up on ATSDR and its implications. Critical.
- EPA test emissions outside Intel property and not announce the timing to Intel
- Present information about abatement technologies to Intel executives and encourage adoption

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 6-19-13, v. 4. Approved: July 17, 2013

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013

- Explore current science on health impact of chemicals contained in Intel emissions
- Complete Code Red
- Study greenhouse gases and climate changes

Stephen Littlejohn asked the group the following question:

**If someone asked you to describe the CEWG, what would you say?**

- Differing perspectives
  - A group of volunteers concerned about health impacts around Intel
  - Old people sitting around the table complaining about things
  - Used by Intel to convince the community that Intel cares about the environment
  - A group of smart and committed people
  - Work collaboratively
  - Forum for communication
  - Public and intergenerational involvement
  - A front for Intel publicity
- John Bartlit said he disagreed with Natasha Martell's earlier statements. He always viewed the CEWG as a group having different perspectives. He did not see it as a collaboration. He made this point many ways to Intel, but they failed to remember. He did not view the group as a single entity or working together or having a single interest. Everyone had different back grounds, different goals, and that did not mean we couldn't accomplish something.
  - Robi Shields suggest the CEWG try to recruit people under age 50.

Stephen Littlejohn asked the group to brainstorm how the CEWG should work in the future. Sarah Chavez said the most successful way the group worked was in small committees with specific tasks. Lane Kirkpatrick said there should be more intergenerational exchange. Hugh Church said the meetings were important.

- Stephen Littlejohn asked if they should meet monthly. Sarah Chavez said because of the type of projects the CEWG worked on, there was not enough information to share monthly, and there were not a lot of topics to discuss monthly.
- Lynne Kinis suggested looking at past meeting history. In an Intel permit meeting that coincided with an Intel "Dear Neighbor" letter sent to the community, many Corrales neighbors attended and were able to voice their concerns. The subsequent CEWG meeting was canceled by Intel because of security concerns stemming from the previous permit meeting. Then, Intel held another permit meeting, facilitated by someone other than

Stephen Littlejohn. Intel packed the meeting with Corrales residents who were also Intel staff and acted as Intel cheerleaders. Thus, public discussion was interrupted in this order of events, so people said why bother coming to any more meetings. She said community members needed to have an avenue to vent, and when they vented, Intel needed to listen.

- Stephen Littlejohn said it was important to know the purpose of a meeting. Venting sessions were fine if that was the meeting's purpose. But if the purpose of a meeting was to work on an outcome, then people had to be willing to collaborate on a process. For example, if the CEWG had a public meeting on new abatement technologies, and someone came to complain and vent, then that would be difficult to balance. Lynne Kinis added that people are not heard, and thus they don't want to waste their time coming to meetings.
- Lane Kirkpatrick said he learned from his neighborhood survey that there were problems in the past but it was better now and they didn't worry about Intel like they used to. He sees the CEWG's role to look at the things people aren't looking at. He was not sure from standpoint of public concern how the CEWG viewed their role.

Stephen Littlejohn said topics were expanding because times are different, and the experiences people had in the 1990s are not the same as today. He said next month the group needed to come back and determine their facilitation needs. Below is the list of points made in the discussion:

#### **What work process should the CEWG use in the future?**

- Small groups of people working on a project
- Use different media—live, email, phone, etc.
- Not all facilitated
- More public, inter-generational involvement
- Meetings are important to get to know others
- Gauge meetings depending upon what projects are going on and how long the work is taking

#### **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

#### **MEETING ADJOURNED**

#### **NEXT MEETING**

July 17, 2013, 5 to 7 p.m., Corrales Senior Center

Filename: CEWG Meeting Summary 6-19-13, v. 4. Approved: July 17, 2013

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: July 23, 2013