

---

## MEETING SUMMARY

### Community Environmental Working Group

---

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

**Date:** August 21, 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  
Mike Williams, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water

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

Roberta King, Corrales resident  
Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident

Dennis O’Mara, Corrales resident  
Natasha Martell, Intel

#### **Facilitator**

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

---

#### **HANDOUTS**

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary July 2013
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Reports
- Media reports and articles, as available
- CEWG Planning Draft
- Letter to ATSDR

#### **PROPOSED AGENDA**

- Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items
- EHS Report, EPA 114 and Permit Updates
- CEWG Planning
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

Filename: CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_08-21-13, v. 3.docx. Approved: 9-18-13 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: September 9, 2013
---

## **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

Stephen Littlejohn said if they had time tonight, they would also address CEWG accomplishments, which was not on the agenda.

Hugh Church corrected date of today's meeting, which was August 21, 2013, and next meeting, which was September 18, 2013.

### Meeting Summaries (July)—Revisions and Approval

Stephen Littlejohn said Marcy Brandenburg's name was misspelled on the July Meeting Summary. Also, she was a resident of Rio Rancho not Corrales.

Lynne Kinis had a correction to the July Meeting Summary. On page 2, the third paragraph, last sentence, she added: ... "cheerleaders who live in Corrales". This was actually a correction to the June Meeting Summary, which was discussed at the July meeting

### HF Modeling Update

Mike Williams said he had all the data he needed as well as the program to run the data, so he was able to move forward with the work. He had looked at some of the emissions data, and something caught his eye, which was that some of the emissions data varied more than what he thought. This was something the CEWG might want to revisit in the future, he said.

### Code Red Update

Dennis O'Mara said the committee met with Intel's site emergency manager Brian Burrows, Natasha Martel and Sarah Chavez at Intel on July 23. The team had completed all interviews and they were now working on the final report. They planned to present the final report at the September CEWG meeting. He asked for 30 to 40 minutes of agenda time at the September meeting.

**ACTION ITEM:** Dennis O'Mara will send Stephen Littlejohn an electronic version of the Code Red presentation in advance to upload on his computer for the presentation.

### Web Site Update

Stephen Littlejohn said as far as he knew, the Web site was up to date, and he did this every month. He added Robi Shields name to the CEWG membership. John Bartlit asked that they

Filename: CEWG\_Draft Meeting\_Summary\_08-21-13, v. 3.docx. Approved: 9-18-13  
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn  
Prepared for: CEWG  
Date prepared or presented: September 9, 2013

follow up with Edward Pineda on his CEWG membership. Stephen Littlejohn said he would contact him for an update.

**ACTION ITEM:** Stephen Littlejohn will contact Edward Pineda regarding his CEWG membership.

#### Facilitator Recruiter Update

Stephen Littlejohn said he advertised the facilitator position on two mediation list serves, and he had received a few queries from good candidates.

#### ATSDR Update

John Bartlit said he had emailed the CEWG letter to Peter Kowalski on the evening of July 30. On August 8, he received a call from Peter Kowalski, who had first called Stephen Littlejohn looking for Mr. Bartlit's phone number. Mr. Bartlit reported that Mr. Kowalski extended his personal apologies for the delay with the reports. They spoke for about 20 minutes. Mr. Kowalski told Mr. Bartlit that the reports now had the attention of division director, he expected a clear status of the reports in about three weeks, and he would keep Mr. Bartlit informed. Mr. Bartlit said Mr. Kowalski was very congenial, implied that the diversity of signers on the letter helped gain visibility with the division director, and complemented the CEWG on helping to make improvements over the years. Toward the end of call, Mr. Bartlit said he had mentioned the idea of regulatory engineering with Mr. Kowalski and sent him a few of his columns about regulatory engineering. Mr. Kowalski said he was a member of the American Industrial Hygiene Association and suggested bringing regulatory engineering to the attention of that group for further discussion. Mr. Bartlit said if he doesn't hear from Mr. Kowalski after three weeks, he would email him to follow up. He also suggested contacting the congressional delegation if there was no movement. Mr. Bartlit said he felt Mr. Kowalski was sincerely trying his very best.

Dennis O'Mara asked how these reports could sit there for years. John Bartlit said the request began in 2004, and work began in 2005. The preliminary report was released in February 2009. The CEWG sent them the crystalline silica final report for peer review in 2011. The ATSDR promised it would be released in 2012 and then 2013. Mr. Bartlit said he was certain bureaucracy had a huge part in the delay. He saw the CEWG as a useful antidote to government and state bureaucracies. Sarah Chavez said she had heard years ago that sometimes ATSDR did not finalize reports. Mike Williams said that the crystalline silica final report had plenty of data, and there was no way that they could not give a clear conclusion. Sarah Chavez said that from Intel's perspective, the ATSDR had limited resources and did not look at all the data. John Bartlit said they could Google the 2009 ATSDR report, using the words, Intel, Rio Rancho and health consultation. Stephen Littlejohn said they were also waiting to hear from the EPA.

Filename: CEWG\_Draft Meeting\_Summary\_08-21-13, v. 3.docx. Approved: 9-18-13  
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn  
Prepared for: CEWG  
Date prepared or presented: September 9, 2013

Public Comment

- Lynne Kinis asked if any Corrales residents had received a test alert today on their cell phones as she did. Dennis O'Mara said he did not. She said the test did not say code red but "Emergency Alert Test of the Commercial Mobile Alert System. This is only a test." Dennis O'Mara said it sounded like Code Red. He and others had received alerts a few weeks ago on their cell phones and home phones after the big storm. Stephen Littlejohn said the cell phone alerts might be coming from a cell phone carrier.
- Lynne Kinis said that at the Code Red meeting with Intel, she was surprised because Sarah Chavez had mentioned Intel had a drainage and containment system. Ms. Chavez said that from a storm water management perspective, there was a big pond on top of the hill that served as a drainage space. Ms. Kinis said she was under the misperception that it drained into a container. Ms. Chavez said it was part of the larger Sandoval County arroyo flood control system.
- Stephen Littlejohn said he saw a catchment system on the Intel tour. Sarah Chavez said this was for individual storage tanks. If a tank had a leak, this system would hold the contents of that leak, and not fall on the concrete or get into the storm water system. Intel was regulated on this issue.
- Lynne Kinis commented that, in reference to the shotgun streetlight thing and possible leak issue, Intel had containment and that was good. Sarah Chavez said that Intel had containment for potential chemical leaks, and anytime there was a leak, it would go into that containment system around the tank.
- Lynne Kinis said her whole neighborhood had received damage from the runoff after the storm a few weeks ago, and she wanted to know who to contact at Intel about it. Natasha Martel said Intel was currently talking with the Village of Corrales on who was responsible for what damage. Also, Intel had reinstated hay bales on their property.
- Roberta King said that whatever went into it would sink down into the ground and aquifer. Sarah Chavez said that in any areas that had a potential for chemicals, the valves were kept closed. After a storm, Intel was required to test the water before releasing it. Intel also had a system for catching water running off paved parking lots and diverting it. If it tested positive, Intel would pump it and not allow it to seep into the dirt.
- Natasha Martel said Intel continued to respond to calls about the storm. Lynne Kinis said that Corrales had a policy that the individual was responsible for runoff from their land. Ms. Martell said that Ms. Kinis could call the Intel hot line to talk with someone about

runoff damage. Sarah Chavez said that all hot line calls were documented and routed to right person, and that the hotline number was on the EHS report.

- Stephen Littlejohn asked if Intel did anything structurally to improve the runoff situation after the big 2006 storm. Sarah Chavez said that Intel had engaged an engineering firm in 2006 to ensure the areas were contained for a 100-year flood. After the storm on July 26, Intel replaced hay bales in areas that were breached. In 2006, engineers recommended things for neighbors to do to protect their homes and set up containment in their yards.
- Lynne Kinis said in 2006 it was called a 100-year flood; in 2013 it was called a 1,000-year flood. She asked that Intel be prepared for these events if they really cared about the community. If this was the case, Intel would realize that hay bales needed replacing before the rains rather than afterwards.
- Roberta King said that neighbors witnessed a tornado touching down on July 26, and it had quickly changed directions. This tornado was not reported. The wind from the tornado caused damage. Ms. King said that many people in Corrales experienced flooding and most of it came from the arroyos. Lynne Kinis said she experienced many hurricanes living near water on the East Coast, and hurricanes could spawn tornados. She could tell by the way the winds were blowing that it was from a funnel cloud.
- Stephen Littlejohn said that given their investment in equipment and personnel, Intel must have given some thought to factory weather improvements. He asked if Intel systematically looked at these issues. Sarah Chavez said she assumed Intel did this but did not know for sure.
- Roberta King commented that the CEWG should pay attention to see whom the state governor appointed to be in charge of Region 6 EPA, and this person determined what was going to happen as per the governor's preferences. Mike Williams said the EPA was federal and state governors did not have much control over it. Sarah Chavez said the ATSDR and the EPA were not related but came from separate entities.
- Lynne Kinis said that any new members of the CEWG should be required to get a background and history of the CEWG, which included reading *Boiling Frogs* and *Corrales Comment* articles as well as past meeting summaries so as to avoid wasting time by covering past materials during CEWG meetings.

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

Sarah Chavez said Intel had received two calls during the rain event and, indirectly, a third call and an odor complaint through NMED. This latter complaint came from a person who lived in Zone 2, the same area where Intel typically got complaint calls. Also, Ms. Chavez said Intel had

Filename: CEWG\_Draft Meeting\_Summary\_08-21-13, v. 3.docx. Approved: 9-18-13  
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn  
Prepared for: CEWG  
Date prepared or presented: September 9, 2013

two meetings with NMED on the Title 5 permit. The due date was in mid December. From a future agenda standpoint, Ms. Chavez said she would be happy to talk to the CEWG again about the Title 5 permit process, if people were interested. She had an action item about presenting on different permit limits, and the CEWG could invite NMED, too, but she wasn't sure if they would come. Dennis O'Mara suggested that the invitation come from the CEWG. Ms. Chavez asked if the group was interested and what kind of information they would like to know.

- Stephen Littlejohn asked that now Intel was a major source for greenhouse gases with the Title 5 permit, was it a major source of the other emissions? Ms. Chavez said no, Intel would keep emissions of other gases below major source threshold, but the same regulations applied to these gases as if Intel were a major source. This was a voluntary restriction.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if anyone had any specific topics or questions to give to Ms. Chavez now. John Bartlit asked how emissions limits to everything but greenhouse gases compared to what they were now, and what the legal limits were. Ms. Kinis asked if the CEWG could request the NMED permit writer to come and speak to the CEWG, because it was very disconcerting to know that, "in my head," the Title 5 permit applied only to greenhouse gases. Ms. Chavez said it applied to everything. Ms. Kinis wanted to know who was monitoring the emissions totals. She wanted NMED to hear her comments and the idea that chemicals were being emitted and the person monitoring the chemicals was the person owning the corporation. Ms. Chavez said that was the way the laws were written. Ms. Kinis said, regardless, she would never stop commenting about it. Roberta King said that the person writing the permit did what Intel told them to do.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if contractors did Intel monitoring. Sarah Chavez said it was done by a combination of both Intel and contracts. Mr. Littlejohn said there were most likely regulations about how the monitoring was done and asked who checked to ensure these regulations were being followed. Ms. Chavez responded that was part of the inspection process. In some cases the regulations were very specific about what needed monitoring, other times the agency put together guidance about what to monitor or the equipment manufacturer made suggestions. All these things were taken under consideration and put on record when inspectors came to validate the process.
- John Bartlit said that during silica testing, he was on the same shift as Kurt Parker. He said Mr. Parker had a book with all the regulations that he referenced. It was very clear there was a specific document from the EPA that he followed. Ms. Chavez said NMED were the inspectors, and as part of the inspection they could look at records, do a field walk, or whatever they felt was necessary to validate compliance.

## CEWG PLANNING

Stephen Littlejohn asked the group to focus on CEWG planning and get priorities in place before the new facilitator arrived. He suggested they reach consensus on topics to focus on in 2014. Another issue to discuss was the CEWG meeting schedule.

- Mr. Littlejohn reviewed planning highlights from the previous month's meeting. Topics of interest to the group included the current state of technology in abatement, monitoring, health, and safety, including greenhouse gasses; and talking with Intel about what was possible, what was being used, the gap, and improvements that might be adopted; changes in emissions/standards science; monitoring technology, green technology, and local issues of concern such as water and storm containment; and engaging the broader community by using focus groups, surveys, and task groups; and the ATSDR report. Mr. Littlejohn asked the group to set priorities for 2014.
- John Bartlit said he saw two categories. The first was items that were started or in the works; the results from these items dictated where the CEWG would go next, for example, ATSDR, HF monitoring and Code Red. The second area was new areas to explore. Maybe there was some way to blend the two together, Mr. Bartlit suggested. Hugh Church asked if Code Red was something that was copyrighted and subscribed to in order to use it. Lynne Kinis said it came through Homeland Security but it was a proprietary system.
- Mr. Littlejohn asked the group how they felt about making a focus for next year new science and technology in related areas such as abatement, monitoring and testing, emissions processes, production technologies, epidemiology/toxicology, and standards/criteria levels. Mr. Bartlit said they could look at what standards were in the past and what they were today. Mr. Williams suggested looking at new research to see what the current knowledge was. Sarah Chavez asked who would do all this research and review. Mr. Littlejohn suggested hiring consultants to talk about it, conducting interviews, surveying the literature to look for summaries and reviews that were written for a lay audience, and establishing a committee with diverse players (CEWG, Intel, the community) to make this a project for a few months and frame the issue, research and bring back to back to the CEWG. The goal right now was not to identify every topic, but instead broaden the scope to see what was out there. This was referred to as "scoping," Mr. Littlejohn said.
- Mr. Littlejohn asked the group how they felt about scoping. Would it be useful? Engage people in new way? Was it too far from the mission? Sarah Chavez said they would have to pick one topic at a time. John Bartlit added unless different people were willing to look at different things. Ms. Chavez said she liked the idea of having different people on a

committee. Mr. Bartlit said he was interested in working on monitoring with several different people.

- Mr. Littlejohn said there were three ways to frame the discussion. One was the kitchen sink way, which was to look at all the areas; the second way was to focus on deciding what to focus on; and the third was to identify the issues now. He asked the group what felt more comfortable and doable to the group. John Bartlit said it depended on who was going to do what. What could they do that was useful? Mr. Littlejohn said that, because Mr. Bartlit expressed an interest in monitoring, the group could commit to looking at research around monitoring as a place to start and then to decide next year other areas to research based on the group interest. Mr. Bartlit said at CEWG meetings they would identify people in the community and at Intel to be involved on a committee, and then the committee could do a lot of work independent of the meeting.
- Sarah Chavez asked how should they handle it if they couldn't get more than a couple people to work on it. Dennis O'Mara said that people might be interested in a topic but might not have the expertise to work on it. John Bartlit said there were technical meetings on the stack heights that included many different levels of expertise, and something came out of it. Ms. Kinis agreed that she found the meetings useful even through many times she didn't understand what they were talking about. Dennis O'Mara said he would ask the experts to translate the technical language for the lay audience. Stephen Littlejohn said he attended those meetings and the engineers did translate the technical terms for the lay audience, and he learned a lot about monitoring from those meetings. Roberta King said that with the stack heights committee meeting, there was mutual respect, and everyone's contribution was respected. People were treated as equals. Hugh Church said he liked to believe that this was the CEWG's approach. Mike Williams said that all contributions were important and valuable. Ms. Kinis said the lay members gave input that was heard, and because she trusted members of the committee, she also trusted their expertise.
- Mr. Littlejohn asked how they felt about getting more input from a broader committee for a diversity of input. Mr. Bartlit said they had tried and failed with HF. Mike Williams said he did not know how to do it. Mr. Littlejohn said focus groups were an excellent way to get diverse input. They could organize a focus group day, hire a facilitator, and then recruit participants by offering incentives, such as a small amount of money and food. Surveys were expensive but gave more valid results; however, it would require an outside company and be prohibitively more expensive. They could do on-the-street interviews, similar to what Lane Kirkpatrick was doing in his neighborhood but more systematic. They could get students from UNM to form a research project to go out and get this information. Mr. Littlejohn asked if the group wanted to do this.

- Dennis O'Mara asked if a focus group could give them more than what they already had. Mr. Littlejohn said it was a way to find out what the community concerns were. For example, maybe they would learn that the community was more interested in storm water containment than emissions. John Bartlit said that he showed little enthusiasm because they had tried to get more community input and more CEWG members but it didn't work. He didn't know what to do differently that would be successful. He had more hope around doing something different with monitoring. Sarah Chavez said asking someone to participate was different than asking their concerns. Stephen Littlejohn commented if there was not a lot of energy around it, then the CEWG should not want to make it a focus.
- Lynne Kinis said she was interested in focus groups as a way to get people to CEWG meetings or to attend events and presentations. Last Monday she attended her condo board meeting and two people on the board laughed at her for going to CEWG meetings. Their perception was that the CEWG did not accomplish anything. If the CEWG had a meeting where people could come and ask questions that were useful to the community, then more people might come. It could be on any topic, Code Red, for example. She also suggested placing more information in the *Corrales Comment* that summarized CEWG activities as a way to inform the community.
- Sarah Chavez asked Ms. Kinis if she thought those kinds of meetings were more effective than the current meeting or should they do it in addition to their regular meetings. Lynne Kinis said the objective would be to get more people involved. People might think that because they weren't scientists they would not want to go to these meetings. To get people to pay attention you have to make it relevant to them.
- Roberta King observed that residents of Corrales were not here because they were worried about the sewer system, the well systems, and other issues. She suggested CEWG members go out to existing groups to learn about Corrales community members' concerns.
- Stephen Littlejohn said there were ways to structure public meetings to encourage dialogue and inspire creativity on possible courses of action, using dialogue groups, for example. He said there wasn't yet consensus among the group to focus on community involvement for next year.
- Mr. Littlejohn asked if there was consensus on scoping current knowledge and learning more about the state of knowledge. He asked the group if anyone objected. No one objected.

**DECISION:** The group agreed to make scoping current knowledge a focus for 2014.

Below is a summary of potential areas to focus on in 2014.

**Focus Areas for 2014**

Completing current projects—ATSDR, HF, Code Red

New initiatives—

- **Scoping:** Current knowledge in relevant areas—Frame and identify issues for immediate research based on interests and expertise of group members. Need to find appropriate champions for areas of interest including Intel and community members
    - Examine current state and innovated ideas related to monitoring (John)
  - **Scoping the community:** focus groups
- Stephen Littlejohn asked about scheduling meeting time. Did they want to meet monthly, every other month with committee meetings in between? This issue would be addressed at the next meeting.
  - Stephen Littlejohn said there was a possibility for Jim Casciano of Intel to come to talk to the CEWG. John Bartlit said Mr. Casciano was the Director of Regulatory Compliance for Intel worldwide and was appointed by the governor to the state Environmental Improvement Board (EIB). He could talk about the EIB and their work. The EIB was the group that set and approved rules and permits but was bound by the EPA. The group could convey to him all their concerns and perhaps engage him in a discussion on monitoring. Mr. Casciano was a trained industrial hygienist. Mr. Bartlit said Mr. Casciano had asked him for his input when he joined the EIB. Mr. Bartlit suggested to Mr. Casciano asking many questions that reflected all perspectives, which helped encourage progress.
  - Lynne Kinis said she was not in favor of Mr. Casciano's coming to a CEWG meeting. She had experience with him while on the task force and had attended many EIB meetings in the past to try to get action on certain issues. Ms. Kinis said the result was "squat all the way around." Ms. Kinis said EIB was appointed by the governor and took orders from the governor. She added that Mr. Casciano was not always forthcoming in task force meetings. John Bartlit asked Ms. Kinis if there was any chance since 2004 that Mr. Casciano might have changed. Ms. Kinis said there was always a chance; she believed in hope, but as a member of the EIB, Mr. Casciano was controlled by Intel and the governor. Stephen Littlejohn said it would be interesting to ask Mr. Casciano that question to see what that says.

<p>Filename: CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_08-21-13, v. 3.docx. Approved: 9-18-13          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Stephen Littlejohn          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: September 9, 2013</p>
--

- John Bartlit reminded that the CEWG had no impact on the regulatory process, the legislature and governor. The CEWG's impact came independently.
- Lynne Kinis said that corporations were considered people and they controlled everything. The EPA came in and investigated because she, Ms. Kinis, told them what was happening. Fortunately Intel kept records on the information that they could control. So the EPA could enforce something, and that's why she called them.
- Stephen Littlejohn checked consensus among CEWG members around inviting Jim Casciano.

**DECISION:** The CEWG agreed to invite Jim Casciano to speak at a CEWG meeting.

- Roberta King and Lynne Kinis said they did not support Mr. Casciano coming to speak at a meeting. Ms. Kinis said she did not object to Mr. Casciano's speaking at a CEWG meeting, since she knew who he was.

## **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

## **MEETING ADJOURNED**

## **DECISIONS SUMMARY**

1. The group agreed to make scoping current knowledge a focus for 2014.
2. The CEWG agreed to invite Jim Casciano to speak at a CEWG meeting.

## **NEXT MEETING**

September 18, 2013, 5 to 7 p.m., Corrales Senior Center