

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: March 18, 2015
Time: 5:00–7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Senior Center

Members Attending

John Bartlit, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water
 Mike Williams, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water

Hugh Church, American Lung Assc. in NM
 Sarah Chavez, Intel

Non-Members Attending

Ron Eppes, Intel

Facilitator

Mark Bennett, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- CEWG Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary, February 2015
- Action-Item Progress Report, March 2015
- EHS Activity Reports

PROPOSED AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, and Brief Items
- EHS Report and EPA 114 Update
- Review Action Item Progress Report
- Preparation for Release of ATSDR Report
- Final Review of Draft 2014 Report
- Announcements
- Adjourn

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, 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.

Filename: CEWG_Final Meeting_Summary_3-18-15 v2.doc. Approved
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Mark Bennett
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: March 23, 2015

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

No comments.

Meeting Summaries—Revisions and Approval

No changes or corrections.

ATSDR Update

John Bartlit said he spoke with Peter Kowalski on Friday, March 13. Mr. Kowalski had told him that the ATSDR report had gone to his Acting Division Head, Dr. James Stephens, for final review before going to the external peer review panel. Mr. Bartlit said that Dr. Stephens was relatively new and had come to the ATSDR from NIOSH. Mr. Kowalski had also mentioned, “There are lots of documents in the queue waiting to be reviewed,” but he would try to get some priority for its review. Mr. Bartlit concluded that the final report would not come out in April. Mr. Bartlit said that he told Mr. Kowalski that the CEWG’s aim was to send him questions and comments on the report at least a month before his visit to New Mexico, and Mr. Kowalski was pleased about getting this material. Mr. Kowalski clarified that the ATSDR’s standard procedure for final reports was to offer to meet first with the petitioners, and he would make this offer to Marcy Brandenburg, the person who petitioned the ATSDR to investigate the community health effects of Intel New Mexico.

Web site Update

- Sarah Chavez said she asked Mark Bennett if he would give her access to the CEWG Web site so she could go in and accurately rename the documents to clarify what information they contained. Many of the documents on the CEWG Web site were named inaccurately or vaguely, so her goal was to rename the document to give a clearer indication of its content. John Bartlit asked her to make sure the dates were correct. Also, he asked how they would know that she didn’t change the report content. Ms. Chavez reminded that most of the documents were pdf files, so she could not alter the document content. She suggested that if she found any documents that were not in pdf form, she could request Mark Bennett to change it to pdf so all files were consistent in type. Mr. Bennett suggested that Ms. Chavez rename the titles because she was more familiar with the documents than he was. Ron Eppes suggested that there might be a date affiliated with each document that showed the last date it was modified, so that was a way to tell whether the integrity of the document was compromised. Renaming the title should not interfere with this modification date, but he did not know for sure. He suggested that Mr. Bennett try it out with one document. Also, if Ms. Chavez intended to change a document, she would inform the CEWG in advance for their approval. Ms. Chavez said she would also keep a table of documents with their original names, corresponding new names, and date modified.

Filename: CEWG_Final Meeting_Summary_3-18-15 v2.doc. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Mark Bennett

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: March 23, 2015

ACTION ITEM: Mark Bennett will visit the CEWG Web site to check on document modification date before giving Sarah Chavez permission to rename documents for clarity and usability. (Per Hugh Church – consider adding a sample date 150323 for year/month/day to front of file name for sorting by date.

- Sarah Chavez asked if documents were posted chronologically or alphabetically and if there was a renaming preference. The group agreed she should do it chronologically. Hugh Church said he used a six-digit date first to rename his files. Ms. Chavez agreed to do it by date.

Regulatory Engineering

- Sarah Chavez said she had spoken with Daren Zigich of NMED to update him on changes made to the Explore Intel Web site, and he had sent Ms. Chavez two emails today. In the first email he asked about redundancy in the system and how it was shown on the Web site. Ms. Chavez said that because the way the permit was written, Intel was not keeping track of time a unit was down if another unit was operating because all emissions were still being abated. The intent on the Web site was just to show the time when emissions were not being abated. She said she would clarify this point with Mr. Zigich. Mr. Bartlit asked if Intel lost useful information by not tracking downtime. Ms. Chavez said that information was still tracked but differently. For example, Intel tracked maintenance and length of time and placed this information in an equipment database as part of Intel's regulatory recordkeeping.
- Ms. Chavez said that Daren Zigich told her NMED held a weekly internal training on a variety of topics and asked if Ms. Chavez could give a 30 minute presentation on the Explore Web site. He thought this presentation would be useful to give a new perspective on what could be done in the area of environmental transparency. Ms. Chavez she would be happy to give the presentation. John Bartlit asked if outsiders could attend the presentation. Ms. Chavez said she would ask.

ACTION ITEM: Sarah Chavez will ask Daren Zigich if external people could attend her presentation to NMED on the Explore Intel Web site.

- Sarah Chavez said Sandra Ely's "acting" replacement was Ralph Gruebel. NMED would begin to actively interview permanent replacements this week.
- John Bartlit suggested that Ms. Chavez introduce the notion of regulatory engineering during her presentation as a new idea.

Public Comment

<p>Filename: CEWG_Final Meeting_Summary_3-18-15 v2.doc. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Mark Bennett Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: March 23, 2015</p>

None

EHS REPORT AND EPA 114 UPDATE

Sarah Chavez said that Intel received a call wanting to speak to Mark Bennett about unresolved flooding issues. Ms. Chavez said she returned the call and explained Mark Bennett's role with the CEWG. Also, Intel received a new odor complaint on Monday of this week, so it was not included in the current report. Ms. Chavez said she would include this call and her response on the next EHS report. She added that Intel had not heard from the EPA.

ACTION ITEM PROGRESS REPORT

- Sarah Chavez discussed #18 regarding a pilot class taught to senior engineers at Intel the end of February. She and Brian Rashap conducted the two-hour class, which included a history of Intel's environmental improvement projects prior to the CEWG, since the CEWG's establishment, and at the corporate level. They also discussed Intel's 2020 goals. Ms. Chavez said the focus was to get these senior leaders to think about their ability to influence change within the factory, which also had implications outside the factory walls, and to give them an overall picture of compliance and the manufacturing process. Ms. Chavez said they received some positive feedback from participants, such as why the class wasn't taught to more people, and they appreciated the class content. Once a decision was made about the pilot program, then she will know if the class will continue. She said she would follow up in the next couple of months on whether they decide to keep the class or not.
- John Bartlit said he responded already to #20. ATSDR would meet with the petitioner first, and it was up to the petitioner who to invite to that meeting. So, the degree to whether the meeting would be public or private was up to the petitioner.
- Mark Bennett said #22 was completed, so he would remove it from the list. He said #23 remained pending. On #25, Sarah Chavez said Intel's comments were embedded in the questions for ATSDR document, "...so this could item could be closed." On #26, the CEWG would review this evening. #27 remained pending, and #29 could be removed. Ms. Chavez said she still needed to complete #28. For item #31, the CEWG would review the 2014 Annual Report one more time this evening, and then Mr. Bennett will post it to the CEWG Web site.

PREPARATION FOR RELEASE OF ATSDR REPORT

The group reviewed the latest version of the "Questions/Comments for ATSDR" document that was compiled by Dennis O'Mara, and made "real time" edits to the document. The group agreed to use track changes to show changes made this evening.

<p>Filename: CEWG_Final Meeting_Summary_3-18-15 v2.doc. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Mark Bennett Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: March 23, 2015</p>

- John Bartlit made a correction to the “Preamble.” On line 9, he changed “a consensus document” to “consensus of concerns.”
- Sarah Chavez said her answers to questions asked by various CEWG members were built in to the document and highlighted in yellow. She emphasized that these responses did not refer to the ATSDR draft report directly, but to individual questions or comments by CEWG members. She requested that these responses remain in the document underneath the corresponding question/comment. Mr. O’Mara suggested that these comments be numbered separately, but Ms. Chavez thought that might be confusing.
- The group discussed how to make it clear that Ms. Chavez was not commenting on the draft report but was responding to specific CEWG member questions or comments. They agreed that the simplest way was to offset Ms. Chavez’s comments using italics, and, with the first place it appeared, to place an “asterisk” (*) at the end of her comment in reference to the following footnote: “*Italicized text reflects Intel CEWG member responses on the above CEWG member questions or comments.”
- Hugh Church discussed item #12 on page 6 and the use of the word “fielded” on the role of the Corrales Air Quality Task Force (CAQTF). He said he chose this word because CAQTF had set up the infrastructure to get the job done but they did not do the analysis. Contactors did that. Sarah Chavez said her comment was because she never saw the word “fielded” used in this context. They decided to leave the word as written and remove Ms. Chavez’s comment “(do you mean studied or evaluation)”.
- The remaining edits involved grammatical and punctuation changes and eliminating extra spaces.
- Sarah Chavez said Dennis O’Mara wanted “Table 106.B” on page 14 to have a legend or footnotes to define the items in the table as well as an indication of what the numbers meant. She said that Peter Kowalski would know everything in the table, so this suggestion would not add value. The table came from Intel’s air permit. They would need to define 10 acronyms. The group did not think the suggestion would add value to Peter Kowalski’s understanding, so they left it as written.
- John Bartlit said Mike Williams’ Sierra Club award was added to his credentials on the CEWG Web site.

ACTION ITEM: Mark Bennett said he would send out a version of this document with tracked changes to the group via email to get final approval (ver. 5.2).

FINAL REVIEW OF DRAFT 2014 ANNUAL REPORT

Mark Bennett asked the group to review the draft 2014 Annual Report one more time before he put it on the Web site. The group made grammatical and punctuation changes and approved the final version for the Web site.

ACTION ITEM: Mark Bennett will post the 2014 Annual Report to the Web site.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Sarah Chavez said that last year Intel conducted a plant tour on Earth Day and would do the same this year on April 22. Intel would send neighbor letters to all Corrales and some Rio Rancho residents with an official invitation to the “2nd Annual Earth Day Tour.” Last year 65 community members attended the tour, which was scheduled for April 22, 5:30 to 7:30 pm. Ms. Chavez said if the CEWG knew of anyone who wanted to attend to please let her know.
- Sarah Chavez said she received notification about the Governor’s First Annual Environmental Excellence Awards Program through the NMED list serv. NMED hosted the program, with Jill Turner as contact. Brian Rashap, Liz Shipley and Sarah Chavez nominated the CEWG for this award in the education and outreach category. The application was a four-page narrative of accomplishments, and John Bartlit helped review the application. Ms. Chavez said she attached the short report to community, Citizens’ Protocol, stack height report, code red report, screen shots for Explore Intel, and a few other documents to the application.
- John Bartlit said he made many comments on the application. The draft narrative followed the award format and used words like the CEWG “collaborated,” “cooperated,” and “partnered” with Intel. Mr. Bartlit said he resisted these words because he did not think they describe how the CEWG gets ideas and makes progress. These words implied agreement. CEWG ideas generally came from disagreement. Ideas were spurred by conflict or differing perspectives and backgrounds, not by cooperation per se. Intel killed the Citizens’ Advisory Panel because they did not get any ideas from this group. Nothing happened because there was little conflict. Friction caused ideas but had to be managed by a facilitator. That was the key to having a useful group. He said he appreciated the nomination but it would fail because the award was trying to promote “collaboration.” So he changed the words he could on the application and tried to accurately present how the CEWG worked, which was with the notion of diversity and constructive conflict coupled with wanting to make change that brought actionable items. He said he changed the language to “the CEWG pursued ideas with Intel,” rather than “partnered” with Intel. Partners had the same goals. The CEWG and Intel had different, though potentially compatible, goals.

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING: April 15, 2015, 5 to 7 pm, Corrales Senior Center.

Filename: CEWG_Final Meeting_Summary_3-18-15 v2.doc. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Mark Bennett Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: March 23, 2015
--