

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: August 19, 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
 Dennis O’Mara, Corrales resident

Non-Members Attending

Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident
 Ron Eppes, Intel
 Natasha Martell-Jackson, Intel
 Jim Tritten, Chair STTF Task Force and Corrales resident

Phil Gasteyer, Corrales Village Council, former Mayor of Corrales
 Jeff Radford, *Corrales Comment*

Facilitator

Mark Bennett, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- CEWG Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary, July 2015
- Action-Item Progress Report, August 2015
- EHS Activity Reports

PROPOSED AGENDA

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items ▪ EHS Report and EPA 114 Update ▪ Review Action Item Progress Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review and Discussion of Past CEWG Action Relevant to Items in ATSDR Report ▪ Planning for Hiring New Facilitator ▪ Adjourn |
|--|---|

Filename: CEWG_Final Meeting_Summary_August 19, 15 v3.doc. Approved: September Mtg
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Mark Bennett
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: August 24, 2015

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 comment.

Meeting Summaries—Revisions and Approval

No comment.

ATSDR Update

John Bartlit said that the ATSDR report was released into the public realm and a meeting would be held September 2 at the San Ysidro Old Church in Corrales. He reminded that he was charged to communicate to Peter Kowalski two things: 1. Having a meeting with an extended time frame to discuss multiple issues, which Mr. Kowalski complied by changing the meeting time from 6:30 to 9:00 pm; and 2. Suggesting epidemiologist Lynne Flowers participate in the meeting to discuss the epidemiology aspect. Mr. Kowalski attempted to communicate with her and learned that she no longer worked at the CDC, and he could not make further contact.

- Dennis O'Mara said that for the record he was concerned that discussion of the methods during the meeting might drown out discussion of the report content, and he would be very disappointed if this indeed happened.
- John Bartlit said that previously Mr. Kowalski had said he would make himself available for a meeting on another day to continue the discussion, if necessary, and Mr. Bartlit did not know if that offer still stood. Lynne Kinis asked if Mr. Kowalski would consider holding a second meeting with the CEWG the day following the public presentation, since the CEWG had so many questions. John Bartlit said he would email Mr. Kowalski to ask if he would stay the next day for a follow up meeting.

ACTION ITEM: John Bartlit will contact Peter Kowalski to ask if he would be available for a follow up meeting with the CEWG.

- Dennis O'Mara asked if Peter Kowalski had seen a copy of the articles in the *Rio Rancho Observer* and *Albuquerque Journal*. John Bartlit said yes. Mr. O'Mara asked if it would be wise to ask Mr. Kowalski to interact with both publications, either to write letters to the editor, or request a response interview or both, to counter the "ridiculous" content in these articles and clarify that the ATSDR did not clear Intel emissions, and they did not say that Intel emissions did not pose a risk. These articles incorrectly stated that the

ATSDR cleared Intel, and in so doing interfered with public interest and potential attendance at the ATSDR public meeting, Mr. O'Mara said, which defeated the CEWG's purpose of getting good participation at the meeting.

- Natasha Martel-Jackson said that time was scheduled for media questions before the ATSDR meeting from 5:30 to 6:30 pm. Dennis O'Mara said that would not solve the problem, which was that people might be dissuaded from attending after reading the article in question.
- Mark Bennett clarified that Dennis O'Mara was making a request to ask Peter Kowalski to comment on the articles because the press coverage was problematic. Dennis O'Mara asked if Mr. Kowalski would agree with the article, since it was a total reverse of what the report stated in the very first paragraph. Mr. O'Mara said the article "was a lie." Lynne Kinis said to call Peter Kowalski to find out about the article's origin. She continued that anyone familiar with the history could "rip the article to pieces," but the general public did not know the background and therefore could take it for face value and not attend the meeting.
- Phil Gasteyer commented that as a former journalist, he instinctively went to the ATSDR Web site to check the press release, and the article corresponded directly with the press release, which led him to believe that there were some lazy reporters who did not bother to investigate the issue further. Thus, the ATSDR's own staff led up to the news story. Dennis O'Mara said he was not aware of the press release and had not seen it.
- Natasha Martell-Jackson said Intel had drafted a "Dear Neighbor" letter with information about the ATSDR report public meeting on September 2 and CEWG meetings and encouraged people to attend. It also included the ATSDR press release
- Lynne Kinis said she spoke with someone quoted in the article who asked the journalist to get back to her because she had more information to provide, but the journalist never got back to her.
- John Bartlit said he was quoted too, but little of what he actually said was in the press release.
- John Bartlit offered the following action: To draft a specific email to send to Peter Kowalski that conveyed the general message that the CEWG had a goal to encourage as many people—and informed people—as possible to attend the September 2 meeting and that the newspaper articles would serve to block what they were trying to achieve.

- Lynne Kinis asked why the ATSDR felt it was necessary to send out a press release that would exonerate Intel and lead people to believe everything was “hunky dory.” John Bartlit said Peter Kowalski would most likely say that the ATSDR always issued a press release, and they had a department for that purpose. He said he could not tell Mr. Kowalski what to do; he only reported what the group asked him to report and left it up to Mr. Kowalski what steps to take.
- Lynne Kinis said that this article was factually incorrect, and as an example read a section that said, “ATSDR filed an initial report in 2009 of its findings, saying the agency needed to conduct more monitoring to determine the health impact of the plant’s emissions.” She said that “monitoring” was not done but calculations were made based on data and information Intel had provided, and “you can’t get anything accurate if you are going to ask the fox for the information.” She added that the journalist who wrote the article was Antonio Sanchez of the *Rio Rancho Observer*.
- Dennis O’Mara said the *Observer* was owned by the *Albuquerque Journal*, and he had spoken with the editor of *Observer* and the managing editor of *Albuquerque Journal*, was in touch with the editorial page editor and several others at the *Albuquerque Journal*, and had copied the editor in chief of the *Albuquerque Journal* on communications about his concerns. He hadn’t heard back from anyone until today, when he wrote another note that said the silence was deafening and it was a matter of professionalism. This afternoon the editor of the *Observer* called, as did the journalist who had written the article, who sounded quite young. Mr. O’Mara had plans to meet him at the *Observer* office on Thursday. Mr. O’Mara said that if Kowalski agreed with the press release and what was written in the article, they were in much deeper trouble than he could imagine and he would be disappointed that his “sister agency” had done this to them. However, he said if the journalist had relied on the press release, then the journalist couldn’t be blamed. He was not sure who was accountable.
- John Bartlit said he was called by Sanchez, the journalist, and asked for a quote. Mr. Bartlit said he had focused on what the CEWG wanted to happen, which included reading the report, attending the meeting and increasing the community’s participation.
- Jeff Radford said he got the news release and the link to the report was embedded in the press release, so reporters had access to deeper information.
- Dennis O’Mara said that the ATSDR press release had eliminated important information that was in the report’s summary of conclusions and recommendations, which was a disclaimer that stated the ATSDR could not accurately determine whether VOCs emitted

by Intel could harm people's health. This was a very different statement from the "ATSDR cleared Intel."

- Mr. O'Mara continued that the odors in the report attributed to the crematorium were absurd. Intel emitted a million pounds of toxic materials, while the crematorium operations were comparatively minor. Many of the complaints occurred in the middle of the night, when the crematorium was not in operation. The section on particulates from windstorms and fires had nothing to do with Intel's particulate emissions, and people in New Mexico knew and understood what they needed to do to protect themselves from fires and windstorm particulates. In addition, these were time-limited events versus Intel's 24-7 operations. Why did the ATSDR choose to offer this lecture?
- Mark Bennett asked the CEWG what action they wanted to take. Did they want John Bartlit to convey their concerns? John Bartlit said he would either draft an email and pass it around for feedback or someone else could write the email to Kowalski. Members agreed to have John Bartlit write the email and send it to everyone for their feedback.

ACTION ITEM: John Bartlit will draft an email to Peter Kowalski and send to group members for feedback.

- Lynne Kinis asked for Mr. Bartlit to check with Mr. Kowalski whether the report was available in hard copies for people to read at the library. Phil Gasteyer called the Rio Rancho library and confirmed they had copies.

EHS REPORT AND EPA 114 UPDATE

Sarah Chavez reported that Intel would start a roof repair project on Monday and go to November, and this was not listed on the EHS Report. The work would occur during the day. Also, Intel had received two odor complaints from the same person. Ms. Chavez said she had left phone messages for this person but had not talked with them yet to get the details. The complaints had different descriptions, different symptoms, and the wind was blowing from different directions at about 5 to 10 MPH. Both complaints were in the early morning hours a couple of weeks apart.

ACTION ITEM PROGRESS REPORT

- Sarah Chavez address item #6, which concerned renaming files posted on the CEWG Web site. She wanted to document the process by showing a screen shot of the Web site before the change and a screen shot after the change. The new document naming protocol included a title, date, and author. She also planned to create a list of document names that included the old name, new name and a comment section. They would keep a copy of the original document on a thumb drive that would be kept by the facilitator. The motivation

<p>Filename: CEWG_Final Meeting_Summary_August 19, 15 v3.doc. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Mark Bennett Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: August 24, 2015</p>
--

for this action was the inconsistency of naming protocols and difficulty finding documents. The advantage of adding dates was that the documents could be ordered chronologically. Ms. Chavez said she would continue to work on it and report back when it was done.

- Mark Bennett asked if they had ever discussed item 7. Sarah Chavez said she would check.
- Dennis O'Mara said item #13 was completed. Plus, he had sent out the news blast to additional organizations and individuals in Corrales to help spread the word about the ATSDR meeting.
- John Bartlit said the Corrales Village Council had a meeting the night before, and it might be useful to mention it. Sarah Chavez said Intel was invited to present a general update on Intel to the Corrales Village Council that lasted about 10 minutes. Liz Shipley discussed volunteerism, education, etc., and Sarah Chavez discussed the CEWG and invited people to attend meetings. Frank Gallegos talked about the ATSDR report. Dennis O'Mara said he was there to announce the ATSDR report publication on behalf of the CEWG and encourage people to read it and come to the meeting. He also spoke as a concerned citizen about the news article and expressed that he was extremely unhappy with the papers and would do everything he could to get out the straight story.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF PAST CEWG ACTION RELEVANT TO ITEMS IN ATSDR REPORT

- John Bartlit began with a discussion about the crystalline silica testing task force (STTF) that included Jim Tritten, Pat Clauser, and John Alsobrook, Hugh Church, Thom Little and Edward Pineda. Mr. Bartlit said the crystalline silica testing was mentioned relatively often in the ATSDR report. He asked Jim Tritten for his thoughts.
- Jim Tritten said he had read the ATSDR report from the perspective of the Chair of the STTF. He checked if anyone had any issues with regard to the methodology, the writing, and if further action by the STTF was called for. The STTF met for the last time in 2011 and adjourned with the intention to stay in force until the ATSDR report was released in case further action by the committee was needed. He said he did not see any further need for the STTF, and since there was not a quorum, he asked the CEWG to adjourn or abolish the STTF. Mr. Tritten said he would pack up his notes and other STTF documents and deliver them to the facilitator for archiving. He added that three people reviewed the crystalline silica report, and he thought the assessment was very thorough.

- John Bartlit asked to wait until September, after the ATSDR meeting, to abolish the STTF, since discussion questions may come up. Jim Tritten said that was fair.
- Dennis O'Mara pointed out that the ATSDR report repeatedly mentioned how things had changed in the semi-conductor industry. He said he believed the results of the silica testing process but had these voices from community members pointing out the weaknesses, including that there was no way to prove that Intel did not alter production levels during the testing time frame. The report did not say anything about what happened in previous years and decades, and he said he could only hope that there were not any more cases of pulmonary fibrosis brewing in Corrales.
- Jim Tritten responded that the sampling for the STTF was done by Intel contractors, and that the choice was either do the test with the contractors before the equipment was dismantled or not do the test. The citizens present were there to make sure they witnessed every single step along the way so the act of who actually took the samples was immaterial. In light of the constraints, this was the only way it could be done. He said he remembered that the issue of production rates was a sensitive area for Intel. At least 3 or 4 witnesses in the room got the briefing and were allowed to see the production rates. At that time Mr. Tritten said he was convinced that the production was not altered. Hugh Church added he was there and also did not think anything was amiss. Mr. Tritten said that he recalled that all present on that day asked the same question and walked out of the briefing not thinking there was an issue.
- Dennis O'Mara said he bought into the silica testing results but was aware that he was the only Corrales resident actively involved on the CEWG so he felt a great responsibility to bring to the table the community's concerns.
- Sarah Chavez said the concern was that when HMDS was put into a thermal oxidizer at a certain temperature it would create crystalline silica. While the amount of HMDS used had changed over the years, the temperature did not. Intel tested both Durr and Munters units, and the permit required they test a range plus or minus 10 degrees since 1994. The units always operated at the same temperature previously. Today, the Munters operate at a higher temperature, and that was a concern, and that was what the study looked at, whether it would create crystalline silica at that higher temperature.
- John Bartlit said he would email Thom Little and ask him to respond to the report on the production levels at Intel in the weeks before and after the silica testing. Jim Tritten said it was in terms of months or years before. Sarah Chavez said Thom Little actually looked at a specific tool set that used the chemical and was able to get a correlation between them. CEWG members thought it was a good idea for Mr. Bartlit to contact Thom Little.

Jim Tritten read from his crystalline silica minutes from September 1 that the plant was operating at the range of 80% of full capacity during the sampling period, which was at the higher end. During sampling, Intel was exceeding the recommended value of operating capacity.

ACTION ITEM: John Bartlit will contact Thom Little and ask him to respond to the ATSDR report on the production levels at Intel in the weeks before and after the silica testing

- John Bartlit referred to Mike Williams modeling of short-term air concentrations of hydrogen fluoride (HF) spikes. This work was mentioned in the ATSDR report. Mike Williams said his work was treated accurately in the ATSDR report.
- John Bartlit mentioned the New Mexico Department of Health (NMDOH) study on pulmonary fibrosis in Corrales. The CEWG tried to get a review of the report by two independent entities. They succeeded with Jonathan Samet, a well-known scholar and researcher on lung issues, who reviewed and commented on the report, but not with the National Jewish Hospital in Denver, which was a leading facility for respiratory research, who did not offer to review the report.
- John Bartlit continued on to mention the EPA 114 report and the areas of concern around Intel noncompliance. Sarah Chavez said Intel had presented to the CEWG about the actions they took to address the areas of concern.
- John Bartlit said there were some things in the ATSDR 2009 report that the CEWG took action on. Now in the 2015 there was a new issue that wasn't in the 2009 report, and that was Lou Gherig's disease or arterial lateral sclerosis (ALS). He said if the CEWG could think of something to do in this area at a later meeting he would welcome it.
- Dennis O'Mara said there was a lot to do on ALS. He went on to read from his letter to the editor about the ASTDR Final Report article:

For me, one of the issues of greatest concern is ALS. In its report, ATSDR has elected to avoid the issue rather than to do some analyses using estimates of incidence and prevalence from various sources such as the NM Department of Health, the national ALS Association and the National Institutes of Health (NIH). NIH, for example, estimates that the prevalence of ALS in the United States is 3.9 cases per 100,000. We have no details about the 10 ALS cases that the ATSDR report mentions, including exactly where and when they occurred. But if, for example, those cases had occurred within a one-mile radius of the plant where about 13,000 people reside, the prevalence would have been, in round figures, about 70 per 100,000, a rate about 19 times the national estimate!

Some studies have suggested, but not concluded, that some ALS cases may be associated with exposure to toxic materials in the environment. Recently we hear that more than 40 ALS cases have been reported in the area of the Intel facilities in Oregon including seven among former Intel workers.

- John Bartlit said one of the challenges was the issue between health data and people's privacy. Mr. O'Mara cited a post on the Internet by a TV station in Oregon where they spoke with the wife of an Intel employee who died of ALS in 2014. She said they had found two others in his work group who had also contracted ALS. She had a conversation with Dr. Michael Fishman, who identified it as a cluster but couldn't find the cause, and medical confidentiality rules prevented Intel from checking for more cases in its plant.
- John Bartlit asked Sarah Chavez if she knew of any reported cases of ALS among Intel employees at Rio Rancho. Ms. Chavez responded that she did not know the answer but she would ask and cited medical confidentiality rules. Mr. Bartlit said they were not asking for who they were, just a number.
- Phil Gasteyer observed that the ATSDR report conclusions and recommendations about ALS and IPF were not very helpful to the public.
- Dennis O'Mara asked if anyone knew anything about the ATSDR meeting format. No one knew any details. The CEWG would not be involved in any way in the meeting. Sarah Chavez said that last time the ATSDR did a presentation and then opened up for questions and answers. John Bartlit said the ATSDR representative invited the EPA from the Dallas office but he did not know if the EPA would attend. Mr. O'Mara said he invited individuals from the NMDOH. Mr. Bartlit added that the ATSDR usually brought an epidemiologist.
- Dennis O'Mara asked if John Bartlit could include a request to the ATSDR to consider issuing another press release that spoke first about first conclusion in report. Mike Williams said the logical step would be to examine what the VOCs were doing, but the press release makes it look like a nonissue. Jeff Radford said that the press release process be expedited ASAP. Dennis O'Mara asked if Peter Kowalski was amenable to being interviewed over the phone by media.

ACTION ITEM: John Bartlit will contact Peter Kowalski to ask if the ATSDR would consider releasing another press release.

DISCUSSION OF HIRING NEW FACILITATOR

<p>Filename: CEWG_Final Meeting_Summary_August 19, 15 v3.doc. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Mark Bennett Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: August 24, 2015</p>
--

Mark Bennett updated the process of hiring a new facilitator. He said a job description was distributed and five people had responded to date. Sarah Chavez said the request for proposals were due August 31. Intel would go through the first interview cut and pick the top three candidates for CEWG member to interview. The time frame was to conduct interviews in September and hire by October since Mr. Bennett would not be available in January. Mr. Bennett clarified that he would not be in New Mexico in January but could respond via WiFi while in Brazil, and he would make himself accessible.

NEW BUSINESS

MEETING ADJOURNED

NEXT MEETING: September 16, 2015, 5 to 7 pm, Corrales Senior Center.