

## MEETING SUMMARY

### Community Environmental Working Group

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

**Date:** April 20, 2016  
**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, Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water

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

Ron Eppes, Intel  
Jeff Radford, Corrales resident, *Corrales Comment*

Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident, Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water  
Carolyn O’Mara, Corrales resident.

#### **Facilitator**

Shannon Beaucaire, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

#### **HANDOUTS**

- CEWG Draft Agenda, April 20, 2016
- Draft Meeting Summary, March 2016
- Action-Item Progress Report, April 2016
- EHS Activity Report
- Draft 2015 Annual Report
- Draft 2016 Topic Prioritization

#### **PROPOSED AGENDA**

Welcome, Introductions,  
Announcements and Brief Items  
EHS Report and EPA 114 Update  
Review Action Item Progress Report  
Review, Prioritize and Discuss 2016 Topics  
Discussion of Ad Content/Process

Mike Williams Slides  
Discussion Steve Dickens Presentation  
Discussion John Bartlit’s 2006 article  
New Business  
Adjourn

Filename: 2016-04-20 CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_v2. Approved: 5.18.16 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: April 24, 2016
---

**WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND BRIEF ITEMS**

John Bartlit opened the meeting by referring to a longer version of the CEWG mission statement on the CEWG Web site, as follows:

*Established in 2004, the Community Environmental Working Group is committed to making continuous environmental improvements at the Intel New Mexico plant, including reduction of Intel's chemical emissions. The Group also promotes constructive dialogue on all issues related to its mission. The Working Group includes longtime "green" activists, local critics of Intel, other community voices, and a representative from Intel.*

Mr. Bartlit said Mike Williams had used this version in his questions about “who we are,” and was similar to the language Lynne Kinis suggested last month.

Mr. Bartlit also called attention to page 6, fourth bullet point from the bottom, in the November 2007 Meeting Summary, also accessible on the Web site, which says:

*Mr. Bartlit said he believes the CEWG should go on record and say the River Network survey should be provided to the ATSDR.*

He said it was historically interesting that the CEWG had discussed the River Network Survey previously, and that they would talk about it again tonight and next month.

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

No comment.

Meeting Summaries—Revisions and Approval

No comment.

Regulatory Engineering Update

Sarah Chavez provided an update on the New Mexico State University (NMSU) design contest. In regards to the Internet of Things task that no students chose to work on, Frank Gallegos and Gabe Flores thought that electrical and computer engineering groups were not involved in the overall process. However, all engineering disciplines could think about monitoring systems as part of their designs. Ms. Chavez said NMSU planned to host a fall design contest, and that Mr. Gallegos and Mr. Flores were working to complete the task description in early to mid May. This fall design would be a virtual contest to encourage more students from different schools to participate without having to travel to NMSU. Ms. Chavez said that John Bartlit had provided feedback on clarifying the tasks language to be more understandable to students as a way to get more students involved. Also, Intel would provide educational material on Internet of Things to students. Ms. Chavez asked if any CEWG members would be interested in judging any submissions on this contest task, which would most likely happen in late November. John Bartlit volunteered to be a judge.

**ACTION ITEM:** John Bartlit volunteered to be a judge for the fall NMSU design contest.

Other Announcements

Filename: 2016-04-20 CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_v2. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Odek & Shannon Beaucaire Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: April 24, 2016
---

None.

### Public Comment

Lynne Kinis commented that changing the CEWG mission statement slightly would make it more accurate. The CEWG had no power with Intel. What the CEWG did was advise, suggest, etc. The wording should change to reflect that dynamic. The CEWG didn't have control, all they could do was recommend. John Bartlit said he did not know what to do with the mission statement, and thought the word "striving" was fairly accurate. Ms. Kinis said her point was to reshape it to draw more people in. Mr. Bartlit said anyone who wanted to draft new language was welcome to do so, and Mr. Bartlit and Ms. Kinis agreed to draft and propose new language.

**ACTION ITEM:** Lynne Kinis, John Bartlit, and anyone else who was interested will propose draft language for a revised mission statement.

### **EHS REPORT AND EPA 114 UPDATE**

Sarah Chavez asked if anyone had any questions on the EHS report. She noted the listed complaint last month and talked about noise complaint. The person complaining recorded the noise, but Intel did not have the recording yet. Lynne Kinis said the action taken box was like a rubber stamp, and people gave up if they thought they were getting a rubber stamp answer. She said she didn't bother calling in most times because it irked her that the response would be "all systems operating normally....no unusual conditions... someone walked the fence line." Ms. Kinis said she did not live on the fence line, therefore it was a constant irritant for here. She said she knew people are disgusted because they were feeling like they were not heard, so they didn't bother coming to meetings. Sarah Chavez said they talked about this before, and Intel was always open to suggestions. Intel documented their process as agreed upon after numerous CEWG discussions. If the CEWG wanted to change the documentation process, then they could discuss it. Lynne Kinis said when Intel said, "all systems are operating normally," to her it means, "get used to it, folks, this is the way it is." Ms. Chavez said sometimes people call after the fact or while its happening. Many times the odor didn't linger, so if someone traveled to the location then it dispersed. That's why they chose to walk perimeter, check to see if they could see or smell anything, check the abatement equipment, etc. She did not think that traveling to the location provided valuable information, but reiterated Intel was open to other ideas.

Dennis O'Mara observed that the column heading "all systems [not sure what the correct word is here but it is not "answering."] normally" does not cite the specific actions taken. John Bartlit suggested being more descriptive in this area.

Jeff Radford said the calls were more than likely coming from the same place and suggested using bucket samples at those locations. Sarah Chavez said it was a possibility, but there were complex issues involved with collecting that data. John Bartlit reminded

<p>Filename: 2016-04-20 CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_v2. Approved: [not approved]          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Shannon Beaucaire          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: April 24, 2016</p>
---

that Thom Little was prepared to get bucket samples (on only one chemical) and went through the training to do it, but he was never called to collect samples before he moved on. Dennis O'Mara said there was reticence on the part of Intel because of safety issues. Sarah Chavez said she lived too far away and could not be on call to travel to complaint sites, especially in that odor complaints came in late at night. Jeff Radford suggested having the person issuing the complaint do the sampling. Ms. Chavez replied that training, analysis, and equipment was involved, so it was complex, and there was uncertainty as to whether the method would produce valid data. Mike Williams said he recalled someone from the National Science Foundation who did grab samples. He said he would check into it more. Ms. Kinis said Joy still had buckets to collect samples.

**ACTION ITEM:** Mike Williams will attempt to find more information about a person from the National Science Foundation who did grab samples

### **REVIEW ACTION ITEM PROGRESS REPORT**

Sarah Chavez updated #7. She and Liz Shipley attempted to meet with Pat Clauser last week but had scheduling difficulties and would continue to try to schedule a meeting.

John Bartlit said he completed #12, which involved the NMSU student project contest.

Dennis O'Mara asked for an update on #5, which was for Intel NM to issue a challenge to employees to develop ideas around reducing emissions. Sarah Chavez said the CEWG had discussed tying this to a cash award, and she needed to figure out some administrative details, such as possible taxes, etc. John Bartlit said the CEWG could get money from Intel to offer the award, and publicize the award. Lynne Kinis commented that if Intel really cared about emissions they would have done that years ago, and if an employee of Intel came up with a good idea she would not be surprised if that person got their walking papers. John Bartlit remembered giving a talk at a luncheon in honor of technicians who implemented a new maintenance schedule for the RTOs. He said taking action inviting more people to think creatively was worthwhile. Dennis O'Mara asked if Intel had a motivational/award system for people who brought ideas to the fore. Sarah Chavez said yes, Intel had many opportunities for staff recognition, for example, they had a corporate-wide Environmental Excellence Award, where people could submit ideas for environmental improvements. Dennis O'Mara said if the CEWG was successful at convincing Intel to adopt their idea, then the CEWG could craft specific wording of what kind of improvements they were looking for to prompt the thinking of people with certain skill sets. John Bartlit agreed that they could use language to fit their interests.

### **WRAPPING UP 2015: REVIEW AND FINALIZE ANNUAL REPORT**

Dennis O'Mara said he approved the Annual Report, but, for the record, he wanted to point out that the CEWG decided not to include any discussion in the Annual Report

<p>Filename: 2016-04-20 CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_v2. Approved: [not approved]          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Shannon Beaucaire          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: April 24, 2016</p>
---

about commentary around the ATSDR draft report. He said, in his view, that NMED leaked the report to Intel and did it on purpose for a variety of reasons that he listed in a series of e-mails. He wanted to clarify NMED's actions for the record, and that these actions negatively impacted the community. As long as his point was clear in Meeting Minutes, then he was happy with the Annual Report. John Bartlit said he had responded to Mr. O'Mara that most of the things the CEWG had ever done involved people's motives, bad, good or indifferent, and they could attach motives to all actions. Therefore, he and Mr. O'Mara did not agree on language, so consensus was not reached on the language regarding the question/comment document related to the ATSDR report and so it was left out.

Lynne Kinis asked why they would leave out an item if there were no consensus on it. Mr. Bartlit responded that the Annual Report was always done by consensus, and if they couldn't agree how to say it then there was nothing to say. Ms. Kinis suggested noting that consensus was not reached, because not saying anything kept the public away. Sarah Chavez asked if Ms. Kinis agreed with the following wording: "The CEWG discussed and prepared for final release of ATSDR report. Consensus was not reached on how to document the process. Please refer to Meeting Minutes and Topic Index on the CEWG Web site for more details." Ms. Chavez asked if this wording addressed Ms. Kinis's concerns. Ms. Kinis said yes. Mr. Bartlit agreed it was a good idea. Shannon Beaucaire changed the language in the Annual Report.

#### **REVIEW PRIORITIZE AND DISCUSS 2016 TOPICS**

Shannon Beaucaire reminded that the exercise to review and prioritize topics was done to guide discussion topics for the coming year and to help draft meeting agendas. John Bartlit added that they never followed this ranking exactly, since new items came up all the time.

Sarah Chavez asked a question on the item in the first position, "Additional Monitoring Options for Emissions," which was only ranked by two people. Shannon Beaucaire said she wanted to include it, which was why she added the qualifier "Not voted on by all participants." She added that on some of the sheets returned to her this item was missing. Dennis O'Mara suggested sending it out again to make sure everyone ranked this item so it could be added to the list.

**ACTION ITEM:** Shannon Beaucaire will send out this item again for ranking, and everyone will return their ranking to her by May 1.

John Bartlit commented on the Regulatory Engineering topic and the question of whether it was a group focus or only a John Bartlit focus. Dennis O'Mara said the group embraced and supported the Regulatory Engineering concept, and Sarah Chavez

participated extensively as well. Thus, the group agreed that it was a group concept and not only a John Bartlit topic.

## DISCUSSION OF AD CONTENT/PROCESS

Shannon Beaucaire said the group had talked about revising the CEWG ad but never talked about what procedure to take to revise it. The suggested procedure is as follows: *The CEWG ad will be prepared by Carolyn O'Mara every month. Ms. O'Mara will update the meeting date and send the ad to the facilitator by the end of the month prior to the meeting unless the ad due date is earlier (i.e. the Corrales Comment had two ad due dates in 2016 prior to the end of the month, which are Oct. 31 and Nov. 28). The facilitator will forward the ads to Intel for publication in the following news outlets:*

- Corrales Comment
- Albuquerque Journal
- Weekly Alibi
- Rio Rancho Observer

Hugh Church said the address listed for this location, 4324 Corrales Road, was not here but across the street. Any mapping apps did not lead the person to this address. Sarah Chavez said the Sandoval County Web site listed the address as: 4324-A Corrales Road.

**ACTION ITEM:** Shannon Beaucaire will research the correct address and in relation to mapping apps..

Lynne Kinis said the ad in the *Albuquerque Journal* this month jumped out at her, so it was a “grabber.”

Dennis O'Mara asked if they could add something to the set of procedures to accommodate special circumstances, like having a guest speaker. Shannon Beaucaire said it could become the facilitator's responsibility to contact the speaker and get their presentation topic. John Bartlit said adding more information to the ad as it was designed now would detract, and something would have to be eliminated. He suggested trading off the upper right corner, where it said “Exchange ideas...” for the speaker information. Carolyn O'Mara said they had talked previously about making this exact section flexible to adjust for special topics. Sarah Chavez asked about space limitations. Ms. O'Mara said she could manipulate space, but the fewer words the better. Ms. Chavez suggested adding to the procedures using a short “snappy” presentation title, and an organization affiliation.

Shannon Beaucaire asked Ms. O'Mara about what kind of turnaround timeframe she needed. Ms. O'Mara said at least a week following a CEWG meeting would give plenty of time. Sarah Chavez said Natasha Martell Jackson would need time to approve the final ad. Ms. Chavez said she would ask Ms. Martell Jackson about timing.

<p>Filename: 2016-04-20 CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_v2. Approved: [not approved]          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Shannon Beaucaire          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: April 24, 2016</p>
---

**ACTION ITEM:** Sarah Chavez said she would ask Natasha Martell Jackson how much time she needed to approve the final ad.

### **MIKE WILLIAMS SLIDES**

Sarah Chavez brought Mike Williams slides onto the screen to do a “live” real time group edit. Group discussion highlights are listed next.

On the issue of having a question on crematorium and waste water plant emissions in the full list of questions to send to Peter Kowalski, Dennis O’Mara said they should not give any credence to the idea that either facility contributed significant emissions, especially when compared to Intel, and was not in favor of the question. John Bartlit said he saw it as opposite, having the question emphasized their emissions were minimally insignificant and added doubt. Mr. O’Mara said every time this issue came up, it diverted attention from Intel. Mike Williams said including the question would put an end to the issues once and for all. Lynne Kinis said the crematorium had come up ad nauseum and thinks that the issue was addressed. She added that it could not possibly be an issue because the crematorium operated during in the day, while Intel odor complaints were usually in the middle of the night. She also disclosed that she was allergic to formaldehyde (used in the embalming process) and if it were in the air she would know it.

Mike Williams said the group would have to reach a consensus on the questions to send to Peter Kowalski. Mr. O’Mara said that based on the discussion, he agreed to keep the crematorium/waste water facilities questions on the list and get it dealt with to eliminate it once and for all. John Bartlit said he advocated questioning everything.

Sarah Chavez said she wanted to make everyone aware that HEE, a listed vendor, actually worked with the NM Intel site and with the Intel Oregon site. John Bartlit asked if they should add something around Intel’s giving permission for HEE to respond to Mike Williams’ questions. Ms. Chavez said she did not know what legal agreements HEE had with Intel around giving information to the CEWG. She said they should continue to look at, and she would inquire about it at Intel.

Mike Williams said to add information on Jonathan Samet, and to get his address from Hugh Church.

Mike Williams said the CEWG would have to decide consensus on sending questions. Sarah Chavez added that she had to get information on how to handle questions to HEE. Sarah Chavez said she would send the updated slides to group. The group would then send comments to Shannon Beaucaire indicating their consensus (or not) around sending the questions to Peter Kowalski.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

Sarah Chavez will send slides to group members.

Group members will send feedback to Shannon Beaucaire and indicate their consensus.

Sarah Chavez will get information from Intel on how to handle questions to HEE

**DISCUSSION STEVE DICKENS PRESENTATION**

Dennis O'Mara said Steve Dickens would attend the CEWG meeting next month by telephone. Shannon Beaucaire said they would use Skype. Sarah Chavez said she would bring external speakers. Mr. O'Mara reminded they would need two laptops: one to project the slides and one to project Skype. Ms. Chavez said she would bring her laptop, and Ms. Beaucaire would bring hers.

Dennis O'Mara said that Steve Dickens' presentation apparently was never sent to Peter Kowalski back in 2007. He said he contacted Mr. Kowalski, who would be pleased to review the slides and was interested in hearing from Steve Dickens. Mr. Dickens would contact Mr. Kowalski to provide as much detail as he wanted. In addition to a short presentation and a long presentation, Mr. Dickens had seven three-ring binders of information. Mr. O'Mara said that Mr. Dickens' research seemed to have been glossed over in the past, which was why he was determined to bring it back for review.

Sarah Chavez said she talked with Mindy Koch from Intel who participated in the Corrales for Clean Air and Water Task force, who said she remembered that whoever was presenting would not share the data. Dennis O'Mara said his understanding was that in 2002 or 2003 Fred Marsh sent out a health survey to Corrales households and got back about 600 responses. NMED prematurely aborted the task force in 2004 before all the work was completed. The analysis of the health survey was not completed until November 2005, long after the task force work ended. Mr. O'Mara looked for a report on the analysis, but there was none—just lots of analysis. Sarah Chavez said the data were referenced in the ATSDR report but said there was no final report.

Jeff Radford said he attended a presentation on that topic at the Southwest Organizing Project (SWOP) headquarters. SWOP had some concern about releasing the information, and since they initiated the study they had a say on what happened to it. SWOP decided against submitting the data to the ATSDR, but why he did not know.

Sarah Chavez asked if the entire meeting would be Mr. Dickens presentation. Dennis O'Mara said Mr. Dickens would go through the long slide set, and if he needed the entire meeting to complete his presentation, then the CEWG should give it to him. He recalled there were over 30 slides, and some of the slides were boilerplate photos or illustrations

that helped explain how conclusions were reached. Discussion time would also be needed.

Discussion time would also be needed.

John Bartlit proposed generating questions to send to Steve Dickens ahead of his presentation so he could be prepared to answer them. Shannon Beaucaire will compile the questions and send to Mr. Dickens at least two weeks before the meeting. She asked that the group send her questions by May 4. Dennis O'Mara asked for Ms. Beaucaire to ask Mr. Dickens for a bio or short curriculum vitae, and how he would like to handle the introduction.

John Bartlit said John Alsobrook, Pat Clauser, and Mayor Gasteyer might be interested in attending the presentation, since they were aware of this study at the time. Dennis O'Mara said he planned to invite the neighborhood and prompt some other attendance.

#### **ACTION ITEMS:**

The group will send questions for Mr. Dickens to Shannon Beaucaire by May 4. Shannon Beaucaire will compile the questions and send to Mr. Dickens at least two weeks before the meeting.

Shannon Beaucaire will ask Steve Dickens for a short biography or introduction about his background.

Sarah Chavez will bring external speakers.

Dennis O'Mara asked that the last agenda item—discussion of John Bartlit's 2006 article—be moved to the June meeting.

**NEXT MEETING:** May 18, 2016, 5 to 7 pm, Corrales Senior Center.

### **Appendix**

Following are the emails referenced on Page 5 of the meeting summary.

John, I have given this a whole lot of thought and am not interested in giving NMED a pass. This is the organization whose leader at the time, when asked what he and his were going to do to protect the health of the people living near Intel, said "Nothing!" This is the organization whose leader at the time told a group of residents that Intel was NMED's "customer" so that speaks volumes about where we the people are left. This is the organization whose leader at the time aborted the Task Force before all the work was complete, declaring victory for Intel and slamming the door in the faces of the residents. And this is the organization whose leadership at the time LEAKED the confidential draft ATSDR report to Intel and insulted our intelligence by writing me a letter that said, "... 'do not cite or quote' does not have the same meaning as 'do not distribute'."

<p>Filename: 2016-04-20 CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_v2. Approved: [not approved]          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Shannon Beaucaire          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: April 24, 2016</p>
---

The NMED website says, in part, that one of their responsibilities is to “Resolve environmental issues that have or could have a direct impact on the health of our state’s residents.” Are they coming anywhere near fulfilling this requirement? Not from where I stand. They have a lot to live up to and also a lot to live down in my book. As far as I am concerned, they are the enemy.

I think we simply need to state the truth in our annual report about how and why we received the draft ATSDR report. It was NOT because NMED accidentally or inadvertently shared it with Intel. It was NOT because they misunderstood the wording on every page of the draft. And it was NOT because they needed to ask Intel some questions about their permit. (After all, isn’t NMED the permit writer and issuer?) No, they did it in order to give Intel, their “customer”, a heads-up, an edge, an advantage. Well, when you play with fire, you are liable to get burned or at least singed a little. In this case, that means they are cast in an unfavorable light in the CEWG 2015 annual report. Will that matter to them in the least? Of course not. But at least we can say that our report accurately reflected what happened. Dennis

Dennis -

For our own understanding, my views on the language are as follows:

I view the annual report as a listing of accomplishments which the CEWG helped to bring about. Nearly all, if not all, of these useful results came about among mixed motives held by participants in the CEWG, in the broader public, in various government agencies and in private organizations. Our method has always been to report the useful results without comment on the mixed motives that can be ascribed to parties involved in lengthy issues. I believe the method has helped to focus greater effort on needed useful outcomes, with less focus on the mixed motives astir in groups and individuals. This innovative method has helped achieve results that were previously thought to be unachievable. Major examples include taller stack heights, community-driven silica testing, and some redundant (backup) pollution controls.

We have concerns yet to work on amid the mixed motives in the public arena.

- John