

**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**  
**Community Environmental Working Group**

*“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”*

**Date:** June 15, 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 (joined by phone)

**Non-Members Attending**

Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident, Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water

Ron Eppes, Intel

**Facilitator**

Shannon Beaucaire, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

**HANDOUTS**

- CEWG Draft Agenda, June 15, 2016
- Draft Meeting Summary, May 2016
- Action-Item Progress Report, June 2016
- EHS Activity Report—May, June
- Thank you to Steve Dickens
- Columns (2) John Bartlit
- Draft adjustment to Mission Statement

**PROPOSED AGENDA**

Welcome, Introductions,  
Announcements and Brief Items  
Oregon Update  
EHS Report & EPA114  
Action Item Progress Report

Steve Dickens Presentation  
Discussion  
Regulating and Encouraging  
Reduced Emissions of HAPs/VOCs  
Revision of Mission Statement  
Adjourn

Filename: 2016-06-15 CEWG\_final. Approved:  
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire  
Prepared for: CEWG  
Date prepared or presented: June 18, 2016

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

John Bartlit opened the meeting by referring to the CEWG mission, which was to make environmental improvements at Intel, reduce chemical emissions at Intel, and improve community dialogue. Introductions were made.

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

No comment.

Meeting Summaries—Revisions and Approval

Shannon Beaucaire confirmed that the May Meeting Summary was sent to Steve Dickens for his comments, which she incorporated into the final draft.

Regulatory Engineering Update

Sarah Chavez said that Gabe Flores, who was a member of Intel's Internet of Things group, had retired, so Intel decided to postpone the NM State University design contest until the spring. John Bartlit asked if they would have another regulatory engineering contact after Mr. Flores's departure. Ms. Chavez said she did not know right now but might next month.

Other Announcements

None.

Public Comment

None.

**OREGON UPDATE**

Dennis O'Mara reported on events in Oregon. Hillsboro Air and Water (HAW) head, Dale Feik, had been traveling recently so he did not have a chance to speak with him. However, Mr. O'Mara said, he did learn of some developments via emails. Concern around high levels of arsenic, cadmium and nickel in parts of Portland, which led to the resignation of the head of Oregon's Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), had continued. HAW filed a petition for judicial review of entire air permitting process. That petition was now assigned to a judge. Recently, Intel filed an intervention motion to dismiss the case. Mr. Feik was in the process of filing a counter motion to dismiss the Intel motion.

Mr. O'Mara said HAW was a subset of Portland Clean Air, a much larger well-structured and well-funded organization. HAW was canvassing all households in Hillsboro and distributing a fact sheet to residents on Intel emissions. The governor of Oregon asked the DEQ director to develop a new permitting process that took into consideration people's health. Also, Mr. Feik had communicated with Brian Krzanich, Intel's CEO, via an open letter published in newspapers that called upon him to apply for the more rigorous permit. Mr. O'Mara recalled that Mr. Krzanich said he was willing to meet with Mr. Feik to discuss the matter.

## **EHS REPORT AND EPA 114, MAY AND JUNE**

Sarah Chavez said both reports were quite short. In May, someone sent an email via [www.intel.com](http://www.intel.com), but it was anonymous. Ms. Chavez sent them a reply with more direct contact information but never heard back

### **ACTION ITEM PROGRESS REPORT**

Sarah Chavez updated item #7, which was getting in touch with Pat Clauser about Intel's water and drainage system. The Village maintenance supervisor, Chris Gonzalez, and another person from the Village of Corrales were given a site tour of Intel's storm system process and how it was managed. The Village requested community members to contact Mr. Gonzalez with any storm water runoff issues. So this item was now closed.

Lynne Kinis said she didn't understand why community members would call the Village of Corrales with issues around Intel's storm water system. Ms. Chavez said that the Village was working on making improvements to the roadway on Morning Sun Trail. That roadway did not have any culverts or drainage. Community members could also call Intel with any issues, too. Mr. Gonzalez now understood what Intel did and could explain it to community members along with the Village's efforts.

John Bartlit said he completed item #9, draft letter to Intel, and item #10, revising the mission statement. Item #10 would be discussed tonight. Ms. Chavez said she started to work on item #13, questions to HEE, but didn't have an answer yet.

## **DISCUSSION OF STEVE DICKENS PRESENTATION**

### Thank You Note

John Bartlit said he wanted the CEWG to send a thank you note to Mr. Dickens, the draft of which was included in the meeting handouts. Mr. Bartlit drafted the note, read it out loud and explained that he particularly called out two things in the letter—Mr. Dickens' detective work and the science behind it—because these were strong points in Mr. Dickens' presentation. Hugh Church asked if Mr. Dickens had a continued interest in his research. Mr. Bartlit recalled that he had interest but was limited in time and money. Ms. Kinis added that Mr. Dickens said he was interested in reading the Darko Koracin report.

Dennis O'Mara commented that using the term "limitation of your findings" in the letter was negative and he objected to its use. He did not think the CEWG was in a position to make this kind of judgment. Mr. Bartlit asked if Mr. O'Mara had another word in mind. Mr. O'Mara said he did not. Mr. Bartlit said he was trying to convey the "limitations in the science" and "limitations of findings" was inaccurate wording. He asked if rewriting it as "scientific limitations" was more acceptable. Mr. O'Mara said he would look at it and offer alternative wording. There was agreement that Mr. Dickens spent significant time discussing the limitations in the science, and that's what Mr. Bartlit was trying to capture in the note. He was not suggesting that there were limitations in Mr. Dickens'

Filename: 2016-06-15 CEWG\_final. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: June 18, 2016

data. He suggested looking through the Meeting Summary to find language that Mr. Dickens actually used in his presentation.

Mike Williams suggested to take out the wording “limitations of your findings” from the note and all agreed.

**ACTION ITEM:** CEWG members will look through the May Meeting Summary for wording Mr. Dickens used around limitations in science.

#### Discussion of Mr. Dickens’ Presentation

John Bartlit said the time spent on Mr. Dickens’ presentation was well spent, and he thought it was a remarkably good talk. Mr. Dickens discussed at length the epidemiology, toxicology and its difficulties. Mike Williams said the talk was well put together and he was impressed.

Dennis O’Mara said it was important to let the data speak for itself. A conclusion with a 95% confidence interval means that the odds of the conclusion being correct are 19/20. He said most of conclusions were reached independently of one another, and therefore, if a person wanted to assume that two of these conclusions were incorrect, the odds would be  $1/20 \times 1/20$  or  $1/400$ . He said most of the findings seemed solid based on the statistical analyses. John Bartlit said finding words in the Meeting Summary that captured Mr. O’Mara’s point would be appropriate.

Dennis O’Mara said for some reason SWOP did not want the results to be widely known, although the results were presented to a small group of community residents. Jeff Radford had written a small article summarizing this presentation in 2005. Mr. O’Mara said it was good baseline information that for the first time expressed in an organized and scientific way the concerns of residents living in the area. Mr. O’Mara said that his neighbors that attended said they never got lost nor bored, and the presentation was easy to follow and understand. Mr. Bartlit thanked Mr. O’Mara for his role in getting Mr. Dickens to present to the CEWG.

Shannon Beaucaire asked if there was anything in the presentation that they should add to the CEWG prioritization list for 2016.

John Bartlit proposed that the CEWG investigate multiple chemical sensitivities. He looked into the topic over the last month, and the language he read on Wikipedia sounded similar to what they’ve been hearing about people who were sensitive to chemicals and the common symptoms they experienced. He learned of a person named Dr. Ann McCampbell, who was the Chair of the Multiple Chemical Sensitivities Task Force in New Mexico, and a founding board member of the Chemical Sensitivity Foundation. Mr. Bartlit proposed inviting Dr. McCampbell, who lived in Santa Fe, to speak to the CEWG.

Filename: 2016-06-15 CEWG_final. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: June 18, 2016
--

Her Web site was: [www.annmcccampbellmd.com](http://www.annmcccampbellmd.com). Mr. Bartlit said that if the CEWG agreed he would pursue this possibility. He read the following excerpt from her Web site:

“People with multiple chemical sensitivity (MCS) are made sick by exposures to low levels of many common chemicals — such as perfume, paint, pesticides, solvents, new building materials, vehicle exhaust, and smoke. Common symptoms include headache, fatigue, body aches, asthma, rash, dizziness, nausea, and tremors. Symptoms can range from mild to life threatening. People with MCS also often react to foods, drugs, mold, pollen, and electromagnetic fields.”

Mr. Bartlit said that her Web site also had resources on various laws on the issue over the years. CEWG members agreed with Mr. Bartlit’s proposal.

**ACTION ITEM:** John Bartlit will contact Dr. Ann McCampbell to set up a talk at a CEWG meeting on multiple chemical sensitivities.

- John Bartlit asked if anything further happened between Steve Dickens and Peter Kowalski. Dennis O’Mara said he did not know if they actually communicated, although both expressed an interest to do so. He said the results of the study should have been an important addition to Kowalski’s report, but it never happened. Someone in Mr. Kowalski’s unit might better understand this study. John Bartlit said he learned that the ATSDR was involved in an association of federal/state agencies to look into multiple chemical sensitivities, but it had disappeared due to lack of funding. Maybe that’s why it was never mentioned in the ATSDR report. Mr. O’Mara said the report focused more on technical issues related to emissions and not health effects, although Mr. Dickens finished his analysis in late 2005 and it should have been included in the report. Sarah Chavez said Mr. Dickens said the report was never finished, so she assumed it was not included because there was no report. The ATSDR report referenced that they were waiting for the report. Mr. O’Mara confirmed this was true, but Mr. Dickens’ slides could have been shared.
- Lynne Kinis said the Darko Koracin report and Mr. Dickens findings could be analyzed and supportive of each other, especially since neither was looked at by the other. Darko looked at the weather and included a map of wind direction, and this information would highlight the health issues in Mr. Dickens report. She suggested sending the Darko report to Mr. Dickens, because he seemed quite interested in looking at it. Mike Williams said Darko basically modeled the weather and wind direction and the days in which there were complaints to look for consistencies, which they found. Dennis O’Mara asked if the Darko report was on the CEWG Web site. Sarah Chavez said the report was part of the Corrales Air Quality task force documents and was most likely on the NMED Web site. Mike Williams said there was at least a summary available on the NMED Web site. John Bartlit suggested pursuing finding Darko’s report to send to Mr. Dickens.

**ACTION ITEM:** Sarah Chavez will look for the Darko report/summary to send to CEWG members and Mr. Dickens.

#### Mike Williams' Interesting Questions

Mike Williams said one of his interesting questions was how to make modeling and complaints fit together more precisely. John Bartlit reminded that they still needed to send Mr. Williams' questions to individual experts, like Kowalski and Jonathan Samet. Mr. Williams asked about the formality of sending the questions, should they go out from the chairman or facilitator. Mr. Williams suggested that Hugh Church should send the questions to Jonathan Samet, because they had a relationship. Hugh feels it may be a bit intrusive to send "the questions" to Jon Samet as he has a lot of fish to fry these days. Maybe one or two would be ok. Mr. Bartlit suggested having Mike Williams write an introduction, signed by the chairman and then sent by the facilitator, since having a facilitator added formality and showed that the CEWG was a more substantial group.

**ACTION ITEM:** Mike Williams' interesting questions will be sent as follows: Mike Williams will write an introduction, John Bartlit will sign it as the chair, and Shannon Beaucaire will send it to the experts, except for Jonathan Samet, in which case Hugh Church will send it.

#### **REGULATING AND ENCOURAGING REDUCED EMISSIONS OF HAPS/VOCS**

John Bartlit said he distributed two articles he wrote with the meeting handouts. One was written in 2006—"Toxic Regulations Uses Science, History"—and the other this month—"Judging Uncertainty Is a Risk." The first article discussed the history of regulating HAPs and why the regulations are not necessarily sufficient. The second article looked at trying to encourage further reduction of HAPs and VOCs at Intel, and discussed persuading Intel to reduce its emissions. The more information the CEWG had, the greater the possibility of getting Intel to make reductions, Mr. Bartlit said. He opened the floor for discussion.

On the 2006 article, Dennis O'Mara asked if the 188 chemicals on the HAPs list had expanded to include more chemicals. Toward the end of the article the discussion turned to auto emissions. Mr. O'Mara said we know about and understand the risk of auto emissions and willingly drive anyway because of the benefits of being mobile. People living near the Intel plant were exposed to toxins against their will. They had no choice, and they received no benefits. So, he disagreed with the analogy, because at least there was some idea of the risk behind auto emissions, but there was no idea about the risks involved in Intel's emissions. Mr. O'Mara said he disagreed with the line, "...we are lots safer from HAPs than from trucks." For residents living around Intel, that just wasn't true. He said he knew plenty of people living around Intel who got sick from Intel's emissions, but he did not know anyone who got hit by a truck.

<p>Filename: 2016-06-15 CEWG_final. Approved: [not approved]          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Shannon Beaucaire          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: June 18, 2016</p>
---

John Bartlit replied that he understood Mr. O'Mara's points, but saw the similarities between the risks a person accepts and the situation in Corrales. There were many kinds of emissions that didn't help us. The CEWG had never talked about the benefit of job creation at Intel or computer chips in general to society, and Mr. Bartlit said he did not advocate that the CEWG discuss these issues. Also, he said he did not advocate allowing industries to pollute more if they offered more benefits to society. One did not offset the other. He advocated reducing emissions as much as possible. He did not think Mr. O'Mara's views were wrong, but they were facing the same dilemma in any pollution issue. Mr. O'Mara said people's health should not be sacrificed for jobs. Mr. Bartlit said he agreed with Mr. O'Mara, but didn't like the word "sacrifice." He strongly disagreed with the notion that liking the product (electricity, computer chips, cars, etc.) or their benefits meant that these industries were allowed to pollute more.

John Bartlit said they agreed on the problem but they were trying to discuss how to do something better. They couldn't change the laws or regulations. Mr. O'Mara said that maybe they would in Oregon, and that would become a model. New Mexico had a law that said nothing more stringent can be done than what the EPA allowed. Mr. Bartlit said that was true, and it came about because of the New Mexico Citizens for Clean Air and Water's lawsuit against the Four Corners power plant. He said he tried to get that law changed but gave up about two decades ago. Dennis O'Mara referred to pages 176 and 177 of *Boiling Frogs*, where Fred Marsh compared the relative toxicity of four chemicals to 373 tons of hydrogen cyanide, which was enough to commit 3.6 million gas chamber executions. Mr. Bartlit said further complicating the discussion was the issue of multiple chemical sensitivities, which affected certain individuals far below the suggested level of toxicity, and was not part of the regulatory structure nor would it ever be. Mr. O'Mara said no one really knew what the risks were, and it was ridiculous to proceed as if there were no risks. The middle ground was that everything that could be done should be done, and that wasn't happening, and it was morally reprehensible.

Lynne Kinis said she agreed with Mr. O'Mara. Each person in the room had a different level of tolerance and sensitivity, and it did not have to do with the amount of emissions but rather individual biochemistry. The fact that chemicals were emitted into the neighborhood without concern for the people living there was unconscionable. John Bartlit said the question was what to do about it. Ms. Kinis said they had to get Ann McCampbell to present to the CEWG, and then work to get EPA standards changed. Mr. Bartlit said the CEWG did not have the power or influence to get EPA to change the standards; he had tried for many years. Dennis O'Mara said maybe Senator Udall could do it. Mr. Bartlit replied that he would bet a lot of money that he couldn't. Ms. Kinis said she disagreed with Mr. Bartlit based on her belief system, which was that right would outweigh wrong. The problem was a lot of people had the same negative attitude as Mr. Bartlit. Mr. Bartlit clarified that he wasn't saying that they couldn't do anything, and he was not a quitter. He was just talking about the futility of getting the EPA to change the law.

Lynne Kinis said the problem was that those who made and enforced the rules had their hands tied by corporations; large amounts of cash also influenced lawmakers. Mr. Bartlit said they were also tied by limitations of science and financial resources. Ms. Kinis said if there was a drip, and it kept dripping, dripping, dripping, eventually it would make an indentation. Therefore, she did not believe in giving up or being quiet about the organizations behind chemical emissions.

## **REVISED MISSION STATEMENT**

The group discussed suggested revisions to the CEWG mission statement.

Dennis O'Mara said he would look at the CEWG mission statement and send comments in email to Shannon Beaucaire. He signed off by phone.

John Bartlit said the CEWG discussed changing mission statement. Mr. Bartlit said he added a sentence suggested by Lynne Kinis, "The Group has no formal control over Intel."

Lynne Kinis agreed with the "no formal controls over Intel" statement. She suggested adding a word to first sentence because the group had no control, and that was "...is committed to encouraging Intel to make continuous environmental improvement...". She said the group could not do anything but encourage. Sarah Chavez suggested rephrasing the first sentence in second paragraph to, "The group is an advisory body to Intel." Ms. Kinis disagreed because she did not think that Intel felt the CEWG was an advisory body, and this line insinuated that Intel took the CEWG seriously. The group discussed at length whether Intel took the CEWG seriously. Shannon Beaucaire asked if there was another term to "advisory." Hugh Church suggested "oversight." Mike Williams said that word implied even more that "advisory." Ms. Kinis said she was fine with the second paragraph as long as the word "encourage" was in the first sentence. Mike Williams said to delete "is committed," that it wasn't needed. CJ Ondek suggested finding another, more "professional sounding" word than encourage, which sounded too soft. John Bartlit said we are really talking about bringing pressure to change. CJ Ondek suggested the word "advocates." The group agreed to the following: "The group advocates continuous environmental improvement at Intel..."

**ACTION ITEM:** Shannon Beaucaire will send suggested changes via email.

## **ADJOURN**

**NEXT MEETING:** July 20, 2016, 5 to 7 pm, Corrales Senior Center.

<p>Filename: 2016-06-15 CEWG_final. Approved: [not approved]          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Shannon Beaucaire          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: June 18, 2016</p>
---