

MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: September 21, 2016
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
Mike Williams, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water	Sarah Chavez, Intel
	Dennis O’Mara, Corrales resident, Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water

Non-Members Attending

Ron Eppes, Intel	Paul Dickens, Interested citizen
------------------	----------------------------------

Facilitator

Shannon Beaucaire, Facilitator	CJ Ondek, Recorder
--------------------------------	--------------------

HANDOUTS

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CEWG Draft Agenda, Sept. 21, 2016 ▪ Draft Meeting Summary, August 2016 ▪ Action-Item Progress Report, August | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2016 ▪ EHS Activity Report—September ▪ Dr. McCampbell’s emails |
|--|--|

PROPOSED AGENDA

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items ▪ Standing Agenda Items ▪ Action Item Progress Report and Priorities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multiple Chemical Sensitivity Discussion ▪ Letter to Intel Discussion ▪ Adjourn |
|--|---|

<p>Filename: 2016-09-21 CEWG_FINAL Meeting_Summary. Approved: October 19, 2016 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: September 25, 2016</p>
--

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

No comment.

Other Announcements

Shannon Beaucaire said she had sent Mike Williams' interesting questions letters and received a response today from Rohit Mathur, which she shared with the group. Mr. Mathur had suggested names of experts to contact for more information. Sarah Chavez asked if they were going to forward the same letter to the people suggested by Mr. Mathur. Mike Williams said he would look at the original letter and suggest modifications to ask for their expertise on the issue. Shannon Beaucaire said she would send the original letter to the group, along with Mr. Williams suggested changes.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Mike Williams will suggest modifications on the original letter to send to the recently recommended experts.
- Shannon Beaucaire will email the original letter to the group along with Mr. Williams suggested changes.

Public Comment

None.

STANDING AGENDA ITEMSALS Study

Dennis O'Mara said he had nothing to report. He said he had inquired to the person leading the study if they were ready to begin the study and was waiting a response. He said he was going to press them more. John Bartlit said he recalled the principal investigators were going to develop a protocol first and predicted it would take quite awhile to develop the protocol since it was a "sticky wicket." Sarah Chavez asked if the study would look specifically at Corrales as part of the protocol. Mr. O'Mara said they had asked them to look at 12 Census tracts around Intel: 2 in Corrales, 6 in Rio Rancho and 4 in North Albuquerque. A Census tract was smaller than a zip code location, and plenty of data was available by Census tract.

Filename: 2016-09-21 CEWG_FINAL Meeting_Summary. Approved: October 19, 2016

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: September 25, 2016

Sarah Chavez asked how they would collect the data. Mr. O'Mara said that the reports of 10 cases of ALS came from the community members around 2004-05. In terms of time frame, they requested the health department to look at the period from 2000 to 2015. The community would help identify or locate families of people that have had ALS. Also, the state health department had many other avenues for pursuing case information, so it was possible they could find case data going way back, Mr. O'Mara said.

EHS Report

Sarah Chavez said the report was very short this time and asked if anyone had any questions. Dennis O'Mara said neighbors had told him personally about three different incidents of odors: 2 in the morning and 1 in the evening. He didn't ask for specifics nor did he suggest they call Intel.

Oregon Community Activities and Proposed Permitting Process Update

Dennis O'Mara said he did not have any updates from Oregon.

Regulatory Engineering Update

Sarah Chavez did not have any updates. John Bartlit said he was pursuing the issue in other ways but did not have anything to report.

Cancer Study

Dennis O'Mara said the UNM Cancer Study was only partially completed but he did not have anything to share. They had asked UNM to conduct the study in the same Census tracts as the ALS study and in the same time frame, from 2000 to 2015. There were some issues around Census tract consistency. Hugh Church asked which particular cancers they were studying. Mr. O'Mara said various cancers: breast, lung, blood, lymphatic, etc. Mr. Church said the Lung Association was very concerned about lung cancer, and especially for women, since the survival rate of lung cancer for women was extremely low. Mr. O'Mara confirmed they were looking at lung cancer, among a range of other cancers.

ACTION ITEM PROGRESS REPORT

- Shannon Beaucaire reported on #10, that the ad design was approved by Intel; item #9, that the interesting questions letters were sent out; and on item #11, that Steve Dickens letter with the link to download Koracin's report was sent. Ms. Beaucaire said she contacted the multiple chemical sensitivity task force, who referred her to someone who said they were no longer involved and suggested contacting a different person. John Bartlit also reported on item #12, that he contacted and got a name from Peter Kowalski on potential multiple chemical sensitivity speakers. This person was the Director of the UNM Poison Center, Dr. Susan Smolinske. He said he called her three times but was not able to reach her yet. He would continue to reach out to her.

Filename: 2016-09-21 CEWG_FINAL Meeting_Summary. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: September 25, 2016

- Dennis O'Mara asked for an update on item #5, which was the possibility of Intel NM issuing a challenge to employees to develop ideas around reducing emissions. Sarah Chavez said that this item tied to the CEWG priority of awarding Intel employees for their innovations around reducing emissions.
- John Bartlit asked if they needed to keep the completed tasks as part of the Action Item Progress Report. Shannon Beaucaire asked the group what they wanted her to do. Sarah Chavez suggested keeping them as a record in the same document but not printing them out every month, but only to print out the pending or incomplete tasks. She said it was important to keep the history. Everyone agreed with this suggestion.

ACTION ITEM: Moving forward, Shannon Beaucaire will only print out the pending or incomplete items as part of the Action-Item Progress Report.

- Shannon Beaucaire asked if there were any thoughts on what to do with the extra Multiple Chemical Sensitivities report. Dennis O'Mara suggested hanging on to it in case they needed it at a future date. Everyone agreed.
- Shannon Beaucaire reported on item #14, the letter to Intel went out to the group for comments, and this would be discussed later on in the meeting.

MULTIPLE CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES (MCS) DISCUSSION

John Bartlit referred to a handout with emails to Dr Ann McCampbell and provided a summary of the emails. Shannon Beaucaire had sent an email to Dr. McCampbell on August 19, and Dr. McCampbell responded August 20. Mr. Bartlit sent an email on August 26, and there had been no contact since. Dr. McCampbell in her August 20email said she was no longer interested in speaking to the group for free, but would charge \$200 to speak about or debate the issue. She recommended reading her article, "MCS Under Siege," which was distributed to the group.

- Mr. Bartlit said Dr. Denece Kesler at UNM was a name provided by Intel's medical expert as someone who might know about MCS. He said he phoned her but did not make contact. However, he did reach someone who lived in Corrales, and this person was somewhat familiar with the CEWG. Mr. Bartlit said he couldn't remember his name.
- John Bartlit said the group read about 11 MCS articles from various sources. He asked if people had read enough about MCS in those articles to get a sense of the current situation. He asked the group where they wanted to go next. Dennis O'Mara said he read through the articles and was not interested in a debate about whether or not MCS existed. He said he

Filename: 2016-09-21 CEWG_FINAL Meeting_Summary. Approved: [not approved]
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: September 25, 2016

clearly understood the extent to which many people were sensitive to a huge range of chemical elements, and it seemed that they would like to learn more about symptoms and not debate definitions. He was concerned that a presentation with Dr. McCampbell would devolve into a debate about definitions.

- John Bartlit said no one in the articles was saying that the symptoms were not substantial. He said he tended to agree with Mr. O'Mara. The CEWG was trying to find if there was a relationship between MCS and emissions in Corrales. Mr. O'Mara said that he was reminded about something Lane Kirkpatrick had said, that he had come to the conclusion that some people were more sensitive than others. Mr. O'Mara said that broad general statement seemed to fit with what was described in the articles. Mr. Bartlit said Barbara Rockwell had said years ago that her husband was more bothered than she around emissions, and both she and her husband believed that he had become chemically sensitive from his work at Sandia, so they moved.
- Shannon Beaucaire asked if the group wanted to research the topic more. Mike Williams said they needed to ask a slightly different set of questions. What would it take to define the characteristics of MCS? One case he had heard of the person had been exposed to pesticides in her home and after that became so sensitive that Los Alamos County would let her know when they would be spraying in the spring and she would leave the county. So, this seems to have some kind of threshold of exposure. He suggested doing a computer simulation to see what it would take to find statistical relationships.
- Sarah Chavez said that part of what she read was that they couldn't conclusively say what the symptoms were related to. In some of the studies they tried to expose people to the same thing but the reactions were different. So it was hard to categorize as a disease. It wasn't something they could diagnose or test because the results were inconsistent. Part of the controversy was that they couldn't use science in the normal way to come to conclusions.
- Dennis O'Mara said if he were a doctor seeing a patient complaining about these symptoms, he didn't care what people called it he was going to try to diagnose it. From his reading it seemed like there was an effort to debate the issue about whether or not it existed rather than looking at it from an individual level. For example, one article wrote about industry organizations needing to study it, but you couldn't study it because it didn't exist. He said a lot of energy was being expended on something so broad it was impossible to categorize.
- John Bartlit said he didn't hear any great demand to gather more articles. Mike Williams wondered if anyone was doing simulations and modeling. Sarah Chavez asked what would be modeled if there wasn't any data to base it on. Mr. Williams said he would model

emission concentrations, and they wouldn't worry about specific thresholds but whether was there some kind of signature to look for. Mr. Bartlit added that Dr. McCampbell had a long list of chemicals.

- Ms. Chavez asked what would be different about a new effort and the modeling Mr. Williams had already done. Mr. Williams said if they were serious about tracking this down then trying to find a cause and effect, such as the case with the woman in Los Alamos mentioned earlier. Mr. Bartlit asked if they could find out to what extent anything like this had been done before for MCS. Mr. Williams agreed this would be good to know. Mr. O'Mara said if they got someone in to speak perhaps they could shed some light on this. Mr. Bartlit suggested doing some Internet research to find out if any of this modeling existed.
- Mike Williams said many years ago winemakers switched from using egg whites to clarify white wine to some kind of iron compound, and 1% to 5% of the population responded badly to this new compound, including his wife, who got terrible migraines from drinking white wine unless it was an expensive bottle. But that was a known thing—it was undrinkable for 1% to 5% of the population.
- Hugh Church asked if Dr. McCampbell had set up the MCS task force, and weren't Drs. Kesler and Smolinske also on the task force. John Bartlit said no, that these were 4 different entities. Dr. Smolinske was recommended by Peter Kowalski as someone who could present the full picture. Dr. Denece Kesler was recommended by an Intel medical advisor. Both were affiliated with UNM. Mr. Bartlit reminded that the CDC and ATSDR saw the MCS symptoms as real but did not recognize MCS as a disease state, which was their official position.
- John Bartlit reconfirmed Mr. O'Mara's preference, which was to have one of the doctors from UNM come and talk at a CEWG meeting first. Mr. O'Mara said he was not impressed with Dr. McCampbell's email. Mr. Bartlit said someone who says there was not two sides to an issue lost credibility in his mind. Mr. O'Mara said he wanted to spend more time hearing what other experts had to say.
- Mike Williams said one of the challenges was that the people most interested in working on MCS were those who were trying to treat it. He doubted that the people doing the research were interested in what the CEWG did, which was trying to limit it from occurring.
- Sarah Chavez said at this point they still needed to understand what it was and how they decided people were affected by it and whether or not they even had it, whatever "it" was.

Even though there were symptoms, they still needed to get more of an understanding of what caused the symptoms. She asked the group what they were trying to learn from looking at this issue. Mr. Bartlit said they could learn whether or not the Intel emissions affecting the population were most likely a MCS issue rather than an ambient air issue. That didn't mean it was not real, but they would have made some headway on the issue. However, Mr. Bartlit emphasized, his goal continued to be reducing emissions at Intel and improving community dialogue.

- Sarah Chavez said if they were still trying to gain an understanding of MCS and wanted to bring in speakers, they could develop questions based on some of the articles they had read that also listed questions and present those to the speakers. They wouldn't be developing new questions but using questions that research was trying to understand. Some examples she suggested, based on a German study and a World Health Organization article, were: What causes MCS? How do you diagnose it? How do you test it? She asked the group if that was what they wanted to find out.
- Dennis O'Mara said that anyone involved in seeing patients can speak to those questions. But if this was a person's area of specialty, surely they would be keeping abreast of new developments, research, and new understanding. He said they could learn more by bringing someone who was familiar with current research and who could direct the group further along this line.
- Sarah Chavez asked what kinds of questions they wanted to ask an invited speaker. Mr. O'Mara said he wanted to hear what they had to say, and questions could emerge from listening to their presentation. Sarah Chavez said this presentation was different than the last couple presentations because it was a new topic. She asked if they invited two people at separate times did they want to ask the same questions. John Bartlit said to start with a few questions to give them an idea of what the CEWG was interested in.
- Shannon Beaucaire asked what the group wanted to do about questions. Mike Williams said that the CEWG didn't have the tools to properly address the questions until they learned more. John Bartlit said that he would continue to reach out to the two suggested individuals. He suggested that other members of the MCS task force were NMED and NMDOH, and perhaps they could reach out to them. Dennis O'Mara said he would mention it to Heidi Krapfel to see what she recommended.
- Sarah Chavez suggested narrowing the questions down to five and offered to compile the questions from documents in the reading list, which were similar across documents. The group went through the list of questions developed by group members. Sarah Chavez will compile a list of questions and send to the group but save the other group questions and/or comments for future reference.

ACTION ITEMS:

- John Bartlit will continue to reach out to Dr. Smolinske and Dr. Kesler.
- Dennis O'Mara will talk to Heidi Krapfel to see what MCS experts she recommends.
- Sarah Chavez will compile a list of questions.

LETTER TO INTEL DISCUSSION

- John Bartlit said he drafted a letter to Intel explaining why the CEWG's continues to have an interest in reducing VOCs and HAPs and sent it to the group for comments. The only comment he received was from Dennis O'Mara, who commented that it was a good prologue. Mr. O'Mara said that it was a good start but the letter did not give specifics about what they wanted Intel to do. He said his position was that Intel needed to look for ways to reduce emissions because they didn't know the impact those emissions have on the long term health of people exposed to them, regardless of the current levels of emissions.
- Dennis O'Mara read his email that listed his suggestions for the draft:

Seems to me that this is a good prologue to what is missing. That is, specifically what do we want Intel New Mexico to do going forward to reduce their HAPS emissions? I would suggest the following as examples.

1. Develop Intel-New-Mexico-specific short-term objectives with quantitative measures and specific time frames for achievement. (Format would be something like "By December 31, 2017, reduce emission of X HAP from Y tons to Z tons. Under each such objective would be action steps leading to the achievement of said objective.)
2. Organize an ongoing, in-house program with rewards to challenge Intel New Mexico employees to develop new methods for reducing HAPS emissions.
3. Extend the so-called "green chemistry" effort to address current processes to see if certain more toxic chemicals now in use could be replaced by less toxic ones.
4. Undertake a review of available abatement technology to determine what improvements could be made to existing equipment or what new, more effective equipment could be brought on line.

- John Bartlit said, in regards to Mr. O'Mara's first suggestion, that the CEWG did not have any success in changing the chip making process. He did not see any advantage in saying that again because the answer would be the same. Where the CEWG did have success was in abatement technology: stack heights, redundant control equipment, cooling towers, additives, etc. He didn't think they would have success in suggesting a change in the chip making process.
- John Bartlit proposed two CEWG awards to give to someone locally who: 1. Comes up with an idea to reduce emissions in things other than chip making and 2. Comes up with an idea to reduce emissions and save costs. Dennis O'Mara said he was fine with either or both. His email suggestions were on the table for someone to pursue to reduce emissions. He agreed that Intel should have an ongoing program to encourage staff to come up with innovative ideas. Sarah Chavez said Intel had a corporate, global reward program for environmental improvement, not necessarily just for emission reductions, and it had been around for a while. Mr. O'Mara asked if it produced any real specific results that lead to reductions. Ms. Chavez said she did not know but there were a range of project over the years that were recognized in the areas of water reduction, energy savings, etc.
- Sarah Chavez said the CEWG would have to decide on the amount of the award and get agreement on that amount from Intel. John Bartlit suggested tying the second award to the cost savings, for example, 50% of the cost savings. Ms. Chavez said she didn't know how that would work from a tax perspective. She said they would most likely have to set a specific amount.
- Shannon Beaucaire asked what would be an acceptable amount. Ms. Chavez said she did not know, but Intel's top award was most likely \$1,000; she had not seen anything more than that. She also said that Intel did not give performance bonuses. Mr. Bartlit persisted that the second award should be more and tied to cost savings. Ms. Chavez said that Intel was a big company and didn't know if it was possible based on corporate rules and regulations, but she was willing to find out. Mr. Bartlit said there was no reason why Intel couldn't consider it. Mr. O'Mara said that the CEWG should ask Intel, as an outside group, "Why can't you?" Mr. Bartlit agreed and said that was a fair question.
- Dennis O'Mara suggested asking "Why can't you?" in the letter and to let the chips fall rather than having Ms. Chavez ask Intel the question on amount limits. He said the CEWG should be on record as saying that this was what it wanted to see happen. Mr. O'Mara suggested melding these comments into what Mr. Bartlit had already written in the letter. Mr. Bartlit agreed to incorporate Mr. O'Mara's second point on awards into the letter, along with revising it to include two awards, with the second being a more substantial award, and with the question "why not." Mr. O'Mara suggested that the letter arrive and be dealt with by Intel. The group discussed suggested amounts for the award. Suggestions

included \$10,000 and a percentage of the savings up to a maximum of \$50,000 or \$100,000. The point was that it should be a genuine incentive to compel employees to put forth an effort, and stated as such in the letter, with an amount given as an example.

ACTION ITEM: John Bartlit will revise the letter as discussed.

OBSERVER DISCUSSION

- Mr. Paul Dickens attended the CEWG meeting to bring his ideas about the needs of NM students for better opportunities in education, physical training, personal growth and career advancement. He was a graduate from an Albuquerque High School and lost his college scholarship because he felt he wasn't well prepared. The group discussed various programs that were already in place such as Mission: Graduate NM, Big Brothers Big Sisters Mentor 2.0 and the Albuquerque Hispano Chamber of Commerce. Ron Eppes provided Mr. Dickens his card as he serves on the board for Mission: Graduate NM as well as a being a mentor and would be able to provide him with more information.

ADJOURN

NEXT MEETING: October 19, 2016, 5 to 7 pm, Corrales Senior Center.

Filename: 2016-09-21 CEWG_FINAL Meeting_Summary. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: September 25, 2016
