

## MEETING SUMMARY

### Community Environmental Working Group

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

**Date:** October 19, 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

Sarah Chavez, Intel  
Dennis O’Mara, Corrales resident, Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water

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

Ron Eppes, Intel

#### **Facilitator**

Shannon Beaucaire, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

#### **HANDOUTS**

- CEWG Draft Agenda, Oct. 19, 2016
- Draft Meeting Summary, September 2016
- Action-Item Progress Report, Sept. 2016
- EHS Activity Report—October
- Questions for MCS presenter
- Draft Letter to Intel

#### **PROPOSED AGENDA**

Welcome, Introductions,  
Announcements and Brief Items  
Standing Agenda Items  
Action Item Progress Report and  
Priorities

Multiple Chemical Sensitivity  
Discussion  
Letter to Intel Discussion  
Adjourn

#### **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.

Filename: 2016-19-10 FINAL CEWG_ Meeting_Summary. Approved: November 16, 2016 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: October 23, 2016
---

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

No comment.

Meeting Summaries—Revisions and Approval

John Bartlit noted that at the end of the September Meeting Summary they added a section about the meeting's visitor, Paul Dickens. CJ Ondek said she purposely left this out of the Meeting Summary because the topic was not relevant to the CEWG's mission. She reminded that meeting summaries were a crystallization of the most important points covered in the meeting, not a transcription of every word said. Sarah Chavez said the agenda team agreed to add in something because Mr. Dickens attended the meeting and spoke at some length. Mr. Bartlit said that many people attended meetings and were not always listed in the discussion.

Ms. Ondek said she would be happy to follow the members' direction on how to address these kinds of events. Mr. Bartlit said to not change but to keep following the same process since enough information was captured in the meeting summaries to keep the group moving forward. Unusual situations, such as this case, could be handled as an Action Item for the recorder.

Other Announcements

Dennis O'Mara said he had to leave the meeting early tonight.

Public Comment

Shannon Beaucaire said the power cord to the projector was missing so she wouldn't be able to use the projector during the meeting.

Shannon Beaucaire brought attention to the December 21<sup>st</sup> meeting date and its closeness to the holidays. She asked if the group wanted to consider changing the date. Dennis O'Mara suggested having the meeting on December 14<sup>th</sup>, since the November meeting was November 16, a full four weeks before. Sarah Chavez reminded that they needed to check room availability, and if they needed to change the venue they could. Hugh Church said he could not make it December 14<sup>th</sup>. After a quick poll, everyone present could make the December 21<sup>st</sup> date, and, with the exception of Hugh Church, the December 14<sup>th</sup> date as well. Sarah Chavez suggested checking with Lynne Kinis' and Mike Williams' availability on December 21<sup>st</sup>. Shannon Beaucaire said she would be out of state from December 24 to January 1 and would not have access to email.

**ACTION ITEM:** Shannon Beaucaire will check with Lynne Kinis and Mike Williams about their availability for attending the December 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

**STANDING AGENDA ITEMS**ALS Study

Dennis O'Mara announced that the ALS study was underway. He checked in with Heidi

Filename: 2016-19-10 FINAL CEWG_ Meeting_Summary. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: October 23, 2016
--

Krapfl at the NM Dept. of Health for an update, but she did not have anything to report. The *Corrales Comment* would run an article about it on Thursday, October 20, in which they interviewed Mr. O'Mara. [Note: Publication of the article was deferred until November 4.] Mr. O'Mara said he was crafting a message to send to all members of Corrales for Clean Air and Water asking them to share information about the study with any families who had family members with ALS during the study period from 2000 to 2015. The idea was to ask family members to contact the state health department and provide information about the date of diagnosis, doctors and so forth. John Bartlit asked if the study had a protocol to follow. Mr. O'Mara said the study had a protocol but the researchers declined to share it until after the study was completed. Sarah Chavez asked how long they would be collecting information. Mr. O'Mara replied that the study was open-ended at this point, but there would be an end point eventually.

#### EHS Report

Sarah Chavez said two events would be happening at Intel not listed on the EHS Report. 1. Intel planned to repair the parking garage that would result in breaking concrete, dust and noise beginning Friday, October 21 until the end of the year. 2. Intel planned to do work along Route 528, the Sara entrance. Ms. Chavez said she would list both activities in next month's EHS Report.

**ACTION ITEM:** Sarah Chavez will list the two items above in the November EHS Report.

#### Oregon Community Activities and Proposed Permitting Process Update

Dennis O'Mara said he had not heard anything from Dale Feik in Oregon, so he did not know what was new.

Sarah Chavez asked about the changes made to the state air program. Mr. O'Mara said the state air quality department and environmental department were directed by the governor to revise the permit process and take into consideration people's health. Ms. Chavez said she had an update and that it was a one- to two-year permit process. Mr. O'Mara said that Mr. Feak was pursuing a court-based appeal of the original permit, but he did not know the progress.

John Bartlit asked if Mr. O'Mara had any response from Oregon about his letter on replacing bromoforms in the cooling tower with an environmentally friendly alternative. Mr. O'Mara said the permit writer in Oregon said he could not address this issue in the permit, citing that the system did not work this way. Sarah Chavez said Oregon knew about Intel New Mexico's action to remove bromoforms.

#### Regulatory Engineering Update

Sarah Chavez said Intel's Internet of Things group had a list of projects that they were working on. Their primary focus was facility items: temperature, pressure, vibration, different types of equipment in factories and how to get the connections to work correctly,

<p>Filename: 2016-19-10 FINAL CEWG_ Meeting_Summary. Approved: [not approved]          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Shannon Beaucaire          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: October 23, 2016</p>
---

and wireless technology. They were looking at these items because of economies of scale; there were hundreds of these types of equipment in the factory versus 10 or 20 abatement equipment pieces. Once they worked out the bugs in this technology and laid the groundwork, then they would shift focus in the future to other things such as abatement. John Bartlit said that although it was not exactly regulatory engineering, they still had to solve these problems first to move forward on regulatory issues, so he considered it as part of regulatory engineering. He asked Ms. Chavez to relay a message: While Intel worked on facility items to keep in mind that it had other applications, and the same problems had to be solved, and to note any useful regulatory ideas. Ms. Chavez said some of these items were used in regulatory as well.

John Bartlit asked who worked on the Internet of Things. Ms. Chavez said a team of folks spread across New Mexico (an electrical engineer), Arizona and Oregon. The project leader was based in Arizona. Brian Rashap also oversees it. Mr. Bartlit asked to meet the project leader from Arizona if he came to New Mexico.

#### UNM Cancer Study

Dennis O'Mara said it would be several more months before more information was available. UNM did not cover the entire timeframe that CRCAW had asked for, so they had to back up and fill in this information.

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

Shannon Beaucaire said Dennis O'Mara asked for updates on items 1 (Intel's effort to condense chemicals) and 3 (condensation technology) but these items were before her tenure. She asked members to remind about these items. Dennis O'Mara said he would put the two of these items together.

Sarah Chavez gave an update on these items. She said she had shared the request with the Intel Oregon engineering manager who was responsible for improvements in the abatement equipment. Oregon was responsible for designing the abatement process. Condensation technologies were still not an option because of low concentrations in a large air volume and mixed VOCs concentration, which condenses at different temperatures and makes condensation difficult to do. New Mexico was a smaller site than Oregon, so had a lower concentration than Oregon, so this option would not work in New Mexico. Intel was focused on their 2020 goals, and further VOC reductions was not included in these goals. Ms. Chavez said the Oregon engineer responded that since condensation technology was not tied to Intel's 2020 goals, looking at it would not be a priority. That didn't mean there wouldn't be other efforts to reduce VOCs.

Dennis O'Mara reported on item #13. He had contacted Heidi Krapfl about recommending an expert in the health department to speak on multiple chemical sensitivities, and she

responded that they did not have an expert in the health department and recommended Dr. McCampbell.

John Bartlit reported on #12. He had contacted Dr. Smolinske, and she agreed to present at the November CEWG meeting. He would discuss this more in the next agenda item. He said he had not successfully contacted Dr. Kesler yet.

John Bartlit reported on #10 on behalf of Mike Williams. To date about four people have responded to his “questions” request. One was a detailed response, and the others were just an acknowledgement. Mr. Williams had drafted email responses to both. Mr. Bartlit asked how the group should proceed with this exchange between Mr. Williams and technical people. The CEWG should have an ongoing understanding and general approval of what Mr. Williams was doing. Dennis O’Mara said he could not offer suggestions because his understanding of technical issues was limited. He didn’t think they needed to micro-approve Mr. Williams’ email responses. He said a progress report was satisfactory. Mr. Bartlit said the group should have the ability to comment on what Mr. Williams was saying. Sarah Chavez said she would like to be able to review and discuss his communication because some of it might contain information specific to Intel.

Shannon Beaucaire summarized that the group would like to have the ability to comment, but once it was agreed upon, she would send/receive the communication. Mr. Bartlit said that was how Mr. Williams began this process and that was his intent in continuing the process. Sarah Chavez clarified that this communication would be sent to the group to review via email between meetings, unless Ms. Beaucaire felt more discussion was needed.

Shannon Beaucaire summarized the agreed upon process. Mr. Williams sends this written response to Ms. Beaucaire, who then sends to the group via email for approval. Once it was approved, she would send the correspondence to the intended party. Also she could expedite the process, by giving people a week to respond. If she didn’t hear back in a week then she would send the communication. Sarah Chavez reminded that Mr. Williams had a quirky email server and there were problems in the past with his getting emails. She asked if Mr. Bartlit could monitor the situation. Both Shannon Beaucaire and John Bartlit said they would remind Mr. Williams if he didn’t respond to email requests.

## **MULTIPLE CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES (MCS) DISCUSSION**

John Bartlit said he invited Dr. Smolinske to the November meeting for one hour. She would have 30 minutes for her presentation, and then 30 minutes for questions, and would most likely arrive around 5:15 pm.

John Bartlit said he sent Dr. Smolinske documents that introduced the CEWG as well as the 11 articles on MCS the group had read previously. Ms. Chavez had sent her information on Intel and emissions, including past reports and studies, and the Web site

<p>Filename: 2016-19-10 FINAL CEWG_ Meeting_Summary. Approved: [not approved]          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Shannon Beaucaire          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: October 23, 2016</p>
---

that contained current emissions data. Ms. Chavez clarified that she sent this background information because Dr. Smolinske had requested it. She said she got the impression that Dr. Smolinske was newer to the Albuquerque area. Mr. Bartlit added that the emails between Dr. Smolinske and the CEWG were included in the meeting handouts. Mr. Bartlit suggested asking her to put together a bio to share with the group and asked Shannon Beaucaire to request this information from her.

Shannon Beaucaire asked the group if they agreed with this agenda item and format. All present agreed.

**ACTION ITEM:** Shannon Beaucaire will request Dr. Smolinske to provide her bio for the meeting.

Shannon Beaucaire asked the group which questions they wanted to send to Dr. Smolinske in advance. John Bartlit added that she welcomed questions ahead of time. He proposed that they send the questions that were of interest to the group, and she could answer these to the best of her ability or pass. He said to clarify that she was not required to answer all the questions.

Ms. Beaucaire asked if Lynne Kinis' questions were relevant to share, for example, #3 was to the ATSDR, and #4 was more like a comment. The group agreed to not include #3 but to keep #4. Mr. Bartlit asked if they should send her Ann McCampbell's booklet to read beforehand. The group agreed.

Shannon Beaucaire clarified that she would remove the names from the document so that it would list only the questions. Also, she would remove Lynne Kinis' question #3 from the document but keep it for future reference.

John Bartlit said he would continue to try to contact Dr. Kesler.

**ACTION ITEM:** Shannon Beaucaire will remove the names and Lynne Kinis' question #3 from the MCS questions and then send to Dr. Smolinske.

## LETTER TO INTEL DISCUSSION

John Bartlit introduced the draft letter, which was included with the meeting handouts. He said the letter had two parts. Part 1 contained the language that he had sent last month to the CEWG to review and was approved at last month's meeting. Part 2 was new and drafted based on Dennis O'Mara's comments last month and introduced the CEWG award. Mr. Bartlit explained that Part 1 referred to the "why," and Part 2 the "what," which was the proposal for the CEWG award for Intel internally directed R&D for emissions reduction and its cost savings. He said at the last meeting they didn't talk about Intel's protocol around developing and testing new ideas. He made adjustments to the CEWG proposal based on this information. Additional details he

Filename: 2016-19-10 FINAL CEWG_Meeting_Summary. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Odek & Shannon Beaucaire Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: October 23, 2016
--

added were that the CEWG Prize began with a \$500 award for an idea of how to reduce HAPs emissions. If the idea was implemented and led to an actual emissions reduction that saved costs, then the employee would receive an award of 50% of the annual cost savings up to a maximum of \$50,000.

Sarah Chavez offered the name of a person to address the letter to, Dr. Ann Kelleher, who was the corporate vice president and general manager of the Technology and Manufacturing Group. She was responsible for corporate quality assurance, corporate services, customer fulfillment, supply chain management, and strategic planning for Intel's worldwide manufacturing operations, including silicon fabrication, assembly and test. Ms. Kelleher used to be the site manager at Intel Rio Rancho and was familiar with the CEWG. She was now based in Oregon.

John Bartlit proposed sending a cover letter to her with Part 1 and Part 2 that reminds her of her connection to the CEWG. CJ Ondek recommended deleting "Part 1" and "Part 2" from the letter and just use the subheadings. Dennis O'Mara said he liked the letter a lot.

John Bartlit said they needed a name for the award. He wanted a name that would get attention at Intel, in the community, and in newspapers. He suggested the CEWG Prize for Reducing HAPs Emissions. Sarah Chavez said that Intel used the term "award" in all their recognitions, so award would be a more appropriate word. Ms. Chavez also reminded that in the award announcement they would have to clarify what the CEWG was, because not everyone at Intel knew about the CEWG.

Dennis O'Mara suggested to rewrite the last line in the letter as: The CEWG proposes Intel fund both awards.

John Bartlit asked what the decision process should be. Dennis O'Mara said that if there were multiple proposals, the one that saved the most dollars got the award. Sarah Chavez recommended that they clarify in the letter if this was an annual award, biannual award or a one-time award, since Intel had to budget the award funds. John Bartlit suggested that the award be ongoing and to say in the cover letter that certain details needed to be negotiated. He suggested giving Ms. Kelleher the opportunity to contribute to the idea. Ms. Chavez said it would be hard to put a time limit on it, and it could take several years for an idea to come to fruition. She highly recommended clarifying in the letter that this was not intended to be a one-time award but ongoing. Shannon Beaucaire suggested saying that "the CEWG proposes to regularly offer an award." Ms. Chavez said that might work, and then to add in that the details needed to be negotiated. Mr. Bartlit said he would draft a cover letter and send to the group for review. He also suggested encouraging Ms. Kelleher to contribute. Mr. Bartlit asked how they should send the letter: email or snail mail. Ron Eppes said sending it electronically would be better because snail mail could get lost at Intel. The group agreed that Shannon Beaucaire should send it electronically.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

John Bartlit said he would draft a cover letter and send to the group for comments, with a one-week turnaround response time.

Shannon Beaucaire will send the letter electronically after it is approved.

**EXTRA BUSINESS**

Ron Eppes said he had contacted Paul Dickens to share email addresses with an organization that did work similar to what he was doing—looking at using sports as a hook to education. His contact at the organization was open to communicating and possibly collaborating with Mr. Dickens.

**ADJOURN**

**NEXT MEETING:** November 16, 2016, 5 to 7 pm, Corrales Senior Center.

Filename: 2016-19-10 FINAL CEWG_ Meeting_Summary. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: October 23, 2016
--