

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **Community Environmental Working Group**

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

**Date:** July 19, 2017  
**Time:** 5:15–7:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Corrales Senior Center

#### **Members Attending**

John Bartlit, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water  
Mike Williams, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water  
Sarah Chavez, Intel  
Dennis O’Mara, Corrales resident, Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water (CRCAW)

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

Ron Eppes, Intel  
Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident, CRCAW  
Marcy Brandenburg, Rio Rancho resident, CRCAW

#### **Facilitator**

Shannon Beaucaire, Facilitator  
CJ Ondek, Recorder

#### **HANDOUTS**

CEWG Draft Agenda  
Draft Meeting Summary, June 2017

- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report

#### **PROPOSED AGENDA**

Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items

- Standing Agenda Items
- Action Item Progress Report
  
- Mike’s Interesting Questions Update
- Sgt. Jackson Brainstorm
- Additional Business

Filename: 2017-07-19 CEWG Final Meeting_Summary.doc. Approved: 2017-08-16 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Shannon Beaucaire Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: July 25, 2017
--

**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.

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

None.

Meeting Summaries—Revisions and Approval

None.

Other Announcements

- Dennis O'Mara said the Sandoval County local emergency planning committee (LEPC) met on July 12. Primary business discussed was the question of whether the committee was fulfilling its four responsibilities. In his view they were not. He said he was told that Sandoval County Emergency Response people had longstanding plans in place to respond to emergencies. They had a 140-page plan on their Web site that was fairly broad and general. Details were contained in annexes. The annexes were not top secret but closely held. Specifics related to the LEPC responsibilities were contained in this plan within Annex A. Two meetings ago Mr. O'Mara said he was given a copy of Annex A to review and compare to the LEPC responsibilities. His opinion was that there was no reason to recreate the wheel if the existing plan and annexes covered what needed to be covered. He was currently reviewing and making an analysis. His proposal was to adopt the existing plan with amendments, with one of the follow up requirements as having to review the plan annually. Mr. O'Mara said the four LEPC responsibilities were to 1. Write emergency plans to protect the public from chemical accidents; 2. Warn and if necessary evacuate the public in case of emergency; 3. Provide citizens and local governments with information on hazardous chemicals and accidental releases in their communities; and 4. Prepare public reports annually on any releases. Mr. O'Mara said that not all of these responsibilities were adequately covered in the existing plan nor being done by the LEPC. John Bartlit asked if the annexes weren't made public as a way to keep bad actors from the details. Mr. O'Mara said that was a fair way to put it. Although the annexes weren't top secret, they didn't want to make the information contained therein obviously available.
- Dennis O'Mara said Dr. Smolinske came to the LEPC meeting and gave an interesting presentation about mercury spills and responses in residential areas. New Mexico did not have the proper equipment to deal with mercury spills and had to bring the equipment in from El Paso. Sgt. Jeremy Jackson of the 64th WMD unit at the Sandoval County National Guard Armory said he would check to see if they had equipment on hand that would do the job. Also, Mr. O'Mara was trying to get the Sandoval County Emergency people to put together a test message on Code Red for residents. At the last meeting Chief Bervin suggested Mr. O'Mara write the test message. Mr. O'Mara said the Code Red company

might already have something written that they could borrow from, and he would check with them first. He didn't want to send out a message that alarmed people, and there were ways to word the message that would not alarm the public. Mr. O'Mara said LEPC members reported that when they have used the system to send out an emergency message in the past, they got complaints from the public. Marcy Brandenburg said that thinking the community couldn't handle emergency messages was doing a disservice to the community. Only finding out after the fact was what upset people. She said that they needed to let the community know that they were living around a dangerous plant, and they needed a Red Alert system. Every large city had these systems, and they needed to inform people because that's where the responsibility lies.

- Lynne Kinis said she agreed with Ms. Brandenburg. Years ago she had met with the Corrales police chief and fire chief and asked if they had an evacuation plan. The police chief said no, that they could never evacuate Corrales. She suggested to these men mailing a schematic to all Corrales residents that gave directions on how to evacuate the village. They didn't like her idea. She said if she received something like that in the mail, she would read it and prepare accordingly. Being informed would reduce the chaos in the event they had to evacuate.
- Dennis O'Mara said that with the Code Red system, every landline was connected, and cell phones and emails could also be connected by individual citizens to the messaging system. He said he wasn't worried about test message objections. As far as evacuation was concerned, he hadn't seen any schematics, but there was plenty of room to inform the public in advance on evacuation plans. He said local communities had evacuation plans, and they needed to check these plans to see they were aligned with the County plan.
- Dennis O'Mara said the next LEPC meeting was in October, and he would continue to keep the CEWG apprised of LEPC meeting discussions.
- Marcy Brandenburg commented on the CEWG's flyer. She said it should state that the CEWG was formed by the community for public safety. She said it took a lot of community effort to get this group going. John Bartlit said he agreed. Dennis O'Mara offered Ms. Brandenburg to edit the document. She said she appreciated the offer and would look at the flyer but didn't want to write it. Mr. Bartlit said similar language might have already been written in the past.

**ACTION ITEM:** Someone will revise the flyer to state that the community formed the CEWG because of concern around public safety.

- Shannon Beaucaire said that the flyer was only shared the day before, so she suggested discussing it under the Action Item Progress Report, and giving others the opportunity to suggest revisions and to report back suggested revisions at the next meeting. Everyone agreed to this process.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Marcy Brandenburg said she would like to learn more about the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) Burden Reduction comment on the June EHS Report. From the layman's point of view, it sounded to her like Intel was saying they wanted to reduce regulations because they were tired of regulations. Or it sounded to her like Intel was admitting to having a Superfund site and therefore wanted a release of burden when the time came. She said that any reductions in inspections or regulations was scary to her, and she was at this meeting to find out what this meant and why.
- Shannon Beaucaire said that Ms. Brandenburg's request would be addressed in the next agenda item.

## **STANDING AGENDA ITEMS**

### EHS Report

- Sarah Chavez provided clarification on the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) Burden Reduction issue that was listed in the June EHS report. Intel recently sent two letters to the NM Environmental Department (NMED). The RCRA was a federal regulation adopted by the state that regulated solid and hazardous wastes. Because of a 1995 Paperwork Reduction Act, the EPA streamlined and eliminated various recordkeeping and reporting requirements to reduce the amount of paperwork. NMED adopted RCRA in May 2009. EPA said that if an organization met specific requirements, they could change what they were doing. For example, if they were doing daily inspections and wanted to move to weekly inspections, the EPA said they had to meet specific requirements. The EPA spelled out these requirements clearly, because they wanted to make sure there were no hazardous waste leaks. Intel wanted to change from a daily to a weekly inspection on some of the waste tank systems. In order to do that, Intel needed to meet the following requirements: 1. Install a leak detection and monitoring system; 2. Have people working in the area; and 3. Install a secondary containment. Intel met all three requirements, so the law allowed the change from daily to weekly inspections. Ms. Chavez said that with these three requirements met, if there were a leak, it would be discovered in a timely manner, and there would be no increased risk to the environment. Because Intel had all the systems in place, they had requested switching over from daily to weekly inspections. That shift would reduce the paperwork burden as long as they met the requirements.
- Marcy Brandenburg asked how Intel could prove that, "normally," there were personnel in the area. Sarah Chavez responded it was one of three requirements that also included leak detection and monitoring with an alarm system. And if there was a leak, there was secondary containment. Intel had floors with a special coating that obstructed any leak from penetrating into the ground. The third requirement was that staff would witness a leak should one occur.

Dennis O'Mara said he had contacted NMED about the RCRA issue. NMED had told him that Intel was requesting a reduction of inspection frequency of some of their piping. He said he told NMED that he was concerned about this reduction, and whether the piping was carrying toxic materials. The person he spoke with would not tell him anything else, but suggested Intel's request was close to being adjudicated. He said he told her that as a member of the community, he would like to know more about it to discuss at the next CEWG meeting. An NMED department spokesperson called him back and suggested he put his concern in writing, which she insured would be shared with the NMED Ssecretary and the Chief of the Hazardous Waste Bureau. Mr. O'Mara said he followed this suggestion and put his concerns in writing in an email. He said he expressed these concerns not as a member of CEWG as both a community member and a member of CRCAW. In his comments he said he took issue with the word "burden." Sarah Chavez said this was an EPA term.

Email from Dennis O'Mara: *Greetings Ms. Majure. Thank you for taking the time to call and speak to me this afternoon about my issues regarding Intel's recent Request for RCRA Burden Reduction. As I mentioned to you, I am a resident of Corrales and a member of two organizations concerned with Intel operations:*

*(1) the Community Environmental Working Group (CEWG), sponsored by Intel and whose purposes are to pursue continuous environmental improvement at Intel and to promote community dialogue and (2) Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water (CRCAW) which has opposed Intel and NMED on many fronts over the years about Intel's toxic air emissions. I emphasize first of all that I am not expressing these concerns as a member of CEWG but rather as an individual. I am, however, representing the views of CRCAW.*

*This request was revealed to us by the Intel representative at the June CEWG meeting as part of Intel's monthly EHS report. Not until after the meeting did I look at the report more closely and realize that this particular item on the report might very well be cause for great concern to those of us who live close to the plant.*

*Since Intel's representative has been on vacation and not reachable, I spoke earlier today with Jeaneane (sp?) Kramer of the Hazardous Waste Bureau to inquire about the details of this so-called burden reduction request. I was told that Intel is asking for a reduction in the frequency of inspections of some of it's piping but I was not offered any specifics. Without knowing more detail, I can only speculate about the reason(s) for this request. What I would say based on current understanding is that if the piping in question carries toxic chemical waste or other dangerous material, I strongly urge NMED to deny the request. Obviously, the inspections are required for safety reasons, and I see no reason to exempt Intel (or any other company) from efforts to ensure the safety of both their employees and residents living near the plant.*

*As I am sure you are aware, Intel has been reducing its staffing in Rio Rancho for several years. Is it possible that those reductions are going to continue, and if so, is the company trying to maintain current production levels with fewer people by devoting less personnel time to inspections?*

*Of course, if it turns out that the piping in question carries material that poses no risks, then my concerns are unfounded. Ideally, NMED would agree to defer the decision on this request until more information becomes available. The CEWG meets next Wednesday, July 19 after which we who are*

<p>Filename: 2017-07-19 CEWG Final Meeting_Summary.doc. Approved: [not approved]          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Shannon Beaucaire          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: July 25, 2017</p>
---

*representing the community should know enough to determine for certain what our position ought to be.*

*Lastly, I object to the use of the word "burden" in this context. Why should safety inspections be considered a burden when instead they ought to be viewed in a positive manner not only by residents but the companies that implement them?*

*Again, I thank you for your attention to my concerns. I look forward to hearing from you.*

*Dennis O'Mara*

- Mr. O'Mara said the NMED had not yet responded to his comments.
- Lynne Kinis said her condo had its own wastewater treatment plant, and they had two wells and two pumps. The pumps were alarmed. If one went down then the other took on the burden. The alarm went to personnel to check. Both pumps were alarmed, she said, and they weren't dealing with hazardous chemicals, but still made sure nothing untoward happened. Ms. Chavez responded that that's what the requirements called for. She needed to go back and verify exactly where the alarms were located, but Intel had a backup system in place to move from daily to weekly inspections. The goal was still to protect the environment.
- Marcy Brandenburg expressed concern that the personnel would be like a canary in the coal mine. Sarah Chavez said that secondary containment was in place to contain the liquid so it wouldn't go anywhere. People were trained in how to handle it.
- Marcy Brandenburg said the community was concerned about lack of transparency and that they—the police, the mayor, etc.—weren't notified when an accident occurred. Dennis O'Mara said this was his argument for years and would continue to be his argument. If an accident occurred and was not immediately reported to emergency response people, then the option to notify the public was taken out of their hands. Intel decided for them, and that was "dead wrong." Ms. Brandenburg emphasized that the community wanted clarification because they could not handle the lies. Sarah Chavez said that Intel had made improvements over the years based on community feedback. Ms. Brandenburg said the community wanted to know if an employee was at risk from leaks inside the facility. Ms. Chavez said this was the first time she had heard a request from the community about wanting to know about risks to employees inside the Intel facility, and that previously the focus was on outdoor events and risks to the general public. Ms. Brandenburg said what happened inside the facility also affected the community.
- Marcy Brandenburg said she wanted to know, as a local resident, about any chemical spills inside and outside the Intel facility, and she requested Intel show transparency via a weekly report made to the community via local media. She also said that Intel needed more security because of all the hazardous chemicals onsite, similar to Kirtland Air Force Base and Sandia National Labs. Sarah Chavez said she would take this request to Intel.

**ACTION ITEM:** Sarah Chavez will bring the request for having a weekly Intel report in the local media to Intel for consideration.

- Lynne Kinis said at the last task force meeting she asked the question: “How would I know if there was a spill at Intel that ran down hill?” She said she asked for a warning system to be put in place for neighbors in case of this kind of emergency, and the weekly report to the media was not enough. She wanted a siren warning system in place followed by a Code Red system. Ms. Kinis reminded that she had raised this issue previously.
- Mike Williams asked about a liquid leak vaporizing into the to atmosphere. Sarah Chavez said the welded piping was inside the facility, and there were other containment requirements around air monitoring.
- Marcy Brandenburg said the public wanted to know about any spill that compromised the safety and health of a human being and/or the environment. She said the community wanted access to incident reports. Sarah Chavez said that was a different request. Ms. Brandenburg said she was making a perfectly logical request and wanted to go on the record saying that she did everything in her power that was reasonable and logical. Ms. Chavez responded that she was simply trying to clarify her request. She said that incident reports included things like someone cutting their finger. She summarized Ms. Brandenburg’s request as follows: Ms. Brandenburg wanted to know if there was a chemical spill inside the Intel facility that fell on the floor or touched or exposed a person. She explained that incident reports were something different. Ms. Brandenburg said she was involved in chemical spills not risk management.
- Dennis O’Mara said in 1986 the emergency planning and community right to know law was enacted. In 1984 Union Carbide’s Bhopal, India, disaster occurred. Five thousand people died, and 50 thousand people were hospitalized due to a massive leak of methyl isocyanate. In January 1985, the manager of another Union Carbide plant in West Virginia made a public statement about the disaster, expressing sympathy for India while extolling the virtues of the safety procedures, records, and equipment in his plant. Union Carbide shut that plant’s methyl isocyanate manufacturing production down while they spent \$500 million dollars on safety improvements. A few months later they resumed production of methyl isocyanate, and not long afterwards five hundred gallons of aldicarb oxide and methyl isocyanate leaked. Fortunately no one died, but 134 people had to be hospitalized. Mr. O’Mara said his point was that in any human endeavor there will never be perfection. In regard to accidents at Intel, Mr. O’Mara raised the accident in Arizona around the leak of nitrogen trichloride, which affected over 40 employees. His concern was that it took 29 minutes before it was reported to local authorities. Then a couple years ago, two hundred gallons of HCL leaked outside at Intel Rio Rancho. It sat there for several hours on a warm day; obviously fumes vaporized from that leak, but Intel never reported it to Rio Rancho emergency management. He said these were the kinds of examples the community was concerned about. If something bad could happen, then it would happen. The bottom line

was that Intel needed to immediately contact local authorities when incidents occur so that they have the option to decide whether or not to notify the public.

- John Bartlit said they went way off the agenda, which was fine as long as the group agreed.
- John Bartlit commented on the RCRA, and the burden reduction issue of what was alarmed and not alarmed. The crux of the discussion was that he would prefer a weekly inspection with alarms rather than daily inspections without alarms. The alarms made the difference, and fit in with Regulatory Engineering, to make things cheaper, better and safer. He asked Ms. Chavez to find out more details about the alarm system as well as containment system Intel used.

**ACTION ITEM:** Sarah Chavez will gather more details about the alarm system, secondary containment process

- Shannon Beaucaire summarized where the group was at in the discussion. She listed three requests raised:
  1. More information on anything involved in the RCRA burden reduction, what did the personnel, alarm and secondary containment system and processes look like for liquids and gases.
  2. Intel should publish a weekly summary of all incidents on their property, both indoors and outdoors, followed by a warning siren system and code red.
  3. Any incidents involving chemicals and employees would be reported to the emergency response authorities.
- Shannon Beaucaire said that the request was for Sarah Chavez to take these three requests back to Intel, and then report back to the CEWG, after which the group would decide how to proceed.
- John Bartlit said if they were going to again discuss Code Red and a warning siren system, they should look at past meeting summaries on the topics so they didn't have to start all over again. They had looked at this extensively in the past. Sarah Chavez said Mr. Bartlit had a valid point to look at past discussions. For example, Intel could not activate Code Red at any given time; there were strict requirements around that. The other issue was lack of trust that Intel would immediately contact local emergency management in the event of an issue. Mike Williams added that the local emergency management and the public needed to know as soon as a leak was detected, not a day or week later. Ms. Chavez said there were regulations in place in the event of a leak with potential of release into the environment. People might not believe Intel, but Intel followed procedures and notified the appropriate agencies, which was the EPA. Dennis O'Mara vehemently disagreed with Ms. Chavez.
- Sarah Chavez reiterated what she was being asked to do as follows:



1. Marcy Brandenburg wanted a weekly report in the newspapers of any chemical spills, leaks, sprays, etc. and that happened inside or outside and/or exposed humans.
  2. Lynne Kinis would like Intel to investigate installing a warning system tied to Code Red.
  3. The group requested more details on the leak detection and monitoring system in place, how it worked, and how it was alarmed.
- Shannon Beaucaire asked if there was a request to review the Code Red report. John Bartlit said that was where they should start. Dennis O'Mara said he just reread it, and one of the recommendations was that Intel should report incidents to the local emergency management center. He said it wasn't happening. Sarah Chavez said it didn't happen for the HCL leak, but afterwards Intel changed procedures to notify the local emergency management system. Ms. Chavez said she didn't know the specific time frame but would have to find out. John Bartlit asked if the CEWG could see a copy of the procedure before and after. Ms. Chavez said she could certainly get the current procedure for the group to review, but wasn't sure about the previous procedure. Dennis O'Mara asked if Intel made the changes because of criticism. Ms. Chavez said she would have to ask Bryan Burroughs the details about the change. She added that there was an ongoing relationship between Intel and the LEPCs, and there was always room for improvement and changes.
  - Lynne Kinis said she hadn't heard that Corrales would be called; it was always Rio Rancho. Dennis O'Mara said Intel had a direct relationship with Rio Rancho emergency response team, and they would get the call to activate the system, not Corrales. Mr. O'Mara said the countywide and local emergency response teams were connected, so the message would reach all the entities that needed to be informed.
  - Shannon Beaucaire confirmed that this should be a future agenda item at a later meeting. All agreed. She asked how the group would like to move forward with the last 20 minutes of the meeting.
  - Dennis O'Mara said he wanted to continue on the current item. Many years ago, the NMED Secretary told residents trying to renegotiate their permit that Intel was their customer. He reminded that people in the state were the customers, and not Intel. He wondered if that attitude remained at the NMED. He expressed concern on Intel's latest request to NMED around RCRA, and was against reducing burden for no apparent reason. He didn't know how NMED would respond to his requests, but he would continue to press them. John Bartlit asked if Mr. O'Mara disagreed with his view on alarms—that having an alarm system in place with weekly inspections was better than not having an alarm system in place with daily inspections. Mr. O'Mara said why not go for both. Mr. Bartlit said because that was the point of Regulatory Engineering—better, faster, cheaper. Mr. O'Mara said this view wasn't the reality right now.

- Lynne Kinis said she got nervous when she heard “people in the area.” She said they couldn’t operate that way when dealing with human life. Shannon Beaucaire said that they needed a definition for this term, “people in the area;” what did that look like. Sarah Chavez said that if someone were working in the area they would see the leak and not necessarily be exposed. Ms. Kinis commented that a human life was more important than anything. She said her neighbors have been exposed repeatedly and haven’t even known unless they smelled something, and the worse chemicals didn’t smell. She said you couldn’t replace a person with money. Wouldn’t it be wonderful if someone could come up with a win-win process? She asked for a reevaluation from the perspective of living in the community. She said Intel needed to make changes, but it was all about money. She said she was interested in people caring about people.
- Shannon Beaucaire asked how the group wanted to move forward in the limited amount of time remaining in the meeting. She also asked how the group would like to prioritize future meetings.
- Dennis O’Mara said Sgt. Jackson should be the priority at the next meeting. Mike Williams suggested looking at this two last slides since they were related to Sgt. Jackson. Mr. O’Mara said this was a good process and then to push the other items to the next meeting.

### **MIKE’S INTERESTING QUESTIONS UPDATE**

Mike Williams addressed his last two slides.

#### **Slide: Other requirements for modified NIOSH sampler**

- ⇒ 8760 changes of the filter per year
- ⇒ Bulky, large unit with electrical power
- ⇒ Detailed chemical separation of 8760 filters per year

#### **Slide: What about the National Guard technology?**

- ⇒ Raman technique is conceptually similar to FTIR, but it uses a different part of the electromagnetic spectrum (visible & UV instead of infrared) so that the two together would have different sensitivities and different interferences, consequently the detection threshold could be lower and the reliability could be better
- ⇒ The technology conceptually could give much better time resolution without a great deal of laboratory work – no 8760 samples with laboratory analysis a year
- ⇒ The combination, Raman plus FTIR, also gives info on other contaminants

- Mr. Williams discussed the positive aspects of FTIR—good time resolution and the ability to look at many chemicals—and the negative aspects, which were that it was difficult to detect specifics, especially with hydrogen fluoride (HF). But using both FTIR and Raman

gave an enhanced capability and could give better information on HF. The question was, could it see subtle levels of chemicals.

- Sarah Chavez said the FTIR could see HF in the stacks and asked if the Raman could detect it at the ground level. Mr. Williams said they saw FTIR levels that were lower than in the stacks. And sometimes they could see low enough to be relevant, but other chemicals interfered and they couldn't see anything at all. Ms. Chavez said they didn't know the level the Raman technique could detect. Mr. Williams said the Raman system was automatable. He added that HF was not totally unique to Intel, but Intel was most likely the principal source.
- Sarah Chavez said Mr. William's has done the modeling and showed Intel was below screening levels, so what would they be looking for with this testing? What was the purpose, how would they use it, etc.; these questions had to be part of the discussion. Mr. Williams said if the modeling was perfect, then they wouldn't be interested in pursuing additional testing. Ms. Chavez said Mr. William's modeling looked at the worst-case scenarios. All conditions had to be considered in any testing, including weather. Mr. Williams said the modeling did not explain complaints. He said these details, including thresholds, should be discussed more thoroughly when they had more time.
- Ms. Chavez said that whatever they chose to do, they had to know what they were testing and why before they called in the National Guard to assist, and that was the purpose of the Citizen's Protocol. Mr. Williams said they just wanted to see if the Guard could get into the ranges that could tell something new. If their technology was feasible, then they could see what they could learn from that. The question was, what could the Guard's equipment do. And that question would be useful to them. Ms. Chavez said she doubted they would be able to show that an HF molecule came from the Intel stack, because Intel's emissions were lower and variable. She said they needed to be clear on what they asked the Guard to do.
- Mr. Williams suggested asking the Guard to do a short period test to see what was feasible. And the Guard would learn more about their capabilities.
- Shannon Beaucaire asked Mr. Williams to write down his question and send it to her. She then would share this question with the group and take comments in order to come to an agreement on it. Once that was done, she would send the question to Sgt. Jackson. All agreed on this course of action.

**ACTION ITEMS:** Mike Williams will send his question to Shannon Beaucaire, who will share it with the group to come to an agreement on wording. When that is accomplished, Ms. Beaucaire will send it to Sgt. Jackson.

- The group agreed to continue to invite Sgt. Jackson to the August meeting. At the very least, Sgt. Jackson could discuss the Guard's capabilities around training and education.

**ADJOURN**

**NEXT MEETING:** August 16, 2017, 5:15 to 7 pm, Corrales Senior Center.