

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: March 21, 2018
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

Hugh Church, American Lung Association in New Mexico
 Sarah Chavez, Intel
 Dennis O’Mara, Corrales resident, Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water

Non-Members Attending

Ron Epps, Intel

Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Facilitator, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- CEWG Draft Agenda
- February Draft Meeting Summary
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- Draft Annual Report
- Draft 2018 Priorities

PROPOSED AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, and Brief Items
- Standing Agenda Items
- New Mexico National Guard Testing
- NMDOH ALS Report
- CEWG Annual Report
- CEWG 2018 Priorities
- Action Item Progress Report Review
- Adjourn

Filename: 2018-3-21 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: April 18, 2018
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: March 25, 2018

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, 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 comments.

Meeting Summary—Revisions and Approval

No comments.

Other Announcements

No comments.

Public Comment

- Dennis O'Mara said Corrales elected a new mayor—Jo Anne Roake. He provided the group with her qualifications. Mr. O'Mara said she was an attorney who began first as a librarian. She was married to an ex-marine who was also a lawyer, and they practiced law together. She had lived in Corrales for 11 years and was heavily active in the community. She was president of Friends of Corrales Library, president of the Corrales Historical Society and presided over the San Ysidro Church renovations. She was also appointed to the Planning and Zoning Commission, serving two terms, including one as Chair, and was also a member of the Sandoval County Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. O'Mara said Mayor Roake was a smart, personable and reasonable lady, and he was confident that she would manage the government well. He said that she had won two thirds of the total vote and beat the incumbent by 3 to 1. She was elected to a four-year term.
- John Bartlit asked if the CEWG should introduce themselves to the new mayor. Mr. O'Mara said that would be a good idea but to wait until she got settled into her new role. Mr. Bartlit suggested making an action item to contact the new mayor in the future. However, this was already listed as an item in the Action Item Progress Report.

STANDING AGENDA ITEMS**EHS Report**

- Sarah Chavez updated the report by adding that on March 22 and 24, an Intel contractor would be trimming trees and doing weed control, so neighbors would see people spraying on Intel property. John Bartlit said that years ago Intel provided the CEWG with a list of pesticides that were used in landscaping.

Filename: 2018-3-21 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: March 25, 2018

- Dennis O'Mara asked about CUB testing on diesel fuel. Sarah Chavez said the CUB normally ran on natural gas with diesel fuel as a back up. Federal regulations required annual testing for diesel backups.

Regulatory Engineering

- Sarah Chavez said she had a couple of updates on regulatory engineering using drone technology similar to that used in an inspection. The first update involved Intel worldwide and was a research project that used drones to help bees pollinate plants. John Bartlit said that Intel drones were used at the Olympics. Ms. Chavez said the Olympic drones used different light colors to draw pictures in the sky.
- Ms. Chavez said the second update was on drones used in the Santa Rosa fire recovery to:
 1. Take pictures to help first responders respond to the fire; and
 2. Use thermo-imaging to figure out a safe location to place equipment.
 John Bartlit commented that most drones had to have a pilot. Sarah Chavez said a person needed a specific kind of pilot license to fly a drone.

LEPC Update: No Update

Dennis O'Mara said the next meeting would be in April, and he would give an update then.

UNM Cancer Study: No Update

Dennis O'Mara said most of the Cancer Study report was done after almost 2.5 years, but the researcher was still doing some analysis. He expected it soon. He said the data to date did not reveal any “smoking guns” or increased cancer rate. The report looked at the same 12 Census tracts the CRCAW requested for the NMDOH ALS study, and from years 2000 to 2015, which was also the same time period requested in the ALS study.

NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ALS REPORT

Dennis O'Mara gave an update on the NMDOH ALS Report. He said he had not yet received feedback from two reviewers, and he had asked an additional person to review the report, so there would be total of four responses. One had responded, and he was confident he would get them all to respond. Originally he had told them “no rush.” So, he did not have much to share tonight about the report.

- Mr. O'Mara said that he remained skeptical about the ALS report until he could see the data and calculations. He hoped that if the reviewers agreed with his concerns, he could convince the NMDOH to do the “right and appropriate thing.” He said that as it currently stood, the NMDOH’s approach was tone deaf to the concerns Corrales residents have had over the years. The NMDOH had an opportunity to be forthcoming and transparent, and in

Filename: 2018-3-21 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: March 25, 2018

his opinion they had not done that. He said if the methodology was flawed so were the results.

- John Bartlit said he researched on the Internet about the ALS prevalence rate, and the situation of having too few people with the disease to determine a connection was fairly common. Another challenge was that to get prevalence rates they needed to know when people were diagnosed with the disease. Mr. O'Mara said this was true, and the ideal data points for calculating disease prevalence would be the date when patients first began to exhibit symptoms (or if not available, the date of diagnosis), and the date of death. The years in between would count in the prevalence calculation. Mr. Bartlit said that the diagnosis year was very hard to find. Mr. O'Mara responded that was true to an extent, since a lot of the local ALS cases occurred in the early 2000s, and medical records were less accessible or not available because of the elapsed time. Mr. O'Mara said ALS was a rare disease, and the numbers were always going to be small. He added that, unfortunately, the standard epidemiological approach to analyzing outbreaks of any sort would always be biased against finding increased prevalence when the numbers were small. It was almost pre-ordained when using standard approaches that the number would be too small, he said. It still didn't mean those situations shouldn't be looked at carefully. Mr. Bartlit suggested that the Corrales study should also show results in a form to compare directly to the national study, because the correct prevalence rate was less important than the comparative numbers. If there wasn't already an alternative methodological approach for rare diseases, there ought to be, Mr. O'Mara said.
- Dennis O'Mara said that he was asking for NMDOH to show the numbers and calculations and not do a "smoke and mirrors" kind of report without showing the basis for the results, especially given the circumstance, background and concerns of the community.
- John Bartlit asked if Mr. O'Mara had heard anything from Heidi Krapfl. Mr. O'Mara said that she knew he was still waiting for feedback. He shared with her the one response he had, and as a result she altered one element she used in the calculations.
- John Bartlit asked what the CEWG could do to help. He suggested contacting two UNM epidemiologists that presented to the CEWG several years ago. Mr. O'Mara said he already talked to his reviewer from UNM about coming to a CEWG meeting to discuss the cancer study results, and the reviewer agreed to do so. He didn't think the NMDOH would come to a CEWG meeting to present on the ALS study because they would have to interact with the news media, something they seem very cautious about doing, Mr. O'Mara said.
- John Bartlit said the CEWG should do everything they could to get to the bottom of what the requirements were in such a study as defined by the disciplines of epidemiology. He said what was done by NMDOH and what was done nationally to get the prevalence

Filename: 2018-3-21 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: March 25, 2018

should be comparable. Whether that method was right was less important than being able to compare the two.

- Dennis O'Mara said NMDOH looked at the raw numbers, declared they were too small for calculations of annual rates, so instead determined a single rate across all 16 years. Doing it that way masks the possibility that cases concentrated in a shorter period of time which, if true, would have resulted in some annual rates far higher than the national average. Mr. O'Mara said that in the NMDOH's view an annualized prevalence calculation would not end up being statistically significant, so they just did it the other way. He wanted NMDOH to show him the data so he could assess the analysis. The national rate was 5 per 100,000, and the NMDOH report cited the local rate for the entire 16-year study period as the same.
- John Bartlit proposed that the CEWG get the names and credentials of the UNM epidemiologists and then discuss whether they were appropriate to review the report. Mr. O'Mara said he had solid epidemiologists lined up to give their assessment of NMDOH's research methodology. He also reminded the group that the ALS report was not a product of the CEWG but CRCAW, and he was sharing it with the CEWG.

ACTION ITEM: Sarah Chavez will try to find the names of the UNM epidemiologists who presented at a CEWG meeting.

- Sarah Chavez asked if Mr. O'Mara was willing to share the names of the people he contacted to review the report. Mr. O'Mara clarified that he indeed intended to share that information but only after he received their permission to do so. Mr. O'Mara added he would try to be more aggressive with getting the three responses before the next CEWG meeting.

DRAFT OF ANNUAL REPORT

John Bartlit said a draft of the annual report was emailed to members, and only Dennis O'Mara responded saying he had no changes. The Annual Report was projected onto the screen and the group made minor edits together.

- Sarah Chavez said she and John Bartlit had made minor edits since the last meeting, such as deleting #2; updating #1 and #3; and updating the topic index to ensure all the information was included. She said she would talk with Jessie Lawrence about where to put the one-page handout on the Web site and then add the link to the Annual Report. The group agreed to review the final version of the report before posting it.

ACTION ITEM: Jessie Lawrence will email CEWG members the final Annual Report for review before releasing it to the public.

Filename: 2018-3-21 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: March 25, 2018

2018 PRIORITIES

John Bartlit said any topic could be added to the list of 2018 Priority Topics as they emerged. The list was a tool to guide future discussion and was subject to change at any time. The group reached consensus on the list as written.

REVIEW ACTION ITEM PROGRESS REPORT

- Item #9: Sarah Chavez said the CEWG already had an action item for Jessie Lawrence to connect with the new Corrales mayor and Council members. Dennis O'Mara suggested adding “invite the mayor” to the action item. The group agreed to amend it as follows: “invite the new Corrales mayor to a CEWG meeting.”
- CJ Ondek asked a question about the “status” column. Why were the items listed as “moved to future agenda item” rather than just being moved. Usually the status column listed “pending,” “ongoing,” or “completed.” Sarah Chavez suggested it might be a preliminary step before actually moving the item and to confirm this with Jessie Lawrence. She added that items #3, #4, #5, #6, and #7 should be removed from the Action Item list to the Standing Agenda list.

ACTION ITEM: Sarah Chavez will ask Jessie Lawrence about the status column process.

- Item #14: Sarah Chavez gave an update on the *Corrales Comment* cartoon printed with the CEWG phosphine/phosgene article correction. She said the cartoon had not yet been posted online.
- Item#17: Sarah Chavez said they were discussing the National Guard testing document tonight.
- Item #19: Dennis O'Mara gave an update, and the item was still pending.
- Item#20: Dennis O'Mara said he had shared information on indium phosphide with both the Rio Rancho and Corrales fire departments. He said the only response he received was from Rio Rancho, which was “Thanks for sharing.”
- CJ Ondek noted that items #11 (annual report) and #12 (2018 priority topics) were completed tonight. She asked about item #2, reflecting on trust and dialogue, and pointed out that it had been there for a couple of years.

Filename: 2018-3-21 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: March 25, 2018

- CJ Ondek asked about item #8, the regulatory engineering document. John Bartlit said item #8 could be changed to “ongoing” rather than pending, since people sent him revision ideas on an ongoing basis.
- Sarah Chavez asked about the necessity of item #1, check on regulatory engineering meeting with Intel, since she gave quarterly regulatory engineering updates. No one disagreed to it being removed from the list.

NEW MEXICO NATIONAL GUARD TESTING

- CJ Ondek said that Sgt. DePalma did not respond to Jessie Lawrence’s email about attending tonight’s meeting. She said that Ms. Lawrence reported that Sgt. DePalma had received the email because he asked her to send the Citizen Protocol attachment to a different email address. She had sent a follow email to him on March 12 about attending tonight’s meeting but he never responded.
- Sarah Chavez said she and Mike Williams took the relevant Citizen Protocol questions agreed to at last month’s meeting to create a new National Guard Testing document. The group would review and edit the new version together at tonight’s meeting. She then preceded to give an overview of the new document.
- Ms. Chavez said for now the working title was the “National Guard Testing Protocol.” The document had three section: Introduction, Sampling Methodology and Reporting. At tonight’s meeting they needed to address:
 - What is the rationale and validity of the proposed test?
 - Where are the testing location/s?
 - What is the sampling timing?
- Ms. Chavez said she and Mr. Williams identified three items to include in the document. The first was a list of chemicals that the CEWG was most concerned about. She said she and Mr. Williams would work together to compile a list of chemicals that they were most interested in knowing about. They would refer to past modeling documents, risk assessments, etc. to compile the list. The second was a list of chemicals typically found in urban areas, such as traffic exhaust, wood burning, wild fires, etc. The chemicals would need to be profiled by season (summer vs. winter, for example). She said they would do some research on these chemicals, perhaps looking at the City of Albuquerque’s list. The third item was to ask the National Guard to identify any chemicals the sampling found that were not included on CEWG-provided list.

Filename: 2018-3-21 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: March 25, 2018

- On reporting results, Ms. Chavez said they would ask for anything above the detection limit to be included in the report. It would include the chemical name, the location where it was collected, the date and time it was collected, the value, and the equipment' detection limit. This reporting process would be different from past CEWG activities, since the National Guard was collecting samples only. The CEWG—most likely Mike Williams—had to compare and analyze the results. Ms. Chavez said the CEWG needed to determine the screening level for comparison.
- Ms. Chavez said another thing they needed to understand was how the National Guard compared their data collection to the standard. For example, if they collected samples for one minute, but the standard was one hour, how did the National Guard compare that to the standard. This process would be similar to what Mike Williams did for the HF study, which involved making adjustments for New Mexico specific conditions, Ms. Chavez said.
- Ms. Chavez said once they determined what levels were “acceptable” or “safe,” then the CEWG would have to decide what steps to take if a chemical came in above the acceptable level. Also, the CEWG would need to decide on what language to use. The Citizen’s Protocol used the term “acceptable,” she said.
- Ms. Chavez said that they would need to discuss where and when the National Guard would sample, and how much guidance Mike Williams should provide them. Dennis O’Mara said that he assumed the “when” would be general and not specific to dates and time.
- Ms. Chavez raised the issue of weather data: who would be responsible for telling the National Guard where to collect the weather data, who would collect the data on the day of the sample, and what weather stations would provide the sample.
- Mike Williams said that he was concerned about the National Guard’s procedure of collecting data within a short period of time only, and how they could be sure they were sampling a plume. The odds that they would find anything were small.
- Sarah Chavez said she changed the reporting piece to indicate that the CEWG would get the report first, since the CEWG still had to analyze and compare the results. The CEWG would need to spell out exactly how that would be done. Ms. Chavez said the testing protocol was still missing a lot of information, but at least they had the general framework together.
- Sarah Chavez asked the group what kind of guidance the CEWG should give the National Guard on choosing sampling locations, frequency, and timing. Ms. Chavez suggested

Filename: 2018-3-21 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: March 25, 2018

telling the Guard what the CEWG would like them to do, provide as much detail as Mr. O'Mara was comfortable with, and then let them respond.

- John Bartlit said at some point the CEWG had to be assertive with the National Guard to get a response about whether or not they were still willing to move forward with the testing. Dennis O'Mara emphasized that Sgt. Jackson was willing, since it helped them to test their procedures and capacities, but he didn't know about Sgt. Jackson's replacement. Mr. Bartlit asked if there was anything to be gained by talking to Sgt. Jackson. Mr. O'Mara said to be persistent with Sgt. DePalma, since he may still be settling in. He suggested that Sgt. DePalma might attend the next LEPC meeting, and if so, Mr. O'Mara would approach him there.
- Dennis O'Mara said he could take a map and point out areas with frequent community complaints and locations that he personally encountered along Corrales Road. Also, there were the locations where it was logically comfortable to pull off the side of the road and not encroach on personal property. He also said he could ask a couple community members to allow the National Guard to come on to their property to collect samples. He reminded that Sgt. Jackson had suggested getting a baseline measurement, and Mr. O'Mara said he would be willing to offer his property for that purpose.
- John Bartlit asked what would be a reasonable number of locations to ask them to sample. Mr. O'Mara suggested 5, but maybe that was a question for the National Guard. He said it was less about the number of locations and more about sampling frequency at a specific location. For example, could they travel to these 4 or 5 locations and take regular weekly readings over one month. Sarah Chavez said this was what the CEWG needed to spell out: for example, go to these five locations, pull three samples while there, and then go back every week for two months. She said the National Guard wanted the CEWG to define these parameters.
- Dennis O'Mara said they also had to consider different weather conditions. Ms. Chavez asked what weather stations would they look at to determine the weather conditions. It would need to be forecasted because it would take the National Guard an hour or two to mobilize. These pieces would need to be specified, she said, along with ideal weather conditions. Mr. O'Mara said Weather Underground stations could be used as reference points or back ups to more official sources of data.
- John Bartlit asked if the National Guard had meteorological equipment on their trucks. Mr. O'Mara said he didn't know. Mr. Bartlit said the more he thought about it, the more likely it was that they had access to weather data on their truck. He said they had to be careful about collecting data during times with unfavorable wind direction, which could set the process up for criticism.

Filename: 2018-3-21 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: March 25, 2018

- Mike Williams said he looked at past modeling situations, and stable weather conditions with light wind was the best weather condition; time of day should be considered, too. Mr. Williams said time of year didn't make much difference, except springtime, which was usually too windy in New Mexico. He also said it would be useful to ask the National Guard if they had access to meteorological modeling. It was important for them to have access to weather data while they were sampling. Mr. O'Mara suggested using several online Weather Underground locations as a backup to determine reliability. Mr. Williams said he would give parameters around time of the day, too. Mr. Williams said the challenge was in finding the plume, otherwise collected data would be worthless. Maybe a specialized camera could help them find the plume.
- Dennis O'Mara said that maybe the CEWG is preparing so detailed and complex a set of criteria that the Guard might say they couldn't do it. John Bartlit said they could give the Guard the option, and the CEWG could pare it down if need be.
- John Bartlit said they needed to have a caveat that listed the limitations with testing. Challenges included finding the plume, weather, sampling time frame, detection limits, etc.).
- Sarah Chavez asked why the CEWG was asking the National Guard to do the testing. Mike Williams said he wanted to get more familiar with their testing instruments to help resolve some of the CEWG's questions around sampling. John Bartlit said to find unexpected levels of pollutants. Another reason he added was that this was a different method using different equipment. Dennis O'Mara said he was looking for independent verification on Intel's claim that their emissions were undetectable at a certain level. The last attempt to independently verify Intel's emission results was in 2004. Mr. O'Mara said community members always wanted to know how to more frequently and independently monitor emissions level. Sarah Chavez suggested group members share their ideas on "why" do this testing over email.

ACTION ITEM: Group members share their ideas on "why" to conduct this testing over email.

ADJOURN

NEXT MEETING: April 18, 2018, 5:15 to 7 pm, Corrales Senior Center.

Filename: 2018-3-21 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence
Prepared for: CEWG
Date prepared or presented: March 25, 2018