

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: March 20, 2019
Time: 5:15–7:00 p.m.
Location: Corrales Senior Center

Members Attending

John Bartlit, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water	Hugh Church, American Lung Association in New Mexico
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

Erika Edgerly, Intel and Corrales Resident	Alexander Lowry, Intel
Jessie Lawrence, Facilitator	CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| ▪ CEWG Draft Agenda | ▪ March EHS Activity Report |
| ▪ January Draft Meeting Summary | ▪ Action-Item Progress Report |
| ▪ February Draft Meeting Summary | ▪ John Bartlit’s Observation of the February Meeting Panel |
| ▪ February EHS Activity Report | |

PROPOSED AGENDA

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| ▪ Welcome, Introductions, and Brief Items | ▪ UNM Cancer Study |
| ▪ Standing Agenda Items | ▪ Action Item Progress Report |
| ▪ NMDOH ALS Report Panel/Dialogue | ▪ Adjourn |

<p>Filename: 2019-3-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: March 26, 2019</p>
--

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, BRIEF ITEMS

John Bartlit opened the meeting by stating 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

Sarah Chavez had one amendment to the January 16 Meeting Summary. On page 9, third bullet point, the sentence should read: "Sarah Chavez said it was a waste treatment system that made a solvent waste **safe** for shipment." There were no other comments on the January meeting summary.

Dennis O'Mara said that he had comments on this February 20 Meeting Summary. He agreed to discuss his comments during the 5:45 agenda item, which would be an in-depth discussion about the February 20 meeting.

Other Announcements

Jessie Lawrence said that she circulated the draft 2018 annual report for final comment via email as discussed at the January meeting. She said she did not receive any additional comments, so finalized the annual report and posted it online.

Jessie Lawrence shared with the group an article about the CEWG written by Sarah Chavez and published in Intel's employee newsletter. Sarah Chavez said that it had been published in time for employees to be aware of the March meeting time. John Bartlit said that the language was slightly different from what he had proposed but the basic message was right.

Public Comment

No comments.

STANDING AGENDA ITEMSEHS Report

Sarah Chavez provided an overview of the February EHS report. She said that Intel was still receiving calls about the east slope and working with those neighbors.

Sarah Chavez provided an overview of the March EHS report. Dennis O'Mara asked for an explanation of the 2/28/19 item, the SDS report. Ms. Chavez said that SDS referred to Safety Data Sheets in which Intel provided standard reporting with updates to emergency responders on onsite chemicals to help responders in the case of an emergency event. John Bartlit asked if the

Filename: 2019-3-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: March 26, 2019

reporting included information on the locations of materials onsite. Ms. Chavez said that the information was not that specific, and in the case of an event, first responders would be escorted to the onsite incident location. She said that all of the information was maintained in an online database.

Regulatory Engineering:

Sarah Chavez said that she had sent an email to the CEWG members regarding the WERC contest at New Mexico State University and the task entitled "Industrial Stack Exhaust Emissions Testing Using Drone Technology." Two schools signed up for the competition, and a third was interested but couldn't participate because of funding. The competition would include a report, an oral presentation, and a bench scale competition. John Bartlit said he signed up to be a judge and that he would share some of his writings on regulatory engineering with the teams. He also said that he would share information about the CEWG, and perhaps someone from a team might be able to come to a future meeting. He noted that this task was a result of the CEWG's work.

LEPC Update.

- Dennis O'Mara said there was a meeting in February and the next one was scheduled for April 17th. He said the two National Guard representatives were not present so he could not speak with them about collaborating with the CEWG. John Bartlit asked how they should handle this issue with the National Guard. Jessie Lawrence suggested consolidating the National Guard items on the Action Item Progress Report into one or two lines and keep it holding until they could definitively determine an action.
- Dennis O'Mara said at the meeting that Tanya Lattin, Corrales Fire Department Commander, was appointed the Deputy Chair of the group. Also, the LEPC decided to pursue a state grant to hire a company to take the lead in developing and writing the existing plan with input from the community. Mr. O'Mara volunteered to work with the new operations chief to prepare the grant application; funding might be available in the state's next fiscal year.

NMDOH ALS REPORT PANEL/DIALOGUE

- Jessie Lawrence asked the group to address any concerns in the February Meeting Summary. She said the invited panelists at the meeting provided clarification to their individual comments in the February Meeting Summary to make sure they appropriately reflected their meaning. The February Meeting Summary that was circulated at tonight's meeting incorporated their comments. John Bartlit said the meeting summary captured dialogue between a community group and experts, which was an important conversation to have.

Filename: 2019-3-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: March 26, 2019

- John Bartlit suggested members might need more time to review the revised February Meeting Summary and comment at the next meeting or by email. Dennis O'Mara said he would appreciate more time to review the meeting summary more closely. He reminded that he was concerned about Heidi Krapfl saying it was "confirmed" that there were not more cases than expected; he disagreed that it was "confirmed," especially in that the community was unable to review the data. He wanted to add a parenthetical statement to the meeting summary pointing this out but was not sure if the meeting summary protocol allowed parenthetical statements.
- Jessie Lawrence responded that the meeting summary was intended to capture what happened at the meeting. Disagreements with what was said could result in a statement to be captured in a subsequent meeting summary or action item. John Bartlit added that changes in the meeting summary usually were made by a person to clarify their own statements, but not the statements of another attendee. CJ Ondek further added that the CEWG protocol had been to clearly capture third party disagreements or objections in a subsequent meeting summary. Dennis O'Mara said he would appreciate more time to review the February Meeting Summary to comment on at the next meeting. Jessie Lawrence stated that February Meeting Summary approval would be delayed until the April meeting and be on the agenda for the April meeting.
- Jessie Lawrence mentioned that in the follow up communication she had received, three panelists responded with comments and edits (Dr. Stommel did not provide edits), and Heidi Krapfl and Andy Rowland both thanked the CEWG for the invitation to participate in their responses and said that they appreciated the experience. She said that Elijah Stommel sent a spreadsheet that listed Intel emissions data from 1987 to 2017. Sarah Chavez clarified that this spreadsheet was a compilation of annual toxic release inventory reports that were threshold based and reported to the EPA. The chemicals stored and used above the threshold were the chemicals reported on the spreadsheet. She clarified that the chemicals listed here were not a complete list of chemicals emitted by Intel. This spreadsheet information was available online through the EPA on facilities all over the United States. Jessie Lawrence said that she would forward the spreadsheet to everyone as well as the link to where this list could be found.

ACTION ITEM: Jessie Lawrence will forward Dr. Stommel's spreadsheet to members as well as the link to where this list could be found online.

- Jessie Lawrence asked the group what their takeaways were from the panel and their ideas for next steps. John Bartlit said he wrote up six observations about the panel discussion in a handout that he shared with the group. He qualified that his observations were not intended to be a critique of the study. He hoped that his comments would spur further

discussion. Dennis O'Mara said he would like more time to consider Mr. Bartlit's observations before commenting on them.

- Dennis O'Mara said he remained dissatisfied with the study as it was done and disagreed with the conclusion that it was done appropriately. He still did not see a clear-cut explanation about how Heidi Krapfl arrived at the study's conclusion that 8.1 cases would be expected in Corrales over the 16-year study period. His overarching concern about the study was that it looked only at Corrales and did not include 10 additional Census tracts that he had requested to be part of the study in the original request. A new proposal that came from the meeting was for NMDOH to look at data on death certificates from the 12 Census tracts, the State of New Mexico as a whole and the U.S. and compare these three data points to see if differences exist. John Bartlit added that both Heidi Krapfl and Andy Rowland entertained this idea. Mr. O'Mara said Dr. Rowland suggested expanding the study backwards to 1995 or earlier and using five-year increments, which might allow for numbers large enough to make a valid conclusion.
- Mike Williams raised the issue of how an ALS patient having lived in New Mexico but died in another state would be handled. Dennis O'Mara said he did not know if the death certificate would be filed in New Mexico but it was something to look at.
- Dennis O'Mara reminded that the state legislature was considering some kind of legislation to establish a state registry for neuro-muscular diseases. Erika Edgerly reported that this was Senate Bill 185, and it was stopped from moving forward in the Senate Finance Committee and did not pass the New Mexico legislature this session. She said that this information and an analysis was on the legislature Web site at: <https://nmlegis.gov>.
- Jessie Lawrence asked if the group would like her to email John Bartlit's panel observations, which they can discuss via email and during the April meeting, if needed. All agreed.

ACTION ITEM: Jessie Lawrence will email the group John Bartlit's panel observations.

UNM CANCER STUDY

- Jessie Lawrence said the UNM Cancer Study report was "almost" done, and she had communicated with Dr. Chuck Wiggins, the report's author, about attending the April CEWG meeting to present on the report. He was holding the April meeting date on his calendar. Ms. Lawrence reported that Dr. Wiggins had said the report was in the final review stages by NM Department of Health (DOH). He agreed to share the report as soon as it was possible in the interest of members having time to review the contents in advance and develop questions for the April meeting; but as of the meeting tonight the report was

not available. Ms. Lawrence said she would continue to follow up with Dr. Wiggins and share any information she learned.

- Sarah Chavez reminded that with every CEWG guest speaker, the group reviewed the report and discussed and compiled questions to ask in advance as a way to make the best of the guest's time. This process worked well, she added. How should the CEWG proceed in terms of process that was different this time, she asked. John Bartlit said they definitely needed to have the report in advance before the April meeting, otherwise it did not make sense to have Dr. Wiggins come then. Dennis O'Mara said that in his conversations with Dr. Wiggins, he learned that the report had bounced back and forth multiple times to and from NMDOH because apparently they had issues with it. UNM's Cancer Registry operated on a contract with DOH. John Bartlit said if there was an issue between NMDOH and UNM, perhaps they could invite both to a CEWG meeting to discuss, although that would most likely be difficult due to bureaucracy.
- Jessie Lawrence asked if the group had a deadline in terms of receiving the report that would give them enough time to review the contents and compile questions. Sarah Chavez asked whether or not the group wanted to collaborate on questions. She wondered if waiting until May was going to matter that much since they had been waiting so long already.
- John Bartlit asked if the CEWG could apply reasonable community pressure to the NMDOH to release the report as a way to handle the bureaucracy. Dennis O'Mara said he would handle it this way: contact Dr. Wiggins and explain this discussion, and that in order to maximize meeting time, they needed to see the report and prepare questions in advance, and would it be possible to have the report at least two weeks before the April meeting. If Dr. Wiggins answered no, then let him know that the consensus was to push his presentation back to May. Mr. Bartlit said the CEWG could still put pressure on the NMDOH to release the report. The group agreed that they could work over email to prepare questions in advance, and having two weeks before the meeting was reasonable but one week might be too short depending on the report length.

ACTION ITEM: Jessie Lawrence will contact Dr. Wiggins as per Dennis O'Mara's suggestion: that the CEWG needed to see the report and prepare questions in advance, and would it be possible to have the report at least two weeks before the April meeting. If Dr. Wiggins answered no, then let him know that the consensus was to push his presentation back to May.

REVIEW ACTION ITEM PROGRESS REPORT

<p>Filename: 2019-3-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: March 26, 2019</p>
--

- Jessie Lawrence said the National Guard items were still pending, and the CEWG had not received any communication. She said she would consolidate the action items as discussed earlier.
- Sarah Chavez updated her items: #7 was completed; #8 and #9 were still pending. On #10, Intel had no upcoming permit changes so that item might be pending for a long time. The CEWG might want to reconsider how they captured that item, she suggested.
- Jessie Lawrence said they might be revisiting the emissions permit again at the next meeting depending on the April agenda. Other ideas for the April agenda were the design contest outcome and follow up to the ALS panel presentation discussion.
- Other potential future agenda items discussed were to investigate the Agricultural Extension Service, which was operated by New Mexico State University, as a potential guest to discuss dying plants.

ADJOURN

NEXT MEETING: April 17, 2019, 5:15 pm to 7:00 pm, Corrales Senior Center.

Filename: 2019-3-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: March 26, 2019
