

MEETING SUMMARY - APPROVED
Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: June 15, 2022
Time: 5:15–7:00 p.m.
Location: Remote: By Zoom and Telephone

Members Attending

John Bartlit, NM Citizens for Clean Air &
 Water
 Sarah Chavez, Intel

Dennis O’Mara, Corrales resident, Clean Air
 for All Now (formerly Corrales Residents
 for Clean Air and Water)

Non-Members Attending

Erika Edgerley, Intel, Corrales resident

Chris Daul, Representing Sandoval County
 Commissioner Katherine Bruch

Marc Kolman, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- CEWG Draft Agenda
- June EHS Activity Report
- February Draft Meeting Summary
- Action-Item Progress Report

PROPOSED AGENDA

- Welcome, Introductions, and Brief Items
- NM Cancer Concerns Work Group Assessment
- Standing Agenda Items
- Review Action Progress Report
- New CEWG Member Recruitment and Other Steps
- Adjourn
- Meeting Frequency

Filename: CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_ June 15, 2022.docx. Approved: [not approved]
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Marc Kolman
 Prepared for: CEWG
 Date prepared or presented: June 20, 2022

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, BRIEF ITEMS

John Bartlit opened the monthly meeting by stating the CEWG mission, which was to advocate for continuous environmental improvements at Intel New Mexico, reduce chemical emissions at Intel New Mexico and improve community dialogue.

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

No comments.

Meeting Summary—Revisions and Approval

No additional comments. Sarah Chavez said that the February Meeting Summary already had been officially approved.

Other Announcements

- Marc Kolman, the new facilitator introduced himself. He said as facilitator he saw his job as administrative coordination and helping the group to engage in constructive, productive dialogue. He shared his work experience over 35 years, a good portion of which was in public health administration. The last 10 years he worked as Deputy Director for the New Mexico Department of Health (NMDOH) in their Developmental Disabilities Supports Division. Part of his responsibility, he said, was to bring people together from diverse parts of a complicated system to have constructive dialogue around policy, and he saw this responsibility as sharing similarities with his duties as the CEWG facilitator. He shared his impressions of the CEWG to date. He said he found the CEWG's purpose to be noble and profound in trying to deal with issues that impact people's lives. Mr. Kolman added that he was pleased to serve as the new CEWG facilitator.
- John Bartlit asked Sarah Chavez to share the process of recruiting a new facilitator for the record. Sarah Chavez said the process used over the last several facilitators was to distribute a Request for Proposals (RFP) through targeted networks. CEWG members (Mr. Bartlit, Mr. O'Mara, Ms. Chavez, with assistance from Erika Edgerley and Jessie Lawrence) updated and modified the RFP used to hire previous facilitators to incorporate virtual meetings and other changes. Then Jessie Lawrence distributed the RFP through her networks, assisted by CJ Ondek. Ms. Chavez said that although Intel funded the position, they did not distribute the RFP. Applicants applied through the CEWG email, which Ms. Chavez monitored after Ms. Lawrence's CEWG tenure ended. She said Intel conducted a first round of interviews to screen for qualifications, and the second round of interviews was conducted over Zoom by Mr. Bartlit, Mr. O'Mara, and Ms. Ondek. Afterwards, Ms. Chavez, Ms. Edgerley, Mr. Bartlit, Mr. O'Mara, and Ms. Ondek met to provide feedback and decide on a candidate. After the candidate was selected, Intel worked on the procurement side of the process, such as getting a quote, setting up a purchase order, getting all the necessary documentation from Mr. Kolman to enable him

to start working. Ms. Chavez added that the purchase order was for 2022, and then Intel would issue a new purchase order for 2023. She said the facilitator hiring process was standard as in previous years except there was no current facilitator to manage the process, so Intel had to take more ownership of the logistics.

Public Comment

None.

STANDING AGENDA ITEMS

EHS Report

Sarah Chavez said the EHS report was short this month. She said she carried over one neighbor complaint from May. A neighbor in Zone 3 contacted Intel via email to notify them that a pile of rocks were placed on her property. Intel removed the rocks. This past Sunday night-early Monday morning Intel received a neighbor call from Zone 2 about odors. A new security officer was on duty and did not get detailed information, so Intel was trying to get in touch with the neighbor to find out more information. She said this incident would be included in next month's EHS report.

- Dennis O'Mara asked about the H-1 Semi-Annual Outfall Analytical Report to the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority (ABCWUA). Sarah Chavez replied that twice a year ABCWUA required sampling done at the water outfall, and the sampling results were included in this report. Mr. O'Mara asked for more details about what they had to sample for. Ms. Chavez said it was a long list of factors, and she would need to check on the details. John Bartlit asked if they could include this list in the June Meeting Summary. Ms. Chavez said she would verify if that list was included in the report, which was posted on the Explore Intel Web site, and if so she would post the link in the meeting summary. Mr. O'Mara asked that this report and sampling results be included on next month's agenda.

ACTION ITEMS: 1. Sarah Chavez will verify whether the list of sampling requirements was included in the H-1 Semi-Annual Outfall Analytical Report that was posted on the Explore Intel Web site, and if so she will add the link to the meeting summary.

2. Marc Kolman will include the H-1 Semi-Annual Outfall Analytical Report as an agenda item at next month's meeting.

Regulatory Engineering

John Bartlit shared the most recent regulatory engineering item discussed at length by the group, which was grab sampling—ways to take air samples in a neighbor's home during an odor event. The CEWG discussed best ways to accomplish grab sampling over several months. Mr. Bartlit said that the CEWG had considered conducting grab sampling that would be funded by Intel, and

that Dennis O'Mara was involved in the same effort through the group Clean Air for All Now (CAFA-now). The CEWG concluded that, since Mr. O'Mara was devoting his time to the CAFA-now effort, now would not be a good time to also do the same project, since there were only two CEWG members. Mr. Bartlit said discussion on this issue was captured on the record in meeting summaries. Mr. Bartlit proposed that the CEWG focus on recruiting new members now, and then revisit grab sampling at a later time. Mr. O'Mara agreed. Mr. Bartlit confirmed that the CEWG would put on hold the grab sampling project until after recruiting new members.

LEPC Update

Dennis O'Mara said the next Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) meeting was in July. The LEPC met quarterly. The only item on the agenda was for developing the LEPC plan. He said he would have more to discuss after the next LEPC meeting in July. Mr. O'Mara explained that the LEPC was established by federal legislation during the 1970s—the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA). This Act said that counties should have an LEPC committee made up of diverse community members. He further added that Sandoval County's LEPC was inconsistent over the years, and he hoped it would begin to function better and more appropriately.

NEW CEWG MEMBER RECRUITMENT AND OTHER STEPS

- John Bartlit said the first question he asked facilitator candidates during the position interview was about recruiting new CEWG members. In his view an effective CEWG needed to include members who were able advocates for the community, able advocates for Intel/key agencies, and able advocates for CEWG's process. The CEWG was seeking traditional members with these traits who were able to participate. Potential members were residents of Corrales and nearby communities; Corrales Village Council members; members **without** technical expertise; and members **with** technical expertise. Mr. Bartlit concluded that these were his thoughts.
- John Bartlit showed a slide and explained that it was from a 2008 document about the stack height issue written by Stephen Littlejohn, the CEWG facilitator at the time. This issue was controversial and raised the question around whether the CEWG and Intel had the same understanding of their relationship. The discussion included Intel's upper management and continued for months. Near the bottom of the report was a section entitled "Future Interactions between Intel Management and the CEWG." Mr. Bartlit thought what was written at the time in that specific section might be a good point of discussion for the current conversation about membership. Maybe the points still held; maybe they needed to change. Either way, Mr. Bartlit said it was worth discussing. He read through the following slide.

On future projects of this nature, several objectives need to be met:

1. The role of the CEWG and expectations for interaction between management and the CEWG must be clearly defined.
2. Get as much information as possible early in the work. This includes the broad context and history of related developments, expanded modeling information as necessary, and improved information about community quality-of-life concerns.
3. The work should be deadline driven, but those involved should manage timelines in a way that ensures careful consideration of information and options.
4. Intel should formalize an improvement orientation by using measurement to demonstrate improvement; communicating the whole picture of improvement, in which everything counts; and show incremental improvement over time.
5. Optimize communication by meeting with management at the earliest possible time to clarify expectations, discuss goals and constraints, explore information, and discuss differences openly.

From: "Future Interaction" on p. 7 and the top of p. 8 of "Determining Stack Height at Intel", 6/18/2008, see <http://www.cewg.org/stack-height/>

- Marc Kolman asked what the bearing of these five objectives were on recruiting members for the CEWG. John Bartlit said the CEWG needed to create something to recruit new members, and potential members needed to understand clearly the relationship between the CEWG and Intel. So, the CEWG needed to craft a statement about how the two worked together using a joint understanding.
- Marc Kolman asked the question on recruiting: Why do people join or not join the CEWG? What was the CEWG's purpose? John Bartlit said the purpose was in the mission statement, and the mission statement needed to be included in recruiting members. He asked Ms. Chavez and Mr. O'Mara for their thoughts.

Filename: CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_June 15, 2022.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: June 20, 2022
--

- Sarah Chavez said the information on the slide was part of the stack height report and not captured anywhere else. Although they had discussed it at the time, they did not create a separate conversation or document that focused on how the CEWG and Intel management was going to work moving forward. It seemed that these points remained buried in the stack heights report. Although these points might be helpful to clarify what the processes were, she wondered how this level of detail would help encourage people to join the CEWG. It might be more useful to discuss what the CEWG was actually working on currently, she said.
- Dennis O'Mara said the document in reference was specific to the stack heights issue. Some of the information on the slide might be helpful to formalize, but to know why people were not joining the CEWG, the questions to ask were: "How effective could the CEWG be? What impact did the CEWG have?" He said # 5 was one of the most important points on the slide because it addressed the relationship and interactions between the CEWG and Intel's upper management. He said he had mentioned this point in a previous meeting. He was beginning to think that the CEWG was spinning their wheels and questioned the extent to which Intel's upper management knew about CEWG and what they were trying to accomplish. He wondered whether the CEWG was just something for management to check a box. He said that the CEWG needed to demand interaction with upper management at Intel if they were going to attract new members. Those new members needed to know that they would have the ear of Intel's upper management. That might be an important selling point to attracting new members. John Bartlit emphasized that the CEWG could not demand anything—and never could—but had to use data and ideas to be as persuasive as possible and hope for the best.
- Sarah Chavez clarified that Intel site manager Mindy Koch had attended several CEWG meetings to report on Intel's Corporate Social Responsibility Report and talk about the kinds of environmental projects Intel was working on. As far as communication within the site, Ms. Chavz said Intel had a management committee headed by Erika Edgerley that met monthly to discuss community issues. While Mindy Koch did not attend all those meetings, upper management and site decision-makers definitely communicated and knew about the CEWG's work, including roadblocks or challenges.
- Dennis O'Mara said he had only seen Mindy Koch twice while he was with the CEWG. He reiterated that he was talking about direct interaction between CEWG and upper management, where members were able to present their perspectives directly to site decision-makers—not interpreted through third parties—and get direct feedback from upper management. Mr. O'Mara said that one of the CEWG's selling points was that it provided some interaction with Intel representatives, but it needed to go beyond standard operating procedure and involve higher management.

- Erika Edgerley said she considered herself part of upper management and ran the site committee, which included a small group of Intel management, that had conversations about the CEWG. She said she understood if Mr. O'Mara wanted to have discussions with other managers, but she just wanted to make this statement. Dennis O'Mara said he was not trying to undervalue Ms. Edgerley's role, but he hoped she could hear what he was saying about wanting their voices to be heard directly by people at the very top, and that the CEWG could then hear directly back from them periodically about issues brought to the table and community concerns
- Dennis O'Mara said that hearing about Intel's Corporate Social Responsibility Report from Mindy Koch was all well and good—although he had issues with what was in the reports—but it was a far cry from what he was talking about. Mr. O'Mara said it came down to a matter of trust. Over time, many community members who might have otherwise considered joining have concluded there was no point to it since membership would not produce any results. The lack of community trust was with both Intel and New Mexico Environmental Department (NMED). He said although the CEWG had accomplished a few things, it was not able to deal with issues most important to a community impacted by Intel's toxic emissions. Mr. O'Mara said the other half of the process was having Intel management take the CEWG and community's input seriously. Over time the perception (if not the actuality) that had evolved was that Intel management had not responded in a useful and positive way; the community received platitudes rather than meaningful action.
- John Bartlit asked if it were useful for the CEWG to create, in one voice, a short, concise single document to use for recruitment. The document could list the kinds of members they were looking to recruit and tell the CEWG's story: We made some progress, but we need to make more progress.
- Dennis O'Mara said the current situation provided an opportunity for the CEWG to reset, and to describe what that "reset" meant, which could include a more ambitious approach to interacting with Intel upper management. He said he believed that if the CEWG could do this then the CEWG could accomplish more. Mr. O'Mara added that if the CEWG was important enough to upper management, then they would take more of an interest. Although he didn't see that happening, if Intel made it happen then he believed this was an important subpoint to recruit new members.
- Sarah Chavez said she disagreed with Mr. O'Mara, but perhaps she was biased because she had been in her position working at Intel and with the CEWG for a really long time. She didn't see how Mr. O'Mara's suggestion would change anything because the upper management knew what was going on and improvements have continuously been made over the years. These improvements might not be the ones that Mr. O'Mara wanted, or

directly related to chemicals of concern. For example, one change over time was that Intel discussed the most recent permit around expansion for several months—from September to February. The CEWG provided a venue to provide education from both Intel and NMED to discuss expansion and the permitting process. None of this was required by regulations. This happened because management continued to support and fund the CEWG. Dennis O'Mara replied, "Let us agree to disagree."

- CJ Ondek commented that Mr. O'Mara's perception and Ms. Chavez's perception were different because Intel did not communicate about upper management's involvement regularly during CEWG meetings. Perhaps at future CEWG meetings, Intel representatives could talk more about how Intel communicated internally with site management about CEWG meetings and provide feedback on key discussion points.
- John Bartlit said that was a useful comment and shared an anecdote. Years ago, the CEWG talked a lot about scrubber maintenance schedules. Scrubbers were offline during maintenance, which caused unabated emissions. He said he had happened to run into an Intel Rio Rancho manager at an Explora meeting and asked him if he knew what was going on with the CEWG. The manager replied, "Yes I do. You're talking about scrubber maintenance schedules. Sounds like improvement to me." Mr. Bartlit added that this discussion at CEWG meetings created change around scrubber maintenance at Intel.
- Erika Edgerley said she appreciated CJ Ondek's comment because it was correct—Intel did not share information on local decision-making at CEWG meetings, and this was one place that Intel could share: how and where the decision-making occurred.
- Dennis O'Mara said he had a few thoughts about recruiting. He thought putting together a recruitment tool was a good idea. He said he wanted to make some calls to a few organizations to see if they could refer other organizations that might be willing to send a representative to CEWG meetings. Also, he planned to make more local calls to neighbors to invite them to sit in on meetings to see if they wanted to participate long-term. He said he would ask his village councilor to see if he were willing to sit in. John Bartlit raised the possibility of making a presentation at a Corrales Village Council meeting to make an appeal for membership. Mr. O'Mara said individuals could attend a Council meeting and make a presentation up to three minutes. He knew the mayor, the administrator, and his councilperson, and the CEWG could probably get on the agenda for a longer presentation. John Bartlit reminded that John Alsobrook worked with the CEWG previously and was a current Corrales Council member.
- Dennis O'Mara asked Mr. Bartlit if he would rework the slide to reflect more the CEWG's current circumstances and include some of the items discussed tonight. Then they could review the draft to share with prospective members. Mr. Bartlit said he would

be willing to draft a recruitment tool and invited Mr. O'Mara to contribute some of his ideas. Mr. O'Mara agreed. Mr. Bartlit also invited anyone to send their ideas to him on the recruitment tool.

ACTION ITEM: 1. John Bartlit will create a first draft at a recruitment tool, and Dennis O'Mara will contribute his ideas to the draft.
2. CEWG members would take individual action to reach out to organizations, etc. to recruit members.

MEETING FREQUENCY

Dennis O'Mara suggested that the CEWG should continue to meet monthly. John Bartlit agreed.

- Sarah Chavez asked what there was now to discuss at meetings besides recruitment that would warrant monthly meetings. How would they fill the agenda? She suggested perhaps shortening meeting times to one hour until after they grew membership. Mr. Bartlit suggested having the July meeting and go from there. Mr. O'Mara said they could add to next month's agenda items from the future agenda items list. Ms. Chavez said there was a long list to go through. Mr. Bartlit said that they might have feedback to discuss at the meeting around recruiting progress. Mr. Bartlit asked if Mr. O'Mara would be willing to talk about Clean Air for All Now's sampling results at some point in the future. Mr. O'Mara said yes, when the time was right.
- John Bartlit said Chris Daul was welcome to participate in meetings. Mr. Daul said he mostly listened and jotted down notes to share with Commissioner Bruch. He also asked attendees that if they had any comments or concerns about the Sandoval LEPC meetings to let him know and he would share directly with the Commissioner. On recruiting, he thought getting someone from the Village Council was a good idea, as was reaching out to constituent groups such as the Rio Rancho residents or the Sierra Club or even the Chamber of Commerce. The thought was to recruit groups that represented different interests. Dennis O'Mara added that he was glad Mr. Daul was participating in CEWG meetings and he appreciated the connection to Commissioner Bruch. He hoped that Mr. Daul would continue to attend meetings. Mr. Bartlit seconded this comment.
- Erika Edgerley said she had reached out to Chuck Wiggins about tonight's meeting but did not hear back from him, and she forgot to follow up. John Bartlit thought Chuck Wiggins would be a valuable CEWG member; he was interested in the societal aspects of epidemiology.
- John Bartlit suggested to Dennis O'Mara that he go through the agenda item list and prioritize the most pressing items to discuss. Mr. O'Mara said he would do that.

ACTION ITEM: Dennis O'Mara will review and prioritize the agenda item list.

- John Bartlit suggested making a list of places to go to and present as a group or individually for recruiting as a way to organize. He asked about Intel's recruiting members. On the Corrales resident side, Erika Edgerley said she had reached out to some neighbors about attending CEWG meetings. She also let the neighborhood association know about the CEWG and they politely declined, but she didn't know why they declined. She thought maybe they were more interested in water. She was happy to approach them again.
- Sarah Chavez said as part of the recruitment effort they should ask what people were interested in discussing. The CEWG tended to only discuss emissions and health effects, so if people were not interested in these topics they might not attend. She said she and Marc Kolman had talked about doing a survey as a way to get input. They also thought about reaching out to newsletter recipients to get their input.
- Dennis O'Mara said one of the things to communicate to prospective members was that they could do as much or as little work as they wanted, either as a member or as a participant. Having people listening was valuable, as was having their input. The major commitment was attending monthly meetings, and they were not required to do a lot of work on behalf of the CEWG. Sarah Chavez said she didn't know if the CEWG had ever documented member duties. She said they had documented process and procedures but not necessarily member duties. John Bartlit said the only difference between members and nonmembers was when they reached consensus. Members got to vote in the decision-making.
- Sarah Chavez said she had the Action Item Progress Report but wasn't sure if it was updated since the February meeting. She would work with Marc Kolman and John Bartlit to update it and bring it back for discussion in July.

ADJOURN

NEXT MEETING

July 20, 2022

<p>Filename: CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_June 15, 2022.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: June 20, 2022</p>
