

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**Community Environmental Working Group**

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

**Date:** October 19, 2022  
**Time:** 5:00–7:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Remote: By Zoom and Telephone

**Members Attending**

John Bartlit, NM Citizens for Clean Air &  
Water  
Emily Schmick, Intel

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

**Non-Members Attending**

Sarah Chavez, Intel

Marc Kolman, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

---

**HANDOUTS**

- |                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| ▪ CEWG Draft Agenda               | ▪ Action Item Progress Report Pending   |
| ▪ September Draft Meeting Summary | ▪ Action Item Progress Report Completed |
| ▪ October EHS Activity Report     |   |

**PROPOSED AGENDA**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| ▪ Welcome, Introductions, and Brief Items | ▪ CAFA Now  |
| ▪ Standing Agenda Items                   | ▪ Potential In-Person Meeting / Planning Retreat / CEWG Structure |
| ▪ Intel Oregon Permit Submissions         | ▪ Adjourn   |

Filename: CEWG\_Draft Meeting\_Summary\_ September 21, 2022.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Marc Kolman

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: September 29, 2022



**WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, BRIEF ITEMS**

Marc Kolman opened the monthly meeting.

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

No comments; agenda approved.

Meeting Summary—Revisions and Approval

No comments; Meeting Summary approved.

Other Announcements

No announcements.

Public Comment

No public comments.

**STANDING AGENDA ITEMS****EHS Report**

Emily Schmick summarized the October EHS Report. There were no regulatory inspections or meetings to report. Site events continued to be onsite cranes, which would remain for the foreseeable future. There was also concrete pouring in the east service area with no community impact. The following information was requested by or provided to regulatory agencies and were permit requirements: New Mexico Environmental Department (NMED) Air Quality Bureau (AQB), Annual Emissions Test Report; NMED Office of the Secretary, Manifest Exception Report; and Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority (ABCWUA) Monthly Ammonia Summary Report. Ms. Schmick said there was one neighborhood complaint call. A neighbor in Zone 2 called to report a burnt coffee chemical odor. Intel's onsite team walked the perimeter with a four-gas monitor and did not find anything out of the ordinary; all systems appeared to be operating within the normal parameters. The public affairs team called the community member and left a message with a call-back number on September 27.

- Dennis O'Mara asked what a four-gas monitor was. Ms. Schmick replied that it was a gas detector that detected gases such as oxygen, combustibles (LEL—lower explosive limits, a percentage of flammability), hydrogen sulfide (H<sub>2</sub>S), and carbon monoxide (CO). Mr. O'Mara asked what a Manifest Exception Report was. Ms. Schmick said that Intel paid HAZMAT shippers to transport waste disposals to a different location. Within 45 days of

Filename: CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_October 19, 2022.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Marc Kolman Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: October 24, 2022
--



the waste leaving the Intel site, the final destination was required to send Intel a signed manifest form. If Intel did not receive a signed manifest form during the 45-day period, they were required to inform NMED. Mr. O'Mara asked what kind of waste was transported and to where. Ms. Schmick replied hazardous waste but was not sure where it was sent. Mr. O'Mara asked that this item be added to next month's agenda so he could have an answer to that question. Mr. Bartlit added that he would like to know this information as well.

**ACTION ITEM:** 1. The agenda team will add Intel's hazardous waste transport final location to next month's agenda.  
2. Emily Schmick will report on the final waste location.

### **LEPC Update**

Dennis O'Mara gave an update on the Sandoval County Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) September meeting. He said he had three things to report. First, he said, a requirement in the Emergency Preparedness Act was that companies that hold substantial quantities of potentially dangerous chemicals must report on it. The EPA had definitions of hazardous substances and reporting thresholds for this Tier 2 reporting process. Companies did not have to report on all the chemicals they used or held unless they exceeded the defined threshold. Companies were required to report this information annually. In most locations, company reports went directly to local LEPCs. In New Mexico, this information was reported to a state-level office. Unfortunately, the person responsible for managing the Tier 2 reporting office had left the position, and a replacement was not found yet. Second, Mr. O'Mara said, an upcoming pipeline exercise would be held soon. The LEPC kept track of the potential for accidents that could occur as a result of pipeline breaches or leaks. An example in the exercise might be to deploy booms into a river to prevent leaking oil, for example. This pipeline exercise might be a tabletop exercise rather than an actual physical exercise. Mr. O'Mara said that the exercise was taking place on Thursday, October 20, and he wasn't sure of the type. Third, no incidents occurred that involved chemicals or chemical releases/spills that required an emergency management response. John Bartlit said pipelines could also refer to sewage, in addition to oil and gas. Mr. O'Mara said his impression was that the reference was to oil and gas pipelines, but he didn't know for sure, and would have to ask. Sewage leaks could mess up streams and human health.

**ACTION ITEM:** Dennis O'Mara will inquire about whether sewage pipelines were included in the LEPC's pipeline exercise.

### **Pending Action Item Progress Report**

Marc Kolman went through the Pending Action Item Progress Report.

<p>Filename: CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_October 19, 2022.docx. Approved: [not approved]          Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek &amp; Marc Kolman          Prepared for: CEWG          Date prepared or presented: October 24, 2022</p>
---



- Marc Kolman said the first item on the list was an older item and concerned the Cancer Concerns Committee. Chuck Wiggins reported by email that he may be ready to present at the November meeting. Mr. Kolman said he would follow up with Dr. Wiggins.
- Sarah Chavez said she had an update to the second item on the list, which referred to a question about the abatement equipment shutdown and rerouting process. Ms. Chavez said she was able to verify that this process was simultaneous. As soon as the equipment was switched over and damper opened, abatement simultaneously kicked in, and there was no delay in that process. Marc Kolman said the third item concerned returning to in-person meetings was ongoing and would be discussed later today.
- Marc Kolman said item 2022-6-15/1 concerned recruiting new members and was ongoing. Item 2022-8-17/4 concerned Chuck Wiggins connecting with a graduate student to get a list of student organizations. Mr. Kolman said he would continue to follow up on that item with Dr. Wiggins. Ms. Chavez said, on item 2022-9-21/1, Mr. O'Mara had already given the LEPC report, but that an Intel employee had attended the LEPC meeting but did not have any notes, so this item was closed. Mr. Kolman noted that items 2022-9-21/2 and 2022-9-21/3 were closed.
- Marc Kolman said item 2022-9-21/4 concerned John Bartlit's discussion about Purdue University. Mr. Bartlit said on October 9 he sent an email to Purdue that included multiple links to the CEWG's work and to his own work on regulatory engineering, and two days later he sent an email to the CEWG group. As of this meeting, he said he had no responses to either email. He added that the current president was leaving in January, and the dean of engineering was becoming the new president. Mr. O'Mara suggested waiting until a new president and new dean of engineering took over and emailing again. Mr. Bartlit said that was a good idea, and to add a new action item for him about following up in the future.

**ACTION ITEM:** John Bartlit will follow up with the new dean of engineering at Purdue, once that position is filled.

- Marc Kolman said that item 2022-9-21/5 was now closed, and items 2022-9-21/6 and 2022-9-21/7 were on tonight's agenda. Item 2022-9-21/8 concerned identifying potential experts to sit on a panel to discuss evolving science around low-level pollutant impact on health and would be a developing, ongoing project. On item 2022-9-21/9, Mr. Kolman reported that he added the newly approved, print-ready flyer to the CEWG website, and that he had sent Chuck Wiggins the newly approved CEWG recruitment flier, so items 2022-9-21/10 and 2022-9-21/9 were both closed.



## INTEL OREGON PERMIT SUBMISSIONS

Emily Schmick said she was following up on Dennis O'Mara's request to get information on wet electrostatic precipitators, which she would refer to as "WESPs," and that had been installed at the Ronler Acres facility in Oregon to meet permit limits. She said installation depended on site characteristics, one of which was low limits, the result of air dispersion modeling that included a high amount of residential wood stove burning that emitted high concentrations of particulate matter and weather inversions during winters. The air dispersion modeling included meteorological data, ambient background concentrations, and emissions. The Rio Rancho facility modeling was based on the highest permitted emissions and did not show that the facility exceeded the New Mexico ambient air quality standards. Oregon's modeling showed that particulate controls were necessary for the Oregon facility to stay within their permit limits.

- Dennis O'Mara asked Ms. Schmick to expand on wood burning stoves. Ms. Schmick said she did not have a lot of information on residential wood burning stoves. John Bartlit asked how particulate emissions compared between Oregon and New Mexico. Ms. Schmick said New Mexico was a much smaller site than Oregon, and particulate emissions in the New Mexico site were much lower. Mr. Bartlit asked her to get specific numbers. Ms. Schmick agreed and added that the numbers were most likely on the Explore Intel website.

**ACTION ITEM:** Emily Schmick will get specific particulate emission numbers for Intel Oregon and Intel New Mexico sites.

- Dennis O'Mara said that state and federal limits on emissions were inadequate to protect public health, regardless of whether New Mexico's site has lower emissions than the Oregon site. Intel was not doing enough to limit emissions and could do much more, including delegating more funding to maximize available technology such as hybrid systems. He said his best understanding of particulates, especially P.M. 2.5, was that they were like little drones that got into the bloodstream and deposited into human tissue. Accumulation became significant after repeated exposure, year after year. Intel took a day-by-day position and ignored the potential cumulative impact over decades on the health of people living near their facilities. Sarah Chavez commented that he could look at all the long-term health studies done by Intel, NMED, and ATSDR—a total of five different studies. They weren't perfect, but the intent was to look at long-term health effects. These studies were all posted on the CEWG website, and almost all of them were discussed at length in CEWG meetings over the years, Ms. Chavez said. She added that these studies were tied to the epidemiological panel discussion and may be good to discuss in more detail then.
- Dennis O'Mara said that the dates of these studies ranged from 15 to 18 years old. He was talking about emerging health science that was revealing that the "so called safe"



EPA emissions levels were inadequate and not safe, particularly over the long haul. John Bartlit added that another way to say it was that the EPA emissions levels had not yet been updated to reflect the emerging science. Marc Kolman asked if this discussion about the relationship between background studies and epidemiological risk or assessment as related to Intel emissions added more impetus to move forward with the panel discussion. If so, what kind of people were they look for to present and on what. John Bartlit said there was another angle, and that was the status of EPA's progress. They were always years behind. Where was the EPA on this? Were they aware of these studies? That might be part of another panel.

- Emily Schmick reported on Intel Oregon's use of ozone to treat NOX. This was a voluntary pilot Intel Oregon performing on seven of their thermal oxidizers. Basically, there were piloting this new technology to enable new technologies, and also because Intel Oregon was a technology development site, including emissions control. If the pilot plan was successful, then Intel would implement it throughout the entire Oregon facility. And if that was successful, then they would examine it for use at other Intel sites. John Bartlit asked if the citizen's group in Oregon played a role in piloting this new technology. Sarah Chavez said most likely no, and that the pilot was driven by the work they were doing in Oregon. Dennis O'Mara that he had the impression that this approach was not specific to Intel but had been out in the scientific community for a while. Emily Schmick confirmed that this was not a new technology but was new for Intel. Marc Kolman asked if Intel Oregon might have held an epidemiological panel relevant to what they were looking at in New Mexico and that may offer helpful information.
- Dennis O'Mara summarized an excerpt from an article about a new study at Harvard's Chan School of Public Health (found at <https://cafanow.org/articles/Long-Term-Exposure.pdf> and <https://consumer.healthday.com/b-2-22-even-low-levels-of-air-pollution-harm-heart-lungs-2650597872.html>) as follows:

Researchers analyzed data from more than 63 million Medicare patients from 2000 to 2016 and looked for associations between three different types of pollutants, including fine particulate matter or PM2.5— particulates with a diameter of less than 2.5 micrograms per cubic meter of air ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )—nitrogen dioxide ( $\text{NO}_2$ ), and summer ozone ( $\text{O}_3$ ), and harmful health effects. They found that long-term exposure to low levels of air pollution could increase the risk of pneumonia, heart attack, stroke and the irregular heart rhythm known as atrial fibrillation (a-fib). "People should be conscious of the air quality in the region where they live to avoid harmful exposure over long periods of time, if possible," said lead author Mahdiah Danesh Yazdi, a postdoctoral research fellow at Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, in a Feb. 22, 2021 article in Health Day,



noting that more than half of the study population is exposed to what U.S. benchmarks deem low levels of these pollutants. "Since our study found harmful effects at levels below current U.S. standards, air pollution should be considered as a risk factor for cardiovascular and respiratory disease by clinicians, and policymakers should reconsider current standards for air pollutants," Danesh Yazdi added in a journal news release."

- Mr. O'Mara said this article was fairly recent. In addition, there was research that suggested that exposure to low levels of combinations of toxic chemicals was risky as well. Based on these articles, he was not changing his mind, he said. John Bartlit said the EPA had a formal policy that took into account the hazards associated with combinations of pollutants but that took years to form. He assumed the EPA was aware of the effects of low levels of pollutants and was interested in learning where the EPA stood on this issue. He said it would be impossible to convince NMED, Intel, or pollution control companies to do something to comply with the most recent data if the EPA hadn't said anything about it. He doubted the CEWG could do anything to push the process faster, but they could inquire. He offered to look on EPA's website for two aspects—very low levels of emissions/concentrations and combinations of pollutants.
- Dennis O'Mara said that based on all the efforts he had undertaken to try to get information from the EPA, the EPA had been gutted by the Trump administration and hadn't been built back yet, and that being a governmental organization, the EPA was frequently dominated by politicians that didn't know what they were talking about or doing, and so have effectively prevented the EPA from really doing what was appropriate and right. CAFA now's position was that the EPA was of no use, and all CAFA now! could do was appeal directly to companies like Intel to do the right thing. Mr. O'Mara added that he would love to hear what Mr. Bartlit learned.
- Dennis O'Mara said he found a lot of good information on the EPA's website but they didn't drive home the issues around hybrid systems. Mr. O'Mara added that it was clear to him that hybrid systems were the way to go, but Intel New Mexico was not interested in using hybrid systems to minimize current emissions. If Intel NM really wanted to do the right thing, they would look hard at adding more equipment to the tail end of their scrubbers and thermal oxidizers. Emily Schmick said that additional abatement systems had their own usage issues, for example, the WESP system required additional electricity/power and water usage. Sarah Chavez added that hybrid abatement systems also released potential emissions, for example, to use a thermal oxidizer they had to burn natural gas, which created emissions. There was always a tradeoff.
- John Bartlit said a potential meeting topic could be what was happening in Intel Ohio—emissions, citizen's groups, technology, etc. Dennis O'Mara said there was a



community-based website and he would try to find the link. He suggested googling “Intel Mega project” to get to the website.

### **CAFA NOW UPDATE**

Dennis O’Mara said that CAFA now! was “not yet ready for prime time,” so he was not prepared to make any kind of extensive presentation about the organization. CAFA now! ran into some impediments that they were working through and making progress on several different fronts. One of the issues was getting the necessary support to keep the website continually updated and that was critical to move forward in a public manner.

### **POTENTIAL IN-PERSON MEETING / PLANNING RETREAT / CEWG STRUCTURE**

Marc Kolman introduced the agenda item, which connected with potential in-person meetings and/planning retreat with the question of participation and who might be interested in participating in CEWG meetings, as well as the CEWG structure and organization. The CEWG was currently structured as a member organization, but there were only three members. An alternative was to structure the CEWG as a non-member organization. How should the CEWG move forward with accomplishing its mission? Should the CEWG continue as a member organization? In addition, what were the thoughts around having an in-person meeting retreat?

- John Bartlit said he and Dennis O’Mara had been trying to recruit members but were batting zero. Why was that? He suggested that the CEWG facilitator, as a neutral party, phone people to ask them why they did NOT want to join the CEWG as a way to get useful feedback.
- Dennis O’Mara said that he would send the newly completed recruitment flyer to neighbors and some CAFA Now members to try to encourage them to attend a CEWG meeting to get a “look-see.” If they were interested, they could continue to attend as participants or as members. Part of this effort would be to include an agenda for the next meeting. Mr. O’Mara emphasized that if they really wanted to sell the CEWG, the agenda items should be intriguing or interesting enough to attract attendees.
- Emily Schmick said it was easier to ask a person to attend a meeting rather than to become a member. Having the CEWG be an attendee-based organization might help with the attendance because of level of commitment implied with the term “member.” Mr. O’Mara agreed and said that was what he was suggesting. Sharing material and information was one thing but talking to people was critical to answer any questions. Sarah Chavez said that having strong topics would fit in well with Marc Kolman’s idea of in-person meetings. For example, plan four meetings for 2023 that featured strong topics of interest. Marc Kolman added that rather than having a monthly agenda create a



strategic plan for the coming year on which topics were covered and when. For example, in June the CEWG would hold an epidemiological panel and have several months to prepare and find the right participants.

- CJ Ondek said that the current CEWG website was dry and ineffective at attracting interested community members, and some of the information, including when and where meetings were held, was outdated. If the CEWG was serious about attracting attendance, then it should get serious about revamping the website and clearly providing fundamental information about how to attend meetings to the public. Emily Schmick agreed and said it was a big project for the facilitator. Marc Kolman said he was not a web designer and was at a point in proficiency that he could make edits only. He added that the website was intended as an archival site for document storage, and that was how it was initially designed. If they envisioned another purpose, that would require hiring a professional web designer. A new website would also present a different public face.
- John Bartlit said the current website needed to be corrected about meeting times and locations, but there was a lot of valuable, historical information stored on that site. Maybe they needed two functions—archival and engaging. Emily Schmick said she agreed with the sentiment that the website could potentially serve two different purposes: 1. Be an archival wealth of information, and 2. Show the public that this was a living, breathing organization. CJ Ondek clarified that the CEWG facilitator should NOT be designing the website. They should engage a professional website developer, and the facilitator could help direct content, but that was the extent of it. She added that there were websites out there than combined both archival and engaging material.
- Marc Kolman asked what would change in a member versus nonmember organization other than designation of someone's status. Other questions were development of agenda items, overall purpose, people's interest in attending meetings, etc. Fundamentally the underlying question was why would people want to come to CEWG meetings. This question had to do with the purpose or function of the organization. What would make the CEWG a more vibrant, dynamic organization? CJ Ondek said it sounded like he was talking about strategic planning, figuring out fundamental questions and then how to get where they wanted to go. John Bartlit said a retreat would serve a purpose of strategic planning. Mr. Kolman added that the issues in this agenda were connected and depended on the direction the group wanted to go in, which in turn informed the key issues they wanted to address, when, and how. These were all strategic planning issues, he said.
- Dennis O'Mara said the term "strategic plan" was a turn off to him because of its bureaucratic implications. He reminded the group that part of the reason community members were not interested in joining the CEWG had to do with trust. The community did not think what the CEWG was doing was worthwhile because it was sponsored by



Intel. He questioned whether that lack of trust continued, or had enough time passed for a turnover in the population and a community that was not informed and not concerned about it. But if that mistrust was still prevalent, it would hobble any efforts to try to increase membership or participation. He again committed to trying to recruit and encourage neighbors to attend a meeting as long as the agenda was appealing to people's interest. John Bartlit said with the past silica testing and stack heights projects, the CEWG had a lot more interaction with community members, but they hadn't had as many specific, concrete, and unique projects in the last 10 years as they did in the previous 10 years. Mr. Bartlit added that Intel had changed also. Intel New Mexico had grown, and Intel as a corporation had become more centralized than it was in the past. Intel headquarters controlled more of Intel New Mexico and made more of the local decisions than previously. This affected the dynamics.

- Marc Kolman said discussion seemed to be leading toward a retreat. The discussion on structures followed intention and purposes, and these issues were better discussed in a retreat as opposed to a monthly meeting. The retreat could be online or in-person. He asked people's thoughts. John Bartlit said a retreat would be a different kind of a meeting, and that they were looking for a different kind of meeting. Mr. Bartlit asked who should attend the retreat, and suggested including other people who played major roles in the CEWG in the past but not having it open to the public. Marc Kolman said the question was who would need to come and for what reason, but before that question could be answered, they would have to address why they wanted the retreat and what was its intention. What was the gathering's purpose in a different format?
- Emily Schmick said the goal would be strategic planning: what should the organization look like, what should the meeting structure look like, whether the CEWG continues to function as a member-based organization or attendee-based organization. Dennis O'Mara said the word retreat sounded to him like being together in-person and isolated for some purpose, but he did not see himself doing that with COVID; he had too many risk factors. Emily Schmick said she could see ways to do this virtually. The retreat sounded like it would be a little more free-form and less of an on-the-record structured meeting to strategize. She said if the term "strategic plan" was too loaded of a word, then call it something else. The point was to figure out the structure and function of the organization. CJ Ondek added to not forget to talk about better ways to communicate with the public.
- Marc Kolman asked how much time they wanted to spend in an online retreat and how they wanted to organize it, for example, one-hour meetings over several days or in a daylong retreat with some breaks. Also, he asked when they wanted to do the retreat and who to invite. John Bartlit said they should aim for November or the first couple of weeks in December, perhaps December 5 – 9. Emily Schmick said she saw three different issues that have been raised: 1. Meeting content; 2. Organization structure; and 3.



Communication. An idea she suggested was to hold one-hour meetings around each issue over three different days. John Bartlit said maybe they could hold two meetings on one day—at 10 am and again at 2 pm—and the meetings did not need to be held on consecutive days. Ms. Schmick recommended that the group stay on task and only talk about the designated issue and not start bleeding into other potential issues. Dennis O’Mara said he didn’t want to spread it out too much, yet he didn’t want to cram it into a very short period of time. He proposed Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of the same week. Marc Kolman suggested scheduling 90-minute meetings, and shooting to finish in an hour but having extra time if they needed it.

- Marc Kolman summarized what he heard. Schedule meetings for an hour and a half; focus on three topics, one per meeting—meeting content, organization structure, and communication; and scheduled during one week—shoot for the second week of December. These meetings would be held separately from the regularly scheduled public meetings. Mr. Kolman said he would work to get these meetings scheduled and send a Doodle to all four people on the call—John Bartlit, Dennis O’Mara, Emily Schmick, and Sarah Chavez. He asked if Frank Gallegos should be included. John Bartlit said, if possible, to include Mr. Gallegos since he had been very involved with the CEWG in its earlier days and understood the history. He would provide good insight. CJ Ondek suggested doing homework on websites they liked before the communication meeting. Marc Kolman suggested the group research content and structure before those meetings as well.

**ACTION ITEM:** Marc Kolman will send a Doodle to CEWG members and Sarah Chavez and Frank Gallegos to schedule a series of online meetings in early December.

- Dennis O’Mara asked if the CEWG would be having public meetings in November and December. Emily Schmick said they were challenged to fill this month’s agenda, and then spent a significant portion of this meeting planning. She asked if there were any major agenda items to cover in November. Marc Kolman said December 21 was the third Wednesday in December and very close to Christmas. Did they want to have a meeting on December 14<sup>th</sup> or did they want to do a November meeting? Mr. Kolman said that Chuck Wiggins had mentioned that he most likely would be prepared to present on the Cancer Concerns Workgroup report in November. John Bartlit said they could dedicate an entire meeting in November to this topic, but what to do if he wasn’t ready? Marc Kolman said he would communicate with Chuck Wiggins about a November presentation. John Bartlit said Chuck Wiggins topic would most likely attract more attendees. Dennis O’Mara asked, if Chuck Wiggins could not make the November meeting, would the next meeting be in January? Both John Bartlit and Marc Kolman said yes.



**ACTION ITEM:** Marc Kolman will follow up with Chuck Wiggins on whether he will be ready to present at a November meeting.

**ADJOURN**

**NEXT MEETING**

**November 16 TBD**

Filename: CEWG_Draft Meeting_Summary_October 19, 2022.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Marc Kolman Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: October 24, 2022
--