

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

Community Environmental Working Group

“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”

Date: June 20, 2018
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

Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident, Corrales Residents for Clean Air and Water

Jessie Lawrence, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

HANDOUTS

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CEWG Draft Agenda ▪ May Draft Meeting Summary ▪ Action-Item Progress Report ▪ EHS Activity Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emails to Trout Unlimited NM, UNM Epidemiologists, Heidi Krapfl, NMDOH |
|--|--|

PROPOSED AGENDA

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Welcome, Introductions, and Brief Items ▪ Standing Agenda Items ▪ Intel/Trout Unlimited ▪ New Mexico National Guard Testing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NMDOH ALS Report ▪ Emergency Management Notification ▪ Action Item Progress Report Review ▪ Adjourn |
|--|--|

<p>Filename: 2018-6-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: August 15, 2018 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: August 15, 2018</p>
--

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. He said the meeting started seven minutes late due to traffic on I-25 that delayed several members.

Agenda—Revisions and Approval

No comments.

Meeting Summary—Revisions and Approval

- Jessie Lawrence said there was a slight correction to the April Meeting Summary. CJ Ondek made a minor change to the April Meeting Summary in response to a request from Sarah Chavez to re-listen to a section of the meeting to clarify confusion around an action item. Jessie Lawrence read the revised paragraph at the meeting. Below is the revised section that incorporated Marcy Brandenburg's rationale behind her request for clarification.

Marcy Brandenburg asked the last time the NMED had visited Intel. Sarah Chavez she would have to go back and look for this information. All regulatory agency inspections were noted in EHS Reports. Ms Brandenburg asked for a list that noted the last time all regulatory agencies—NMED, EPA, etc.—visited Intel to inspect compliance. She said she wanted this list as a way to check Intel's compliance with regulatory agencies. Ms. Chavez reminded that all the visits were noted in the EHS Reports and available on the CEWG Web site, and she agreed to compile this list.

ACTION ITEM: Sarah Chavez will compile a list noting the last time all regulatory agencies visited Intel as a way for Ms. Brandenburg to check Intel's compliance.

- Jessie Lawrence said unless anyone objected, she would make this addition to the final. No one objected. Lynne Kinis asked Ms. Lawrence to send her a revised Meeting Summary. Ms. Lawrence agreed.

ACTION ITEM: Jessie Lawrence will send Lynne Kinis a revised April Meeting Summary.

Other Announcements

None.

<p>Filename: 2018-6-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: June 24, 2018</p>

Public Comment

Mike Williams asked if Toner Mitchell from Trout Unlimited was coming to the meeting. Jessie Lawrence said she forwarded the email exchange she had with him to members, and that exchange was also included as a meeting handout. She said that he hadn't responded to her email about whether he would attend tonight's meeting.

STANDING AGENDA ITEMSEHS Report

- Sarah Chavez said she added Lynne Kinis' and Brenda Stamper's neighbor complaints to the bottom section of the EHS Report. She said she checked and didn't find anything unusual that occurred during the times in question in the complaints. She asked Ms. Kinis if she agreed with the wording. Ms. Kinis approved as it was written. Ms. Chavez said she could not find a way to check if there was roadwork going on nearby. Ms. Kinis asked what Intel was doing about the kangaroo rat infestation on the escarpment. Ms. Chavez said she hadn't heard about it but would check, as these rodents could cause a problem for Intel as well as for neighbors.

ACTION ITEM: Sarah Chavez will check on whether Intel was doing anything about the kangaroo rat infestation.

- Dennis O'Mara asked about the 5/21/18 onsite power disturbance that resulted in a factory evacuation. He asked if all the thermal oxidizers were down. Sarah Chavez said the factory lost power so everything went down. Mr. O'Mara asked why the plant was evacuated. Ms. Chavez said that as a standard procedure when losing power the building was evacuated because it was dark inside with the exception of emergency lighting. Mr. O'Mara asked if any manufacturing was going on during the down time. Ms. Chavez responded that everything was shut down during the outage, and they had to restart all the equipment. Mr. O'Mara asked if they restarted the manufacturing equipment before the thermal oxidizers were back online. Ms. Chavez said they were able to start two of the three sets of thermal oxidizers as they turned on the manufacturing equipment. Mr. O'Mara asked if the emissions normally sent to the thermal oxidizer units not online were rerouted or if they were emitted unabated. Ms. Chavez said the emissions were bypassed but not treated during this event. John Bartlit asked if they had to report this incident. Ms. Chavez said the incident was included on the bi-annual emissions report. She said internally they documented what happened but the report was an aggregate.
- Dennis O'Mara asked if it was really necessary to start the equipment without the thermal oxidizers being online. He asked why Intel couldn't have waited a few hours. Ms. Chavez said she would ask that question. Mr. O'Mara said she could ask but he already knew the answer, which was that Intel clearly "didn't give a damn" about the health and safety of nearby residents; it flew in the face of logic and was another example of Intel's not caring

Filename: 2018-6-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: June 24, 2018

about the community's health. He said it was sad. Also, he noted that it had been a month since the incident happened, and no one had heard anything about it. Ms. Chavez said Intel notified the Sandoval County Emergency Manager, the Rio Rancho Emergency Manager and the Corrales Fire Department using the procedure that was reviewed at the CEWG recently. If the community emergency managers deemed it necessary they would have notified the community. Mr. O'Mara said it was commendable that Intel followed this procedure, but they still dumped untreated emissions into the air, so this was really about two different issues.

- Mike Williams asked if Intel was able to make a calculation about the amount of untreated emissions that was released. Sarah Chavez said yes, and the next report to the regulating agency was due around mid-August, and the emissions would be calculated and reported on then.
- Dennis O'Mara said he thought that with the changes made in the deployment of abatement equipment to provide redundancy, emissions that would usually go to a thermal oxidizer that was down for maintenance or repair would be shunted to another thermal oxidizer Ms. Chavez said normally that was the case; if one unit failed, the other unit(s) could handle the load. But in this case all three units in one system were down due to the power failure, and they couldn't restart all three units, so there was no redundancy. That didn't happen very often, as far as the whole system being down. Mr. O'Mara said the purpose of redundancy was to avoid putting unabated emissions into the air. He thought that was the main goal, so it didn't make sense to him that Intel couldn't wait until all the equipment was operable. He said that the amount of production that occurred in those few hours could not have been that significant. Ms. Chavez said she would bring information to the CEWG to report what the emissions were and they could compare the impact to other months. John Bartlit asked for details on how it was calculated. Ms. Chavez said she would provide this information.
- Lynne Kinis said that production didn't stop and chemicals were going unabated because of greed and lack of concern for human beings, both in and out of the plant. If Intel had to release people from work because the plant lost power, it amazed her that Intel didn't have generators to switch over to. It showed her what mattered. She asked why it was necessary for Intel to continue production, which had been proven to affect people's health when emissions were sent out unabated. Why did Intel dismiss communities? Why didn't Intel notify the community that there was a problem, that chemicals were being released unabated, and suggest to the community to stay inside or leave the area. Ms. Kinis said Intel didn't "give a rat's ass." From the time noted in the EHS report, it was almost 10 hours that had passed. She said that the community deserved more attention. Sarah Chavez clarified that Intel had emergency generators used to keep safety systems in place, such as emergency lighting. Also, employees were not told to go home but to assemble in a

Filename: 2018-6-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: June 24, 2018

specific location to wait for further instructions. She reminded that Intel had notified emergency managers because of work the CEWG had done. Intel was not allowed to notify anyone beyond the community emergency managers, whose responsibility was to notify the community. Mr. O'Mara asked if the community emergency managers knew that Intel was going to start manufacturing without the abatement equipment. Maybe the emergency managers "fumbled the ball," he said, but it came back to Intel's management and their lack of concern for the health and safety of people living in the community.

- Sarah Chavez asked Ms. Kinis to clarify her comment that it had been proven that when Intel's equipment was down it affected people's health. Ms. Kinis referred to the Darko Koracin report, where he mapped out people's reactions to the chemical emissions. That was before the thermal oxidizers were installed, which the community pressed for.
- Mike Williams asked if the change in emissions would be noticeable. Sarah Chavez said likely it would be unnoticeable because the emissions coming out of the thermal oxidizers were so low anyway. Lynne Kinis said that the incident was going to be lumped in with regular emissions, which were so low that it would not be noticed. Ms. Chavez said Intel reported emissions on a ton per year basis, and they likely wouldn't see it because the amount emitted was most likely in the pounds. She said she would bring the numbers to compare.
- Dennis O'Mara said no one knew the long-term impact of those emissions. Someone had once commented to him, "You can't prove a negative." He wanted Intel to prove a positive, that it was safe for people near the plant to be breathing these emissions. Intel couldn't prove that, he said.
- Sarah Chavez said when Intel did the second risk assessment, they had applied scenarios that assumed the abatement equipment was down for one year. That was the best method available at the time to look at the long-term health affects. They looked at different chemicals, the amount of time exposed, and the potential health affects. She reminded that Intel had been able to reduce the thermal oxidizer down time by quite a bit over the years. A few years ago, she was reporting down time almost every month, so Intel had made improvements because of the input of the CEWG and the community. Mr. O'Mara reiterated that he hoped the feedback going up the chain of command was that the community did not appreciate that Intel thought it necessary to go back to production without the abatement systems in place, and they encourage management in the future not to go back into production until abatement systems are back online.
- Lynne Kinis asked if Intel told the emergency management what chemicals were being emitted unabated. Ms. Chavez said that would be event specific, and Intel would provide

Filename: 2018-6-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: June 24, 2018

whatever information the emergency responders asked for. John Bartlit suggested inviting emergency responders to a meeting to discuss this issue. He asked people to think about it.

ACTION ITEMS: Sarah Chavez will:

1. Ask Intel management why Intel couldn't have waited until all the thermal oxidizers were online before starting the production.
2. Bring information to the CEWG on the amount of unabated emissions that occurred to compare with other months; and
3. Bring details on how that number was calculated.

Regulatory Engineering:

- John Bartlit brought an issue of *Time* magazine dated June 11, 2018. The issue was dedicated to drones and the cover was an Intel advertisement and said: "Get your data off the ground." Mr. Bartlit said he agreed with that headline, and that it was connected to regulatory engineering. The *Time* issue focused on the application of drones, but it didn't talk about the application of drones per se to regulatory issues. Mr. Bartlit said he wanted to remind as many people as possible about the potential use of drones for regulatory engineering. Intel stood to make a lot of money around drones. This issue of *Time* was available online at: <http://time.com/longform/time-the-drone-age/>. Sarah Chavez added that she had shared examples of using drones to do jobs that were dangerous to people. The technology was there, but improvements still needed to be made.
- Sarah Chavez referenced an article about the San Diego Port Authority that used sensors and data analysis to track energy consumption and help figure out ways to reduce energy use. The Port Authority placed sensors along the building to see where they were wasting energy. Ms. Chavez said although it was a different approach, it was an example of a "smart" building and how to more easily get data to do an analysis and reduce energy consumption. The article was available online at: https://iq.intel.com/iot-san-diego-port-authority-gets-data-tech-smart/?_series=smart-cities
- John Bartlit said the day would come—20 or 30 years in the future—when a system would be created that didn't allow facilities to start up the production process until the abatement equipment had started. It would automatically lock. That was the potential of regulatory engineering.

LEPC Update: *No update.*

UNM Cancer Study: *No update.*

INTEL/TROUT UNLIMITED INFORMATION

<p>Filename: 2018-6-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: June 24, 2018</p>

- John Bartlit said meeting handouts contained emails sent to Trout Unlimited. He asked if the CEWG wanted to talk more with Toner Mitchell at Trout Unlimited. Mr. Bartlit asked if they wanted Toner Mitchell to come to a CEWG meeting to discuss the organization's work with Intel. The group indicated they were interested in Mr. Mitchell attending a meeting.
- Dennis O'Mara said he read an article in the *Albuquerque Journal* that volunteers were working in small streams up north to help with erosion, which was wreaking havoc, including not allowing the water to be retained in the area. They were building "beaver dams" to try to stop water from gushing.

NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (NMDOH) ALS REPORT

- John Bartlit said meeting handouts contained emails sent to Heidi Krapfl from NMDOH. Ms. Krapfl replied that she would respond, but asked for some time as NMDOH is in the thick of work related to fire season.
- Dennis O'Mara said he had received feedback from Chuck Wiggins, the University of New Mexico epidemiologist doing the cancer study, who said he understood where Mr. O'Mara was coming from in terms of different approaches to calculating prevalence, but was concerned about the small numbers. He also got feedback from Steve Dickens, who also understood Mr. O'Mara's perspective, and said he'd been thinking about it some more and agreed that calculation of annual prevalence rates could be useful. Mr. O'Mara said that so far, out of the three sets of comments that were returned, two of the reviewers agreed with him that the study author should graphically depict the dates of diagnosis and death of each case so that annual prevalence rates could be calculated, even if, in the end, these calculations would not be statistically significant. He also said that he shared those three sets of comments with Heidi Krapfl and told her he had a couple more reviews that were pending, and that he wanted to speak with her in person after he received all the reviews.
- Sarah Chavez said she understood from previous conversations that the way NMDOH calculated the numbers allowed them to compare the data to the national ALS database. So if the way the data were calculated changed, then what would he do with the data. Dennis O'Mara said they could look at year-by-year prevalence, and even though the numbers would be small and not statistically significant, it would help to understand the pattern of occurrence, which was important. Calculating one prevalence rate for the entire 16 year study period masks the pattern of occurrence, and such a rate is not comparable to the national estimate which is an annual rate. Each year's ALS prevalence rate is determined by the number of individuals living with ALS during any part of that year. Mike Williams said as he understood it, the way NMDOH calculated the numbers was not quite comparable to the national database.

Filename: 2018-6-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: June 24, 2018

NEW MEXICO NATIONAL GUARD TESTING

- Jessie Lawrence said she hadn't had any additional contact from the National Guard and assumed they were still in Guam or other places. She said this was typical of their pattern, and she had no reason to believe that they wouldn't pop up again at some point. The question was if the CEWG wanted to proceed as far as they could, or if they wanted to identify specific questions for the Guard to move forward. Ms. Lawrence added that she felt that the Guard may not be responding because they have yet to have specific questions to respond to and were waiting for the CEWG to ask. She asked the group where they wanted to go from here. Dennis O'Mara said he did not have any other contacts at the Guard. In July there will be a Local Emergency Planning Committee meeting, and a Guard representative might attend. If so, Mr. O'Mara will try to speak with him.
- Sarah Chavez said she and Mike Williams continued to work on the National Guard Testing protocol, and specifically, potential locations for the testing to occur, when not to take samples, weather monitoring, and the number of samples to take. Ms. Chavez said the suggested potential sampling locations were as follows:
 - Dennis O'Mara's house (distant location)
 - End of Camino Los Cerros Road (Lynne Kinis' neighborhood)
 - Empty lot on Morning Sun Trail (further north)
 - End of Windover Road (south of Lynne Kinis' neighborhood)
- Ms. Chavez said these locations were open spaces and had space to park a large vehicle and get out and take samples. Ms. Chavez said they would have to communicate with the neighbors to let them know the sampling was taking place. Lynne Kinis said she was okay with the location choices. Dennis O'Mara said he was okay with the location choices, but he also believed the Guard should not be limited to these locations and allowed to collect samples in random locations as well. John Bartlit said the challenge with random locations was that authorities and neighbors needed to be notified that testing would be taking place, especially because of potential nighttime sampling. Mr. O'Mara suggested notifying the Corrales Police Department about the sampling project, because they were out patrolling all night and day. He also suggested adding to the location list the area from the far south end of Corrales Road to the Village offices, because much of that portion of the road has wide enough shoulders that would allow a vehicle to pull off the road safely. He also suggested Loma Larga Road, from the south end to Sagebrush. Ms. Chavez added these two locations to the list.
- Sarah Chavez said the next section concerned "when" to sample, and that she and Mike Williams thought it was more useful to tell the Guard when NOT to sample rather than when to sample. They came up with the following list of weather conditions to avoid when sampling.

Filename: 2018-6-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: June 24, 2018

- Winds above 3 meters/second
 - Cloudy overcast skies
 - Daytime hours between sunrise and sunset
 - When smoke from forest fires was visible or smelled in the area.
- Sarah Chavez said next they looked at where the Guard could get weather data. If they had the ability to monitor weather at their truck, then this data would be collected at the time of the sampling event. If they didn't have it, then they would need to get it from somewhere. The CEWG would need to ask the Guard if:
 - They had weather monitoring equipment on their truck
 - They had access to some type of forecasting data
 - If the Guard did not have weather data, then they could take data from the Intel weather station. The CEWG would need to check if the Guard had the ability to get online and pull data from the Explore Intel Web site that had wind data, or was it better for the Guard to call Intel security to get weather data. Dennis O'Mara asked that besides the so-called Weather Underground system, wasn't there something online and somewhat official to pull weather data from? Sarah Chavez said the City of Albuquerque used to have weather monitoring stations that weren't online, but their weather stations that were closest to Intel had closed.
 - Sarah Chavez said that they also addressed the number of samples to take. She reminded that the Guard's sampling was very short, so taking more samples was important.
 - For each sample event, at each location, take 5 samples at 10-minute intervals.
 - Each location will be sampled 5 times over the course of 3 months.
 Ms. Chavez said that this method was a way to get more data, but they had to be aware of asking too much of the Guard. Also, establishing this parameter would give the Guard a better idea of what the CEWG wanted to accomplish. Dennis O'Mara said this was something they needed to negotiate with the Guard in advance.
 - Sarah Chavez said she and Mr. Williams still needed to work on chemicals to look for, detection limits, etc., and they would continue to do that work.
 - Jessie Lawrence asked what they could share with the Guard. Sarah Chavez said they could share this document and request that they needed information from the Guard as noted on the document. Ms. Lawrence suggested framing the email as follows: "We hope you can still assist us, we have some information here and some questions for you." She noted that it was important to be clear about what those questions were.

ACTION ITEM: Jessie Lawrence will share the working document with questions for the Guard after ensuring the questions were clearly labeled as such.

Filename: 2018-6-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: June 24, 2018
--

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT NOTIFICATION

Sarah Chavez said this agenda item was meant to prompt looking at a list of future agenda items (listed on the second page of the meeting agenda) on this topic to ascertain if they were still relevant. She hoped the group would provide feedback on how to proceed on these future agenda items; some of them were on the future agenda item list for a while. John Bartlit asked if it was worth looking at the Code Red Community Report, which was posted on the CEWG Web site. Dennis O'Mara said one of the primary recommendations of the report was for Intel to notify the Rio Rancho Emergency Operations System in a timely manner about incidents before they might get out of hand and jeopardize the community. Emergency management officials need to know early on about incidents so they can make the decision about whether or not to notify the community, Mr. O'Mara said.

John Bartlit asked Sarah Chavez to find out when Intel notified the community emergency managers on this latest power outage incident. Ms. Chavez said she wasn't onsite at the time so didn't know but would find out.

ACTION ITEM: Sarah Chavez will ask when Intel notified community emergency managers about the recent power outage.

- Regarding the last item on the future topics list, "Consideration of a warning system tied to Code Red," Dennis O'Mara said that Code Red is the warning system. To his knowledge the Code Red System process hadn't changed, but what may be changing was the effort to get the database updated and prompt people in Sandoval County to register their cell phones. Landlines were automatically included in the system. He said if CEWG wanted to pursue this item further they could invite someone from Sandoval County Emergency Management to a CEWG meeting to discuss it. Mr. O'Mara said Chief Dave Bervin, who passed away suddenly a couple months ago, had not been replaced yet.
- Sarah Chavez asked for an agenda item at the next meeting to thoroughly go through the future agenda items to see if there was still interest. Some of these items had been on the future agenda list for over a year. John Bartlit said a part of that discussion was action—who would do what about it. Dennis O'Mara said he would try to find out the latest on the Code Red system at the July LEPC meeting. He then reported on the second to the last bullet: the efforts to update the Sandoval County All-Hazards Emergency Operations Plan were underway. At some point when it was complete he would provide CEWG with an update.

ACTION ITEM: Jessie Lawrence will add as an agenda item at the next meeting to thoroughly go through the future agenda item list to see what still remained relevant.

<p>Filename: 2018-6-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: June 24, 2018</p>

REVIEW ACTION ITEM PROGRESS REPORT

Jessie Lawrence said items #6, 7, 10, and 11 were completed. Sarah Chavez updated item #12. She said if an Intel employee dialed 911, the call would go to the Sandoval Emergency Management Dispatch, who would then respond as well as call Intel's Command Center to let them know they received the call. This was neither a written nor official process, but the Sandoval County Dispatch was aware of the procedure. Dennis O'Mara asked what would happen to an Intel employee who bypassed the Intel emergency operations desk and called 911 directly. Intel staff would not be disciplined for calling 911, Ms. Chavez confirmed.

ADJOURN

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

Filename: 2018-6-20 CEWG Final Meeting Summary.docx. Approved: [not approved] Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Jessie Lawrence Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: June 24, 2018
--