

## **DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

### **Community Environmental Working Group**

---

*“Striving for Continuous Environmental Improvements at Intel”*

**Date:** January 20, 2010  
**Time:** 5:00–7:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Corrales Senior Center

#### **Members Attending**

John Bartlit, Acting Chair  
 Sarah Chavez, EHS Department, Intel  
 Hugh Church, American Lung Association

Thom Little, Intel  
 Mike Williams, NM Clean Air & Water  
 Edward Pineda, Rio Rancho resident

#### **Intel Staff**

Frank Gallegos, Intel

#### **Public**

Roberta King, Corrales resident  
 Ken Lienemann, City of ABQ, Env't. Health

Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident  
 Phil Gasteyer, Mayor of Corrales

#### **Facilitator**

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

---

#### **HANDOUTS**

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary December 16, 2009
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- December newspaper ad
- Draft ad or PSA for *Corrales*  
*Comment re: silica testing*
- Priority Topics Status Report
- Introduction to EPA report on particulate matter (for full report, see <http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=216546>)
- Bartlit column on toxics regulation

#### **PROPOSED AGENDA**

- Welcome, Introductions, and Brief Items
- Albuquerque Monitoring Data
- Learning about Toxicology
- PSA or Ad on Silica Testing
- Following up on Odor/Contaminant Complaints
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

Filename: cewg_meeting_summary_1-20-10 v 3 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn Prepared for: CEWG Date prepared or presented: February 9, 2010	Approved: 2-17-10
---	-------------------

## **WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND BRIEF ITEMS**

John Bartlit opened the meeting by stating the CEWG mission, which was to work towards continuous environmental improvements and improved community dialogue. Introductions were made.

### Agenda—Revisions and Approval

No comments.

### Meeting Summary—Revisions and Approval

Lynne Kinis gave Judy Hemphill's comments on the December Meeting Summary, since Ms. Hemphill was out of state and could not attend the January meeting. The comments referred to the following line on page 9 of the December Meeting Summary: "Ms. Hemphill asked if Intel was prepared to look at a problem with the new process. Mr. Little said yes, but it was difficult for them to locate what was causing the problem." Ms. Kinis reported that Ms. Hemphill said she never heard Thom Little say "Yes," and added that Mr. Little needed to get agreement with his team whether they would look at and modify the process. CJ Ondek verified that Mr. Little did indeed say "yes," as she heard it on the recording while transcribing the Meeting Summary and also made a note of it during the meeting. Thom Little said that perhaps the issue was Ms. Hemphill's dissatisfaction with the EHS process and report, and he was prepared to work offline with her to incorporate her thoughts and create a more satisfactory and useful EHS report.

### Status Report—Intel Tour

Thom Little reported that Intel's policy remained the same regarding facility tours; there wasn't any change in status from December for either the media tour or CEWG tour. He also said that Jeff Radford would visit with Thom Little, Sarah Chavez and Liz Shipley, of Intel's Public Affairs office, on Thursday, 9 a.m., at the Intel's campus. The interview would focus on nine questions put forth by Mr. Radford, plus an additional few questions on Intel well water use. Edward Pineda asked if Intel's policy was in response to Homeland Security. Mr. Little said it was not; rather, the policy concerned Intel's intellectual product, plus the construction and safety issues at the NM plant.

### Status Report—Meeting Space Rent

Stephen Littlejohn reported that he paid \$365 dollars to the Village of Corrales for meeting room rent for 2010—the whole year. The space was rented from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m., which includes an extra hour tacked at the end for additional committee meetings. Mr. Littlejohn said there is about \$2,000 discretionary money remaining in the CEWG budget, and the group needed to discuss how to use it by the end of the year. This topic would be on the agenda for February, and Mr. Littlejohn asked the group to think about ways to use the money and report back at next month's meeting their ideas. A couple proposals already on the table were to rent an RV and park in a Corrales neighborhood to monitor smell and to buy an ad in the *Corrales Comment*.

Other Announcements

No other announcements.

Public Comment

No public comment.

**ALBUQUERQUE MONITORING DATA**

Hugh Church reiterated the status of the monitoring stations discussed in previous meetings. Last summer, the air quality bureau was considering moving a monitoring station located on Meadowlark Road. The CEWG was hoping they would move it to an area convenient to monitor Intel emissions—of Loma Larga Road, in southern Sandoval County. Instead, the station was relocated to Navajo Lake, where the NMED/AQB decided had a greater need, and there was no funding available to replace the station. After discussions with Ken Lienemann, who is in charge of the monitoring system in Bernalillo County, Mr. Church said he discovered the monitoring station on Coors Boulevard was also shut down. If the group wanted to use a station in Bernalillo County, the only practical one available was on Second Street and Alameda, which was about three and a half miles away from Intel. Mr. Church thought it might be useful to compare the meteorological data from this site with the meteorological data collected by the tower at Intel. On calm, cool nights with light wind, there could be a substantial difference between what occurs on top of the mesa and down in the Valley, and it would be interesting to see that. The Second Street station monitored criteria pollutants, mainly ozone, carbon monoxide, etc, and fine particles, PM 10 and PM 2 1/2. Mr. Church asked if we had the data, who would do what with it?

- John Bartlit said that looking first at the meteorological data to see to what extent it differed was a good idea. He cited the work Harry Hunsicker, formerly of Intel, who correlated meteorological data and levels. Mr. Church said the meteorological information that was measured was the wind and temperature from the top of a 10-meter tower, and the temperature was also taken at 2 meters. He said he experimented with collecting wind and temperature data at 2 meters and 10 meters while working at Sandia Labs. Mr. Church said they could collect temperature difference between 2 and 10 meters, which gave an indication of stability at the time, information that impacted the distribution and transport of contaminants near the surface. Mr. Bartlit verified whether this monitoring station measured anything unique to Intel, since it was there for a different purpose. Mr. Church said no, it did not sample anything other than meteorological variables near Intel.
- Ken Lienemann brought the group a map that showed where the monitoring sites were located in Bernalillo County, and a matrix that showed the equipment located at each site. He said that all the sites collected meteorological data, and the Second Street site was one of the largest in the network, along with South Valley and Del Norte. Mr. Lienemann said the site shut down on Coors was not intended to be a regular site; it was installed temporarily during the height of residential construction, when people were concerned about dust, carbon monoxide, etc. being emitted from the construction. Mr. Lienemann

Filename: cewg\_meeting\_summary\_1-20-10 v 3

Approved: 2-17-10

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: February 9, 2010

said that every year he had to assess the value of all the sites, and the site that was removed was deemed redundant during an assessment, since the data collected didn't show any difference from other sites. It was shut down with EPA's approval. Mr. Lienemann said the data collected were public data and could be accessed by computer. They were available on EPA's system 90-120 days after they were collected. He said hopefully, in a few months, the data would be able to be accessed in "real time" on their Web site, with the caveat that the data was not quality controlled or "scrubbed." Stephen Littlejohn asked if the group would like to receive the matrix, map and Web site for data mart. The group said "yes." [These are available on Albuquerque's web site at: [www.cabq.gov/airquality/pdf/2009abqberconetworkreviewfinal.pdf](http://www.cabq.gov/airquality/pdf/2009abqberconetworkreviewfinal.pdf).]

- Mr. Lienemann said that wind collected near the surface was strongly affected by terrain roughness and interferences. Wind curves, whips around, and changes at low levels. The bare minimum for collecting wind data was 10 meters above ground, which was the international standard. Mr. Lienemann said all their modeling was done with airport wind data; NOAA/NWS launched balloons twice a day from ABQ airport and huge amounts of data could be accessed on the University of Wyoming Web site about an hour after the balloon launch. He said the data showed how variable wind was with altitude, and you had to be careful looking at ground wind data.

**ACTION ITEM:** Stephen Littlejohn will distribute the matrix, map and data mart Web address to the group.

- John Bartlit asked Hugh Church if he was willing to compare Bernalillo County meteorological data with Intel's data to see if they correlated. Mr. Church said the difference in height and location would make the data variable due to the ABQ box. Edward Pineda asked if there were enough monitoring stations to do modeling in the future. Ken Lienemann said one of the standard complaints from organizations that provided the city with modeling was that there was not enough meteorological data, especially near the Sandia Mountain, which had a huge effect on air masses. Mr. Pineda said he was concerned about an accurate and sufficient modeling of Intel emissions in the future. Sarah Chavez said that historically the Intel modeling had used only the data from the Intel site along with data from the airport. Typically, most companies in ABQ would use only airport data; Intel happened to have the advantage of having a station on their site, she said.
- Mr. Lienemann said their modeling was general purpose and on a macro scale; they looked at a huge bubble versus the modeling at Intel, which was source modeling.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group what the next step it would like to take. Thom Little said that there were data out there, but what did the group want to do with them, and how could they be used to further collective investigation or what was happening at Intel.

- John Bartlit said the place to start was to look at how the meteorological data compared with Intel's. Ken Lienemann suggested they would find continuous variation and almost no pattern because Albuquerque is a large area and wind/weather changed regularly. Lynne Kinis said she was more interested in the particulate information that has been collected, even on the monitoring systems that were discontinued, to see if there was anything relevant to crystalline silica. She said she was also interested in carbon monoxide/dioxide levels, as well as historical levels found on data mart.
- Stephen Littlejohn said that the group needed to move the agenda and they would have to revisit this item either later in the meeting or at another meeting.

### **LEARNING ABOUT TOXICOLOGY: STARTER CONVERSATION**

John Bartlit said that the CEWG had a panel on epidemiology in the past, which the group felt was interesting and useful. Mr. Bartlit suggested having a similar panel on toxicology, so the group could better understand what toxicology was, how it was done and who did it. He referred to an EPA document that was over 2,000 pages to demonstrate the complexity of information and detail collected over time involved with one pollutant/particulate. Because of this complexity, he proposed that a presentation on toxicology would be useful to the group, and suggested they plan a panel discussion with experts not connected to state agencies or Intel.

- Edward Pineda agreed with Mr. Bartlit's proposal and said it would be helpful in understanding cause and effect. Lynne Kinis said she could give a report on who it effected and how. She said she would rather spend the time pinpointing what particulates were causing the problem, and then figure out what action to take. Neither she nor the residents had the time for an investigation on toxicology; they knew they were toxic. Ms. Kinis said she wanted to find out what was causing the illness and then do something about it; she believed the group's time should be spent on crystalline silica.
- Roberta King agreed with Ms. Kinis and reminded the group that Corrales residents had been complaining for the past 20 years, and the ATSDR report said they should focus on crystalline silica. She said that from the very beginning, citizens were concerned with how emissions were affecting their health, and early documents on the CEWG Web site stated that the CAP should not concentrate on health effects, but neither should they deny there were health effects. Ms. King said she did not think a panel on toxicology was helpful. The residents, she said, knew that the toxins affected everyone differently. "Unless you live here and experience it then you don't know what we are talking about." Edward Pineda said they needed to learn more about where the emissions were coming from and which elements were causing the problem.
- John Bartlit said since he heard no consensus on moving forward with any kind of discussion on toxicology, he proposed dropping the subject. Stephen Littlejohn said that they hadn't yet heard from others in the group. He reminded the group that they typically held one panel a year to provide knowledge of specific content areas to better inform the

Filename: cewg\_meeting\_summary\_1-20-10 v 3

Approved: 2-17-10

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: February 9, 2010

group's dialogues. He also said that there was direct action occurring, with the ATSDR follow-up committee looking closely at silica testing, and with reworking the odor-contaminant complaint process and EHS report. The group, he said, had done both: direct action and informational meetings.

- Edward Pineda recommended that the toxicology panel be kept on the list of potential subjects since he believed it would be useful to the group. Stephen Littlejohn said they would look at reprioritizing topics shortly, and toxicology could be added to the list of topics to consider.
- Roberta King said the silica topic was put on hold many times over the years. Thom Little said that he thought the group was gaining traction on the silica topic. He commented that the toxicology panel should not impair their ability to make progress, but it would be more of an educational add-on. John Bartlit said his top priority was silica testing, and if the toxicology panel interfered, he would not vote for it. Mr. Little said the question was “could there be a toxicology panel that would not get in the way of silica testing progress?” Ms. King said they wouldn't learn anything different than what was learned from the epidemiology panel.
- Lynne Kinis suggested that they isolate the chemicals/particulates that cause the latest ailments, and then study their toxicology. John Bartlit said that the first job was mammoth, and the second one even more so, as evidenced by the 2,000-page document. The best the group could do was to measure crystalline silica and reduce emissions where possible, and if having a panel on toxicology was perceived as slowing things down, then he was against it.
- Stephen Littlejohn summarized the discussion. There were two issues: 1. A competition of time—whether the toxicology panel would get in the way of moving forward on crystalline silica; and 2. Whether there was anything to be gained by looking at the topic.
- Edward Pineda said that he was afraid that the toxicology panel could be misinterpreted as a maneuver to avoid trying to learn what was causing the problems with residents. He wanted to go on the record and say that he was concerned about that. He did not think the CEWG should avoid looking at what was causing the problem with residents.

**ACTION ITEM:** Stephen Littlejohn would add toxicology to the list of potential agenda topics.

### PSA OR AD ON SILICA TESTING

Stephen Littlejohn asked the group if they wanted to proceed with publishing an ad or public service announcement (PSA) in the *Corrales Comment*.

Filename: cewg\_meeting\_summary\_1-20-10 v 3

Approved: 2-17-10

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: February 9, 2010

- John Bartlit asked the group to keep in mind the priority, which was to do crystalline silica testing and get maximum public involvement, participation and awareness. He said he wrote a first draft ad and incorporated some e-mail comments from both Ms. King and Intel.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if anyone had reservations about publishing this or another draft. Edward Pineda said they should actively pursue publishing a draft that included the complete story and history, however, he was concerned that editors would cut copy. He asked which would be better, an ad or a PSA. Mr. Bartlit said that if Jeff Radford would publish this version as a PSA, he would be delighted, but he did not know whether that was possible. Mr. Pineda recommended going with a version that offered the most control. Mr. Littlejohn suggested sending this version to Mr. Radford, saying they wished to have it published free as a PSA, however, if he needed to edit it or did not feel it was appropriate as a PSA, then the CEWG would place an ad. He asked if anyone objected to this proposal.
- Roberta King said that her idea of a PSA was telling facts: who, what, where and when. The draft read to her like a propaganda piece. She said the CEWG complained that the community did not get involved in meetings, but the community used to come to meetings all the time to no avail, since everything went Intel's way. Stephen Littlejohn asked Ms. King if she would agree to publishing a PSA if Jeff Radford approved it as such? Ms. King said Mr. Radford could publish whatever he wanted. Mr. Littlejohn asked her if she objected to the group buying an ad if Mr. Radford would not publish the PSA. Ms. King said she did not object to anything the group wanted to do, but took issue with saying that "the public has agreed to it," since the public did not agree to it. Mr. Littlejohn explained that the group had a consensus process in place, which was to first ask CEWG members if they were in consensus, and if so, that was noted in the Meeting Summary. Then the remaining people present were asked if they objected and why, and that was noted in the Meeting Summary as well, which was why he had to ask her whether or not she objected. Ms. King said Mr. Littlejohn could ask the questions but no one should assume that the residents in the room were "the public"—the public out there couldn't care less, their heads were in the sand and they had blinders on. John Bartlit said he felt great pressure from some members of the public present at the meetings to do crystalline silica testing, and publishing this draft was a way to further that goal.
- Lynne Kinis said that most ads in newspapers were concise—when, what, where, and how. If she had to read volumes, she wouldn't read it. She also suggested not using acronyms (ATSDR), since people did not know what that meant. She suggested putting an ad similar to the monthly CEWG ads saying there was to be a meeting that the ATSDR suggested having to provide information and get community input. She believed an ad of this nature would be more widely read. Mr. Bartlit said he wanted the history told. Ms. Kinis said that those people who had not read the book [*Boiling Frogs*] or attended meetings would not read that. CJ Ondek suggested, if using a short ad, to include a Web site address where a person can go to for more detailed information.

- Thom Little said he approached Intel Public Affairs about buying ad space in the *Corrales Comment*. They agreed to buy ad spots for 12-months that announced the CEWG meetings. He said they could include in one of these ads an invitation to a meeting on crystalline silica. Mr. Little said that Intel would create a stock standard ad, which would read the same every time, except Mr. Radford would change the date. Lynne Kinis thanked Mr. Little for taking action with an ad in the *Corrales Comment*, since she had asked for that for years. The ad in the *Albuquerque Journal* was not reaching the local people who were most affected.
- Hugh Church asked Roberta King if she thought an entity that represented the public existed. Ms. King said her objection was CEWG putting out notices saying something about meeting with the public or the public had input. She said that the few residents who attended meetings could not be portrayed as “the public.”
- Phil Gasteyer said that the CEWG was welcome to use the village’s Web site, since it was being used increasingly for information of interest to the community [www.corrales.nm.org]. Also, he mentioned the Kiwanis club had a Web site that disseminated meeting notices. Mr. Bartlit thanked Mr. Gasteyer for his offer.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if the group had consensus on the following proposal: a *Corrales Comment* ad, produced by Intel, that would invite people to join the group to work on silica testing, with a note at the bottom directing them to a Web site for more information. Lynne Kinis suggested not using the word “work on” since people were not the type to volunteer. She believed “informational” would be more applicable. She agreed with Ms. King, that “she” did not represent the public, and reminded the group that the ATSDR recommended strongly in their report that NMED and Intel further investigate silica, based on statistics provided by Intel. Since neither Intel nor NMED picked up the ball to test silica, the CEWG stepped in.
- Stephen Littlejohn said he was not reading anything near consensus on whether to advertise silica testing. Edward Pineda said that crystalline silica was an important subject, and Mr. Bartlit’s draft should be available for others to read. John Bartlit said he did not see any reason not to publicize this as widely and in as many formats as possible. Mr. Pineda said he supported publicizing crystalline silica, since it was an important subject for community residents.
- Stephen Littlejohn again asked if there were anyone in the room who would object to announcing the group’s work on crystalline silica in an ad in the *Corrales Comment* and referring them to Web sites that contained more information and the longer document drafted by Mr. Bartlit. No one objected; the group reached consensus.

- Lynne Kinis clarified that she did not think that this information should be suppressed. She just believed that the long form would not be appropriate for the newspaper. She suggested a shorter form for the paper and perhaps giving a handout to people attending the meeting. John Bartlit suggested keeping a copy at the library.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if there was consensus on the text of Mr. Bartlit's draft. No one objected; the group had consensus on Mr. Bartlit's text.
- Roberta King commented that it was the first time she remembered reading anything put out by the CEWG that included the history of what CRCWA had done and reference to the book, *Boiling Frogs*. She suggested including references in the draft to more inclusive information. John Bartlit agreed with Ms. King completely, and said he did not include more information because in the past Ms. King asked him to remove it, so he was sensitive to that request this time. Mr. Bartlit said his purpose was to reach the widest audience with the most information, and he thanked Ms. King for her suggestion. Mr. Bartlit said he would revise the document to include more reference information and send it to the group for their review.
- Stephen Littlejohn said that there was an emerging agenda item on public communications: how to coordinate the ads, meet deadlines and how to make reference to a wider variety of community information on the CEWG Web site and perhaps the village Web site. This topic of discussion needed to be addressed more fully by the group.

**ACTION ITEM:** John Bartlit will revise his draft to include more information and send it to the group for review.

#### **FOLLOWING UP ON ODOR/CONTAMINANT COMPLAINTS**

- Thom Little said that he and Judy Hemphill did not have a chance to act on their action item, which was to modify the EHS report to better reflect what residents wanted to know. Currently the EHS report stated the incident and actions taken, and Ms. Hemphill and other residents did not find that format useful. Mr. Little said that after he worked with Ms. Hemphill, he would propose a new format to the group.
- Lynne Kinis read the following comment from Judy Hemphill: "I know what the source of the odor is: Intel. You need to identify what has changed in chemical use and discharge, from the first 6 months of 2009 to last 6 months of 2009 with bringing the new process in line. Then identify the chemical and reduce usage and discharge."
- Ms. Kinis commented that in reference to the EHS report, telling people that everything was running properly was a button pusher. It said to residents, "Everything is running properly, so just breath it." Ms. Kinis said that whatever the odor/contaminant was, it settled in pockets and stayed close to the ground. She said that giving the

temperature/wind at the airport was also a button pusher. She added, “Don’t tell me everything is working; I’m not.”

- Stephen Littlejohn summarized Ms. Kinis and Ms. Hemphill’s concerns as (1) determining what chemical and emission changes have occurred in past year how these might correspond with the symptoms people are experiencing; and (2) determining what information is most useful to report when Intel follows up with community complaints instead of simply reporting whether or not the systems were working correctly and the results of sending out a team. Mr. Littlejohn noted that as a first step in dealing with chemical/emission changes that occurred, Thom Little reported on chemical purchases at Intel at the December meeting. The group needed to decide what the next step was regarding that information. On the second level of concern, Mr. Little and Ms. Hemphill were going to rework the EHS report. Ms. Kinis thanked Mr. Littlejohn for using the phrase “chemical/emissions”. She said she wasn’t concerned about reducing emissions but rather the chemicals that were harmful in the emissions.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group what follow up action they’d like to see on Mr. Little’s December report. Edward Pineda said that he would like to see the significant changes that will occur in the next 12 months—a change forecast. Thom Little said he would look into whether providing that information was possible. Sarah Chavez responded that Intel would submit a permit revision on March 15<sup>th</sup> for the boiler emission factors, the VOC and the HAP emission factors. This permit revision process had occurred every year since 2005. Ms. Chavez said that new chemicals and new processes would be listed on the permit.

**ACTION ITEM:** Thom Little and Sarah Chavez will investigate forecasting chemical/process changes in next 12 months and how that will dovetail with the permit process.

- Thom Little said he would revise his December PowerPoint presentation and apologized for not doing it sooner. He agreed to put a date on the revised version. Stephen Littlejohn asked the group what they wanted to do with these data. Edward Pineda said at the very least, they should go onto the Web site. Roberta King said the only thing she got from Mr. Little’s report was the way Intel had recalculated and refigured their emission factors. Mr. Little said that the presentation discussed usage/purchase and emission factors. The presentation also discussed changes and key changes of chemicals purchased and used onsite, and slides on emissions that were validated through testing. He encouraged the group to ask for further explanations. Ms. King said she couldn’t really process the information when it was projected on the wall; she needed to see the printed form. She said it was important for the group to have the printed copy ahead of time so they could review it. Mr. Little said doing that wasn’t always possible, and especially in this situation, where he had to gather a large amount of data. His key deliverable was to have the presentation completed in time for the meeting. He thanked Ms. King for her feedback and said he would try harder next time.

Filename: cewg\_meeting\_summary\_1-20-10 v 3

Approved: 2-17-10

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: February 9, 2010

**ACTION ITEM:** Thom Little will revise his December PowerPoint and send it to the group.

- Roberta King said it was her understanding that when Intel had to submit their permit request, NMED had 30 days to get back. Why did CEWG have to wait during that period to know what was being requested? Sarah Chavez said she sent out the application to the whole CEWG distribution list close to the time the application to NMED was made, and that this was standard practice. The e-mail would have “request for technical permit revision” in the title and was most likely sent the first week of December. For the annual technical permit revision in the spring, Ms. Chavez said she would also send an e-mail to the group with the application information soon after Intel made the submission to NMED.
- Lynne Kinis said that she missed the December presentation, but something changed in Intel’s process and then built up and peaked in mid-summer, when the problems hit the residents. She wanted to see what new chemicals went into the process in ’09, because that would tell her what was making her sick.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group what they wanted to do with the data. One concrete suggestion was to look at when the changes occurred and how it correlated with people’s symptoms. Possible options were to have a small group or a single person look at it, ask questions about the chemicals about timing, and report back. Edward Pineda said that a combination of those steps might be useful. After the presentation was revised and distributed, the group would know whether or not they need a task force to correlate timing of changes and onset of symptoms. Mike Williams said that the volatility level of chemicals was not made clear in the presentation, and tracking the actual air emissions would be important. John Bartlit asked if there was a historical record of public complaints and times. Mr. Little said he had a document with this information.

## **ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

### **EHS Report**

- Roberta King asked if there was a power outage at Intel, since she experienced one at her home at 7:20 am for 30 minutes. On what day was unclear. Sarah Chavez, Frank Gallegos and Thom Little said they were not aware of Intel’s having a power outage. Mr. Little said that if there was a deviation from the norm, PNM would submit a report that listed power outages, sags, and bumps. Intel’s systems also adjust to deviation from the norm. Mr. Little said it was a big deal when the power went down because it often resulted in Intel’s losing product, which triggered lots of reports.
- Sarah Chavez said she did not recall seeing any down time due to power outages that impacted abatement. She would investigate the matter, and if there was it will be included in the next EHS report. Ms. King said she was concerned because in the past Intel had a power surge that discombobulated the computer systems that managed their work process.

Filename: cewg\_meeting\_summary\_1-20-10 v 3

Approved: 2-17-10

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: February 9, 2010

Ms. Chavez said that Intel's systems had backup so they continue to run and avoid any issues.

- Edward Pineda said that on he was glad to see the Munters redundancy working on January 10. Lynne Kinis referred to complaints received on 12/14 and 12/27, which both mentioned "strong hot metal odor," yet the first complaint action said "All systems operating normally and no unusual conditions or activities" while the second one read "Possible gas purge and change over of gas source or related to diesel generator PM." She said this difference in "action taken" is why people don't understand or don't believe what Intel tells them. Ms. Kinis said that the noise complaints were "something else lately."
- Thom Little said he was able to resolve the noise issue. One of Intel's wells had "major surgery." Normally the well was encased in a cinder block house to contain noise. After they repaired the well, they ran it without putting the wall back up. He said he used the complaints to track and locate the problem, and Intel was now working on a procedure to alleviate it happening in the future, including using soundboards.
- Thom Little said that he investigated a separate noise complaint that mentioned a "jet engine" sound. He located the source while checking on the well; engineers were testing multiple generators near the well and using a device to mimic high usage. Combined, they created quite a racket. He was working with engineers to correct the problem. He said he thinks they had the first steps to correcting it for the future. He said the complaints and feedback were useful and helped him dig deeper; he took every one seriously. Ms. Kinis thanked Mr. Little and asked if he notified the person who complained. He responded that he e-mailed the person with updates and asked her to call if she heard the noise again. He said that even though many times people didn't feel they were getting anywhere with phone calls and complaints, the calls were valuable to him because he made progress and they helped to make continuous improvement at Intel.
- Stephen Littlejohn said they had not forgotten baseline modeling, and it remained on the queue for next time.

## **MEETING ADJOURNED**

### **NEXT MEETING**

February 17, 2010, 5 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center.

Filename: cewg\_meeting\_summary\_1-20-10 v 3

Approved: 2-17-10

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: February 9, 2010