

## **DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

### **Community Environmental Working Group**

---

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

**Date:** November 17, 2010  
**Time:** 5:00–7:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Corrales Senior Center

#### **Members Attending**

John Bartlit, Acting Chair, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water  
 Mike Williams, NM Citizens for Clean Air & Water

Sarah Chavez, EHS Department, Intel  
 Thom Little, Intel  
 Hugh Church, American Lung Assc. of NM

#### **Non-Members Attending**

Roberta King, Corrales resident  
 Lynne Kinis, Corrales resident  
 Frank Gallegos, Intel  
 Jami Grindatto, Intel  
 Andrew Moen, Intel  
 Theresa Isaacson, Corrales resident

Richard Isaacson, Corrales resident  
 Jane [Last name withheld], Corrales resident  
 Susan Weiss, Corrales resident  
 Phil Gasteyer, Corrales mayor and resident  
 Trais Kliphuis, NMED  
 Coleman Smith, NMED

#### **Facilitator**

Stephen Littlejohn, Facilitator

CJ Ondek, Recorder

---

#### **HANDOUTS**

- Draft Agenda
- Draft Meeting Summary October 15, 2010
- Action-Item Progress Report
- EHS Activity Report
- November Newspaper Ad
- Press coverage of EPA 114 report (several articles)
- Email from John Bartlit of October 26, “CEWG’s Detailed Work (2007) on Major Source Permits re Intel”
- “The What, Whys and Hows of Baseline Modeling”
- Lane Kirkpatrick bio
- Intel Scrubber Testing Proposal
- Approved STTF Minutes 9/29
- NMED Handout on Intel Air Quality Permit

Filename: CEWG\_Meeting\_Summary\_11-17-10, v. 2  
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn  
 Prepared for: CEWG  
 Date prepared or presented: December 6, 2010

Approved: [not approved]

**PROPOSED AGENDA**

- Welcome, Introductions, Announcements and Brief Items
- Follow-up on EPA 114 Report
- NMED Report and Discussion
- Additional Business
- Adjourn

**WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, 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

- Stephen Littlejohn said that there were three things to address regarding the agenda: 1) That the next meeting would be held December 15; 2) He did not put the EHS report on the agenda because the CEWG still had to agree on the new agenda setting process and then on moving the EHS report to the meeting's first order; and 3) NMED would not arrive until 6:15 pm, so this evening's agenda order would be changed to discussing the EPA 114 report first. Lynne Kinis expressed displeasure that the EHS report was not addressed for the third month in a row because of time. Since the EHS report was primary to residents' health, it made her want to take the word "community" out of the "CEWG." Mr. Littlejohn explained that because of the timely nature of the EPA 114 report, the agenda-setting process proposal had been delayed, which highlighted a persistent dilemma of the group—addressing procedural issues took time away from discussing more substantive issues. The EPA 114 report, he said, was a high priority.
- Roberta King said that several meetings ago when the group was discussing the issue it sounded like there was consensus around moving the EHS report to the top of the meeting, but it was never followed through with because the facilitator suggested looking at the whole agenda-setting process. She said that the EHS needed to be at the beginning of the meeting. She pointed out that the silica testing report was set in stone; why couldn't the EHS be set in stone too?
- Stephen Littlejohn said the group could change the current agenda to discuss the agenda-setting process instead of the EPA 114 report item. He asked how they would like to proceed. John Bartlit moved to discuss the EPA 114 report as planned citing the large number of attendees at the October meeting who were focused and wanted action on the issue. He said the EPA report was time urgent. Lynne Kinis said that she did not think the CEWG should get involved with the EPA 114 report because it was none of their business—it was between the EPA and Intel, and an Intel representative should just update the group on how the issue progressed. Roberta King agreed—it made the CEWG look like Intel's public relations "front man." Mike Williams said it was important to address the

Filename: CEWG\_Meeting\_Summary\_11-17-10, v. 2

Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: December 6, 2010

EPA 114 report because it suggested things the CEWG should be paying attention to. Hugh Church said he favored keeping the agenda as it was for the evening. Thom Little abstained. John Bartlit said he felt public pressure at the October meeting for the CEWG to become more active than they were in the past. Sarah Chavez said she also heard a strong desire from the public at the October meeting for the CEWG to get more involved in the process. She said the EHS report was put in the public domain even if they did not discuss it during the meeting, and Intel representatives were available to answer calls or e-mails about it, therefore, she voted for addressing the EPA 114 report. Stephen Littlejohn said consensus was reached.

**CONSENSUS:** Keep the EPA 114 report on the meeting agenda.

- Stephen Littlejohn next asked the group if they should push the EPA 114 report back on the evening’s agenda to review the motion to place the EHS report first at every meeting. John Bartlit said that after six years of having the EHS at the end of every meeting, he did not think delaying a decision on its placement one or two months would represent “a great tipping” point. His view was that the EPA 114 report was timely and urgent and it should stay where it was. All CEWG members present agreed with Mr. Bartlit to keep the EPA 114 on the agenda where it was and discuss the agenda-setting process and moving the EHS report to the first slot at a subsequent meeting.

**CONSENSUS:** Maintain the evening’s agenda with EPA 114 report as the first agenda item.

#### Meeting Summary—Revisions and Approval

No comment.

#### Public Comment

- Lynne Kinis critiqued the following comment on the agenda listed under the NMED report item: “Due to the importance of the following agenda item, we will restrict this discussion to 30 minutes.” She asked why they were cutting short NMED’s time since they had never attended a meeting before. She felt that anything that involved the community’s health was shortened or cut out. She told John Bartlit that he did not get the correct message from the October meeting, and the reason why so many community members attended was because the “the public that attends religiously rallied the troops.” The community was frustrated, and their requests were always, without fail, pushed aside. She said she suggested that Intel report on aspects of the EPA 114 report, and that these reports would reveal aspects of the information the CEWG was looking for. She said she did not understand why they had to make a “magillah” out of the 114 report. While it addressed community health, the EHS showed her there were discrepancies in Intel reporting that had to be emphasized.

Filename: CEWG\_Meeting\_Summary\_11-17-10, v. 2

Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: December 6, 2010

- John Bartlit said the NMED requested 15 to 30 minutes of time, and they were given 30 minutes. Lynne Kinis clarified that she was taking the “statement” after the NMED item to task, not the NMED item. Sarah Chavez said that the request for NMED came to her, and that NMED asked for a specific amount of time to discuss the permit revision and not anything else.
- Richard Isaacson said that the statement as written made it seem that the CEWG was cutting NMED short. Roberta King asked if NMED knew that members of the public would be present who might want to ask questions about the EPA 114 report. Sarah Chavez replied that permit writers from NMED were attending the meeting, and they would not answer any questions about the 114 report because it was not their report—it was the EPA’s report. They were here to discuss the permit application to add Munters thermal oxidizers.
- Stephen Littlejohn acknowledged that many people in the room were frustrated with how the CEWG was doing its business. He said he was not sure how to proceed at this point. He explained how the agenda was set for this evening’s meeting. Based on the community response at last month’s meeting, the group wanted to dedicate the entire meeting to EPA 114 follow up. Some CEWG members felt this was a very high priority item. Mr. Littlejohn pointed out that the evening’s discussion showed there were different readings on last month’s meeting. Then NMED asked for time on the agenda to talk about the permitting process, and the CEWG knew the community would appreciate having NMED on the agenda. The dilemma, Mr. Littlejohn said, was how to balance and use the time.
- John Bartlit said that page 6 and 7 of the October Meeting Summary clearly documents that the community was pushing the CEWG to take more action around the EPA 114 report. He referred to Marcy Brandenburg’s language.

#### Other Announcements

Stephen Littlejohn said that Lane Kirkpatrick had emailed him saying he would like to rejoin the CEWG in December 2010. Mr. Littlejohn reported that Mr. Kirkpatrick had mentioned that he was interested in silica testing and other interesting things the CEWG was doing, and his workload had been reduced so he had time to participate.

#### **FOLLOW UP ON EPA 114 REPORT**

- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group what they thought the CEWG’s role should be on the EPA 114 process. He mentioned that Lynne Kinis and Roberta King had already mentioned that, in their opinion, the CEWG should have no role in the EPA 114 process.
- John Bartlit said that Edward Pineda had strongly vocalized that CEWG should participate in the EPA 114 follow up process, but Mr. Pineda was not in attendance at the meeting to

Filename: CEWG\_Meeting\_Summary\_11-17-10, v. 2

Approved: [not approved]

Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn

Prepared for: CEWG

Date prepared or presented: December 6, 2010

discuss his views. Lynne Kinis said that both she and Mr. Pineda had suggested a separate meeting be held to discuss the EPA 114 so as not to take time away from the monthly CEWG meetings.

- Stephen Littlejohn pointed out that holding a special public meeting was one of the recommendations listed on page 2 of the agenda under “Proposals from Previous Meeting.”
- Thom Little asked Lynne Kinis to clarify her view. Ms. Kinis said that she did not think the CEWG had any place in the EPA 114 follow up, but that Intel should keep the group apprised of all goings on around the follow up process. She would like to see this report from Intel at every CEWG meeting.
- Mike Williams said that he thought the community wanted the CEWG to help with publicizing the EPA 114 report. He said that he was more interested in using the information in the report to help shape CEWG issue priorities in the future. He said he did not see any point to the CEWG being “between” the EPA and Intel, and the CEWG had no legal role, but he felt the CEWG could learn something from discussing the EPA 114 follow up process. An example he gave was the question around what was contained in scrubber emissions.
- Roberta King said she had heard at last month’s meeting that the community was pleased that EPA Region 6 had investigated Intel and was holding them accountable. She also commented that she did not know why it took two focus groups for Intel to come to the conclusion that they should be raising stack heights when the community had been saying this for years, and the CEWG stack heights committee had recommended the same. Intel never paid attention to the community or to the CEWG, Ms. King said. Mike Williams commented that Intel’s initial reason for not raising the stack heights was that the community did not want them raised; then the focus group changed that. Frank Gallegos said that Intel had conducted a door-to-door survey and many people responded that they were concerned about aesthetics. Mr. Williams pointed out that in this case the focus groups got it right—that the community was more concerned about health than aesthetics.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked Roberta King if she would agree to Lynne Kinis’s idea about Intel’s reporting monthly to the CEWG on the EPA 114 follow up progress. Ms. King replied that CEWG members who were Intel representatives could never give a straight answer to residents’ questions—they always had to check with their superiors to make sure they used the right words in their responses.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if anyone in the room objected to Intel giving a monthly report on the EPA 114 items. No one objected in principle. He next asked if anyone objected to allowing questions, suggestions and comments in response to the report. Sarah Chavez

pointed out that with adopting this process, the group's opportunity to provide input might be limited on interactions that happened between meetings. Thom Little said that the way the response process had been working was that Intel proposed a solution, and then there was a lag time between EPA's response.

- John Bartlit commented that pages 3 to 11 on the October Meeting Summary contained strong messages on CEWG's taking action. A smaller group was at this evening's meeting, with the most vocal attendees of the previous meeting absent. Stephen Littlejohn said that last month's meeting was an open, general discussion, and this month's meeting was more focused. The idea was to look at the specific ideas and vote on them. What people said last month would stand on its own in the Meeting Summary.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked how to prevent Intel reports at monthly CEWG meetings from consuming too much meeting time? How do they control time devoted to this issue? Roberta King wondered who would give this report—would it be someone with authority or someone who would have to check back with his or her supervisors. Sarah Chavez said it would most likely be her, since it would be technical. Lynne Kinis asked if the report could be sent out prior to the meeting so people could come to the meeting with questions. Stephen Littlejohn asked if this was doable. Thom Little said it depended on the reply timing. Sarah Chavez said the report would be limited to the date the report was published. Mr. Littlejohn said the report could be distributed a week before the meeting with the other materials. Ms. Chavez commented the trade off was between having the most up to date information vs. enough time to review the report.
- Stephen Littlejohn said there was agreement for Intel to send out a written report a week before CEWG meetings, with discussion limited to what was contained in the report. There would be opportunity at the meeting for comments, suggestions and questions. It was important to be cognizant of time in order to have time for other agenda items.

**CONSENSUS:** Intel will send out a written EPA 114 follow up report a week before meetings, and although they would leave time for comments, suggestions and questions, the group would have to be cognizant of time.

- Stephen Littlejohn said that if Edward Pineda were present, he would say that the CEWG should be involved every step of the way in Intel's response to the EPA 114 report. Mr. Littlejohn he wanted to make sure that the group could say to Mr. Pineda that the CEWG considered his suggestion and voted on it, so he asked if there were concrete suggestions on how the CEWG should follow up as per Mr. Pineda's suggestion. Thom Little read Mr. Pineda's quote, "If Intel was not planning to utilize the CEWG's input in their response to the report, then they should consider disbanding this group, since it was created to work

Filename: CEWG\_Meeting\_Summary\_11-17-10, v. 2  
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn  
 Prepared for: CEWG  
 Date prepared or presented: December 6, 2010

Approved: [not approved]

with Intel and the community.” He said he read that quote to reflect what Mr. Pineda stated at the time. Mr. Little said that, in Mr. Pineda’s absence, the group was saying that they would rather pursue Ms. Kinis and Ms. King’s suggestion to have Intel issue reports on the 114 responses and not get between Intel and the EPA, but rather listen in on their process. Stephen Littlejohn said he wanted to make sure the group agreed on whether and what type of involvement the CEWG should have. He asked if there were any other concrete proposals on how the CEWG should be involved. No one commented.

- Stephen Littlejohn next asked what the CEWG would do with the information they learned from the Intel reports. Susan Weiss said that the CEWG needed to get the information out to the public. John Bartlit replied that the CEWG distributed information the best they could by placing it on the Web site. Ms. Weiss said she preferred newspapers, but the CEWG needed to keep poking the community until they woke up. She said she talked to many people who shrugged off their experiences with Intel emissions, and it would be a community service to get more information out to the community.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked Mike Williams to expand on his proposal to glean information from the Intel reports. Mr. Williams responded that, since the CEWG had not dealt much with scrubbers previously, they would like to know basic information such as how effective Intel’s control equipment was, for example. Mr. Littlejohn suggested that the CEWG could put scrubbers on the agenda and use the EPA report to talk through what the issues around scrubbers might be and what the CEWG might want to address in the future. He also suggested that someone could synthesize the information around scrubbers and report back to the CEWG on what he/she had learned. John Bartlit said that it was important to be specific and focus on the issue—in this case scrubbers--and what the group could do around the issue. He said his goal was to make progress rather than rehash what they did not know.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if anyone objected to putting the scrubber issue on the agenda for the future. John Bartlit recommended Mike Williams present on the issue. Thom Little said that the discussion should be specific to an area of concern. Roberta King said that all topics should be addressed according to one of the 15 items in the EPA report.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked if it would be permissible to raise additional issues during the discussion. Thom Little suggested sticking to what would make an impact on the EPA response, but he said they would have to define how far off track they could go on a topic. Mr. Littlejohn added that it would need to be relevant to the group’s ongoing dialogue.
- Sarah Chavez suggested, as an alternative approach, to begin talking about scrubbers from the starting point of Intel’s response letter to the EPA on the scrubber issue. In this letter, Intel suggested doing additional testing. Mike Williams said he agreed with that approach. Hugh Church reminded the group that there was a fine line between Intel’s response to the

EPA and the CEWG's interest, and the group needed to be careful not to impede Intel's progress on responding to the EPA. It was a boundary that had to be watched so as not to muddle the issues. Stephen Littlejohn clarified that somehow they had to make a distinction between interests that surfaced in the report for discussion versus Intel's response to the EPA.

- John Bartlit said that the CEWG priority list might help them stay on task. But, he said, here was a conflict between adding new items, which pushed the older priority items back on the list. He also reminded the group that, with this new process, having a week to review a report meant that they would not have the most up-to-date information.
- Stephen Littlejohn summarized the discussion as follows: The first topic to discuss would be the scrubbers. The discussion would begin by focusing on Intel's response letter to the EPA on the issue. Then, Mike Williams would give a report to the group on scrubbers. They would leave the door open to other issues that may come up from the 114 report that would advance the CEWG's work. He asked if everyone agreed with this process.

**CONSENSUS:** The CEWG would first discuss scrubbers and begin by focusing on Intel's response letter to the EPA on the issue. Next, Mike Williams would give a report to the group on scrubbers. Issues from the 114 report that advanced the CEWG's work could be discussed further.

- Roberta King asked how they could get the 37-page EPA 114 Summary Report published in newspapers and covered on TV or radio. She said the media in New Mexico had not given any attention to the EPA report. She said there were a couple of short articles in the business section of the *ABQ Journal*, but these articles did not address the situation as it really was. She also asked where people could go to find this information on the Web.
- Stephen Littlejohn asked the group how they should disseminate information on the EPA to a larger public. He said that press coverage was part of the meeting handouts. Articles were in the following newspapers: *ABQ Journal*; *Corrales Comment*; *Rio Rancho Observer*; and the *West Side ABQ Journal*.
- Roberta King said she did not want someone else telling the story. She said journalists did not have the proper background on the issue and did not write about it accurately. She also said it seemed that Intel sent information out that did not tell the whole story, and she wanted the entire "thing as issued by EPA Region 6" made available to the public and put on a Web site or at least start with the 37-page summary. She felt Intel was not facing the issue.
- Jane [last name withheld] said she agreed with Ms. King, that it should be a matter for the public in the greater Albuquerque area. She said she heard about the EPA report through word of mouth. She said it did not look good for Intel to withhold information. She said the

information should be publicized in the media more since these were health concerns.

- Jami Grindatto said it was his team that did media relations, and no one could force or ask a reporter to print anything. At the end of the day it was the paper's choice. He said that they did disseminate information, answered questions, gave reporters the CEWG phone number, and put the report in libraries.
- Jane [last name withheld] said she heard what Mr. Grindatto was saying, but why wasn't the media reporting on something this big? Mr. Grindatto said they probably did not think it was big. Jane [last name withheld] said that people were dying, how could they not think it big? Mr. Grindatto said that they probably did not know. John Bartlit said that there was nothing in the EPA 114 report that said that people were dying. Mr. Grindatto said that they sent the news about the report to the broader CEWG list and to the local journalists. Thom Little said he sent a note to journalists offering to send the full report if their emails could handle the 17mg, 720-page report. No one asked for it. He said Mr. Grindatto's group made themselves very accessible for interviews. Mr. Grindatto said they provided the information, but they had no control over what the media chose to cover. Sarah Chavez added that information about the report was included in a neighbor letter. Mr. Grindatto asked the group to suggest what else they could do.
- Roberta King said Jim Norton of NMED sent out a press release to the media. She asked why Intel did not send out a press release that said EPA Region 6 sent out this report and Intel was addressing it, and mention where they could access the summary or full report. Jami Grindatto said they could do that. He reiterated that Intel did not have control over the media. The conundrum was that the community believed that Intel had control over the media, but they did not. He was willing to work with ideas the community had about disseminating the information.

**ACTION ITEM:** Anyone with ideas on how to disseminate information about the EPA 114 report or what to include in a press release contact Jami Grindatto directly.

- Susan Weiss suggested instead of Intel doing a press release to write an op-ed article for the *Albuquerque Journal*.

## **NMED REPORT AND DISCUSSION**

- Coleman Smith, permit writer for major source unit at the NMED Air Quality Bureau, and Trais Kliphuis, NMED acting minor source permit manager addressed the CEWG about the recent Intel's air quality permit submission.
- Cole Smith said the permitting process allowed for 90 days public comment, and during this period Intel's permit modeling analysis was being reviewed. The results of this

Filename: CEWG\_Meeting\_Summary\_11-17-10, v. 2  
 Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn  
 Prepared for: CEWG  
 Date prepared or presented: December 6, 2010

Approved: [not approved]

analysis would be posted on the NMED Web site when it was completed. He said that, as far as he knew, most of the citizens were in favor of more thermal oxidizers because the intent was to provide redundancy to the existing RTOs. He said he had not received any public comments that objected to the process, so instead of hosting a public meeting about it, he came to the CEWG meeting instead. Mr. Smith said that NMED and Intel had agreed to changes in the permit, as listed in the handout. He said that the last significant permit revision was done in 2000.

- Cole Smith explained his comments on Table 1 of the handout (page 27 of 35). What changed, he said, was the addition of the 5 new Munters units. The emissions factors would apply to all 10 units. John Bartlit asked if stack height information and location was an integral part of the permit. Mr. Smith said typically not, only if it were required for passing the ambient air standards or a specific regulation. Mr. Bartlit asked if there was a minimum stack height that would violate ambient air standards. Trais Kliphuis said that the permit had general language that said they could not change the stack height as cited in the permit modeling. Mr. Bartlit confirmed that when Intel submitted a permit application, NMED judged it for meeting all requirements, and then there was a stipulation that Intel could not change what was in the permit without approval.
- Lynne Kinis read a list of questions from Judy Hemphill: What do the Munters do? Why do they need to be permitted? What benefit is the Munters to me and my environment, especially in the elimination of the daily onslaught of toxic and noxious fumes into my home? Do you know what chemicals go into the Munters and what's coming out? Where is this information available to the public, and where is your analysis of the outcoming discharge and its affect to health? NMED should not allow dumping on anyone's head without a toxicology analysis. NMED, have you done more recent modeling of the emissions and where are those reports available? Do Munters improve air quality, or will production be amped up so citizens do not see an improvement in the air quality? Ms. Kinis reported that Ms. Hemphill was inclined to say "no" to an increase in the Munters units because she believed there would not be an improvement to the air quality.
- Cole Smith responded to the questions. To the first question, "What do the Munters do?", Mr. Smith asked if people understood how the Munters worked. He said there was a Web site where people could read about it. He explained the process as follows. The solvent exhaust stream passed through a ceramic, porous wheel that absorbs the volatile organic compounds very efficiently. As the wheel slowly rotates from a cold side to a hot side, a portion of clean gas exhaust is forced back through the hot side of the wheel and deserts a more concentrated stream of the volatile organic compounds, which was then sent into very hot zone that turned those compounds into carbon dioxide and water. The efficiency was 99%.

- Question: “Why do they need to be permitted?” Mr. Smith said the permitting regulations for technical permit revisions were allowed for increases up to one pound per hour of a criteria pollutant. If the increase was more than a pound an hour, then the increase in emissions needed to be modeled and it became a significant permit revision. In Intel’s case, the increase of emissions from the 5 RTOs was more than one pound an hour, which was in the regulations. [Note of explanation: Munters remove the VOCs by burning natural gas which results in combustion emissions – NOx, CO, particulates, etc – this is the “increase” in emissions and the NOx and CO emission rates in particular are what trigger permitting. The trigger levels are set in the NMED regulations at over 1 lb/hr = significant permit revision – each unit has 1 lb/hr NOx and 0.6 lb/hr CO – emissions from all 5 units have to be added together to determine if level is exceeded. So bottom line there is a trade off, reduced VOCs but increased combustion emissions.]
- Question: What benefit is the Munters to me and my environment, especially in the elimination of the daily onslaught of toxic and noxious fumes into my home? Mr. Smith said that there were periods of time when RTOs needed to be taken down for maintenance, and emissions would be released unabated. Having the extra Munters would help reduce unabated emissions.
- Question: Do you know what chemicals go into the Munters and what’s coming out? Mr. Smith said the HAPs were listed in the permit. Sarah Chavez said that when Intel did their permitting, they had to do modeling for pollutants—total NOCs, VOCs, and CO and particulates—that come from the units. By law, that was what NMED had to look at. The application had the emission rates of the criteria pollutants, which was used in the modeling and analyzed. Ms. Chavez said the group discussed this at a previous meeting. Ms. Chavez said they did not look at HAPs unless they were volatile organic compound HAPs. Mr. Smith said criteria pollutants had ambient air quality state and federal standards. HAPs and VOCs did not have ambient air quality standards for any individual compound, so they were not modeled directly. VOCs were a pre-cursor to ozone so they were tracked.
- Question: Do Munters improve air quality, or will production be amped up so citizens do not see an improvement in the air quality? Mr. Smith said Intel had represented in their application that the air quality would improve and there was no mention about production levels in the application. Lynne Kinis responded that Intel did not do weekly, daily, monthly or hourly emissions monitoring, so how could it be based on hourly emissions? She said the community would love to see Intel have a major source permit, and that was what Ms. Hemphill was trying to get at with her questions. The EPA 114 report said the modeling that was done was based on a formula from 1994-95. Intel’s expansion since that time had tripled or quadrupled. Ailing citizens, Ms. Kinis said, needed EPA and NMED to

become more involved and not rely on what Intel gave them as their emission. She said the community had a trust issue with Intel.

- Mayor Gasteyer said that for years they've heard that government agencies—NMED—made a mistake years ago by giving Intel a minor classification instead of a major permit. He asked if it was within the scope of what permit writers did that they could recommend a major rather than a minor source permit. Mr. Smith responded that they analyzed information that Intel was required to submit in a quarterly report, and Intel's HAPs was less than 5% as reported every quarter, which was much lower than the major source threshold. Mr. Smith said he did not understand how to make a case for Intel being a major HAPs source.
- Susan Isaacson said the problem was that there weren't any testing devices set below Intel, and then there was the issue of what they were testing for, which was a funding issue. NMED did not know what was coming out of the stacks and was relying on Intel's calculations, and Intel may not know what was coming out of the stacks. And since Intel was a company motivated by profit, they did not really want to know what was coming out of the stacks. Mr. Smith responded that Intel did test their stacks, but the state did not have ambient HAP or VOC monitors. Trais Kliphuis said they needed to focus on what they came here to discuss, the RTOs and the permit action, and the discussion was getting away from topic.
- John Bartlit said the CEWG did a lot of work on the major versus minor source permit in 2006-07, and it was documented on the CEWG Web site. He said they asked the EPA many questions about major source permitting. He said that in their investigation, getting a major source permit did not solve problems. The major source permit allowed more emissions than a minor source permit. And that was the difference. He recommended the summary of CEWG's work on the issue, which was in a handout at this evening's meeting. He said revisiting the issue again wouldn't get them anywhere. The only major source permit for a chip plant in the country, as of 2007, was Eastman Kodak. He said that major source permit did not buy lower emission limits, more monitoring, because the laws were that way. Trais Kliphuis said that in some cases major source permits could be more stringent. Mr. Bartlit said that point was touched on in the handout.
- Thom Little reminded everyone that the purpose behind the permit was to remove the Durrs and add Munters units to increase redundancy so emissions would not go unabated. If the key goal were to reduce emissions, then the new permit would make unabated emissions a thing of the past. He asked for more input for and against redundancy.
- Lynne Kinis said that Munters units ran at a higher temperature. Corrales seemed to have a high concentration of pulmonary fibrosis due to crystalline silica. She was concerned that

the higher temperatures of the Munters would lead to higher productions of crystalline silica, whether they had abatement or not. Cole Smith said that Intel's usage of HDMS, the precursor to crystalline silica, had been reduced drastically over the years. He also said crystalline silica formed at higher temperatures—1425—than what the Munters operated at, and he did not understand the thought that crystalline silica would be formed at the Munters operating temperature.

## **MEETING ADJOURNED**

### **NEXT MEETING**

December 15, 2010, 5 p.m. at the Corrales Senior Center in Corrales.

## **MEETING CONSENSUS SUMMARY**

1. Keep the EPA 114 report on tonight's meeting agenda.
2. Maintain the evening's agenda with EPA 114 report as the first agenda item.
3. Intel will send out a written EPA 114 follow up report a week before CEWG meetings, and although they would leave time for comments, suggestions and questions, the group would have to be cognizant of time used for agenda item.
4. The CEWG would first discuss scrubbers and begin by focusing on Intel's response letter to the EPA on scrubbers. Next, Mike Williams would give a report to the group on scrubbers. Issues from the 114 report that advanced the CEWG's work could be discussed further.

Filename: CEWG\_Meeting\_Summary\_11-17-10, v. 2  
Prepared or presented by: CJ Ondek & Stephen Littlejohn  
Prepared for: CEWG  
Date prepared or presented: December 6, 2010

Approved: [not approved]