

3/28/2007 CHURCHILL AREA NEIGHBORS (CAN) MEETING MINUTES

I. GENERAL MEETING

1. Announcements, agenda revision & Intro of Hynix topics
 - a. Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (represented by Doug Erwin and Sally Markos) and Hynix Semiconductor Manufacturing America, Inc. (represented by Bobby Lee and Greg Sladcik) were introduced.
 - b. Hynix's permit application to increase hydrogen fluoride emissions is the main agenda item; the application can be viewed at www.LRAPA.org.
2. Doug Erwin's comments on his "Status Summary" handout and comments by him, Hynix reps and community members who attended the meeting were as follows:
 - i. Query by Suzanne Buck, CAN rep for areas 1 & 6, as to whether soil and water quality are the purview of DEQ rather than LRAPA: yes.
 - ii. Hynix rep says their stormwater effluent samples are available - we can email them to get their data at gregs@hsma.us.hynix.com
 - iii. Audience suggested a baseline fluoride in soil/water be obtained prior to any permitting; Mr. Erwin replied that LRAPA is only empowered to study air; but DEQ does that; LRAPA might contact them.
 - iv. Tradeoff of one toxin for another? (PFC emissions aren't toxic (?), but represent a grave threat to the ozone layer, where they can persist for thousands of years.
 - v. There's data on total fluorine emissions, but not PFC's.
 - vi. Hynix management in Korea has mandated a change in the cleaning process to reduce PFC's & give more effective cleans (HF used to clean chambers can reduce PFC emissions, and 99% of it can be scrubbed out and disposed of as mineral solids without environmental impact).
 - vii. Increased production @ Hynix is planned over several years; Hynix needs headroom to increase the emissions that they expect could occur some years down the road; permitting process is too lengthy and expensive to revisit annually.
 - viii. Should the LRAPA Permit be denied, the denial process would include feedback to Hynix suggesting revisions that would allow the permit to be granted.
 - ix. Emissions data in the permit refer to ACUTE rather than chronic inhalation exposure (at 1 mile away, where there is peak concentration). See www.EPA.gov to learn how these are typically reported.
 - x. How are emissions determined/monitored? Difference between testing and modeling discussed. Prevailing analytic tool, endorsed by EPA and every air quality jurisdiction, is MODELING. Problem with testing (not only maintenance intensive and expensive) is only a few points can be monitored; modeling can provide more data points.
 - xi. Hynix has had interns studying relevant ecology (paid) and also sponsors activities for Churchill HS (Rachel Carson School) students. Not at present.
 - xii. Breakdown of HF—almost immediate, does not persist.
 - xiii. Acid rain assessment not well addressed by available methodology; not a subject of the permit application

3/28/2007 CHURCHILL AREA NEIGHBORS (CAN) MEETING MINUTES

- xiv. Concern about sensitive species in the wetlands. Best model of HF emissions standards that LRAPA reviewed is in Ontario, Canada; in North America, LRAPA found ~6 jurisdictions with standards.
 - xv. How should our community look at any new data from refined modeling or consultants that may show up in response to a possible denial of initial permit application? Need means for community to look at new data and provide feedback to LRAPA and Hynix.
 - xvi. PFC emissions are not measured now, nor is there a plan to measure them; they are not regulated. Hynix is motivated by Memorandum of Understanding among US semiconductor manufacturers to reduce PFC's and their need to improve manufacturing process to increase semiconductor production.
 - xvii. Hynix continues to upgrade tools and point of use scrubbers; also upgrades main house scrubbers annually. Each phase of scrubbing removes ~90% of HF from their emissions; there are 2 phases at present.
[REL=california's estimated values for the air pollution]?
- II. Adjournment of the General Meeting, socialization/informal conversation among the Neighbors and guests
- III. CAN Executive Committee meeting. Present: Chair Topham, Vice-Chair A. Buck, Secretary-Treasurer Sheinin, Newsletter Editor Oaks, Area Representatives S. Buck, Fields, Jestice, Taubenfeld.
- a. Circulation and discussion of letter to LRAPA as drafted by Oaks and emailed to CAN mailing lists prior to today's meeting.
 - b. Further discussion of Hynix's proposal.
 - i. 200 Citizens have written in to LRAPA, partly in response to local newspaper articles.
 - ii. CAN has obligation to weigh in on the permit application
 - c. Vote—Motion that CAN should take a position that the permit application. This motion failed to pass by a split vote of the Executive Committee.
 - d. Vote—Motion letter to be sent to LRAPA, draft as prepared by S. Buck based on earlier email by Oaks, and containing a CAN request to LRAPA for a subsequent formal public comment period prior to any final action. This motion passed by unanimous vote of the Executive Committee.
 - e. Copies of the draft letter by Oaks, the draft letter by S. Buck (as approved by the Executive Committee per the above vote), and the final letter sent to LRAPA as edited and mailed by your Secretary, are attached.
- IV. Adjournment of the Executive Committee Meeting; next Exec meeting scheduled for April 28.

3/28/2007 CHURCHILL AREA NEIGHBORS (CAN) MEETING MINUTES

Attachment 1. Draft letter to LRAPA as provided by David Oaks, as discussed by the Executive Committee

We the Churchill Area Neighbors (CAN) Executive Committee ask that Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA) deny the request by Hynix Semiconductor Manufacturing America, Inc. to increase the level of hydrogen fluoride they may release from 1.8 to 5 tons a year.

We are concerned that there is insufficient objective scientific testing to understand the current and cumulative effects of the Hynix hydrogen fluoride pollution on vegetation, animals and people in nearby communities, wetlands, gardens and farms.

We request that improved technologies be explored to control both greenhouse gas and hydrogen fluoride emissions by Hynix.

According to a 22 March 2007 Eugene Weekly article, Professor Paul Engelking of the University of Oregon had his Instrumental Analysis class recently take water samples from the 18th Ave. ditch in the vicinity of the Hynix plant and discovered that surface water fluoride levels are already elevated.

This Eugene Weekly article also states, "According to Engelking, LRAPA did not make an adequate attempt to quantify the effects on vegetation, and plants are far more sensitive to the effects of HF than humans are. He pointed out that these areas that will be affected are 'high quality natural resources,' and the HF could potentially irrevocably damage three endangered species of wildflowers found only in the Willamette Valley: Bradshaw's lomatium, the Willamette daisy and Kincaid's lupine. Kincaid's lupine is the main food source for Fender's blue butterfly, also an endangered species, which is primarily found in the Willow Creek Preserve."

Because of these serious concerns we request the permit be denied.

Attachment 2. Draft letter prepared by Suzanne Buck based on Attachment 1 and Executive Committee discussion; the draft approved by vote of the Committee

We the Churchill Area Neighbors (CAN) are concerned that there is insufficient objective scientific testing to understand the current and cumulative effects of the Hynix hydrogen fluoride emissions on vegetation, animals and people in nearby communities, wetlands, gardens and farms.

We request that improved technologies be explored to measure and control both greenhouse gas and hydrogen fluoride emissions by Hynix.

In the event that LRAPA has future negotiations, mitigations or new information relating to the Hynix permit application, CAN strongly requests the opportunity to have an additional public comment period.

3/28/2007 CHURCHILL AREA NEIGHBORS (CAN) MEETING MINUTES

Sincerely,

Churchill Area Neighbors Executive Committee
Craig Topham, Chair
Alan Buck, Vice-Chair
Matthew Sheinin, Secretary-Treasurer
Anne Fields, Area 5 Representative
Dale Jestice, Area 3 Representative
Suzanne Buck, Areas 1 and 3 Representative

→Secretary's notes on Attachment 2:

- a. The designations of the Area Representatives are incorrect, but the stated individuals did vote their intention to sign the letter.
- b. David Oaks, Newsletter Editor, was also present and voted to sign the letter
- c. Thomas Price, Area Representative, was also present for the most of the discussion but had to leave prior to the final vote and did not designate a proxy.

Attachment 3. Final letter promulgated by the Committee, as edited by the Secretary-Treasurer.

