

ted smith, 11:35 AM 12/9/97 , Re: intel case

>From tsmith Tue Dec 9 11:35:19 1997  
Return-Path: <tsmith@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Tue, 9 Dec 1997 11:35:00 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: tsmith@pop.igc.org  
To: RCoheh1608 <RCoheh1608@aol.com>  
From: ted smith <tsmith@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: intel case  
Sender: tsmith@igc.org  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id LAA288953

Rebecca:

attached are my most recent e-mails to Julio to bring you up to date. Any more thoughts?

Ted

Julio:

Mandy and I went over the document you faxed yesterday and have the following comments. Mandy and I will also fax you additional toxicological information that is missing from analysis of the Miniteric de Salud. I will fax it to 506-2379735. If this is not the correct fax number, please let me know. Some of the information is in very small print and may be too small to read via fax, so we may have to express mail it to you. let me know what address to send it to.

1. On page 8, the probable concentrations in the work area for lead (plomo) and antimony (antimonio) appear to be in excess of the TLV (threshold limit value), which is the legal worker exposure standard in the US. The lead appears to be substantially above the TLV ( 6,8 mg/m3 compared to 0,05-0,15 mg/m3) while the antimony appears to be somewhat over the TLV (0,65 compared to 0,5). You have a good argument that any industry that says it plans to expose its workers to toxic materials that exceed legal standards can not be called "inoffensive."

2. The toxicological information that is contained in the Minitry's report is almost totally lacking in chronic health effects information. The most glaring example is the failure to even mention that lead is a very serious reproductive toxin ( it mentions the carcinogenicity only). I am sending more information on the toxicology of lead, which is well documented.

The information is also completely inadequate concerning the toxicology of antimony, which is similar to arsenic in its toxic effects. It has reproductive toxicity as well as being toxic to the liver, heart, lungs, etc. I am also sending more information via fax on antimony.

3. The information on the identity of the adhesives (adhesivo) is completely lacking. While there are many kinds of adhesives, many of them are extremely toxic, such as some epoxies, acrylics, etc. Some contain bisphenol A, an endocrine disrupting chemical. It is essential that Intel disclose the exact identify of the adhesives that they plan to use, listing all of the constituents by CAS number as well as by percentage and weight. Mandy will fax more information on adhesives.

4. It is important to learn whether the acetone that they refer to is "benzene free" acetone or not. Often times, acetone comes in a grade that contains significant amounts of benzene, a known carcinogen, which would then require a much lower TLV. Acetone often comes in a 99.5% pure mixture, which means it could still contain benzene in in extremely high parts per million concentrations.

5. I believe that you should continue to make the case that Intel should be required to use lead free solder, which is increasingly being used by other companies. That would get rid of one of the most toxic problems, both on the job and as a hazardous waste. Continuing to use solder with a high percentage of lead can hardly be deemed to be "inoffensive"!!

6. The 2 chemicals listed as "SUVA 95" and SUVA HF82" are listed as a type

ted smith, 11:35 AM 12/9/97 , Re: intel case

of CFC (chlorofluorocarbon). If this is true, they could be banned by the Montreal Protocols as ozone depleting compounds (I'm not sure what the exact composition of the SUVAs is -- it was hard to read the fax. But you should request the CAS number and MSDS information on both of them, and then compare to the Montreal protocol list. It is also quite possible that they are global warming compounds. In either case, they should not be declared to be inoffensive.

In conclusion, I believe that you have a strong argument that Intel should have to prove the following points if they are to be declared to be inoffensive:

1. That they have disclosed \*\*\* all \*\*\* of the toxic data on all of the constituents of all of the materials that they intend to use and that they can guarantee that there will not be harmful exposure to any of the toxic materials (to either workers or the community).
2. Intel should have the burden of proof to prove that there are also no harmful \*\*\*synergistic \*\*\* effects from exposure to the multiple chemical exposures.
3. Where there are alternative materials available ( such as lead free solder), or CFC free solvents, Intel should be required to use them if they want the designation of inoffensive.

I hope that this helps. I will fax the reference materials soon. Let me know what else would be helpful. Good luck!!

Salud

Ted

-----  
Julio:

I have sent you a package of information by federal express since I was not able to get a fax through. Please let me know when it arrives.

it is not possible for Mandy or me to come down on the 16 of December, since we already have other plans. I also checked with Dan Hernandez who is a toxicologist we work with, but he too will be out of town. This is a very difficult time of year!!

I wonder if you could ask for more time on one of the following grounds:

1. you need more time to obtain expert witnesses to support your case; or
2. you could present the information that we have sent you and claim that based on this information, Intel should be required to supplement their information to the Ministry of Health to fill in the many blanks and missing pieces of information, and then to have another hearing in the future after they have presented the material that they have failed to submit so far. This would be another way of trying to buy more time. It would be much easier to get people to come to C.R. after the new year, especially if it were in February or March.

Let me know how things are going.

Ted

At 09:28 AM 12/3/97 +0000, you wrote:

>Thanks to you and Mandy for your prompt response. I am sending today  
>via UPS all the related information to your office.

>  
>My mail address is: Julio C. Rojas

> Ave. 1, Calles 5 - 7  
> Alajuela, Costa Rica

ted smith, 11:35 AM 12/9/97 , Re: intel case

tel: (506) 441 0614

> >  
>The hearing is on december 16, why some of you come and participated  
>as our experts, because INTEL is having their people and the Ministry  
>of health as well. And we dont have any expert. So we will be in  
>bad shape. Try to convince Mandy or you or both, and at the same  
>time take a break. I can offer a place to stay (my home) but I can  
>not afford the tickets. Please consider this invitation. We can  
>take advantage of your visit and plan some meetings and conferences.

> >  
>I wait your y our response.

> >  
At 03:32 PM 12/1/97 +0000, you wrote:

>Dear friends:

> >  
>The heat is on! We have continued with some debates about Intel, but  
>what have got more of the press attention is the Electromagnetic  
>Fields (EMF) and the Risk for leukemia in children. Those EMF will  
>be generated by the power lines that are being built to provide  
>INTEL. As I think I already mentioned, those lines will pass by to  
>neighborhoods, and they have been very active. One of them, are  
>middle upper class and they have money to support the activities and  
>some local lawyers have help them. They try to stop the construction  
>by a law suit, the construction is paralyzed and we are waiting for  
>the final decision of the court. The solution will be to pass the  
>lines for areas less populated. This will be more costly because it  
>is farther.

> >  
> Concerning to the other lawsuit, against Intel. We will have  
>some kind of hearings to discuss if INTEL is inoffensive or not.  
>This will be around december 16. This lawsuit is against the Ministry of  
Health since they call INTEL  
>inoffensive. We have the list of chemicals and their classification,  
>and material safety data sheet (MSDS) according several sources like; OSHA.  
>Part of the information was given by the proper producers, and the  
>other is by INTEL it self. The Ministry of Health use as reference  
>data from the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety.  
>Iam sending via fax (to Ted Smith only) the Ministry of Health  
>Report and the reason to classified Intel as inoffensive. SO WE  
>NEED YOUR HELP! In the sense to debate this classification in the  
>hearing, I am contacting some locals chemists to ask for their  
>help. We need information in how to attack this report. Depending  
>on how we do in this hearing we go to court or not. If we are able to  
>declare INTEL as ofensive to health and environment, we may be able  
>to stop the construction.

> >  
>If you need more information, please let me know.

> >  
>Greetings for everyone.

> >  
>Just for Rebeca:

>The course in Ocupational and environmental epidemiology is in  
>february of 1999. Hope to see you here.

> >  
t 09:52 AM 12/6/97 EST, you wrote:

> >  
>Ted- got a very desperate email from julio re: Intel. he appears to be  
>concentrating on elf-emf rad vs chems (limited list). i don't know the  
>southwest gang, but the canada group who provided their msds's are members of  
>the apha in subcommittee. i wrote back that savitz (UNC) and breyse (hopkins)

449-5105

23  
9735

ted smith, 10:29 AM 12/11/97, More about INTEL

>From tsmith Thu Dec 11 10:30:05 1997  
>Return-Path: <tsmith@igc.apc.org>  
>Date: Thu, 11 Dec 1997 10:29:58 -0800 (PST)  
>X-Sender: tsmith@pop.igc.org  
>To: lbyster@igc.org  
>From: ted smith <tsmith@igc.apc.org>  
>Subject: More about INTEL  
>Sender: tsmith@igc.org  
>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id KAA29750

>Return-Path: <jurojas@samara.una.ac.cr>  
>From: jurojas@samara.una.ac.cr  
>Organization: Universidad Nacional, Costa Rica  
>Comments: Authenticated sender is <jurojas@samara.una.ac.cr>  
>>To: ted smith <tsmith@igc.apc.org>,  
> > Southwest Organizing Project <swop@igc.apc.org>  
>Date: Mon, 1 Dec 1997 15:32:16 +0000  
>Subject: More about INTEL  
>CC: rcohen1608@aol.com  
>X-Confirm-Reading-To: jurojas@samara.una.ac.cr  
>X-pmrgc: 1  
>Return-receipt-to: jurojas@samara.una.ac.cr  
>Priority: normal  
>

>Dear friends:

>>  
>>The heat is on! We have continued with some debates about Intel, but  
>>what have got more of the press attention is the Electromagnetic  
>>Fields (EMF) and the Risk for leukemia in children. Those EMF will  
>>be generated by the power lines that are being built to provide  
>>INTEL. As I think I already mentioned, those lines will pass by to  
>>neighborhoods, and they have been very active. One of them, are  
>>middle upper class and they have money to support the activities and  
>>some local lawyers have help them. They try to stop the construction  
>>by a law suit, the construction is paralyzed and we are waiting for  
>>the final decision of the court. The solution will be to pass the  
>>lines for areas less populated. This will be more costly because it  
>>is farther.

>> Concerning to the other lawsuit, against Intel. We will have  
>>some kind of hearings to discuss if INTEL is inofensive or not.  
>>This will be around december 16. This lawsuit is against the Ministry of  
>>Health since they call INTEL  
>>inofensive. We have the list of chemicals and their classification,  
>>and material safety data sheet (MSDS) according several sources like; OSHA.  
>>Part of the information was given by the proper producers, and the  
>>other is by INTEL it self. The Ministry of Health use as reference  
>>data from the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety.  
>>Iam sending via fax (to Ted Smith only) the Ministry of Health  
>>Report and the reason to classified Intel as inofensive. SO WE  
>>NEED YOUR HELP! In the sense to debate this classification in the  
>>hearing, I am contacting some locals chemists to ask for their  
>>help. We need information in how to attack this report. Depending  
>>on how we do in this hearing we go to court or not. If we are able to  
>>declare INTEL as ofensive to health and environment, we may be able  
>>to stop the construction.

>>If you need more information, please let me know.

>>Greetings for everyone.

>>Just for Rebeca:  
>>The course in Occupational and environmental epidemiology is in  
>>february of 1999. Hope to see you here.

Ted Smith

ted smith, 10:30 AM 12/11/97, intel case

>From tsmith Thu Dec 11 10:30:16 1997  
>Return-Path: <tsmith@igc.apc.org>  
>Date: Thu, 11 Dec 1997 10:30:13 -0800 (PST)  
>X-Sender: tsmith@pop.igc.org  
>To: lbyster@igc.org  
>From: ted smith <tsmith@igc.apc.org>  
>Subject: intel case  
>Sender: tsmith@igc.org  
>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id KAA29805

>Return-Path: <RCohen1608@aol.com>  
>From: RCohen1608 <RCohen1608@aol.com>  
>Date: Sat, 6 Dec 1997 09:52:21 EST  
>To: tsmith@igc.apc.org  
>Subject: intel case  
>Organization: AOL (<http://www.aol.com>)  
>

> Ted- got a very desperate email from julio re: Intel. he appears to be  
> concentrating on elf-emf rad vs chems (limited list). i don't know the  
> southweat gang, but the canada group who provided their msds's are members of  
> the alpha ih subcommittee. i wrote back that savitz (UNC) and breyse (hopkins)  
> know as much as anyone, and that there is free/total access to the nlm  
> databases back to 66.  
>

> i understood from our last talk about this that you were having the report  
> analyzed to help julio with the case against intel. are you/ your gang going  
> there to help him with the case?

> let me know  
>  
>

Ted Smith  
Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition  
760 N. First Street  
San Jose, CA 95112  
408-287-6707-phone  
408-287-6771-fax  
tsmith@igc.apc.org

>NOW AVAILABLE AT OUR WEBSITE -- New information on the  
>grassroots politics of regulatory reinvention. Includes  
>a new chart comparing Project XL other models of community participation.  
>Also information on the the impacts of high-tech industry.  
>

> <http://www.svtc.org/svtc/>

Food for thought:

How Gandhi Definded the Seven Deadly Sins

- Wealth without work
- Pleasure without conscience
- Knowledge without character
- Commerce without morality
- Science without humanity
- Worship without sacrifice
- Politics without principle