Monsanto

FROM (NAME & LOCATION) J. T. Bell - Anniston

DATE : October 24, 1972

CC: G. L. Jessee
L. C. Lahman

SUBJECT :

REFERENCE :

10/27/72

TO : W. R. Richard
T3A
St. Louis

(1) Cc for W Papageage

sent 10/27/72

Do you recommend approval? The expenses are now more in line with projected budgets. I assume we would withhold final approval for an approved budget. WR

Attached is a revised contract proposal submitted by Gunning and Suttkus regarding continuation of the biological specimen, polychlorinated biphenyl residue study. This revision reflects the changes discussed in our phone conversation and conforms to the magnitude of cost which you anticipated.

In consideration of the proposal, please consider that this change in survey technique could leave the company open to criticism as being inconsistant in a data base for historical, comparative and interperative results in a court of law. If the consultants are ever employed as expert witnesses, credibility of their testimony could be compromised as the testimony would surely reflect that Monsanto elected not to follow their advice on a more rigorous and previously used approach.

Upon consideration of the above statements, the plant recommendation is that if the contract is to be renewed, that the same approach employed in the past two years be used to maintain the integrity of the total study.

Please advise us of your final decision so that we may plan accordingly.

JTB
J. T. Bell

sh
Attach

(2) Brig Up - 2 Weeks

(3) File Consultants

cc of this page to W Papageage

11/10/72

To Bill Papageage

Art K tells me we cut $45,000 from the ~~budget~~ product acceptance budget* 31,000 from pentachlorophenol contingency and I recommended we ~~[illegible]~~ get $10,000 more by deferring this study for 1 year. If agree, we need to tell T. Bell. WRR

DSW 178289

STLCOPCB4050730