DRAFT

W.G. Krummrich Plant
Community Relations Plan
1994

GOAL:

To build or maintain the support of key audiences by demonstrating that Monsanto is acting responsibly to safely resolve long-standing issues, and earn the status of a good corporate citizen.

Major Community Relations Issues for 1994

Environmental Equity
Potential Proposed National Priority Listing for Sauget Sites
Remedy selection for the former Krummrich landfill
New Mississippi River crossing
Rush City buy-out

Strategic Issues and Situation Analysis:

After analysis of Monsanto locations where environmental justice could become an issue, we have determined that our greatest vulnerability resides in Metro East St. Louis, Illinois. Several complicating factors led to this conclusion.

There is a perception that not only is East St. Louis in dire financial straits because Monsanto and other companies formed the Village of Sauget to avoid being a part of the tax base, but that the residents are exposed to intolerable levels of emissions from the chemical plants. The assertion is that the City of East St. Louis is in a death spiral -- ever eroding tax base begets higher taxes on the remaining few -- and attempts to lay the blame on the Sauget (formerly Monsanto), Illinois industrials.

The creation of the American Bottoms waste water treatment facility added fuel, because the facility is controlled by the Village of Sauget. This is further complicated by the perception that the Sauget industrials do not generally employ residents of East St. Louis.

The attempt to create a buffer zone around the industrial sector has stalled due to: difficulties involving the solidification of corporate participants; what constitutes a "fair" price for the properties; and the physical boundaries of the buffer zone. The uncertainty surrounding the buy-out has led to some disappointment among residents. Other complicating factors include environmental issues regarding Sauget Sites, Dead Creek, and the former Krummrich landfill which is currently being analyzed for options for corrective action.

The concept of these real or perceived inequities in the distribution of environmental risk, and lack of financial inclusion, especially in poor, minority communities is being advocated by environmental groups, civil rights organizations, academics and legislators at the state and federal level.

Initial observation indicates that the primary concerns surrounding these issues include inequities in the siting of hazardous waste facilities, inequities in the enforcement of existing environmental laws for operating facilities, lax regulatory standards for exposure to risk, workplace opportunities, and inclusion on decisions important to the community.

Key Audiences

Community officials and other opinion leaders
Area residents
Neighboring businesses
News media
Krummrich employees
State senators and representatives
Regulators
Emergency responders
Environmental Groups

Monsanto Strategy:

The recommended course at this time is for Monsanto to become more active in some of the targeted organizations we identified as new Monsanto Fund recipients, and engage other players and activities that our research indicates would be of value. Execution on the local level by plant personnel is recommended if we are to be viewed as active and willing participants in the discovery of reasonable remedies.

Enhanced use of the formal community advisory panel to identify existing or potential concerns will support our efforts to respond to issues promptly and effectively.

We should engage in proactive efforts to promote dialogue and partnerships with environmental groups such as the Sierra Club.

We must develop relationships with the surrounding community approximating our relationship with Sauget where the citizens are knowledgeable and appreciative of Monsanto's value as a catalyst for economic development, and as a good neighbor.

Supporting materials and reports on our environmental and philanthropic efforts will need to be developed and delivered to the community.