

From: Clegg, Patsy M SCC-CHSE-PC [pmclegg@Shell.Com]
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2001 11:44 AM
To: 'George Woodall'; Donald Burnett (E-mail); Patsy Clegg (E-mail)
Cc: Stuart Cagen Ph.D. (E-mail); Lorraine Twerdok
Subject: RE: October 30, 2001 Conference Call Summary
George,

My memory of the budget for communications and legal is that in the January, 2001 meeting in DC we discussed the need for these two activities. A \$1M was thrown out as a number that should cover the costs of both a PR firm and legal counsel. My suggestion to the Oversight Committee is that we ask communications to come up with a scope document and budget. With a proposal in hand then we may merge the monies needed for communications into the overall project budget.

Patsy

-----Original Message-----

From: George Woodall [mailto:Woodallg@api.org]
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2001 9:10 AM
To: Donald Burnett (E-mail); Patsy Clegg (E-mail)
Cc: Stuart Cagen Ph.D. (E-mail); Lorraine Twerdok
Subject: FW: October 30, 2001 Conference Call Summary
Importance: High

Don and Patsy,

I forward Lynn's comments to you in your capacity as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Oversight Committee. I do not believe her first point is controversial and will change the minutes as suggested pending your approval. On her second point, I have reviewed the written record of our meetings and calls, and do not find much in the way of specifics. The one set of notes regarding scope for public affairs is in the minutes from January 26, 2001; the points below were in that list.

Public Affairs

- Dealing with complex Chinese society
- Issue with Apparel Industry, esp. glue in shoes
- NGO's will want interim results/progress
- communicate the drivers for the study
- perception needs to be that this is not being done to protect against litigation.
- Suggestion to use a consulting attorney to address these issues of perceived motivation.

I do believe that this issue of the scope for the Communications Committee and what is to be included in the \$1-million budget needs to be addressed soon. Please advise on next steps.

George

-----Original Message-----

From: lynn.b.russo@exxonmobil.com [mailto:lynn.b.russo@exxonmobil.com]
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2001 10:49 AM
To: woodallg@api.org
Subject: October 30, 2001 Conference Call Summary

George, two comments on the write up of the oversight committee:

- suggested change: in the action item on the opening ceremony, would you revise it such that the Communication Committee is advising both on the

whether there should be an opening ceremony or other event, its nature, participation, costs, etc., etc.

- on the point on costs and communications/Law role in those costs, while I can't speak for the memories of the Oversight Committee members, I can advise on what the Communication Committee did/said. I think some of the early presentations I gave discussed the issues and the type of activities the Communications Committee was recommending; we advised that could best be done by hiring a consultant and anticipated fees for those services would be about \$1million, although at that point we had no firm basis for that estimate. That did not anticipate including legal support for the oversight committee. You'll recall I've been surprised that there has been this misperception that we're a legal/communications committee.

Since your report references the "collective memory" no need to change it; if it is appropriate to put in a Communications Committee comment, I'd suggest something like this: The communications committee subsequently advised its request for a budget of about \$1million was for a PR firm consultant fees and was not meant to include legal fees.

Lynn

----- Forwarded by Lynn B Russo/Fairfax/ExxonMobil on 11/02/01 10:34 AM

George Woodall
<Woodallg@api.org> To: "BenzConsort-OC@listserve.api.org" <BenzConsort-OC@api.org>
rg> cc: "William Broddle (E-mail)" <bill.d.broddle@usa.conoco.com>
Subject: October 30, 2001 Conference Call Summary

11/02/01 10:31
AM

&! nbsp;

Oversight Committee,

Attached is the summary from the conference call of this Monday; I am working backward in updating the documentation, so please bear with me. Please review and provide corrections. Also note that there are several action items embedded in the summary that are clearly marked as such (Action Item), and that some questions that were unresolved during the call have since been answered [blue text in brackets]. I will post this to the Consortium web page later today.

Thank you,

George M. Woodall, Ph.D.
Senior Toxicologist
American Petroleum Institute
1220 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Tel. (202)682-8067

Fax. (202)682-8031

Visit the New www.api.org. (See attached file:
ConferenceCallSummary30Octoberr2001.doc)