Jan. 21, 1993

CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
3:00 p.m., Thursday, January 21, 1993
Salon A Room (Lower Level), Four Seasons Hotel
Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

		TAB
3:00 p.m.	1. **Call to Order and Approval of Minutes of October 18, 1992 Meeting -- J. Roger Hirl Chairman**	18
	2. **Review of Board Agenda and Selection of Items for Executives Committee Discussion:**	
	a. Board Information and Discussion Items (No Executive Committee discussion planned unless requested by Executive Committee members)	
	o State Initiatives Work Group -- John E. Peppercorn	4
	o Board Risk Committee -- Mort L. Mullins	5
	o CHEMSTAR Policy Committee Annual Report -- Gordon D. Strickland	6
	o Board Responsible Care® Committee -- Earnie Deavenport	8
	o Public Perception Committee: Values Research Results and Proposed Public Outreach Strategy -- Jon C. Holtzman	9
	o Trade Issues -- William M. Stover	13
	o Federal and State Issues and Outlook -- Messrs. Stover, Mullins and McIntire	14
	o MSDS Public Access Program Status Report -- Gordon D. Strickland	16
	b. Board Action Items Not Deemed to Require Separate Executive Committee Action (No Executive Committee discussion planned unless requested by Executive Committee Members)	
	o Nominating Committee Report -- Frank Popoff	2
	o Membership Recommendations -- Charles W. Van Vlack	3
	o Marine Emergency Response Contingency Plans -- Mort L. Mullins	12
	c. Identify Other Items for Later Discussion Under New Business (Item 5)	

3. **Discussion of any Board Agenda Items Identified in 2(a) and (b) above**

4. **Policy and Program Action Items**

30 minutes	a.	Superfund Policy and Strategy -- Paul M. King, PPG Industries, Environmental Management Committee; and Tom Helscher, Monsanto Company, Chairman, FGRC Superfund Task Group	10
20 minutes	b.	Energy Efficiency Improvement Program -- John C. deRuyter, DuPont; Chairman, Energy Committee Energy Efficiency Task Group	11

15 min 5. **Executive Committee Discussion Items**

a. Finance Committee: 1993/94 Budget Process -- Vincent A. Calarco

b. Concept For Management Development Seminars

6. **New Business (Discussion of any items identified in 2(c) above)**

7. Association Activities

20 min	a.	President's Report -- Robert A. Roland	15
		o Proposed Budget Amendment For a CMA Member Survey and Development of a Strategy for Enhanced Member Dialogue, Commitment and Communication	19
	b.	Committee Appointments -- Charles W. Van Vlack	20
	c.	Treasurer's Report -- Gary C. Herrman	17

5:00pm 8. **Adjourn**

CMA
EC-1/21/93

CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Thursday, January 21, 1993
The Four Seasons Hotel
Washington, D.C.

Minutes of Meeting

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chairman Hirl. There were present:

Members:
J. Roger Hirl, Chairman
J.A. "Fred" Brothers
Vincent A. Calarco
Earnest W. Deavenport, Jr.
James E. Fligg
Bruce C. Gottwald
Michael H. Grasley
Alan R. Hirsig
Robert D. Kennedy
Ray B. Nesbitt
John E. Peppercorn
Frank P. Popoff
Robert A. Roland
Arthur R. Sigel

Secretary: Charles W. Van Vlack
Treasurer: Gary C. Herrman
General Counsel: David F. Zoll

By Invitation:
David S. Alcorn, Crompton & Knowles Corporation
Charles A. Aldag, CMA
R. M. Julie Archuleta, Occidental Chemical Corporation
*John C. deRuyter, DuPont
J. Brian Ferguson, Eastman Chemical Company
*Tom Helscher, Monsanto
Jon C. Holtzman, CMA
*Paul M. King, PPG Industries
John A. Lamping, Amoco Chemical Company
Fred G. Marshall, Exxon Chemical Company
James D. McIntire, CMA
Frederick L. Moore, Union Carbide Corporation
Morton L. Mullins, CMA
William M. Stover, CMA
Gordon D. Strickland, CMA
A. Glenn Weaver, Chevron Chemical Company
Frederick L. Webber, CMA
Ben Woodhouse, The Dow Chemical Company

* Part time only

2. Minutes of Last Meeting. The minutes of the October 18, 1992, meeting were approved as distributed.

3. Discussion of Board Agenda Items. The Executive Committee discussed these issues which were on the following day's Board agenda but were not otherwise scheduled for Executive Committee:

- The success of CMA's state ballot initiatives program in the past year and the need to improve our coalitioning and early intervention, and to continue to support the contingency fund through renewed pledges.

- The unique project in CHEMSTAR to assist the Hydrogen Fluoride Panel in meeting unusual advocacy demands by developing certain standards for hydrogen fluoride. The Executive Committee requested that the standards issue be brought back to it for evaluation if further activity beyond the limited hydrogen fluoride project were contemplated.

4. Superfund. Messrs. King and Helscher presented the proposed Superfund policy and strategy, including an update on current coalitioning and legislative activities. Mr. Helscher highlighted the need for CMA and its members to be the catalysts for motivating and coalescing the business community and Congress to "fix" Superfund. He also reported on the various agendas of the insurance and financial communities and the municipalities.

The Executive Committee approved and recommended for Board concurrence the proposed policy principles on Superfund reauthorization with a clarifying amendment on funding issues. (See Exhibit A - which also reflects further amendments from the following day's Board meeting.) The Executive Committee discussed in some detail the importance of coalitioning activities in order to generate broad-based support for Superfund reform and to resist "Carveouts" by other interests. Key partners and other players in this process are the Business Roundtable, API, NAM and the insurance industry. The Executive Committee also discussed the significant challenges which any kind of public works program might present.

5. Energy Efficiency Improvement Program. Mr. deRuyter presented the proposed voluntary energy efficiency improvement program which was approved as set forth in Exhibit B. The Executive Committee discussed the program's relationship to Responsible Care®, the possible renewal of the special energy efficiency investment tax credit, and the potential for energy taxes and the role of this program relative to possible legislation.

6. 1993/94 Budget Process. Mr. Calarco reviewed the process under way to develop the proposed 1993/94 Association budget which would be reviewed by the Finance Committee on March 1, the Executive Committee on March 2 and the Board on April 15. He indicated that budget requests significantly exceed current Association resources and that the program additions requested seemed to fall in three general categories: Board developed or authorized programs (State Affairs improvements, CHEMTREC upgrades, CAA and RCRA enhanced regulatory advocacy, judicial education, etc.); "new" programs such as expanded TUR advocacy and legislative coalitioning; and extending existing programs such as support for implementation of the six Responsible Care® codes. He concluded by indicating that the Finance Committee would be reviewing all of the Associations programs as part of the

budget process and that Executive Committee member's input would be appreciated.

7. Senior Management Seminars. Mr. Webber reported that the Officers had requested that he further develop the concept of CMA sponsoring a program of senior management development and education seminars, similar to what has been provided through the Petroleum Management Education Forum. Mr. Popoff commented on the potential value of such a program to maximize the members' investment in CMA in a new area in ways that will make the entire industry move competitive globally. Mr. Webber solicited additional input from the Executive Committee.

8. President's Report. Mr. Roland commented on the following issues:

- The need for a loaned executive to lead a new effort on environment, health and safety management systems (Exhibit C)
- Ongoing discussion between CMA and AAR on rail cars.
- Indications that a few member companies may not be fulfilling their Responsible Care® obligations and that CMA's formal process of reviewing their membership status had been initiated.

Mr. Roland presented a proposed amendment (Exhibit D) to add $216,800 to the 1992/93 CMA budget to fund an in-depth survey of CMA member companies to: better understand their needs; assist in formulating a strategic plan to meet those needs; and maximize the return on the members' investment. This survey will be conducted by the Wirthlin Group and will involve in its first phase a 20 minute telephone survey of all Executive Contacts, including Board members.

The amendment was approved following discussion of the phasing of this project and its potential relationship to the budget process.

9. Committee Appointments. Mr. Van Vlack presented a series of appointments to fill vacancies on various CMA committees. These were approved as set forth in Exhibit E.

10. Treasurer's Report. Mr. Herrman reported that through the six months ending November 30, 1992, the Association had received revenues of $25,367,000 and had incurred expenses of $13,589,500. Overall variances were reported as modest, but unfavorable variances in investment revenue and in several expense categories have the potential to result in the overall use of reserves of approximately $2 million by year end. The specific variables will be estimated and presented as part of the 1993/94 budget process. He further indicated that members had been requested to provide their 1992 chemcial sales data as part of the 1993/94 budget process. He concluded by reporting that dues had been received from all but one member, with resolution of that situation expected by the next Board meeting.

11. New Business. Mr. Brothers noted CMA's excellent standing in a recent Communications Foundation Survey.

* * * * * * * *

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Charles W. Van Vlack
Senior Vice President-Secretary

EXHIBIT A

PRINCIPLES FOR SUPERFUND REAUTHORIZATION

CMA supports reforming Superfund to make it equitable, efficient, and effective. The current program is none of these things. The following principles, if adopted, will significantly improve this country's waste site remediation program for all.

I. REMEDY SELECTION

A. Superfund should be reformed to assure an efficient process that results in cost-effective remedies which are protective of human health and the environment.

B. The Superfund program needs to emphasize the identification and management of "true" risks to public health and the environment, i.e. those realistically estimated risks reasonably associated with specific sites. The process for assessing and managing risk under Superfund should comply with CMA's approved "Policies on Risk Assessment, Risk Management, and Risk Communication."

C. Remedial decisions should be site-specific and risk-based, account for actual or planned future land use, and recognize the limits of remedial technology. Decisions should be cost-effective and justified by risk reduction goals.

D. Artificial impediments to sound, site-specific, risk-based remedial decisions should be removed. These include Superfund's absolute requirement that sites be remediated to levels that meet "all legally applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements" (ARARs) and the law's "preference" for "permanent solutions" and "treatment." In practice these requirements impede cleanup and lead to arbitrary and wasteful remedial decisions.

E. Conflict and duplication between state and federal remedial programs should be eliminated. Either the federal program or the state program should prevail at a site. Similarly, conflicts and duplications between Superfund and other federal envirnomental programs should be eliminated.

F. Early and informed participation by the local community, including meaningful dialog, should be encouraged in the remediation decision process.

II. LIABILITY

A. Changes to the existing liability standard for any group of Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs) should take place only as part of the comprehensive reauthorization of Superfund and the reform of the liability standard for everyone. No group of PRPs should be selectively exempted from Superfund liability on a piece-meal basis.

B. Superfund's existing standard of joint and several liability should be changed and a new standard of proportional liability should be adopted, provided that such a new standard includes --

- Requirements that each PRP at a site pay its fair share of remediation costs and the Superfund Trust Fund pays the share belonging to unknown or insolvent PRPs and recalcitrant PRPs.
- Requirements that the government identify all PRPs that could reasonably be identified and to bring a cost-recovery action, including treble damages, against all recalcitrant PRPs.
- Administrative procedures to fairly and expeditiously allocate shares of liability and the right of limited judicial review of the allocations.
- Broad-based funding and strict limits on total tax collections.

C. Superfund should be reformed to increase program efficiency and to gain more effective use of Fund revenues. These reforms should include an annual independent financial audit of government expenditures, to be submitted to the Congress, with specific detail to permit evaluation on a site-by-site basis.

D. Proposals to turn Superfund into a no-liability, public works program could be considered depending on how the program is structured and also on the specific details of how it is funded. At a minimum such a program must include acceptable broad-based funding, strict limits on total tax collections, an annual independent financial audit of government expenditures, an improved remedy selection process, and administrative efficiencies to make more effective use of Fund revenues.

E. Any proposals to address sites containing both municipal and non-municipal waste resulting in increased funding requirements must be financed through a broad-based tax.

III. NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENTS

A. CMA supports comprehensive reform of the existing procedures in Superfund for assessing natural resources and damages. According to some estimates natural resource damages will ultimately double the already exorbitant cost of Superfund. Yet, the existing procedures for assessing these damages are seriously inadequate. Without dramatic reconsideration and reform of these procedures, enormous sums of money will be needlessly wasted.

B. CMA believes that natural resource damages should be assessed based on the loss of the services provided by the natural resources. Damages should be based on restoring or replacing the services, depending on which would provide the most cost-effective settlement of the claim. Further, natural resource trustees should be required to clearly demonstrate that the releases which are the subject of the claim actually caused the damage to the resources in question.

C. CMA believes that any restoration or replacement alternative that is selected must be technically feasible, cost-effective, and supported by a cost/benefit analysis. If these three criteria are met, then other criteria should be considered, such as the results of other remediation activities (e.g., Superfund remediation), the potential for additional injury to the resource, the ability and time expected for the resource to recover naturally, and potential effects on public health and safety.

D. CMA opposes compensation for the loss of so-called "non-use" values provided by natural resources. The only method currently available to calculate such losses, contingent valuation methodology, is totally unreliable and amounts to, at best, pseudo-science. If new, reliable methods are ever developed, then compensation for "non-use" losses should be limited to situations that involve irreversible or very long lasting damage to unique and widely recognized natural resources.

E. CMA believes that the use of funds recovered through natural resource damage claims should be limited to restoring or replacing the resource that is the subject of the claim. Current practice allows otherwise.

IV. FUNDING

A. Any change in the Superfund funding mechanisms should support developing acceptable, more broad based funding.

EC -- 1/21/93
BD -- 1/22/93

PROPOSED VOLUNTARY

CMA ENERGY EFFICIENCY CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

I. BACKGROUND

CMA member companies have made significant progress in improving energy efficiency since the early 1970's. Current economic conditions and increased personnel time constraints occurring in many companies make it more difficult to maintain this improvement trend in energy efficiency. Comprehensive energy legislation recently enacted by Congress and signed by the President (the Energy Policy Act of 1992) includes provisions to improve energy efficiency through a number of programs, including increased reporting and a national energy efficiency improvement goal. In addition, the recently negotiated U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, which the U.S. has already ratified, will require preparation of national plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These plans are expected to have a strong emphasis on energy. Finally, a variety of environmental benefits of more efficient energy use are now widely recognized. With this environmental link, efforts to gain further energy efficiency improvements should garner even more support than in the recent past.

In addition, the CMA Product Stewardship Code, part of the Responsible Care® initiative, includes a reference to energy use. This heightened focus on energy would mesh well with a voluntary Energy Efficiency Continuous Improvement Program sponsored by the Energy Committee.

With this background, the Energy Committee believes it is in CMA member companies' best interest to institute a program to foster energy efficiency improvements. The intention is to adopt a program in which CMA fosters and recognizes energy efficiency improvements, facilitates open communication, and consolidates information regarding member company performance. This program would rely on member companies voluntarily directing their efforts in this area. This proposed program contains voluntary guidelines for member companies. Companies could select from or modify these guidelines or use other guidelines as appropriate to tailor their programs to fit their own needs. It would be much more productive to voluntarily institute a program developed by member companies and demonstrate achievements, than be forced to comply with a government-mandated program.

II. PROPOSED PROGRAM

The following are the elements of the proposed CMA Energy Efficiency Continuous Improvement Program.

A. CMA ROLE

1. CMA will provide a positive influence supporting continuously improved energy efficiency. CMA will continue to collect information on member companies' energy efficiency performance through the annual member company Energy Efficiency and CO_2 Emissions Survey. This survey will also provide a means of gauging aggregate progress in improving energy efficiency. The survey will request data on a total corporate U.S. SIC 28 basis regarding purchased fuels, steam, and electricity, on-site-generated fuels, feedstock energy, total sales and transfer dollars, and total pounds of production. The confidentiality of individual member company data will be rigorously protected and only aggregate data will be used to analyze trends. In addition, companies will be given the opportunity to identify major energy efficiency efforts and corporate changes which impacted performance. Full member participation in the annual survey will be encouraged in order to provide meaningful results. Those member companies which use less than one trillion Btu's per year will continue to be given a "small user" exemption from the survey if they so wish.

2. CMA, using data obtained by the annual survey, will assess aggregate energy efficiency performance on the basis of both Btu/$ of sales (Value of Shipments), corrected to constant dollars, and Btu/lb of product. These parameters are useful in determining trends in industry performance. These ratios will be tracked for both Offsite-Produced Energy and Total Inputs of Energy (see definitions). The data on sales dollars and pounds of production reported in the survey can, after aggregation, be used for extrapolation to total industry sales and value added data obtainable from the Bureau of the Census. They can also be compared to Department of Energy/Energy Information Administration (DOE/EIA) data from the Manufacturing Energy Consumption Survey (MECS) which consider Value of Shipments and Value Added by Manufacture only. (CMA does not intend to seek value added data from member companies.)

3. CMA will sponsor periodic meetings/seminars for member company plant and corporate representatives focusing on energy efficiency programs, achievements, education, etc. Generic examples of technology application could also be covered.

4. CMA will initiate and sponsor an annual Energy Efficiency Award program in recognition of individual member company performance.

5. CMA will routinely inform member companies of industry energy efficiency progress in the Energy and Feedstock Issues newsletter and other CMA publications. This will include short articles relating to energy efficiency improvements or technologies which are being applied or have potential application to the industry. Where appropriate, this information will be used in CMA advocacy efforts.

6. CMA will maintain open lines of communication with DOE and

EPA regarding energy efficiency performance and energy efficient technology and methodology development which could have application in the chemical industry.

B. MEMBER COMPANY ROLE: ILLUSTRATIVE MEMBER COMPANY VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES

1. Each member company should have a corporate energy policy that establishes energy management as an integral part of the corporate culture and decision-making process.

2. Upper level management should be responsible for implementing and supporting a cohesive, coordinated corporate program to implement the energy policy.

3. Each member company should track its energy use on at least an annual basis, relating that energy use to whatever base is indicative of efficiency performance.

4. Each company should establish goals for energy efficiency improvements and plans to meet those goals. A goal such as "continuous improvement" is considered an appropriate goal option for energy efficiency. Individual companies could establish fixed percentage goals if that is appropriate for their situation.

5. Companies should keep employees informed of energy efficiency performance and the importance of efficient energy use. Some sort of mechanism should be established to encourage employees to suggest changes, to help them get ideas funded and implemented, and to recognize those responsible for improvements.

6. Individual companies should recognize the inherent interconnection of energy management and environmental impacts, for example, lower emissions obtainable by reductions in energy use. Conversely, the additional energy requirements associated with some environmental control projects should also be recognized.

7. Economic evaluation procedures which consider the lifetime energy impact of equipment and processes should be used in the decision-making process, rather than methods which consider only the purchase cost or installed cost of equipment.

8. Corporate energy program progress should be regularly reported to and by executive management, either through annual reports or other means. This would serve to show the importance accorded the energy program.

C. DEFINITIONS

The following are definitions for selected terms which refer to energy use and performance measurement. These are to a large extent derived from DOE/EIA references in the MECS.

Energy Efficiency or Energy Intensity - The ratio of energy consumption input to the total production output.

Offsite-Produced Energy - The total amount of energy purchased or transferred from offsite sources that is consumed onsite to produce heat and power and to generate electricity. This excludes raw materials or feedstocks and excludes energy which is both produced and consumed on site.

Output - Units of production (pounds), or the value of shipments (dollars).

Total Inputs of Energy - Total amount of energy used to produce heat and power and to generate electricity, including byproduct/waste fuels produced on-site, but excluding raw materials or feedstock energy.

Total Primary Consumption of Energy - Total energy requirements for production, including raw materials or feedstocks, and off-site produced energy for heat power and to generate electricity. This excludes byproduct/waste fuels produced on site from another energy source.

Value Added by Manufacture - This represents the contribution of a manufacturer to the production of finished goods. It is equal to: ([Value of Shipments] minus [Cost of all Materials] plus [Net change in Finished Goods and Work in Progress Inventory]). Value Added basically consists of wages and employee supplements, net interest, indirect business taxes and adjustments, and income or corporate profits.

Value of Shipments or $ of Sales - Total receipts for products manufactured, services rendered, and the resales of products bought and sold without further manufacture.

III. RELATIONSHIP TO RESPONSIBLE CARE

The Energy Committee believes that with the goal of continuous improvement and with member companies given flexibility as to how to pursue this goal, the proposed voluntary Energy Efficiency Continuous Improvement Program is fully consistent with Responsible Care®.

The Energy Committee's consultations with member companies indicated broad member company support for this proposal, although some concern was expressed that beginning an additional mandatory program at this time might be asking too much of companies still getting used to the requirements of Responsible Care®. Consultations between Energy Committee representatives and CMA Responsible Care® staff indicated that significant additional time would be needed to make the Energy Efficiency Continuous Improvement Program part of Responsible Care®. However, the assumption of power by the Clinton/Gore Administration underlines the importance of prompt adoption by CMA of a program such as the one proposed.

Given the above, the CMA officers have recommended that the proposed voluntary Energy Efficiency Continuous Improvement Program be adopted in its present form, and that the Energy Committee and the Responsible Care® Coordinating Group begin work on evaluating and developing this type of program as part of Responsible Care®.

IV. ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of the proposed voluntary Energy Efficiency Continuous Improvement Program and endorsement of further exploration by the Energy Committee and the Responsible Care® Coordinating Group of an energy efficiency component for Responsible Care®.

CMA
EC - 1/21/93
BD - 1/22/93

EXHIBIT C

JOB DESCRIPTION

LOANED EXECUTIVE TO MANAGE CMA's EFFORTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL, HEALTH AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

CMA is organizing an Ad Hoc Committee to play a major role in the development of national and international standards for Environmental, Health and Safety (EHS) Management Systems. These standards will include quality management standards, audits, life cycle analyses, labeling (eco-labeling), environmental product performance, and guidelines for incorporating environmental considerations into all product standards.

We are seeking a "loaned executive" to manage this activity for CMA. Duties would include:

- Management of an Ad Hoc Committee of members to develop policy on EHS Management systems, audits, life cycle analyses, environmental product performance, and environmental aspects of standards,

- Coordinate the delivery of policy positions on the above subjects to national and international standards organizations,

- Represent CMA, as appropriate, at national and international standards organizations as they develop standards on the above subjects,

The person in this position should have experience in managing a diverse set of issues and professionals. He/She should have have experience in environmental, health and safety issues in either the U.S. or the international arena. Knowledge of processes at CMA and at standards organizations would be useful. We estimate that this assignment would require about 50% of the persons time for the next 2-3 years. Some international travel will be required.

ENHANCING MEMBER DIALOGUE, COMMITMENT AND COMMUNICATION

Proposed Survey of CMA Member Needs and Development of Strategic Plan

SUMMARY

A request for a budget amendment to fund an in-depth survey of CMA member companies to better understand their needs and to formulate a strategic plan to meet those needs.

BACKGROUND

For the past six months CMA's Officers have been reviewing ways to assure that CMA's services, programs and policies are properly reflective of a changing industry. In addition they have searched for a better understanding of member needs and for a way to assure that members understand and support CMA's contributions and requirements.

The Officers have reviewed a proposal by The Wirthlin Group to conduct research and help formulate a strategic plan to accomplish those objectives and are recommending Executive Committee approval to proceed with the proposal.

Through surveys with member company executive contacts, upper and mid-level managers, plant supervisors and CMA staff The Wirthlin Group will gather information to achieve the following research objectives:

- Identify major issues and determine priorities;
- Identify major problem areas for members in accessing and using the CMA process;
- Determine members' expectation of CMA and assess CMA's performance in meeting those needs;
- Identify needed services being provided by other associations, business groups, or single-issue organizations;
- Determine CMA's greatest strengths and weaknesses;
- Assess CMA's strengths and weaknesses vis-a-vis competing organizations; understand how companies manage membership decisions, allocate resources, and review those decisions;
- Understand how companies manage employee participation;
- Evaluate the potential for additional support for current and future services at the local, state and international level.

The research will help industry leadership better understand member company needs and formulate plans to provide for those needs. The goal is to help answer the questions: How is CMA doing? How should CMA be doing? How is the association viewed by members? What are the needs of the members? Where is the association and it members going? How do we collectively get there?

RESEARCH APPROACH

Phase 1 includes in-depth interviews with Executive Contacts and senior members of CMA staff. Staff interviews will provide association perspective on all of the issues and give a basis to compare what CMA provides with what members expect and need. Executive Contact interviews will address the full range of issues identified above as objectives. All Executive Contacts will be asked to participate.

Phase 2 includes interviews with 300 upper and mid-level managers and 300 plant managers.

Upper and mid-level manager interviews will include a half and half mixture of people now active on CMA committees and task groups and of senior managers who have not been active at CMA but whose decisions affect the implementation of industry-wide policies and programs. Plant manager interviews will provide understanding of needs to better support advocacy and implement initiatives such as Responsible Care®.

Phase 3 provides for developing the plan to help better target current and future programs and services.

COST

Phase 1:	66,300
Phase 2:	115,845
Phase 3:	34,675
TOTAL	216,820

TIMING

All phases of the research are expected to be completed by March 1993. Reports will be provided by The Wirthlin Group at the end of each phase and reviewed before agreement to proceed with the next phase.

ACTION REQUESTED

Approve proceeding with the research and development of the strategic plan and amend the 1992-93 budget to provide funds.

CMA
EC-1/21/93

EXHIBIT E

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

RECOMMENDATION

Appoint the following individuals to the committees for the terms designated:

International Trade Committee

D. Lynn Johnson, Eastman Chemical Company, term ending May 31, 1993. (Replacing Allen B. Miles of the same company.)

State Affairs Committee

Nancie S. Johnson, DuPont, term ending May 31, 1993. (Replacing Colbert Wilhite of the same company.)

John H. Stuart, Occidental Chemical Corporation, term ending May 31, 1995. (Replacing William A. Margaritas of the same company.)

Chemical Industry Federation Advisory Council

Gary Durst, BASF Corporation and President, Michigan Chemical Council. (Replacing Robert Jurczyszn, Akzo Coatings, Inc., of the same council.)

Thomas Gray, Jr., Union Carbide Corporation and Chairman, Louisiana Chemical Association. (Replacing Joseph MacKenzie, Chevron Chemical Company, of the same council.)

Jack Henrikson, Takeda Chemical and President, Chemical Industry Council of North Carolina. (Replacing James E. Hieserman, FMC Corporation, of the same council.)

Harold Hicks, Ashland Chemical Company and Chairman, Chemical Industry Committee, West Virginia Manufacturers Association. (Replacing Ronald N. Roberts, GE Plastics, of the same council.)

Stephen LeDoux, ICI Americas, Inc. and President, Alabama Chemical Association. (Replacing Michael W. Voss, Amoco Chemical Company, of the same council.)

Ronald R. Roat, ICI Americas, Inc. and Chairman, Chemical Industry Council of Delaware. (Replacing Jeffrey H. Sommerman, Allied-Signal, Inc., of the same council.)

Richard Smith, BP Chemicals, Inc. and President, Ohio Chemical Council. (Replacing David Cox, Grace Specialty Chemicals Company, of the same council.)

H. Daniel Wenstrup, CHEMCENTRAL Corporation and Chairman, Chemical Industry Council of Illinois. (Replacing Richard M. Zielinski, Amoco Chemical Company, of the same council.)

Public Outreach Coordinating Group

Barie S. Carmichael, Dow Corning Corporation, to replace Kenneth E. Davis, Rohm and Haas, as Chairman of the Committee.

ACTION REQUIRED

Approval of recommendation.

CMA
EC-1/21/93