

TO: Bruce Trego

TGG: JOL: ERT: MJH: AJO: RF

FROM: T. G. Grumbles

DATE: March 18, 1991

XF: tickle 4/2

Interoffice
Communication

SUBJ: ADDITIONAL REVIEW OF RESPONSIBLE CARE CAER SELF-EVALUATION RESULTS

VISTA

We have compared the 1990 self-evaluation results with this year's results to identify areas where we have improved. In theory we should not regress on any code element. However, the Aberdeen results appear to indicate this has occurred on the elements listed below. Please review these elements to verify this and let me know the cause for this. If it was an inadvertent mistake or actual change in your assessment, I need to communicate this change to CMA. It could affect the overall industry trend analysis, but I also need to assure they understand the reasons.

I realize the scorecard stages changed this year. Please keep in mind that a stage I and stage VI were added this year to allow consistency with other code self-evaluations. Last year's stage I is a stage II this year, last years stage II is a stage III, etc. This may be a reason for one stage regressions.

Please review your self-assessment and let me hear from you by April 1.

Community Awareness		
Code#	1990	1991
5	V	III
6	V	IV
7	V	III
9	V	IV
Emergency Response		
None		



Thomas G. Grumbles

ajo
1001GN/TGG.025

cc R. W. Seymour

Stayed the same

VVV 000006204

TO: George Williams

FROM: T. G. Grumbles

DATE: March 18, 1991

Interoffice
Communication

SUBJ: ADDITIONAL REVIEW OF RESPONSIBLE CARE CAER SELF-EVALUATION RESULTS


VISTA

We have compared the 1990 self-evaluation results with this year's results to identify areas where we have improved. In theory we should not regress on any code element. However, the Blane results appear to indicate this has occurred on the elements listed below. Please review these elements to verify this and let me know the cause for this. If it was an inadvertent mistake or actual change in your assessment, I need to communicate this change to CMA. It could affect the overall industry trend analysis, but I also need to assure they understand the reasons.

I realize the scorecard stages changed this year. Please keep in mind that a stage I and stage VI were added this year to allow consistency with other code self-evaluations. Last year's stage I is a stage II this year, last years stage II is a stage III, etc. This may be a reason for one stage regressions.

Please review your self-assessment and let me hear from you by April 1.

Community Awareness		
Code#	1990	1991
4	III	II
Emergency Response		
None		


Thomas G. Grumbles

ajo
1001GN/TGG.024

VVV 000006205

TO: Matt Tonkovich

FROM: T. G. Grumbles

DATE: March 18, 1991

Interoffice
Communication

SUBJ: ADDITIONAL REVIEW OF RESPONSIBLE CARE CAER SELF-EVALUATION RESULTS


VISTA

We have compared the 1990 self-evaluation results with this year's results to identify areas where we have improved. In theory we should not regress on any code element. However, the Hammond results appear to indicate this has occurred on the elements listed below. Please review these elements to verify this and let me know the cause for this. If it was an inadvertent mistake or actual change in your assessment, I need to communicate this change to CMA. It could affect the overall industry trend analysis, but I also need to assure they understand the reasons.

I realize the scorecard stages changed this year. Please keep in mind that a stage I and stage VI were added this year to allow consistency with other code self-evaluations. Last year's stage I is a stage II this year, last years stage II is a stage III, etc. This may be a reason for one stage regressions.

Please review your self-assessment and let me hear from you by April 1.

Community Awareness		
Code#	1990	1991
2	IV	III
Emergency Response		
6	V	IV


Thomas G. Grumbles

ajo
1001GN/TGG.023

cc J. Pavao

VVV 000006206

TO: Joe Ware

FROM: T. G. Grumbles

DATE: March 18, 1991

Interoffice
Communication

SUBJ: ADDITIONAL REVIEW OF RESPONSIBLE CARE CAER SELF-EVALUATION RESULTS


VISTA

We have compared the 1990 self-evaluation results with this year's results to identify areas where we have improved. In theory we should not regress on any code element. However, the LC LAB results appear to indicate this has occurred on the elements listed below. Please review these elements to verify this and let me know the cause for this. If it was an inadvertent mistake or actual change in your assessment, I need to communicate this change to CMA. It could affect the overall industry trend analysis, but I also need to assure they understand the reasons.

I realize the scorecard stages changed this year. Please keep in mind that a stage I and stage VI were added this year to allow consistency with other code self-evaluations. Last year's stage I is a stage II this year, last years stage II is a stage III, etc. This may be a reason for one stage regressions.

Please review your self-assessment and let me hear from you by April 1.

Community Awareness		
Code#	1990	1991
None		
Emergency Response		
5	IV	III



Thomas G. Grumbles

ajo
1001GN/TGG.022

cc R. Gantz

VVV 000006207

TO: George Shirley

FROM: T. G. Grumbles

DATE: March 18, 1991

Interoffice
Communication

SUBJ: ADDITIONAL REVIEW OF RESPONSIBLE CARE CAER SELF-EVALUATION RESULTS


VISTA

We have compared the 1990 self-evaluation results with this year's results to identify areas where we have improved. In theory we should not regress on any code element. However, the LC VCM results appear to indicate this has occurred on the elements listed below. Please review these elements to verify this and let me know the cause for this. If it was an inadvertent mistake or actual change in your assessment, I need to communicate this change to CMA. It could affect the overall industry trend analysis, but I also need to assure they understand the reasons.

I realize the scorecard stages changed this year. Please keep in mind that a stage I and stage VI were added this year to allow consistency with other code self-evaluations. Last year's stage I is a stage II this year, last years stage II is a stage III, etc. This may be a reason for one stage regressions.

Please review your self-assessment and let me hear from you by April 1.

Community Awareness		
Code#	1990	1991
1	IV	II
3	V	IV
5	V	II
Emergency Response		
2	V	IV
3	V	IV



Thomas G. Grumbles

ajo
1001GN/TGG.021

cc P. Carrico

VVV 000006208

TO: Keith Fogg

FROM: T. G. Grumbles

DATE: March 18, 1991

Interoffice
Communication

SUBJ: ADDITIONAL REVIEW OF RESPONSIBLE CARE CAER SELF-EVALUATION
RESULTS

VISTA

We have compared the 1990 self-evaluation results with this year's results to identify areas where we have improved. In theory we should not regress on any code element. However, the LCCP results appear to indicate this has occurred on the elements listed below. Please review these elements to verify this and let me know the cause for this. If it was an inadvertent mistake or actual change in your assessment, I need to communicate this change to CMA. It could affect the overall industry trend analysis, but I also need to assure they understand the reasons.

I realize the scorecard stages changed this year. Please keep in mind that a stage I and stage VI were added this year to allow consistency with other code self-evaluations. Last year's stage I is a stage II this year, last years stage II is a stage III, etc. This may be a reason for one stage regressions.

Please review your self-assessment and let me hear from you by April 1.

Community Awareness		
Code#	1990	1991
None		
Emergency Response		
		II
5	V	III
7	V	IV



Thomas G. Grumbles

ajo
1001GN/TGG.020

cc J. Friend

VVV 000006209

TO: Paul Warner

FROM: T. G. Grumbles

DATE: March 18, 1991

Interoffice
Communication

SUBJ: ADDITIONAL REVIEW OF RESPONSIBLE CARE CAER SELF-EVALUATION
RESULTS


VISTA

We have compared the 1990 Self-evaluation results with this year's results to identify areas where we have improved. In theory we should not regress on any code element. However, the Baltimore results appear to indicate this has occurred on the elements listed below. Please review these elements to verify this and let me know the cause for this. If it was an inadvertent mistake or actual change in your assessment, I need to communicate this change to CMA. It could affect the overall industry trend analysis, but I also need to assure they understand the reasons.

I realize the scorecard stages changed this year. Please keep in mind that a stage I and stage VI were added this year to allow consistency with other code self-evaluations. Last year's stage I is a stage II this year, last years stage II is a stage III, etc. This may be a reason for one stage regressions.

Please review your self-assessment and let me hear from you by April 1.

Community Awareness		
Code#	1990	1991
1	V	III
4	V	II
Emergency Response		
1	V	IV



Thomas G. Grumbles

ajo
1001GN/TGG.019

cc L. R. Bauer

VVV 000006210