

CMA GRASSROOTS PROGRAM - 1984

The CMA Grassroots Program has made tremendous progress over the last twelve months.

Last fall, more than half of the CMA member companies declared their interest in participating in a coordinated industry-wide grassroots effort. 88 companies designated grassroots managers within their company to spearhead their individual efforts. Most of those managers responded to a questionnaire that identified the strength of the chemical industry presence in a variety of key congressional districts.

Computer

During the first quarter of 1984, CMA acquired computer capability which can identify member company facilities in every congressional district - from American Cyanamid in Bound Brook, N.J. to the Exxon station in Arkadelphia, AK.

Personnel

Ron Smith joined the CMA government relations staff to lead the grassroots effort within CMA. Six months later, the communications department brought in Erin Donovan to provide communications assistance to the CMA grassroots program.

Superfund

Beginning in January, 1984 the CMA Grassroots Program concentrated exclusively on two aspects of the Superfund issue: Size of Fund and Broaden the Tax Base through the waste end tax concept. The grassroots effort on the Superfund issue took on three different aspects.

I. CLR - Congressional Liaison Representative

A congressional liaison representative is a CMA member company employee that has volunteered to act as the leader or coordinator of the industry's grassroots efforts focused on the key lawmaker from the employee's home congressional district.

With the help of the member companies grassroots managers, we identified CLR's in 52 key congressional districts:

29 Energy and Commerce Committee  
12 Public Works and Transportation Committee  
11 Ways and Means Committee

CLR Objective:

To organize a diverse group of business and community leaders from within the local congressional district - to cause this group to communicate our position on Superfund to their Congressman. Because of the Congressman's committee assignment, these selected lawmakers had the best opportunity to affect the content of the new Superfund law.

During January, 5 CLR seminars were held on a regional basis. The seminar objective was to help CLR's understand their role in the CMA grassroots program and to increase their effectiveness in this role.

An intense organizing effort took place in twenty (20) congressional districts, concentrated on Democrat members of the Energy and Commerce Committee. The objective of this organizing effort was to bring together a diverse group of business and community leaders so that they could understand the local impact of the Superfund proposals and to cause them to seek a face to face meeting, as a group, with their key Congressman.

Chemical industry employees met this new challenge well. Ferris Brown of Texas Eastman, Hank Bentancourt and Billye-Lynn Ratliff of Shell, were particularly outstanding in this effort. Outstanding support from the Washington offices of FMC, Eastman, Monsanto and W.R. Grace was critical to this CLR effort.

CLR Results:

Face to face meetings between Congressmen and their CLR organized constituents took place in 10 different districts (7 Democrats - 3 Republicans; 7 Energy and Commerce; 2 Public Works; 1 Ways and Means). These meetings were particularly instrumental in favorably changing the Florio-Superfund proposal. Congressmen Tauzin and Hall were especially helpful.

CMA 065173

## II. SUPERFUND - INDUSTRY-WIDE LETTER WRITING

### Phase two of the CMA-Superfund-Grassroots Effort

#### A. What was Done?

- 1) Asked all 88 grassroots managers to activate a letter writing campaign on Superfund - size of fund and broaden the tax base.

Letters from constituents living in districts of Ways and Means Committee members.

#### B. RESULTS:

- 1) 10 major companies responded to this call.
- 2) A questionnaire has been sent to the 88 grassroots managers to determine:
  - how many responded to this call.
  - the number of people solicited for letter writing.
- 3) Several Ways and Means members commented on mail volume from the chemical industry, especially Henson Moore (R-LA).

#### C. Critique

- 1) Suspect weak response overall to CMA's call.
- 2) Message on broadened tax base was too detailed and too limiting. We talked specifics instead of concept. Specifics are for the DC lobbying effort - concepts can be supported at the grassroots.

III. SUPERFUND - CEEAN - CITIZENS FOR EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION NOW  
Phase III of the CMA - Superfund-Grassroots Effort

A. What was done?

- Solicited individuals living in Ways and Means Committee member districts to sign a mailgram stating their opposition to over-taxation of businesses for Superfund - size of fund.

II. CEEAN Results and Cost

- a) Solicitations: 25,000 telephone calls  
42,000 direct mail
- b) Supporters: 7,167

| <u>DEMOCRAT MEMBERS</u> | <u>PHONE OUTREACH</u> | <u>BRC's AND 800 NUMBER</u> | <u>TOTAL SUPPORTERS</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Gibbons (FL)            | 1,251                 | 153                         | 1,404                   |
| Pickle (TX)             | 1,189                 | 263                         | 1,452                   |
| Anthony (AK)            | 600                   | 224                         | 824                     |
| Jacobs (IN)             | 600                   | 289                         | 889                     |
| Pease (OH)              | 600                   | 193                         | 793                     |
| Jones (OK)              | 600                   | 308                         | 908                     |
| Gephardt (MO)           | 600                   | 297                         | 897                     |
| <br>                    | <br>                  | <br>                        | <br>                    |
| TOTAL ALL MEMBERS       | <u>5,440</u>          | <u>1,727</u>                | <u>7,167</u>            |

c) COST: \$156,673

d) LEGISLATIVE IMPACT: Raised awareness of the Superfund issue especially amongst Ways & Means member's staff.

All members attended the committee hearing and expressed grave concern for Size of Fund.

Observations:

What Have We Learned?

- 1) It takes a long time to develop our issue position in grassroots terms and to organize the constituents. However, it can be done.
- 2) We can frame the debate on our issue on our terms and put our opponents on a defense.
- 3) Position Statement:
  - Grassroots efforts forces our lobbying message to become well focused - simple: e.g. size of fund/broaden tax base.
  - We need to use audio visual techniques to help communicate our message.
  - We have difficulty understanding and describing how our position relates to other businesses or other voter groups outside the chemical industry.
  - We must improve our ability to answer the following questions on any grassroots issue:
    - 1) Who else cares about this issue?
    - 2) Why does/should each group care?
    - 3) How does the issue affect an individual member of each group.
- 4) CLR Phase on Grassroots
  - Very positive reaction and involvement of industry employee's at the local level. They helped tune/focus our position statement and localize our message.
  - A continuing personal relationship with each Congressman has resulted.
  - Lots of management support and care of CLR's is required.

5) Responsiveness to Congressional Advocates

Grassroots delivered 3 Congressmen who were ready to take action during committee writing of legislation.

Water - Moody

Superfund - Hall, Tauzin

In each case, the Washington Industry lobby was unable to respond quickly to their offer to help and the question - "What do you want me to do?" We must be prepared to provide the Congressman with a simple action plan and legislative language.

6) CEEAN

- Very effective
- Cost efficient
- Time efficient
- Telephone solicitation has a 20% yield
- We can utilize our district support on the issue several times:
  - a) Mailgrams to member advocating our position
  - b) District meetings between member and his constituents
  - c) Testimony before committee by local constituents
  - d) Reminder mailgrams during committee votes.
- Committee and subcommittee chairman districts should be included.

In 3 instances, the Washington based lobby was our only effort on these 3 districts and it was not successful.

In 3 instances, the chairman blocked our advocates from taking action on our behalf.

CMA 065177

1985 CMA Grassroots Outlook

I. Primary Objective:

Improve integration of grassroots activity into the CMA issue management and lobbying effort.

Recommendation: 1.

The Grassroots Task Group 1984-85 Objective: Apply the CMA grassroots system to the 1 or 2 most important chemical industry issues.

Recommendation: 2.

Change the grassroots task group make-up to include:

- 2 Washington representatives who's effort is devoted to CMA's most important issues.
- 2 Non-Washington representatives
- 1 Chairman - A Doer & Leader - GRC member
- 3 CMA staffers - Communication - Donovan  
State Affairs - Buckley  
Federal Affairs - Issue Manager

Recommendation: 3. CLR Program Changes

- Expand the CLR system depending upon:
  - a) Government Relations Committee identification of 3 most important issues
  - b) Key House Committees for the 3 issues
  - c) November election & Committee membership changes.
- Utilize CMA computer to identify new CLR prospects as necessary.

Recommendation: 4. Improve Communications

A. Communications Department

- Retain Communications Department dedication of Erin Donovan to grassroots activity support
- Maintain excellent coordination thru participation in grassroots Task Group and Issue Management Committees.

B. CLR's & Grassroots Managers

- Professional newsletter highlighting individual efforts and legislative status of the issue.

C. Washington Representatives

- Task Force Participation
- Issue Management Committee
- February Conference

D. Chemical Industry Councils

- Include in communications link on the issue

Recommendation 5.

Hold a Legislative Conference "Grassroots and the 99th Congress"

Objective: Review the chemical industry's 3 most important federal legislative objectives for 1985 and 1986

Who: CLR's - Congressional Liaison Representatives  
old and new for 1985-86

Company Grassroots Managers

Washington Representatives

Where: Washington, D.C.

When: February 7 & 8, 1985

CMA  
BD-9/18/84  
EC-9/17/84

CMA 065179