

Chron

November 24, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kay Packett

FROM: Susan Stuntz *MS*

RE: Comments on OA&R/S&A Memo on OSHA RFI

See some suggested edits on the attached November 22 memo from the 1901 L Street agencies regarding the OSHA RFI. Frankly, a lot of what's being done -- particularly the scope of the activity -- is still unclear enough so as to make me question how the agencies can estimate such a large volume of work to emanate from this project.

At our meeting on Thursday, I thought we had winnowed the activity down to a manageable level. I thought also that some of the activity -- particularly the assignments to work with key unions to encourage scientific submissions -- was going to be assigned to Forscey and/or Rich Gross. If this is the case, then the following assignments still rest with OA&R:

1. NEMI and HBI building studies. There are about a dozen. We already did the summary for them. All that's needed is a cover letter.
2. Other building and IAQ studies. In some states and among NEMI consultants there may be additional building studies. Until we know what's out there, we don't know how many more we're talking about.
3. Anecdotal comments. See item #2 for the scope of this section.
4. Collective bargaining submissions. We agreed to hold off on this one.

The work with the state consultants is a project that is being handled by Savarese & Associates. And we agreed Thursday that the AFGE activity is on hold pending a meeting between Schlein and Forscey/Savarese. After that meeting, I would suspect that Forscey would acquire the lion's share of responsibility for making sure that an AFGE statement follows ... in conjunction with Miriam Szapiro.

=====**CONFIDENTIAL**=====

THIS DOCUMENT IS SUBJECT TO A COURT ORDER AND THIS DOCUMENT AND ITS CONTENTS SHALL NOT BE USED, SHOWN OR DISTRIBUTED EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN THE COURT'S ORDER

TI DN 0024069

Chron

November 24, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: Kay Packett

FROM: Susan Stuntz *MS*

RE: Comments on OA&R/S&A Memo on OSHA RFI

See some suggested edits on the attached November 22 memo from the 1901 L Street agencies regarding the OSHA RFI. Frankly, a lot of what's being done -- particularly the scope of the activity -- is still unclear enough so as to make me question how the agencies can estimate such a large volume of work to emanate from this project.

At our meeting on Thursday, I thought we had winnowed the activity down to a manageable level. I thought also that some of the activity -- particularly the assignments to work with key unions to encourage scientific submissions -- was going to be assigned to Forscey and/or Rich Gross. If this is the case, then the following assignments still rest with OA&R:

1. NEMI and HBI building studies. There are about a dozen. We already did the summary for them. All that's needed is a cover letter.
2. Other building and IAQ studies. In some states and among NEMI consultants there may be additional building studies. Until we know what's out there, we don't know how many more we're talking about.
3. Anecdotal comments. See item #2 for the scope of this section.
4. Collective bargaining submissions. We agreed to hold off on this one.

The work with the state consultants is a project that is being handled by Savarese & Associates. And we agreed Thursday that the AFGE activity is on hold pending a meeting between Schlein and Forscey/Savarese. After that meeting, I would suspect that Forscey would acquire the lion's share of responsibility for making sure that an AFGE statement follows ... in conjunction with Miriam Szapiro.

=====**CONFIDENTIAL**=====

THIS DOCUMENT IS SUBJECT TO A COURT ORDER AND THIS DOCUMENT AND ITS CONTENTS SHALL NOT BE USED, SHOWN OR DISTRIBUTED EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN THE COURT'S ORDER

TI DN 0024069

Budgets:

OA&R:

I think the \$30,000-\$40,000 per month for OA&R staffers is high, given that many of the assignments contemplated have been reduced or shifted elsewhere.

In addition to the \$15,000 that OA&R receives per month for work with NEMI and AFGE (if that's all the public smoking portion of the retainer is devoted to, then I question how the agency can consistently report activity worked far above the retainer), the agency also receives \$15,000 per month for work for the Labor Management Committee. How much activity other than OSHA is contemplated in this area for November-January, and can a portion of that also be used against this activity?

Finally, I am concerned about the agency's ability to handle the writing assignments that it is taking on, given recent problems with its written work product. We should not have to pay for third and even fourth drafts of products that should be accomplished in one. More than a month ago the agency committed to the establishment of a writing task force to review material that is sent over here is acceptable quality; we were promised that the individuals assigned to that task force would be introduced to us. That has not occurred.

I think with all of these issues taken into consideration, OA&R can reduce its monthly outside-scope activity to \$5,000 per month for this project.

Savarese & Associates

I would recommend that Stan Gordon and John Brown ... as well as Harry Kaiser ... continue their normal level of activity, and simply shift focus to place additional emphasis on OSHA. That would mean the same 20 hours per month for Gordon and Brown.

Once their hours are reduced to normal levels, then the Savarese & Associates billings are down. I have no problem with an additional \$5,000 per month for Savarese & Associates, given that that firm is coordinating all of the work of the state labor consultants as well as the AFGE activity.

Attachment

cc: Martin Gleason

=====**CONFIDENTIAL**=====

THIS DOCUMENT IS SUBJECT TO A COURT ORDER AND THIS DOCUMENT AND ITS CONTENTS SHALL NOT BE USED, SHOWN OR DISTRIBUTED EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN THE COURT'S ORDER

TI DN 0024070

Budgets:

OA&R:

I think the \$30,000-\$40,000 per month for OA&R staffers is high, given that many of the assignments contemplated have been reduced or shifted elsewhere.

In addition to the \$15,000 that OA&R receives per month for work with NEMI and AFGE (if that's all the public smoking portion of the retainer is devoted to, then I question how the agency can consistently report activity worked far above the retainer), the agency also receives \$15,000 per month for work for the Labor Management Committee. How much activity other than OSHA is contemplated in this area for November-January, and can a portion of that also be used against this activity?

Finally, I am concerned about the agency's ability to handle the writing assignments that it is taking on, given recent problems with its written work product. We should not have to pay for third and even fourth drafts of products that should be accomplished in one. More than a month ago the agency committed to the establishment of a writing task force to review material that is sent over here is acceptable quality; we were promised that the individuals assigned to that task force would be introduced to us. That has not occurred.

I think with all of these issues taken into consideration, OA&R can reduce its monthly outside-scope activity to \$5,000 per month for this project.

Savarese & Associates

I would recommend that Stan Gordon and John Brown ... as well as Harry Kaiser ... continue their normal level of activity, and simply shift focus to place additional emphasis on OSHA. That would mean the same 20 hours per month for Gordon and Brown.

Once their hours are reduced to normal levels, then the Savarese & Associates billings are down. I have no problem with an additional \$5,000 per month for Savarese & Associates, given that that firm is coordinating all of the work of the state labor consultants as well as the AFGE activity.

Attachment

cc: Martin Gleason

=====**CONFIDENTIAL**=====

THIS DOCUMENT IS SUBJECT TO A COURT ORDER AND THIS DOCUMENT AND ITS CONTENTS SHALL NOT BE USED, SHOWN OR DISTRIBUTED EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN THE COURT'S ORDER

TI DN 0024070