

Exhibit 47



Chevron Chemical Company

San Francisco, CA
March 1, 1976

PPD - CHEVRON MEETINGS
19 FEBRUARY 1976

Loren Stelzer felt Paraquat would be a restricted chemical for air uses only under the new E.P.A. regulations. Concerning the rebuttable presumption status, Paraquat is currently in Category 5 -- those chemicals whose status is undetermined at present. PPD is relying on Chevron to keep them informed on this, and see that neither company is complacent.

Lemac Hopkins reported on the development of the closed system for pouring and mixing Category 1 chemicals. Several systems have been developed which handle all pesticide containers, except one-gallon plastic and glass jugs. PPD requested information so they could obtain one of these systems.

David Whitehead reviewed the performance tests, comparing Glyphosate and Paraquat. In pasture tests, both Paraquat and Glyphosate appear equal at the one-pound rate; in no-til tests, pound for pound, Paraquat is better. PPD data indicates that both products are equal when they are used alone. Their data does differ when both products are combined with residual herbicides. More data should be developed at rates between one-half to one pound per acre to get a truer picture of the relation between the two chemicals.

Dr. Braumholtz requested that both companies put together a technical dossier on Glyphosate. Chevron will make their comparison data available to PPD, along with a summary and interpretation. Lemac Hopkins noted that Paraquat could be blamed for Glyphosate drift problems in the future, so Chevron should be aware of the differences in damage.

Loren Stelzer reviewed the new Glyphosate label. We are doing work to remove our "one-use-per-season" restriction from the Paraquat label in order to remain competitive with Glyphosate. Art Assad reviewed the Glyphosate pricing and marketing plans.

Loren Stelzer and Carl Tanner discussed the Taiwanese Paraquat problems that we could encounter. It was felt that any other company would have a difficult time registering a Paraquat product in the U.S. To help protect our position in the market, these things were suggested:

- * 1. Cancel the dimethyl sulfate registration (Dual Paraquat);
- * 2. Restate the Paraquat tolerances as the dichloride salt; and
- 3. Develop a product profile on the 10 Taiwanese products to determine if different impurities are present. Impurities could change the product toxicity and require toxicology research before the product could be registered in the U.S.
- * Chevron was requested to estimate the cost to do this toxicological work.

Lemac Hopkins summarized the status of Paraquat with the state regulatory people as being stable. A study is going on in California on the effect of Paraquat on mixers, applicators and users.

Art Assad reviewed the 1976-81 Paraquat sales projections. David Whitehead reviewed the on-going research on Paraquat.

Loren Stelzer reviewed the pending E.P.A. Paraquat labels and gave a status report on each.

Ospenson reviewed our work on the solid Paraquat formulation. By June, a decision will be made as to which of our formulations will be developed toward registration if proved necessary.

PPD suggested we work with a 0.01% level of dye, rather than a 0.1% level of dye in order to eliminate the cotton staining we are noticing now. PPD is also working on a non-temperature-dependent thickener and suggests we look into this as well as emetics for inclusion in our liquid formulation.

Ospenson and Arnes discussed the plans to stench Paraquat with 1% Valeric Acid as soon as the Dallas Plant begins supplying us with product.

The Paraquat Review Book will not be published until PPD and Chevron Management have reviewed its contents in light of the potential benefit it would be to anyone seeking a registration of the Taiwanese Paraquat product.

- Dr. Cavelli reviewed our Physician's Guide for Paraquat poisonings and several lawsuits which we have against Paraquat and Diquat. We are being sued, on the grounds of chronic dermal exposure to Paraquat and/or Diquat. One suit claims that Diquat causes aplastic anemia. Dr. Cavelli recommends that the chronic
- * dermal exposure studies be redone in order to determine exactly what effect could be expected from this type of exposure. Our current data is sufficient for label and tolerance, but not sufficient from a legal liability standpoint.
 - * Dr. Fletcher of PPD says we should sit down and discuss this during the next month and set up an in-depth meeting with CTL and PPD to determine exactly
 - * what needs doing. PPD will send Chevron a review of the toxicological information on Paraquat. Hans Franke will review this with Ospenson.

Carbon-14 animal metabolism studies, necessary for the higher tolerances on forage crops, will be completed in June and the final recaps available by August.

- * Hans Franke and Bev Tucker will review our Diquat residue problems and set up a meeting with Marketing to discuss future plans. The Diquat Potato Harvest Aid label cannot be submitted to E.P.A. for another three years due to the additional work needed on the label using the application and tolerances.

PPD suggested that the week of September 6 be set aside for the next meeting date. No final decision was made.

The meeting then adjourned.