

December 2, 2015

The Honorable Michael Froman  
United States Trade Representative  
600 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20508

Dear Ambassador Froman:

In accordance with Section 5(b)(4) of the Bipartisan Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, and Section 135(e) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, I am pleased to transmit the report of the Industry Trade Advisory Committee on Textiles and Clothing on The Trans-Pacific Partnership Trade Agreement, reflecting majority, minority, and diverse advisory opinions on the proposed Agreement.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jane L. Johnson".

Jane L. Johnson  
Chair  
Industry Trade Advisory Committee  
on Textiles and Clothing

The Trans-Pacific Partnership Trade Agreement

Report of the  
Industry Trade Advisory Committee on Textiles and Clothing

December 2, 2015

December 2, 2015

Industry Trade Advisory Committee on Textiles and Clothing .

Advisory Committee Report to the President, the Congress, and the United States Trade Representative on the Trans-Pacific Partnership Trade Agreement (TPP).

## **I. Purpose of the Committee Report**

In accordance with Section 5(b)(4) of the Bipartisan Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, and Section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, I am pleased to transmit the report of the Industry Trade Advisory Committee on Textiles and Clothing on The Trans-Pacific Partnership Trade Agreement (TPP) reflecting majority, minority, and diverse advisory opinions no later than 30 days after the President notifies Congress of his intent to enter into an agreement.

Under Section 135(e) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the report of the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations and each appropriate policy advisory committee must include an advisory opinion as to whether and to what extent the Agreement promotes the economic interests of the United States and achieves the applicable overall and principal negotiating objectives set forth in the Trade Act.

The report of the appropriate sectoral or functional committee must also include an advisory opinion as to whether the Agreement provides for equity and reciprocity within the sectoral or functional area.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Industry Trade Advisory Committee on Textiles and Clothing hereby submits the following report.

## **II. Executive Summary of Committee Report**

While the Committee is unable to make a consensus statement supporting or opposing the TPP and the extent to which it is in the economic interest of the United States, a majority of members view the Agreement as achieving a balanced outcome. Some members are neutral or concerned with particular provisions and therefore declined to support or oppose a consensus statement as to whether the Agreement provides for equity and reciprocity within the sector. Advisors' comments on specific elements in the TPP are noted more fully in subsequent sections of the report.

Generally, members favor free trade agreements that promote export and import opportunities and contain clear and enforceable rules of origin. Members agree that mechanisms need to be included to provide reasonable flexibility for inputs not made in the TPP region. Strong customs enforcement provisions, intellectual property rights (IPR) protection, and a safeguard provision to prevent import surges that threaten serious damage or actual threat thereof to the domestic industry are critical to a fair and balanced agreement. Members were in agreement on the

importance of Berry Amendment protections in TPP; a key government procurement concept for the U.S. textile, apparel, and footwear industries.

Most members agree that the TPP Agreement creates expanded export opportunities through the elimination of duties in other TPP markets. Some members believe that export opportunities from the U.S. to other TPP countries on certain finished apparel products were not enhanced because of overly restrictive rules of origin.

In terms of process, advisors were split in their opinion regarding the opportunities to provide input during the negotiating period. Some committee members felt they were given more significant opportunities over the negotiating period to provide input than in any previous agreement, while others felt that there were fewer meaningful opportunities. Although stakeholder events were held at the negotiating rounds, these were all non-secured briefings. In negotiations of previous agreements, secured advisor meetings were scheduled at the rounds to provide advisors with updates and to permit an exchange of views about the topics being negotiated. Some members also felt that the loss of a number of advisors due to the lobby ban contributed to this dynamic. Most committee members strongly advised that more access to the actual text and major provisions of the Textile and Apparel Chapter as it was developed would have resulted in more meaningful input from the Committee. Given that the TPP is certainly the most complicated free trade agreement (FTA) ever negotiated by the United States, committee members were also unified in their concern that they were provided such limited access to the completed text of the Agreement before the 30 day review and report period provided for under Trade Promotion Authority.

Advisors' comments on specific elements in the Agreement are noted more fully below.

**Summary Comments by Textile Members:** The majority of textile members felt that it was critical that the TPP include textile and apparel rules of origin similar to those negotiated in previous U.S. FTAs. Failure to do so would have undermined the existing yarn forward structure with countries like Mexico, Canada, Peru, and Chile, where U.S. textile manufacturers have established large export markets. Since these countries are also included in the TPP, weaker origin rules under the TPP could have displaced billions in existing U.S. textile exports to these current FTA partners. Therefore, textile members, and at least one member who produces both apparel and textiles, were highly supportive of the yarn forward rule of origin in the TPP. One member representing several textile companies opposed the yarn forward rule in favor of more flexibility.

Like all previous FTAs, the yarn forward rule was paired with a series of exceptions. These exceptions to the yarn forward rule were generally more limited than in some previous FTAs. This was important due to Vietnam's position as the second largest exporter of textiles and apparel to the U.S., with China supplying the vast majority of yarns and fabrics for Vietnam's current apparel production. The yarn forward rule of origin, and the fact that no generic tariff preference level (TPL) was included in the Agreement, helps ensure that the benefits of the Agreement flow mainly to the signatory parties. Due to Vietnam's strong apparel sector, textile advisors were pleased with longer duty phase-outs on sensitive products in the Western Hemisphere supply chain that support U.S. jobs. Some Members did express concern that the

short supply list includes yarns and fabrics produced in the U.S. and that numerous items scheduled for immediate duty elimination are also produced in the U.S.

The Committee's advisor representing the nonwovens industry commented that this industry segment is generally supportive of the TPP because it provides the opportunity to eliminate duties on nonwoven roll goods (HTS 5603) and other key products from the industry value chain. This is meaningful because of the unilateral elimination of U.S. duties on roll goods during the Uruguay Round of GATT negotiations, which has meant the U.S. maintains zero duties on these items while other trading partners continue to charge tariffs on these goods. FTAs like the TPP, therefore, provide opportunities to level the playing field with more of our trading partners. As with all FTAs, certain segments of this particularly diverse industry may benefit more than others. However, generally speaking, the nonwovens industry tends to be highly flexible and adaptable and feels confident that members will identify opportunities created by the TPP and adjust business models to take maximum advantage of them.

**Summary Comments by Apparel Members:** Apparel members who source goods globally were disappointed that the rule of origin for apparel goods in the TPP is yarn forward. However, one apparel member approves of the yarn forward rule of origin in the Agreement. Members were disappointed that the short supply mechanism resulted in a narrow and limited number of exceptions to the strict yarn forward rule of origin, and they were disappointed that there is no process to make future determinations about short supply. While apparel members were pleased to see that all duties for qualifying apparel would eventually be eliminated, the initial reductions on many apparel items of around 35 percent are the smallest of most FTAs and the phase-out period for some apparel goods is as long as 12 years, which is the longest of any FTA. However, one apparel member favored the duty phase out schedule. Members remain uncertain whether the benefits of sourcing under the TPP in the first 12 years will outweigh the compliance costs. Likewise, restrictive rules of origin will present difficulties for certain segments of the U.S. apparel industry, like legwear, to be exported from the United States under the TPP.

The committee member representing the used clothing industry noted that the yarn forward rule of origin applied to used clothing is disappointing. The yarn forward rule of origin will severely impede the trade of used clothing within the TPP countries.

**Summary Comments by Footwear Members:** The footwear members on ITAC 13 represent a wide variety of interests as they relate to the TPP. By and large, those representing footwear companies are satisfied with the final outcome of the negotiations. While importers, retailers, and brands sought full duty elimination for all footwear and domestic production interests were in favor of more stringent market access provisions, it is the opinion of this Committee that U.S. negotiators provided both immediate and meaningful market access for importers while also granting reasonably sufficient protections for most remaining domestic manufacturing interests. With an annual duty bill approaching \$3 billion (\$450 million of which relates to footwear imports from TPP partner countries), TPP as negotiated could provide significant savings for consumers and for brands, retailers, and their footwear supply chain. TPP will also permit greater market access for domestic footwear in other TPP countries, although one member believes the likelihood of footwear exports from the United States to most TPP countries is low. However,

TPP will result in the elimination of a highly injurious tariff rate quota that Japan has imposed on leather footwear for decades.

Beyond market access, the TPP rule of origin for footwear provides alternative rules depending on the type of non-originating materials or components that are used in manufacturing. For the majority of products that are manufactured exclusively from both originating and non-originating raw materials, TPP provides a simplified and flexible rule. For products that use non-originating footwear parts and components, the rule is significantly more restrictive, as it should be. However, advisors believe that the rule will allow for sufficient flexibility to account for complexities of modern supply chains while helping to ensure that significant manufacturing activity remains in the TPP region. The industry stands ready and willing to formulate sourcing strategies and investments that will allow companies to take advantage of the duty saving opportunities made available through TPP. The industry encourages strong enforcement of the rule of origin provisions of the Agreement

**Summary Comments by the U.S. Travel Goods Industry:** Committee members representing travel goods are divided on TPP. A number of members strongly support the flexible rules of origin and immediate duty free treatment for all travel goods in the Agreement. One member expressed strong opposition to the cut and sew provision and immediate duty free treatment of travel goods. This member strongly believes that these provisions will not only have a drastic negative impact on his company's U.S. and Dominican operations, but also on all producers of textile travel goods in the Western Hemisphere.

### **III. Brief Description of the Mandate of the Industry Trade Advisory Committee on Textiles and Clothing**

The Committee is established by the Secretary of Commerce (the Secretary) and the United States Trade Representative (the USTR) pursuant to the authority of Section 135(c)(2) of the 1974 Trade Act (Public Law 93-618), as delegated by Executive Order 11846 of March 27, 1975. In establishing the Committee, the Secretary and the USTR consulted with interested private organizations and took into account the factors set forth in section 135(c)(2)(B) of the Act.

The Committee currently consists of 24 members from the textiles, clothing, footwear, leather, and travel goods industry sectors. The Committee is balanced in terms of points of view, demographics, geography, and company size. The members represent a full spectrum of textiles, clothing, footwear, leather, and travel goods interests ranging from importers to domestic manufacturers, and many combinations thereof. Collectively, they are involved in all facets of importing, exporting, and/or domestic production and, thus, present many diverse perspectives on this sector. The members, all of whom come from the U.S. private sector, serve in a representative capacity presenting the views and interests of these industry sectors. They are, therefore, not special Government Employees.

In particular, the Committee provides detailed policy and technical advice, information, and recommendations to the Secretary and the USTR regarding trade barriers, negotiation of trade agreements and implementation of existing trade agreements affecting its sectors; and performs

such advisory functions relevant to U.S. trade policy as may be requested by the Secretary and the USTR or their designees.

Section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 requires that the Committee meet at the conclusion of negotiations of major trade agreements and provide the President, the United States Trade Representative, and Congress with a report regarding that agreement.

#### **IV. Negotiating Objectives and Priorities of the Industry Trade Advisory Committee for Textiles and Clothing**

The Committee represents U.S.-based manufacturers and importers of fibers, yarns, textiles, clothing, footwear, leather, and travel goods and their inputs. Some members produce and sell all over the world, while others produce almost entirely in the United States and are focused on the U.S. market, possibly in conjunction with co-production facilities in this hemisphere. Because the members hold widely divergent views on whether rapid opening of markets in the United States and around the world through FTA negotiations serve the best interests of these industries, the Committee has not developed a uniform set of negotiating objectives.

Most of the members agree that there should be greater opening of markets globally. Members have sharply divergent views over how that should be accomplished, whether that involves greater U.S. market access for foreign products, and what role consumer perspectives should play in this debate. There are strong differences over how the current agenda of trade negotiations can best accommodate the industries' needs to prepare for and accommodate new and on-going competitive pressures. Nevertheless, there is broad consensus that U.S. negotiators should continue to strive to level the playing field and achieve reciprocal tariff reductions on the part of negotiating partners. The Committee views the continued existence of non-tariff barriers as a major impediment that denies market access and prevents export opportunities for U.S. products. The Committee also strongly supports the inclusion of strong IPR/anti-piracy enforcement language in trade agreements so that U.S. trading partners will fully enforce their obligations and fully respect U.S. intellectual property rights. Finally, the Committee supports the inclusion of language in FTAs confirming the Berry Amendment protections for military clothing, textiles, and footwear purchased by the U.S. military.

In particular, the Committee urges effective, clear, and transparent customs procedures and anti-circumvention/enforcement requirements so firms doing business under specific trading regimes can do so with predictability and certainty. The Committee also supports consistency among FTAs on the rules of origin, documentation, and other requirements, with some members noting that the current situation involving different rules and requirements for different trade agreements and preference programs is intolerable. However, there is considerable disagreement over which FTAs already negotiated present the best templates for future agreements.

##### **A. Textiles and Apparel**

**Textiles:** The textile industry's primary objectives in trade negotiations include a yarn forward rule of origin with limited exceptions and longer duty phase-outs for sensitive products made in the Western Hemisphere supply chain. Textile members note that the

U.S. textile industry is largely dependent on the coupling of supply chains in countries of close proximity, primarily North, Central, and South America. The U.S. is often not a low cost producer, competing mainly by offering higher quality and more technically advanced inputs and through linkages in the Western Hemisphere to gain the advantage of quick delivery response in a rapidly changing, fashion-driven industry. As a result, many urge that the primary focus of U.S. textile and apparel trade policy be directed toward strengthening the North, Central, and South American industrial platform and ensuring a level playing field with respect to other supplying countries. Textile advisors also noted that, particularly with large multilateral trade agreements, strong and enforceable customs language and a safeguard provision to prevent import surges that threaten serious damage to the domestic industry are critical to protect the economic interests of U.S. manufacturing companies. Textile members agree that priorities in a fair and balanced trade agreement must include provisions to minimize market distorting elements, such as export subsidies, state owned enterprises, currency manipulation, and a lack of basic labor and environmental standards.

**Apparel:** The apparel industry’s primary objectives in trade negotiations include a more flexible rule of origin like a cut, cut and sew, knit to shape, or regional value added origin rule with limited exceptions. The industry also favors immediate duty elimination upon implementation of FTAs with narrow exceptions for sensitive goods actively sourced using existing U.S. inputs under the NAFTA and CAFTA-DR agreements. The apparel industry is frustrated that previous agreements intended to open trade have become a rationale for restricting future trade agreements and flexibilities.

## **B. Footwear**

Import penetration in the U.S. footwear market exceeds 98 percent,<sup>1</sup> with about 66 percent<sup>2</sup> of all U.S. footwear imports coming from China. Vietnam is the second largest footwear exporter to the United States, with a growing market share. Although the non-rubber footwear industry (which represents more than 90 percent of the footwear sold in the United States)<sup>3</sup> has reduced tariff rates in recent FTAs, the rubber footwear industry remains supportive of protections in trade agreements that it hopes will help the remaining small number of U.S. manufacturers of rubber footwear stay competitive in today’s economy.

Footwear members on the Committee advocate an agreement where significant market access can be achieved for the majority of footwear that is imported into the U.S. while maintaining sufficient protection for remaining domestic manufacturing interests. This means that most non-rubber and many rubber/fabric and plastic/protective footwear items can go duty-free immediately under any trade agreement. Furthermore, this footwear should be subject to a simple and reasonable “substantial transformation” rule of origin with simplified local or regional content requirements. It also means that many rubber

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.usitc.gov/research\\_and\\_analysis/trade\\_shifts\\_2014/footwear.htm](http://www.usitc.gov/research_and_analysis/trade_shifts_2014/footwear.htm)

<sup>2</sup> Ibid

<sup>3</sup> <http://otexa.trade.gov/FLT/imports/catV101.htm>



and rubber/fabric and plastic/protective footwear items should continue to have tariffs in any trade agreement.

**C. Travel Goods (i.e., luggage, brief and computer cases, handbags, backpacks, purses, travel and duffle bags, flatgoods, wallets, and other travel goods products)**

Prior to 2008, the U.S. travel goods industry had successfully transitioned from one of domestic manufacturing to one of primarily importing, warehousing, and distribution companies. The Great Recession of 2008-2010 hit the travel-dependent travel goods industry very hard, forcing many firms to downsize or to leave the industry entirely through bankruptcy. The recession, combined with the passage of CAFTA-DR, reinvigorated the U.S. manufacturing of travel goods as many consumers were interested in “made in USA” products again and, generally, in buying goods made outside of China. These new firms have invested heavily in manufacturing and in the training of U.S. workers in a skilled trade that had previously disappeared from the U.S. The remaining firms have survived for a number of reasons. Primarily, U.S. travel goods firms have successfully responded to an increasingly discriminating U.S. consumer by offering a wider variety of high-quality products at lower prices. At the same time, U.S. travel goods firms have dramatically cut costs. This process has left most U.S. travel goods importers believing that removing trade barriers for all travel goods (both textile and non-textile) has become one of the keys to remaining competitive in the global travel goods market, while most domestic and CAFTA-DR manufacturers feel that removing trade barriers from countries like Vietnam with state sponsored economies will have a negative effect on the rebuilding of U.S. manufacturing and likely on U.S. jobs.

Thanks to the legacy of textile quotas, which disappeared over a decade ago, textile and non-textile travel goods are treated differently in U.S. trade policy. This artificial and arbitrary distinction does not reflect the marketplace, which does not differentiate between the two. In fact, most U.S. travel goods firms deal in both types of travel goods.

Travel goods advisors have diverse opinions on whether this distinction should be maintained in U.S. trade policies. Importers believe that having different rules for textile vs. non-textile travel goods is arbitrary, confusing, and burdensome. They believe that all travel goods (both textile and non-textile as described in HTS 4202) should receive immediate, reciprocal duty-free access under a simple and flexible “tariff shift” or “cut and sew/single transformation” rule of origin with no local or U.S. content requirements in all FTAs. U.S. and CAFTA-DR manufacturers view the distinction as meaningful and should be considered on a case-by-case basis for future FTAs. While they supported the cut and sew rule of origin and immediate duty-free access accorded all travel goods (both textile and non-textile) in the CAFTA-DR, they believe these provisions may not be appropriate with respect to other free trade partners, such as Vietnam. These advisors believe that these same rules in other FTAs could negatively impact production in the U.S. and CAFTA-DR region.

## **V. Advisory Committee Opinion on Agreement**

The Committee presented mixed views on many aspects of the Agreement relating to rules of origin, market access, and customs procedures.

### **A. Textiles and Apparel**

Textile members generally believe the TPP will have a significant impact on trade flows due to that fact that Vietnam is a major producer and supplier of apparel items and Japan is a major producer of industrial textiles. Members expect that these strong competitors in many categories will present greater than normal ramifications for U.S. textile producers. The potential for other countries to dock onto this Agreement at a future date will inevitably create additional pressure on the U.S. textile industry as textile and assembled apparel producing countries who have expressed interest in the TPP join the Agreement. Textile members were pleased to have the opportunity to consult during the negotiations to encourage longer duty phase-outs on sensitive items that will help prevent damaging outcomes and avoid the sharp duty reductions that create strong incentives for transshipment fraud. Textile advisors expressed approval of the U.S. duty phase-out schedule for textiles and apparel. Textile advisors stressed the critical importance of the lengthy tariff phase-out period for products deemed sensitive to the textile industry.

Most textile members see export opportunities to TPP partners as limited; however, the yarn forward rule of origin may initially provide U.S. producers the chance to fill needs for compliant yarns and fabrics during the early implementation of the Agreement while other TPP countries build their textile production. Members producing cotton yarns and fabrics express some optimism for export opportunities due to competitive pricing.

Customs fraud, including illegal transshipment, duty evasion, and improper or misleading country-of-origin marking is a risk in this Agreement. Close cooperation with trading partners is needed to help ensure strong enforcement of the trade rules in this sector. Textile members noted that the TPP is the first U.S. trade agreement to include disciplines on the imposition of customs penalties—a problem U.S. exporters encounter in many foreign markets—to ensure that businesses are not unfairly charged inappropriate or excessive penalties. TPP also expands on customs cooperation commitments in previous trade agreements by committing all TPP countries to cooperate on preventing duty evasion, smuggling, and other customs offenses.

While textile members believe the provisions in the TPP on state-owned enterprises (SOEs) were a sincere attempt to limit these entities from engaging in unfair competition, some members fear they do not go far enough, and could be subject to evasion. The definition of SOEs is limited essentially to direct control: 50% of ownership, 50% of voting rights, or ability to elect 50% of the entity's board of directors or similar governing body. The entity could be influenced or affected in any number of other, more indirect ways, resulting in unfair trade advantages. In addition, there is a threshold amount of 200 million Special Drawing Rights in annual revenue for the SOE before the restrictions on anti-competitive behavior kick in. Currently, that amounts to approximately US\$276

million; thus many medium-sized entities would escape scrutiny. And, if the entity had no more than 500 million SDRs in annual revenue in the three years prior to entry into force, the restrictions could not be initiated until five years after entry into force.

Apparel members generally support FTAs. Multilateral FTAs like the TPP are ways to reduce tariff and non-tariff barriers to global trade. Such agreements are particularly beneficial given that the World Trade Organization (WTO) has not been able to reach a tariff reduction agreement on manufactured goods in the DOHA round. The challenge for textiles and apparel in the WTO and in FTAs is that, for political reasons, textiles are covered separately from most other manufactured goods. This approach has led to narrow and arcane rules of origin and classification, high average and peak duties on apparel compared with other manufactured goods, and, in some cases, long duty phase-outs. In fact, duties on apparel imports in 2014 amounted to around 34 percent of all duties collected by CBP,<sup>4</sup> and the average duty rate on an article of apparel is over 13 percent compared with the average rate on all other products, which is around 1.4 percent.<sup>5</sup>

While apparel members are pleased that all duties will eventually be eliminated, and that all duties will see some reduction on the first day the TPP enters into force, the majority were disappointed that the categories containing most of the significant apparel trade will see long duty phase-outs of 10 and 12 years. These apparel members were highly critical that the TPP contained only minimal and complicated flexibilities in a highly restrictive yarn forward rule of origin. They noted that the rule of origin is more restrictive than most other FTAs the United States has negotiated, and that the minimal flexibilities will mean that there is little opportunity for trade under the Agreement, given the lack of textiles currently produced in the TPP region that are traded across the Pacific. Paired with long duty phase-outs, the restrictive rule of origin may consign most trade opportunities to the longer term. While long-term investment and the accession of future countries may remedy this deficiency, the short term opportunities to use the Agreement will be limited. One apparel member was highly supportive of the yarn forward rule of origin and noted his support for the duty phase-out schedule in TPP for apparel goods.

Some members representing the legwear industry were critical of the Agreement's rule of origin since the majority of those producing both domestically and globally had requested a knit to shape rule of origin. They also noted that the short supply list is of little use for the legwear industry since many of the items deemed to be in short supply are not deemed in short supply with respect to socks and hosiery. However, one member representing a small number of domestic sock and legwear manufacturers as well as members of the U.S. fiber and yarn sectors opposed the knit to shape proposal.

Apparel members expressed support for customs facilitation and IPR protection improvements in the TPP.

---

<sup>4</sup> USITC Dataweb

<sup>5</sup> USITC Dataweb

## **B. Footwear**

The U.S. non-rubber footwear industry supports the TPP because the Agreement generally reflects the internal agreement reached by the industry. The rubber footwear and plastic footwear industry that manufactures footwear in the United States is neutral on the TPP. It appreciates the consideration given to its positions in the negotiation of the Agreement, but remains concerned about the rapid reduction of some tariffs, and the phasing out of all tariffs over time. TPP contains flexible substantial transformation rules of origin and immediate duty-free entry for the majority of footwear products imported into the U.S. (HTS Chapter 64). At the same time, the TPP achieves a balance by providing some protection to the U.S. domestic industry and also creates export market opportunities for U.S. based manufacturers. In particular, members were very happy with the elimination of Japan's tariff rate quota (TRQ) on leather footwear, which will provide greater market access to the Japanese market for U.S.-made and U.S.-branded footwear.

## **C. Travel Goods**

Travel goods industry members (both those who import and those who do some manufacturing in the U.S.) appreciate that the TPP reflects this sector's clear desire to have all travel goods (both textile and non-textile) become duty-free immediately (and eventually for Japan and Mexico) under simple and flexible rules of origin similar to what the U.S. government successfully negotiated in CAFTA-DR and KORUS. Industry members who manufacture in the USA or in CAFTA-DR countries feel that having all travel goods become duty free immediately from Vietnam is likely to have a negative effect on the redevelopment of the domestic industry and thus have a negative effect on U.S. jobs.

## **VI. Membership of the Committee**

The members of the Industry Trade Advisory Committee on Textiles and Clothing are:

**Chairman:** Jane L Johnson, Unifi, Inc.

**Vice Chair:** Mark S. Jaeger, Esq., Jockey International, Inc.

Sara O. Beatty, National Council of Textile Organizations (NCTO)

Ned G. Cochrane, Mount Vernon Mills, Inc.

Shawn J. Dougherty, Dillon Yarn Corporation

Dean Draughn, Under Armour, Inc.

Katherine M. Dutilh, Milliken & Company

Marc L. Fleischaker, Esq., Rubber and Plastic Footwear Manufacturers Association

Jessica E. Franken, INDA, Association of the Nonwoven Fabrics Industry

Nathanael "Nate" E. Herman, Travel Goods Association

Maristella Iacobello, PVH Corp

H. Clayton Jenkins, Caleres

Michael D. Korchmar, The Leather Specialty Company

Stephen E. Lamar, American Apparel & Footwear Association (AAFA)  
Matthew B. LeBretton, Esq., New Balance Athletic Shoe, Inc.  
Kathie M. Leonard, Auburn Manufacturing, Inc.  
Stephen M. Mostofsky, TTI Global Resources, Inc.  
Daniel E. Nation, Parkdale International Parkdale Mills, Inc.  
Paul T. O'Day, American Fiber Manufacturers Association, Inc.  
R. Matthew Priest, Footwear Distributors and Retailers of America  
Charles L. Sanders, Union Underwear Company, Inc. (Fruit of the Loom)  
Timothy C. Voit, Thomaston Mills  
Eric F. Warshaw, Secondary Materials and Recycled Textiles Association (SMART)  
Jeffrey B. Whalen, Esq., NIKE, Inc.