



MARYLEE MAENDLER [USSP01.US277642]@HOSTMAIL on 02/26/1997  
09:25:00 PM

Please respond to MARYLEE MAENDLER [USSP01.US277642] @ HOSTMAIL

To: Robert D. Howell/ET-ET&S/3M/US@3M-CORPORATE  
Geary Olsen/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-CORPORATE  
Dale L. Bacon/ET-ET&S/3M/US@3M-CORPORATE  
Andrew Seacat/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-CORPORATE  
JEFF MANDEL [ALLIN1.US312588]@HOSTMAIL  
John L. Butenhoff/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-CORPORATE  
Paul Lieder/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-CORPORATE  
LAEL PICKETT [USSP01.US216511]@HOSTMAIL  
WILLIAM WEPPNER [USSP01.US230229]@HOSTMAIL  
cc: Jerry F. Colbert/SC-SpecChemD/3M/US@3M-CORPORATE  
Larry R. Zobel/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-CORPORATE  
CHESTER BIERBRAUER [USSP01.US067738]@HOSTMAIL  
THEO LE DUC [DIEVMB.BE100996]@HOSTMAIL  
AL ZEITZ [VM01.US097357]@HOSTMAIL  
JAY IHLENFELD [USSP01.US117456]@HOSTMAIL

Subject: Tox/Env'tl Issues - DuPont Risk Assessment

cc: US117456--USSP01 IHLENFELD, JAY US097357--VM01 ZEITZ, AL  
BE100996--DIEVMB LE DUC THEO US067738--USSP01 CHESTER J. BIERBRA  
US265515--LMUS01 ZOBEL, LARRY R. US025237--LMUS01 COLBERT, JERRY F.

From: FROM: Marylee Maendler -  
SCD - 236-2A-01 - (736-0247)

Summary of Conversations with Greg Chapman (DuPont PKB plant - 304-863-2535)  
and Matt Koenings (Prod. Mgr - DuP Wilmington, DE)

G. Chapman - 2/25/97 meeting at Parkersburg, WV plant

I spoke with CHapman one-on-one following our technical meeting and discussed the Tox/Environmental issues as they relate to DuPont's business needs, the upcoming Tox meeting to discuss the proposed primate study and DuPont soil analysis need.

It was obvious that as of yesterday afternoon, Chapman (who speaks with M. Koenings on a daily basis) thought that the joint meeting requested by 3M to discuss the primate tox study proposed by DuPont was a business meeting. Chapman emphasized that Gerry Kennedy of DuPont had the business responsibility for this project and knows all of the issues surrounding this study.

I emphasized that 3M's purpose for this meeting was for it to be a working technical meeting to discuss the DuPont proposed test design. I summarized the general subject of the questions that Tox/Med put together...i.e. dose levels, end point questions, statistical significance and justified our reason for asking that John Cook of DuPont be present in addition to G. Kennedy. Chapman seemed a bit surprised but SEEMED to understand our position. As of today, 2/26 - Chapman has a list of these detailed questions.

I asked about the timing of this study (i.e. results by Sept. 97) and what was driving it. Chapman said that there was no legislation or OSHA requirement, etc around this date and that it was arbitrary. Apparently Joe Glass felt that the fluoropolymer Business had been "dragging" the APFO issue around and the

**Exhibit  
2697**

State of Minnesota v. 3M Co.,  
Court File No. 27-CV-10-28862

3MA00194581

2697.0001

business finally made a promise to Glass to get some answers by the end of the year.

Answering the APFO human/envt'l fate questions will allow DuPont to set a future path for fluoropolymer emulsifier use requirements...i.e. recycle vs. virgin, APFO vs. alternative and justify or negate the need for these DuPont programs. The statement made by Glass that 'DuPont will not use any APFO by the year 2000' is based on the fact that these fate questions are yet unanswered. If APFO can be defended, this mandate would most likely be revised. If APFO cannot be defended...then DuPont has a huge liability given the size and impact of their fluoropolymer business.

DuPont uses APFO in PTFE, FEP, PFA, ETFE.

2/26/97 - phone conv. w/ M. Koenings (302) 999-4091

Koenings received the questions (Tox/Medical and Prod. Stewardship) and was in the process of distributing to the appropriate technical people. The DuPont tox persons (assume John Cook, Doug Keller, Gerry Kennedy) are in Europe this week so a meeting date cannot yet be confirmed.

Koenings was surprised by the Prod. Stewardship questions and said that this discussion would require another group of people including Prod. Responsibility and an FDA person (2 diff. people). He asked if 3M would agree to 2 meetings Toxicology mtg in Cincinnati ---- Prod. Stewardship mtg future. This is fine unless the broader stewardship questions need to be answered to discuss the primate test protocol. COMMENTS?

I proposed that we agree to an agenda (in writing) after DuPont has a chance to review the 3M questions and determine which people NEED to be at the TOX meeting to discuss the agenda items.

I asked Koenings if DuPont would be sending questions to 3M so that we could be prepared...he said that "a list of questions from DuPont for 3M does not exist".

Koenings also stated that DuPont did NOT need to discuss Environmental issues at this TOX meeting...since 3M agreed to run the DuPont soil samples for analysis of APFO degradation products. IS THIS OK WITH 3M? DO WE NEED TO BE MORE INVOLVED IN THIS SOIL TESTING? ARE THERE IMPLICATIONS (I.E. APFO DOES NOT DEGRADE) THAT WE NEED TO PROACTIVELY ADDRESS INTERNALLY? W/DUPONT? Koenings said that Ron Hemingway, therefore, will not attend this tox mtg.

I will follow up with Koenings on the meeting date and agenda in the next week. Please contact me with any comments, questions, etc.

Best Regards.

Marylee Maendler