

Georjean L. Adams
03/29/99 04:22 PM

Corporate Product Responsibility
290-04-01
Tel: 737-4795
Fax: 736-9278

To: David A. Sonstegard/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
cc:
Subject: Re: 8e Follow up - Fish

03 166319

What I sent to the 8e committee on Friday 1:30pm and Tom's reply:

To: Dale L. Bacon/ET-ET&S/3M/US@3M-Corporate
Thomas J. DiPasquale/LA-Legal/3M/US@3M-Corporate
Bill Weppner/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
John P. Pasinski/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
John L. Butenhoff/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
Richard E. Purdy/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
Jeffrey H. Mandel/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate


cc:
Subject: 8e Follow up - Fish

ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGED

03 166320

It has been more than 3 months since we reviewed Rich's hypothesis on food chain contamination. At that time we decided there was insufficient data to support a submission. What is the status of obtaining data to either support or refute the need to report?

Forwarded by Georjean L. Adams/US-Corporate/3M/US on 03/29/99 04:12 PM -----



Thomas J. DiPasquale
03/26/99 03:21 PM

Office of General Counsel

This communication contains confidential information intended only for the addressee(s) named below and may contain information that is legally privileged.
Building 220-12E-02, 3M Center, St. Paul, MN 55144 USA
Tel: (651) 733-1891
Fax: (651) 736-9469

To: Georjean L. Adams/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
cc: Dale L. Bacon/ET-ET&S/3M/US@3M-Corporate
Bill Weppner/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
John P. Pasinski/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
John L. Butenhoff/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
Richard E. Purdy/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
Jeffrey H. Mandel/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
Subject: Re: 8e Follow up - Fish

Georjean, I'm not sure there is a need to support or refute the hypothesis within any particular time frame. If I recall correctly, the work was itself not part of our formal plan for assessment of environmental

03 166321

**Exhibit
1003**

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

3MA01373218

exposure. There are many other theories circulating within the company about paths of exposure, but we cannot undertake extensive efforts to confirm or refute them in each instance. As we discussed earlier this week, a comprehensive exposure assessment plan, with timetables, milestones, objectives, etc. should be our guiding document. This will be needed both for the EPA and for our own purposes. If in the judgment of those who are managing the environmental exposure project the Purdy hypothesis deserves consideration, then it should be incorporated into the comprehensive plan, assigned a priority, and given the necessary resource allocation. I don't see it as standing alone or separate from the broader plan.

Tom

Rich's response to Tom:

Plan! That is the same stalling technique you have been using for the last year. There is a high probability that PFOS is killing marine mammals and you want another plan when we could have had data to support the risk assessment long ago. You were given a plan in 1983. Again in the early 90s. And you authorized no testing.

As I recall we obtained data that eaglets contain PFOS in their plasma last April. Then you as part of an upper management team dispersed the team that initiated the collecting of that data as part of their plan. And then you said we had to put together a plan under the Battelle umbrella. As of now we still have not gotten any data because of that tactic. Battelle is an albatross around our necks and so are you.

Preliminary data indicates that adult eagles have 50 times as much in their plasma than those eaglets. We could have gotten that data and more last summer if we were not stuck planning with Battelle. Don't you realize we have a plan. You continually ignore our plans and start new plans that slows the collection of data essential for our risk assessments. You slow our progress in understanding the extent of PFOS pollution and damage. For 20 years the division has been stalling the collection of data needed for evaluating the environmental impact of fluorochemicals.

PFOS is the most onerous pollutant since PCB and you want to avoid collecting data that indicates that it is probably worse. I am outrage.

03 166322