

Michael A.
Santoro/US-Corporate/3M/US

01/22/2007 01:23 PM

To Philippe Hoff/BE-Europe/3M/US@3M-Corporate

cc Dale L. Bacon/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
John L. Butenhoff/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate

bcc

Subject Re: Fw: Considerations for conducting a PFOA avian repro study

Philippe, overall I am fine with the arguments you have raised. The only one that I question is the one in your earlier note: "possibility of finding repro effects when conducting such a study." Is this what you mean, or is it that any reproductive effects would be a result of captivity, that is not related to the compound. I think this phrase needs to be reworded to capture the point.

We can discuss briefly later this morning during our conference call.

Thanks,
Mike

Michael A. Santoro
Director, Environmental, Health,
Safety and Regulatory Affairs
3M Enterprise Services
Bldg. 236-1B-10
Tel: 651-733-6374
Fax: 651-733-1958

Notice: This e-mail, including any attached files, contains information that may be confidential. It is intended to be a private communication only for the recipient(s) named above. If you are not an intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete or destroy this e-mail and all copies of it, including any attachments. The unauthorized receipt, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this e-mail or any part of it, is not permitted and may be unlawful.

Philippe Hoff/BE-Europe/3M/US

Philippe
Hoff/BE-Europe/3M/US

01/15/2007 03:40 AM

To Michael A. Santoro/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
Dale L. Bacon/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate
John L. Butenhoff/US-Corporate/3M/US@3M-Corporate

cc

Subject Fw: Considerations for conducting a PFOA avian repro study

Mike, Dale, John,

Thank you for your input on the PlasticsEurope group suggestions to conduct a PFOA bird reproduction study. May I ask you for your final OK on the argumentation below so that I can share these arguments in writing with the PlasticsEurope group. Based on our conf call of 12 Jan, I noted as arguments in addition to the ones mentioned in my note below, that:

- it would make more sense to complete the PFOA data package on acute toxicity data first before embarking on such a repro study.
- there are ethical concerns linked to testing on vertebrates.

**Exhibit
2727**

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

3M_MN03436924

2727.0001

I will add these additional arguments to the ones I have shared with you in my note below.

Best regards,

Philippe HOFF
3M Europe&MEA EHS&R Specialist
Hermeslaan 7
B-1831 Diegem
Belgium
Tel: +32 272 248 70
Triminet: 832 248 70
Mobile: +32 478 881 832
Fax: +32 272 245 14
E-mail: phoff@mmm.com

----- Forwarded by Philippe Hoff/BE-Europe/3M/US on 15/01/2007 10:34 -----

Philippe
Hoff/BE-Europe/3M/US
23/11/2006 10:35

To Michael A. Santoro/US-Corporate/3M/US
Dietrich Sinnaeve/BE-Europe/3M/US
John L. Butenhoff/US-Corporate/3M/US
Dale L. Bacon/US-Corporate/3M/US

cc

Subject Considerations for conducting a PFOA avian repro study

The attached draft document contains pro/con arguments for conducting a PFOA avian reproduction study. The intent is to distribute this document among the PlasticsEurope APFO ad hoc tox group members so that a group decision can be made on whether to conduct such a study or not. I have discussed this to some extent with John and Dale. I felt that it was better not to present the considerations to the group as pro/cons. I also believe that some additional arguments could be added but these should probably not be in such a written document. I am thinking in particular about the following:

- high cost of bird repro study
- possibility of finding repro effects when conducting such a study
- unfavourable political climate around perfluorochemicals in general so that the impact of a bird repro study with favourable outcome won't probably have a big impact
- political pressure on PFOA will most probably lead to PFOA as a "substance of equivalent concern" for authorisation under REACH, irrespective of the availability of a PFOA bird repro study with a favourable outcome. Now that it seems that only the "PT" part of "PBT" will be considered to be met by PFOA the pressure to have PFOA as a "substance of equivalent concern" is even higher.
- no particular concern of authorities about bird APFO repro effects
- bird repro studies are not by default required under existing chemical legislation applicable to PFOA and won't by default be required under REACH.

Comments are welcome.

[attachment "considerations on conducting a PFOA avian repro study.doc" deleted by Michael A. Santoro/US-Corporate/3M/US]

Best regards,

Philippe HOFF
3M Europe&MEA EHS&R Specialist

3M_MN03436925

2727.0002

Hermeslaan 7
B-1831 Diegem
Belgium
Tel: +32 272 248 70
Triminet: 832 248 70
Mobile: +32 478 881 832
Fax: +32 272 245 14
E-mail: phoff@mmm.com