From: Dawn D Jackson on 06/23/99 07:55 AM

To: Robert L Ritchey/CL/DuPont@DuPont, Anthony J Playtis/CL/DuPont@DuPont, Roger J Zipfel/AE/DuPont@DuPont

cc:

Subject: Outline of communications with GE Plastics regarding C-8

Gentlemen,

I have attached a draft of an outline of points to be made in communications with GE Plastics. If there are omissions or errors, please let me know. I will attempt to send you a revision before I leave today at 4:30. I will be out of town until Monday.

Dawn

GE Communication

6/22/99
Bob Ritchey, Tony Playtis, Roger Zipfel, Dawn Jackson
Planning for Communications with GE Plastics regarding C-8

Scenario 1: Results of early June testing of GE drinking well show <3 ppb

Recommended communication: John Little calls Dallas Silverthorne to report test results and speak from talking points such as those below; John also offers to send MSDS on C-8 and Community Exposure Guideline (CEG) information.

Outline of talking points (in brief form; to be developed further):

- Why ? – Why we did the sampling (RFI; C-8 in groundwater; need to know if it crosses site boundary; model says no; WW wanted to sample to be sure.)
- What ? – What is C-8? (Explain what it is: detergent-like material; surfactant; used in manufacture of Teflon® fluoropolymer resins)
- Where? – Where is it coming from? (old supernate ponds – anaerobic digestion ponds constructed in mid-1950's (one) and mid-1970's (two); decommissioned in 1988.)
- Re: concentration – represents dose lower than TLV would allow; it's ___% of the TLV; below the CEG.
- Toxicity piece: Refer to MSDS; offer to provide copy of MSDS; at these levels, no acute health effects ever observed; however, it does persist in the bloodstream; in animal testing at high doses, liver is the target organ.
- Path forward: Emphasize that concentration in GE well is comparable to concentration in WW drinking water; WW will continue to monitor; if there is an increase at WW, we will contact GE; Site EA will prepare standby statement and Qs/As, in the event of media inquiries.

Scenario 2: Test results – 3-25 ppb

Recommended communication: John Little calls Dallas Silverthorne to request a meeting (1/2-day?) with Silverthorne and his Playtis, Ritchey counterparts; to attend from WW – Little, Ritchey, Playtis, Zipfel.

Outline of talking points (to be more detailed than for first scenario):

- Why? – Same info as above, + some detail about its being the only chemical in the RFI above EPA screening levels; assurance that WW will work with EPA to define levels acceptable to EPA and methods/controls to reach those levels.
- What? – Same info as above + a review of the C-8 molecule itself; possible other applications outside DuPont
- Where? – Same info as above + hydrogeology, including river recharge, plume in groundwater

- Re: concentration: Provide MSDS; discuss toxicologic information in detail, such as major exposure routes (inhalation, skin absorption) vs. ingestion; discuss CEG and intent to reduce or eliminate human health exposure route.
- Toxicity piece: Talk through elements of MSDS, vs. just providing a copy; provide occupational health background – animal studies details, human health-related information, U. of Minnesota paper (flawed study); review what we've done with our own employees since 1981, including employee communications; share Pace Team strategies?
- Path forward: DuPont will take necessary action to protect human health and meet regulatory requirements; Site EA will prepare standby statement and Qs/As, in the event of media inquiries.

Anticipated Qs from GE:

1. What kind of engineering controls are effective to handle elevated levels of C-8?
2. What exposure routes are there besides drinking water?
3. Do the levels in GE drinking water indicate a probability of measurable levels in employees' blood?
4. ...

RJZ015504