

12/12/96

32 3 2507514  
09:14 PCF EBU - LE DUC, V. AKEN, WOUTERS -> 87331773

NO. 051 001

Theo Le Duc  
Business Manager  
Performance Chemicals  
& Fluids

3M Belgium N.V.  
Chemical Group

Haven 1005  
Canalstraat 11  
B-2070 Zwijndrecht  
Tel. +32 (0) 3 250 75 20  
Fax +32 (0) 3 250 75 14

File: 1225(-1)



### FACSIMILE MESSAGE

12 DEC 96 → Jon G. LANDE 220-10E-10

<b>TO :</b>	→ C.J. Bierbrauer	236 2B 03	Fax No. : +1 612 733 4335
	→ J.L. Butenhoff	220 2E 02	Fax No. : +1 612 733 1773
	→ R.H. Cox	B, Zwijndrecht	
	→ R.G. Perkins	220 2E 02	Fax No. : +1 612 733 1773
	L.J. Pickett	53 5S 02	Fax No. : +1 612 778 45 38
	J. Tribble	B, Europe	Fax No. : +32 2 725 19 79
	W. Weppner	223 6S 04	Fax No. : +1 612 736 75 42
	A.P. Zeitz	223 6S 04	Fax No. : +1 612 736 86 43
	→ D.D. Zimmerman	220 2E 02	Fax No. : +1 612 733 1773

<b>FROM :</b>	Theo LE DUC 3M Belgium NV, Chemical Group	Fax No. : +32 3 250 75 14
---------------	--	------------------------------

**No. of pages :** 3 (including this one)

**DATE :** 12/12/96

**Subject :** Minutes Tel. conversation with Dr R. JUNG

Dr. R. JUNG placed the call to TLD on 10-Dec-96 /a.m.

Dr. R. Jungs co-ordinates are:

Dr Reinhard JUNG  
HOECHST AG  
Pharma Entwicklung - Zentrale Toxikologie  
Mainzer Landstr. 500  
Hattersheim 65795  
GERMANY

Recently there was increased nervousness at Dyneon with respect to the pending reply from 3M on a few outstanding SHER-related topics. Most of these points have been reported in a short PROFS note following R. Perkins' and the undersigned's visit to the Hoechst Hattersheim Center close to Frankfurt, late June '96.

td/ letters/dyneon/1012

**Exhibit  
1466**  
State of Minnesota v. 3M Co.,  
Court File No. 27-CV-10-28862

3M\_MN03591099

### 1. CAS numbers :

This request from Dyneon goes as far back as June this year, when Dyneon was still Hoechst.

That time we were requested by Hoechst to resolve the CAS numbers as mentioned on our MSDS. R. Cox has looked into this, but apparently not to a degree that is satisfactory to Dyneon. This request has been re-activated by Dyneon.

#### The problem :

3M's MSDS contains several CAS numbers for several different products (C7, C8, C9, ...), BUT only one CAS number for the C8 material. This C8 CAS number stands for the linear material. Dyneon is of the opinion that the 3M MSDS is, therefore, inadequate due to the lack of the CAS number for the branched isomer(s) and therefore may possibly violate an EU reporting guideline.

#### Action :

R. Cox to co-ordinate either resulting in a change in our MSDS or an explanation to Dyneon that we are in complete compliance with EU guidelines.

Timing : Bob, please communicate our timing to Dyneon, Dr. R. Sulzbach, copy to Dr. R. Jung and T. Le Duc.

### 2. Cancerogenic Classification :

Dr. R. Jung has studied both the DuPont and 3M studies. These studies report tumors in liver, testicals and pancreas of the test animals at test dosis. Dr. R. Jung clarified that the liver and testical tumors could be explained and could lead to a class 3 classification, but that the pancreas tumor is rare and puts the class 3 classification on questionable grounds. He has difficulty with the present 3M position (see fax R. Cox hereto attached) and would prefer a harmonized Dyneon-3M position with respect to labeling of the C8 salt.

He is of the opinion that 3M should ask a confirmation to the EU of 3M's intention to classify and label the product in the class 3 cancerogenic classification. This action needs to be initiated by 3M via a documented toxicological dossier supporting the class 3 classification. Dr. Jung informed me that in the US, the product is in the A3 category (Am. Conf. of Industr. Hyg.), which would / could be translated to a class 3.

So far a synopsis of a long tel. call with Dr. Jung.

I am out of my depth to express a conviction or a belief on the tox. aspect of this matter. However, we also have to ask ourselves a few questions: Does an R40 label for C8 damage the market place at all ? (We are selling to DuPont's , ICI,...I assume these companies can handle class 3 chemicals, or does this have an effect on some of their PTFE dispersion grades labeling ? Direct food contact applications ?). Does an R40 label raise other questions in the domain of eco toxicity (bioaccumulation, long half lifetime )? If, the answer to these questions is negative, why not just go for an R40 label ?

**3. Blood monitoring :**

The contact for this topic is the responsible for Medical Surveillance and Safety at the Gendorf site is : Dr. Jürgen COMMESSMANN, Werk Artzlicher Dienst  
tel. +49 / 8679 - 7 5808  
fax. +49 / 8679 - 7 5077

Action : As per our PROFS correspondence, W. Weppner to establish contact and agree on protocol.



Theo Le Duc

Note : Request to L. Pickett : pls. circulate / copy to people that need to know. Txs.

Att. : <sup>1</sup> PROFS R. Perkins  
<sup>2</sup> Fax R. Cox