



John R Bowman
11/09/2000 05:04 PM

To: Thomas L Sager/AE/DuPont@DuPont, Martha L Rees/AE/DuPont@DuPont
cc: Bernard J Reilly/AE/DuPont@DuPont
Subject: Lubeck-Dawn Jackson note

In view of the interest the letter is getting I think we need to make more of an effort to get the business to look into what we can do to get the Lubeck community a clean source of water or filter the C-8 out of the water. I spent a good bit of time over the past two days talking to an in house lawyer from Exxon and Chris Gibson from Archer and Greiner about their experience in defending MTBE water contamination suits. They both told me that experience has told them it is less expensive and better to remediate or find clean drinking water for the plaintiffs than fight these suits. I think we are more vulnerable than the MTBE defendants because many states have adopted a drinking water guideline for MTBE and it is not biopersistent. My gut tells me the biopersistence issue will kill us because of an overwhelming public attitude that anything biopersistent is harmful.

We are going to spend millions to defend these lawsuits and have the additional threat of punitive damages hanging over our head. Getting out in front and acting responsibly can undercut and reduce the potential for punitives. Bernie and I have been unsuccessful in even engaging the clients in any meaningful discussion of the subject. Our story is not a good one, we continued to increase our emissions into the river in spite of internal commitments to reduce or eliminate the release of this chemical into the community and the environment because of our concern about the biopersistence of this chemical.