

**Confidential**  
**Attorney-Client Privileged**  
**DRAFT 5/6/04**

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: FC Core Team

FROM: Larry Zobel  
Mike Santoro  
John Butenhoff  
Geary Olsen  
Sue Beach

DATE: May \_\_, 2004

RE: Review of FC Manuscripts

---

We currently have in excess of 30 manuscripts we intend to prepare and publish regarding FC toxicology, epidemiology, environmental or risk assessment data. We recognize the value of multi-disciplinary review of these papers, but we also would like to expedite the process of manuscript review given the number of forthcoming papers.

We therefore propose the Core Team adopt a defined procedure for manuscript review and we offer the following suggested process:

Prior to submission to Journal

1. The authors prepare the draft manuscript.
2. The authors send the manuscript to a designated attorney knowledgeable in the issues for review. The attorney will be asked to comment within three weeks. (It has worked well during the last year when the authors have sent draft papers to counsel for review *early* in the process.)
3. *[Note to John Allison: In the particular circumstances of perfluorooctanyl FC issues, can we skip 3M's standard review by an IP lawyer in order to expedite the process?]*
4. The author responds to the legal comments, and then sends the draft paper to the Core Team for review.
5. The Core Team members will respond to the author with their individual comments within three weeks. If any Core Team member wishes, the Core Team as a whole will discuss the draft paper.

**Exhibit**  
**2354**

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

6. The author will respond to Core Team comments, and will provide a copy of the revised paper to Larry Zobel or Mike Santoro, who will ensure the author has addressed all comments and approve the paper for submission.
7. The author submits the paper to the journal.

Following Journal Review

8. Upon receipt of peer review comments, the author will revise the paper as needed.
9. The author will provide the revised paper to either Larry Zobel or Mike Santoro, as appropriate, and the designated attorney.
  - a. The author will address any comments of those persons on the revised draft.
  - b. If the author or any of those individuals believe the changes resulting from peer review are sufficiently substantive or extensive that the Core Team should review the paper again, the author will send the paper to the Core Team members.
    - i. The Core Team members will respond to the author with their individual comments within two weeks. If any Core Team member wishes, the Core Team as a whole will discuss the draft paper.
    - ii. The author will address the Core Team comments, and send the revised version back to either Larry Zobel or Mike Santoro indicating the comments have been addressed.
  - c. If the author, Larry Zobel or Mike Santoro, and the designated attorney are satisfied that the changes are such that additional Core Team review is not needed, then Larry Zobel or Mike Santoro will notify the Core Team that the peer review changes or any remaining issues were not sufficiently significant to require a second Core Team review.
10. The author will submit the revised paper to the journal.