DUPONT Responds to Dark Waters Film

• At the New DuPont, we are focused on the future of our company and our continued commitments to our employees, customers and the communities in which we operate.

• While the people, products and businesses featured in the film “Dark Waters” are no longer part of New DuPont, we carry the same company brand and it is important that we speak up and defend that heritage from those that would profit from community concerns.

• “Dark Waters” misrepresents and mischaracterizes executives and employees and actions associated with historic DuPont in decades past.

About Dark Waters

• We are not, and historic DuPont never was, the company portrayed in the film.
• The behavior of fictional employees and related acts of intimidation in the movie are entirely in the realm of make believe.
• We don’t wish to move through a blow-by-blow refutation of all the artistic license taken by the writers and producers, however, there are abundant, intentional factual misrepresentations that should be pointed out.

Health Effects

• The movie alleges various sorts of health effects, most notoriously cancer.
• For years, a wide body of publicly-available science on PFAS developed by industry, independent1 and government2 sources show that low-level contact with PFAS does not cause ill health effects much less have carcinogenic effects.
• In fact, a recent 20143 review evaluated 18 previously conducted epidemiology studies and concluded that there is no evidence that PFOA or PFOS exposure causes cancer in humans.

Birth Defects

• The movie alleges that an individual suffered birth defects due to maternal exposure.
• The facts regarding this individual were reviewed in the underlying litigation by a Board-Certified Doctor in Medical Genetics. The medical expert concluded that the individual was born with Bosma Syndrome, a genetic condition not caused by exposure to PFOA.
• The allegation was based on a single 1981 toxicology study that identified potential exposure-related birth defects in rats.
• The methodology of the study was questioned, and its data could not be replicated. Two follow-up animal studies the following year identified no relation between PFOA exposure and animal birth defects.

Since that time, numerous epidemiologic studies and other scientific data have validated that there is no association between exposure to PFOA and birth defects. In fact, the litigation study\(^4\) done by the “C-8 Science Panel” determined there is no relationship between PFOA and birth defects.

**Impacts on Cattle/Livestock**

- The focal point of the movie is a herd of cattle allegedly injured by exposure to PFOA.
- These complaints were raised to local and federal agencies and U.S. EPA, along with DuPont, conducted an exhaustive study of these animals.
- That 1999 report\(^5\) - authored by leading scientists and veterinarians - concluded that the cows at the Tennant farm died as a result of malnutrition, endophyte toxicity, pinkeye and copper deficiency – not PFOA exposure.
- Additionally, a 2011\(^6\) study confirmed that PFOA does not accumulate in bovine tissue as has been observed in other animals. PFOA exposure is rapidly cleared and does not appreciably concentrate in their tissues. A 2013\(^7\) study also confirmed that PFOA is not accumulated, is rapidly eliminated, and has very low uptake in bovine tissue.

**Depiction of our People, Culture and Core Values**

- Finally, the filmmakers go to great lengths to cast former DuPont executives as Hollywood villains or create totally fictitious characters and try to pass them as real persons. They imply, or outright portray, that DuPont negligently put employees in harm’s way and engaged in outrageous acts of intimidation.
- If the filmmakers had even bothered to film in West Virginia and speak with the people in the community, they would know that their movie is out of sync with reality.
- Any differences our company has ever had with others have always, and only, been handled through respectful engagement or ultimately through the judicial system – not through surveillance, car bombs, or arson as the filmmakers would have people believe.

- Here are the facts:
  - DuPont cares deeply about our employees and the communities in which we operate and has always made their health and well-being our top priority.
  - DuPont has always respected our laws, our judicial and legal system and the rights of people and parties to have their day in court under the law. Any legal differences our company has ever had with others have always, and only, been handled in the judicial system – not on farms or in parking garages, as the filmmakers would have people believe.

# # #

\(^4\) [http://www.c8sciencepanel.org/pdfs/Probable_Link_C8_Birth_Defects_5Dec2011.pdf](http://www.c8sciencepanel.org/pdfs/Probable_Link_C8_Birth_Defects_5Dec2011.pdf)

\(^5\) [https://cdn.toxicdocs.org/3Q/3QLmJm4yR82NZZ2ZnkxG3dBQJ/3QLmJm4yR82NZZ2ZnkxG3dBQJ.pdf](https://cdn.toxicdocs.org/3Q/3QLmJm4yR82NZZ2ZnkxG3dBQJ/3QLmJm4yR82NZZ2ZnkxG3dBQJ.pdf)

\(^6\) [https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/jf2042505](https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/jf2042505)

\(^7\) [https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/jf304680j](https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/jf304680j)