PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

UC-5222

CAUSE NO. 01–1761-I

LARRY COFFMAN, ET AL	§	**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF**
	§	
VS.	§	**DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS**
	§	
U.S. GYPSUM COMPANY, ET AL.	§	**193RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

DEFENDANT UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF LARRY COFFMAN'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES, REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION

TO: Plaintiff, Larry Coffman, by and through his attorney of record, Elizabeth R. Schick, Scott L. Frost, Monty Sullivan, David T. Ritter, and Chris Panatier, Baron & Budd, P.C., The Centrum, 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 1100, Dallas, Texas 75219.

COMES NOW, UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION, Defendant, and makes and serves this its Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coffman's First Set of Interrogatories, Requests for Production and Requests for Admission.

Respectfully submitted,

DEHAY & ELLISTON, L.L.P.
3500 BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
901 Main Street
Dallas, Texas 75202-3736
(214) 210-2400
(214) 210-2500 (fax)

By: _____
GARY D. ELLISTON
State Bar No. 06584700
MISTI D. MOSTELLER
State Bar No. 24012778

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coffm… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 1 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/1

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify, that on this date, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Answers to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories and Request for Production was forwarded via certified mail, return-receipt-requested to counsel for Plaintiff, Elizabeth R. Schick, Scott L. Frost, Monty Sullivan, David T. Ritter, and Chris Panatier, Baron & Budd, P.C., The Centrum, 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 1100, Dallas, Texas 75219, on this the 5 day of June, 2002.

MISTI D. MOSTELLER

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coffm... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 2 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/2

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Union Carbide objects to Plaintiff's entire set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production to the extent that they call for information about Union Carbide facilities or premises where the Plaintiff never worked. Over the course of its business, Union Carbide owned or operated a numerous amount of locations and premises. Ascertaining plant and employee practices for each Union Carbide facility or premises, even during a specified time frame, would be unduly burdensome, if possible at all. Morever, the nature of the processes and work conducted at Carbide's various plants and facilities differed considerably, and information relating to another plant or facility is not necessarily relevant. Plaintiff's attempts to expand discovery to include information regarding irrelevant time periods and irrelevant materials produced at irrelevant locations by irrelevant persons or entities constitutes an impermissible abuse of the discovery rules and a general misuse of the laws of the State of Texas.

Union Carbide states that trial preparation and factual investigation, including locating additional information and documents, are ongoing. Union Carbide's answers to these Interrogatories and Request for Production are based on information known to Union Carbide at this time. Union Carbide reserves the right, however to make reference at the trial or at any hearing in this action to facts and documents not identified in these responses, the existence or relevance of which is later discovered by it or its counsel. By this reservation, Union Carbide does not in any way assume a continuing responsibility to update its responses to these Interrogatories and Request for Production, and specifically objects to each of these Interrogatories and Request for Production to the extent that they seek to impose any such continuing obligation upon Union Carbide. To the

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coffm... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 3 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/3**

extent the information contained herein differs in any respect from any prior responses to discovery, this response shall be deemed to update and supersede such prior responses.

Union Carbide objects to Plaintiff's Interrogatories and Request for Production in their entirety on the grounds that they are not reasonably framed in terms of the facts and subject matter of the present action, with the result that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to what information relevant to the present case, if any, may be deemed to fall within the scope of the Interrogatories and Request for Production as phrased.

Union Carbide objects to this entire set of Interrogatories and Request for Production to the extent that they call for information about Union Carbide employees or premises, or policies pertaining to Union Carbide employees or premises. Inasmuch as the plaintiffs do not allege that they or their decedents were ever employed by Union Carbide or worked at any job site controlled by Union Carbide, such information is irrelevant and immaterial to matters at issue in this case. Any pertinent information which the employee or premises information can be said to reflect can be requested directly without requesting the irrelevant and immaterial information or documentation about employees or premises.

Union Carbide further objects to Plaintiff's entire set of Interrogatories, Request for Production and Requests for Admission on the grounds that they are completely devoid of limitation in time or scope and, therefore constitute an oppressive, burdensome and impermissible fishing expedition. Despite repeated requests, Plaintiff has failed to provide Union Carbide with any information concerning Plaintiff's alleged presence at Union Carbide's Texas City facility with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to the relevant time period at issue, the

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coffm... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 4 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/4

relevant employer or contractor in question and whether Plaintiff has any evidence whatsoever corroborating Plaintiff's alleged presence at a Union Carbide facility.

OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

1. Union Carbide objects to the instructions and definitions supplied by Plaintiff with regard to these Interrogatories, Request for Production, and Request for Admissions on the grounds that the definitions are overly broad, vague and often inconsistent with the normal common usage and meaning of such words. As a result, these definitions constitute an unreasonable expansion of the Interrogatories, Request for Production, and Request for Admissions themselves. Union Carbide has therefore responded to this discovery consistently with the common understanding of the language used in the Interrogatories, Request for Production, and Request for Admissions.

2. Union Carbide objects to Plaintiff's definitions and instructions to the extent those definitions and instructions request Union Carbide to make any inquiry beyond that which is required by the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure or to the extent they seek to include documents not within Union Carbide's custody or control.

3. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' definitions of the terms "Defendant," "you," and "your," and "your company". To the extent the terms could be read to refer to Defendant's attorneys, any interrogatories, request for production, or request for admission utilizing any of these terms necessarily invades the work product and/or attorney-client privileges embodied in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. To the extent the terms are intended to include predecessors, divisions, subsidiaries, forms of subsidiaries, forms of subsidiaries of predecessors, and/or affiliates, as well as present and former officers, directors,

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coffm... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 5 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/5

agents, employees and other persons acting or purporting to act on behalf of the corporate Defendant, any interrogatories, request for production, or request for admission utilizing these terms is so overly broad and over burdensome as to make any requests utilizing the terms virtually impossible to answer. Further, to the extent the definition is intended to include any merged, consolidated, or acquired predecessors, divisions, subsidiaries, forms of subsidiaries, forms of subsidiaries of predecessors, and/or affiliates, any interrogatory, request for production, or request for admission utilizing any of these terms is necessarily overly broad, unduly burdensome, and calls for material which is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects to Plaintiff's apparent attempt to place upon Defendant the burden to seek information from former officers, directors, agents and employees over whom Defendant no longer has dominion or control. Any interrogatory or requests utilizing any of these terms is a "fishing expedition" in violation of Texas law as concerns discovery.

4. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's definition of the terms "document", "documents", "written materials", or "printed matter" as the definition of those terms renders any interrogatories or requests utilizing any of these terms overly broad, unduly burdensome, harassing, and reduces any such discovery requests to a "fishing expedition" in discovery. Defendant further objects to the definition of these terms as calling for the production of material or information which is not relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects to the definition of these terms to the extent it purports to include an obligation to locate and produce information or documentation which is no longer in the possession or control of this Defendant or from entities who are not parties to this cause of action.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coffm... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 6 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/6**

5. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's definition of the words "meeting" or "meetings" as any interrogatory, request for production, or request for admission utilizing those terms is overly broad, and over burdensome in that it purports to require documentation or information concerning any casual or coincidental meeting. Defendant further objects to the use of the term "any person"on grounds that it is overly broad and calls for speculation.

6. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's definition of the terms "describe" or "description" as it is vague, ambiguous and requires Defendant to speculate on what identification rises to the level of sufficient particularity so as to enable one to "fully comprehend" or understand the place, thing or occurrence described.

7. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's definition of the term "medical advisory capacity" in that the definition renders any interrogatory, request for production, or request for admission utilizing the term overly broad, over burdensome, harassing and calling for information or material which is neither relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects to the use of the term "services of a medical nature" on grounds that this term is undefined and overly broad, with the result being that Defendant is called upon to speculate as to whether or not "services of a medical nature" includes casual or coincidental services. Defendant further objects to the use of the term "medical advisory capacity" on grounds that it has not been reasonably limited in time or scope or to a particular plant or premises.

8. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's definition of the terms "trade organization" and "trade association" on grounds that they are intended to include predecessors, divisions, subsidiaries, forms of subsidiaries, forms of subsidiaries of predecessors, and/or affiliates, as well as present and former

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coffm... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 7 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/7

officers, directors, agents, employees and other persons acting or purporting to act on behalf of the corporate Defendant, any interrogatories, or request for production, or request for admission utilizing these terms is so overly broad and over burdensome as to make any requests utilizing the terms virtually impossible to answer. Further, Defendant objects to these definitions on grounds that they could be read to include each and every casual or coincidental meeting where ideas and information were exchanged for the purpose of achieving or discussing common goals, and as such is overly broad and calls for speculation.

9. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's definition of the terms "medical department" and "safety department" in that the definitions render any interrogatory, request for production, or request for admission utilizing the term overly broad, over burdensome, harassing and calling for information or material which is neither relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects to the use of these terms on grounds that they are intended to include predecessors, divisions, subsidiaries, forms of subsidiaries, forms of subsidiaries of predecessors, and/or affiliates, as well as present and former officers, directors, agents, employees and other persons acting or purporting to act on behalf of Union Carbide, making it virtually impossible to answer. Defendant further objects to these definitions on grounds that they have not been reasonably limited in time or scope, and as such, are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

10. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's definition of "industrial hygiene surveys"on grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, and overly broad, in that it fails to limit the use of the term to matters which are reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coffm... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 8 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/8

to this definition on grounds that the use of the terms "any procedures" renders any interrogatory, request for production, or request for admission utilizing this term, over broad and unduly burdensome.

11. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's definition of the terms "potential health hazards" or "health hazards" in that any interrogatory, request for production, or request for admission utilizing these terms is vague and ambiguous in that issues exists and minds differ with respect to impairments or disabilities and their associations with exposures to asbestos dust and fibers, if any.

12. Defendant objects to Plaintiff's definition of the terms "test" and "testing" on grounds they are not reasonably limited to matters which are reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects to the use of these definitions on grounds that they purport to include each and every test, survey or study ever conducted by Union Carbide that concerned health and safety and as such, any interrogatory, request for production, or request for admission utilizing these terms is inherently over broad and unduly burdensome, and calls for speculation in light of the lack of limitation with respect to these definitions.

13. Union Carbide objects to the terms "plant" and "facility" as defined because they render these Interrogatories, Requests for Production, and Request for Admissions over broad and not reasonably limited to matters which are relevant to the subject matter of this lawsuit or to the discovery of matters which are reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Because Union Carbide has, over the years, owned or operated a variety of locations and premises, and because it appears that Plaintiff's claims against Union Carbide are based on Plaintiff's alleged presence at Union Carbide's Texas City facility, answers contained herein pertain to solely to Union

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coffm... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 9 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/9**

Carbide's Texas City facility.

14. Union Carbide objects to the term "time period at issue" on the grounds that it is vague and undefined. Union Carbide further objects to this term on the grounds that it is overly broad to the extent that it has not been limited in time or scope and as such it constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. Union Carbide objects to this term on the grounds that it calls for speculation in light of Plaintiff's failure to provide Union Carbide with any work history or any other information which is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 10 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/10**

ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

For each person who has supplied any information used in answering these interrogatories, or who assisted in identifying, locating or retrieving documents responsive to Plaintiff's Requests for Production, identify such person and include the length of time employed by Defendant or other employer, and a year-by-year list of all other positions, titles, or jobs held.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it seeks information beyond the scope of discovery. Union Carbide Corporation objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome and the burden of answering this Interrogatory substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Union Carbide further objects and states that countless individuals who may have some knowledge of the information contained in Union Carbide's Answers have worked for Union Carbide over the years, and to require Union Carbide to discover the names of each and every individual, much less identify a year-by-year list of all positions, titles and jobs held would be immensely burdensome and time consuming in light of the overly broad, vague nature of this interrogatory as drafted and as such, Union Carbide Corporation objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429,430 (Tex. 1996). Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states that these answers and responses are the result of a diligent investigation and review of Union Carbide's Texas City facility and corporate business records, deposition testimony, as well as, a result of many interviews conducted by counsel for Union Carbide with current and past Union Carbide employees, many of whom are no longer under the control of Union Carbide.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

As to each of the following, please state the first year you first became aware, what you learned, and how Defendant learned that humans who inhale asbestos fibers can contract

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 11 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/11

a asbestosis
b. lung cancer
c. mesothelioma

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it is vague and overly broad and is not reasonably limited to a specific time period, and as such, this Interrogatory as drafted, constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it would burdensome to require Union Carbide to identify how and when Union Carbide, as a corporation, became "aware" of the diseases listed above. Furthermore, Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that the use of the term "aware" is vague and undefined, and as a result Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to what information might be responsive to this Interrogatory. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

According to the best information currently available, Union Carbide's knowledge concerning the potential health hazards which, in some cases, have possibly been associated with excessive exposure to asbestos fiber inhalation developed gradually and as a result, it is impossible to state precisely when and how this information was ultimately acquired. Union Carbide is aware that the following sources of asbestos related information contributed to Union Carbide's knowledge of the potential hazards of excessive asbestos exposure: Union Carbide's participation in various trade association conferences and meetings, the development of OSHA and other government related information and programs in regard to asbestos, general and scientific literature published throughout the years. In addition to various corporate research, reports and memoranda developed by or for Union Carbide employees.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

Please list all trade organizations, trade associations and any other industry-wide groups to

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 12 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/12

which you belong(ed) (specifically including but not limited to the following groups: American Hygiene Foundation, Industrial Hygiene Foundation, Chemical Manufacturer's Association, American Chemical Council, American Petroleum Institute, Texas Chemical Council, Ohio Safety Congress, National Safety Council, Asbestos Information Association, Industrial Medical Association) in which information or documents relating to asbestos was discussed, disseminated, or published (including, but not limited to, the effects of exposure to asbestos, industrial hygiene measures relating to asbestos dust, and medical information or research relating to asbestos or its effects on animals or humans, populations at risk). As to each such group, please state:

a. the inclusive dates of your membership and
b. identify Defendant's employees or former employees or representatives who attended any of the meetings held by each organization, and
c. the meetings they attended, and
d. if any individuals employed by Defendant or representing Defendant were members of committees or subcommittees of any such organizations, (such as, e.g., a medical advisory committee or legal committee), identify the committee or subcommittee on which such individual served and the position occupied on the committee, if applicable.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it is overly broad and is not reasonably limited to a specific time period, or for that matter, a particular plant or premises and as such, this Interrogatory as drafted, constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is vague and unduly burdensome, and the oppressive, time consuming and costly nature of this burden, to the extent that responsive information and/or documentation exists, substantially outweighs the probative value of any of the information sought by this Interrogatory. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Over the years, Union Carbide was a member and/or participated in the following organizations:

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 13 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/13

The Industrial Health Association:

Based upon the best information currently available, Union Carbide was a member of this organization during the 60's and 70's.

The Asbestos Information Association of North America:

Based upon the best information currently available, Union Carbide was a member of this organization during the 70's.

The American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists:

Union Carbide states that based upon the best information currently available, the dates surrounding Union Carbide's participation with the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienist is unknown at this time. However, it is believed that Union Carbide received information from the ACGIH possibly as early as the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's.

The American Industrial Hygiene Association:

Based upon the best information currently available, Union Carbide may have participated in this organization during the late 60's and 70's.

The National Safety Council:

Based upon the best information currently available, Union Carbide may have participated in this organization at some point in time during the 50's, 60's.

The Industrial Hygiene Foundation:

Based upon the best information currently available, Union Carbide participated in this organization beginning in the late 1940's.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 14 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/14

American Petroleum Institute:

Based on the best information currently available, Union Carbide was at some point in time a member of this organization, but the exact dates of membership are currently unknown. It is believed that various Union Carbide employees at various Union Carbide facilities may have participated in the API during the 1960's and 70's.

Union Carbide further states that it will make any documents which might contain information pertaining to Union Carbide's membership and/or participation in the various trade associations listed above which are contained in Union Carbide's repository, available to the requesting party for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

Please identify Defendant's employees or former employees or representatives who attended any proceedings, symposia, or conferences of a scientific or medical or technical nature at which information or documents relating to asbestos was discussed, disseminated, or published, (including, by way of example, the effects of exposure to asbestos, industrial hygiene measures relating to asbestos dust, and medical information or research relating to asbestos or its effects on animals or humans, populations at risk) and specifically including but not limited to the Seventh Saranac Symposium, 1952, and/or New York Academy of Sciences, October 1964 , and for each such individual, state the proceedings, symposia, or conferences attended and to whom within your corporate organization information concerning attendance at such proceedings, symposia, or conferences were reported, either verbally or in documentary form.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome, and the time consuming and oppressive nature of the burden entailed in identifying each and every employee or former Union Carbide employee or representative, who throughout Union Carbide's entire history of operation might have attended any proceedings, symposia, or conferences of a scientific or medical or technical nature at which information or

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 15 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/15

documents relating to asbestos was discussed, disseminated, or published, much less reported either verbally or in documentary form, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it has not been reasonably limited in time or scope, and as such as drafted or defined, this Interrogatory constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Furthermore, Union Carbide states that it would be overwhelmingly burdensome to require that Union Carbide contact each and every employee that might have had some knowledge of asbestos in order to inquire as to whether or not they have, at any time, ever attended an asbestos related proceedings, symposia, or conferences of a scientific or medical or technical nature to determine if information pertaining to asbestos was discussed.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

Please identify each company from which you acquired asbestos-containing products used at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the years Plaintiff has indicated he worked at Defendant's Premises At Issue and include in your response

a. a description of each asbestos-containing product acquired
b. and the dates each asbestos-containing product was acquired.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is vague and unduly burdensome, and the oppressive, time consuming and costly nature of this burden, to the extent that responsive information and/or documentation exists, substantially outweighs the probative value of any of the information sought by this Interrogatory. Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it seeks information which is irrelevant to this lawsuit and therefore is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, Union Carbide objects to

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 16 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/16

this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information which has not been limited in time or scope, and as such, this Interrogatory constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Additionally, Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that Plaintiff, not Union Carbide, is in the best position to determine what asbestos-containing products, if any, he might have worked with during the years he allegedly intermittently was present on the premises of the Texas City facility, and therefore it would be burdensome to require Union Carbide to describe each and every asbestos-containing product ever used on Union Carbide's premises, without having the benefit of knowing where and when Plaintiff might have worked. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states that the discovery process and Union Carbide's own investigation into this matter remains ongoing, therefore, as a result, Union Carbide may presently lack the availability of complete responsive information to this Interrogatory.

Union Carbide used asbestos-containing products at its Texas City facility over an extensive period of time, in variety of industrial units. Union Carbide began discontinuing the use of asbestos-containing products well over twenty-five years ago and as such, will be unable to produce, much less identify, an all-inclusive list of products by brand name, the location where these products may have been purchased, used or applied, or the time period in which they were present.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 17 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/17**

INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

If any asbestos-containing materials located or formerly located at Defendant's Premises At Issue have been removed, encapsulated, or otherwise abated at any time,

a Identify each person or company that performed such abatement services;
b. State the dates and locations within Defendant's Premises At Issue of each abatement procedure; and
c. Describe what asbestos-containing materials were abated
d. State how such asbestos-containing waste was stored at Defendant's Premises At Issue prior to disposal and how it was disposed of.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, to the extent that it has not been limited in time or scope, and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Over the years, Union Carbide has conducted extensive abatement activities at the Texas City facility in a manner consistent with OSHA guidelines, in addition to state and local asbestos-related regulations. Since Plaintiff has not provided Union Carbide with evidence that he ever worked around or in the vicinity of asbestos abatement, and has been unable to impose a reasonable limitation in time or scope with respect to this Interrogatory, it would be immensely burdensome to require Union Carbide to ascertain, identify, and locate every piece of information which pertains to asbestos abatement, including the relevant dates, locations, products, disposal methods and related practices.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 18 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/18

Additionally, Union Carbide states that the discovery process as well as Union Carbide's own investigation into this matter remains on going. Union Carbide is diligently attempting to conclude its examination of the Texas City facility business records pertaining to asbestos abatement, and to the extent that responsive and non-privileged documentation and/or other materials containing information pertinent to the full breadth of this overly broad Interrogatory are discovered, said documents and/or materials will be made available to the requesting party for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

Finally, Union Carbide maintains a repository of asbestos related documents. Any documents responsive to this request, or containing responsive information, still accessible to Union Carbide would be contained in Union Carbide's repository of asbestos-related documents and material. Upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its Repository available to Plaintiff for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

Please identify and state the experience and qualifications, if applicable, of every person known to you, your agents, or contractors as having knowledge of facts relevant to this case concerning Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue, including but not limited to the identification or location in your premises of asbestos-containing products to which Plaintiff was exposed or facts disputing the identification or location of such product or type of products.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome, and the oppressive nature of the burden entailed in identifying each and every person which may or may not have knowledge of facts which took place over thirty years ago, without the benefit of knowing exactly where Plaintiff worked, and what Plaintiff allegedly did for Union Carbide at the Texas City facility during the relevant years at issue, substantially outweighs

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 19 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/19

the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Furthermore, since Plaintiff has provided Union Carbide with insufficient information concerning his alleged presence at Union Carbide, any interrogatory seeking to discover information concerning Plaintiff, but not actually known by Plaintiff, as evidenced by the lack of specificity apparent in Plaintiff's work history, constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

With respect to Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue, please identify and state the experience and qualifications, if applicable, of every person known to you, your agents, or contractors as being employed by you or having been employed by you whose duties and/or responsibilities included interface or liaison with Plaintiff's employer or other contractors who installed, removed, maintained, repaired or replaced asbestos-containing products {including foremen or supervisors or Plaintiff) on Defendant's Premises At Issue (regardless of job title, including but not limited to "plant engineers", "project engineers", "company engineers", "project superintendents", "purchasing agents" or job descriptions of a similar nature) and specifically include those whose duties and responsibilities included the following:

a. entering into contracts or purchase orders (including specifications) with such contractors,
b. allowing such contractors access to Defendant's Premises At Issue,
c. overseeing or supervising or observing or monitoring such contractor activities or addressing any contractor questions or concerns relating to the work being performed
d. providing or approving asbestos-containing materials to be used by such contractors
e. inspecting or approving work done by such contractors or authorizing payment for work done by such contractor.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is unduly burdensome, and the oppressive nature of this burden, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Additionally, Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it has not been confined to the subject matter of the underlying lawsuit, and as drafted this Interrogatory is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 20 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/20

evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that Plaintiff has not identified when specifically he was present on the Texas City premises, who he might have been working for, what specific tasks he allegedly performed, what he earned, or any particular co-workers, therefore, without any knowledge of his own to speak of, any interrogatory seeking the discovery of information concerning Plaintiff constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9:

If you have or have had an industrial hygiene or safety or medical department, please

a. state the year such department was established, and whether it was established on the corporate level or at Defendant' s Premises At Issue or both and

b. with respect to Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue, please identify and state the experience and qualifications, if applicable, of every person known to you, your agents, or contractors as being or having acted in a medical, safety, or industrial hygiene advisory capacity (regardless of job title), specifically including, but not limited to, physicians, medical directors. medical personnel, nurses, safety engineers or managers and industrial hygienists. (You should include in your answer those persons on a corporate level, regardless of whether they worked directly on Defendant's Premises if they had such responsibilities for workers on Defendant's Premises At Issue, and identify such individuals as affiliated with the corporate headquarters of Defendant.)

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is overly broad. Additionally, Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it would be unduly burdensome, to require that Union Carbide identify each and every person ever involved with industrial hygiene or occupational medicine during the unspecified time periods Plaintiff was allegedly present at the Texas City facility. Furthermore, Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it has not been reasonably limited in time or scope, nor has it been confined to the subject matter made the underlying basis for this lawsuit, and as such, this Interrogatory constitutes

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 21 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/21

an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide Corporation may presently lack the availability of complete responsive information to this Interrogatory, the discovery processes and Union Carbide's own investigation into this matter remains ongoing. Union Carbide Corporation therefore reserves its right to supplement this response if Union Carbide obtains any additional pertinent information.

Union Carbide's Medical Department was formally organized in 1939. Prior to that date, the National Carbon Company division hired Dr. Girard Cranch as the medical director, and other Union Carbide facilities or entities consulted with physicians as needed. The medical directors at Union Carbide have included the following individuals for the years respectively indicated below:

(1) Girard Cranch
[1939-1945]

(2) Thomas Nale
[1945-1963]
Kenneth Square, PA

(3) John J. Welsh
[1963-1978]
45-25 Douglaston Parkway,
Douglaston, NY 11383

(4) Thomas A. Lincoln
[1978-1985]
Oak Ridge Associated Universities,
Medical Sections, Oak Ridge, TN

(5) T. Guy Fortney
[1985-1989]

(6) Jean B. Case
[1989-Present]
Old Ridgebury Road,
Danbury, CT 06817

The present duties of Union Carbide' s medical director include coordination of all of Union Carbide's medical programs, including employee physical examination programs; recommendations with respect to medical policies, standards and procedures; and administration of medical services at Union Carbide's corporate headquarters, a corporate epidemiology program, a medical program

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 22 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/22**

for employees traveling overseas and an alcoholism prevention and treatment program. During the relevant years at issue, it is believed that the medical director reported to the corporate Vice President in charge of Union Carbide's Community and Employee Health, Safety and Environmental Protection.

It is believed that Union Carbide has led the industry with its concern for industrial hygiene, and Union Carbide industrial hygienists have been pioneers in their field. In 1919, less than two years after Union Carbide was created, the National Carbon Company division hired Dr. Girard Cranch as its Medical Director. In that capacity, Dr. Cranch developed and launched health and hygiene programs which were paragons for the industry. In 1937, Dr. Cranch was appointed Manager of the new corporate-wide Industrial Toxicology Department. One year later, he also took on the responsibility of Corporate Medical Director. In those capacities, he was instrumental in establishing the Mellon Institute Chemical-Hygiene Fellowship, which is renowned for its toxicological studies.

Upon Dr. Cranch's retirement in 1948, the medical and industrial hygiene functions were divided. Oliver Stam succeeded Dr. Cranch as a corporate level industrial hygienist. In 1953, Mr. Stam was succeeded by Paul McDaniel. Upon Mr. McDaniel's retirement, Marvin Huffman served Manger of Risk Assessment Group. Mr. Timothy J. Cawley has served in that capacity from 1995 until 1998. Since 1998, Mr. Roy Myers has served as Manager of Risk Assessment Group.

In addition, in the early 1960s Drs. Carl Dernehl and K. S. Lane of Union Carbide 's Medical Department were given the corporate positions of Director and Assistant Director of Toxicology, respectively.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 23 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/23

For an extensive period of time, all major Union Carbide facilities employ an industrial hygienist and industrial hygiene staff on the premises. Industrial Hygienists report, ultimately, to the Vice President for Health, Safety, and Environment, who is also responsible for establishing corporate HS&E standards and for assessing business group performance against those standards and applicable governmental requirements. In the past, Ron J. Cottle served as Union Carbide's Vice President of Health, Safety and Environment.

Union Carbide's various divisional employ Industrial Hygienist for their respective facilities and premises. In the past, Ronald Van Mynen has served as Vice President in care of Union Carbides' Health , Safety and Environmental Dept. and was primarily responsible for establishing corporate HS & EP standards, and for assessing business groups performance against those standards and applicable governmental requirements. During the period of the Calidria business, Dr. Harrison Rhodes, and various industrial hygienist, supervised Union Carbide's dust count program for its customers. Union Carbide's various divisions employ Industrial Hygienists for their respective facilities and premises. In the past, C. C. Smith has served as Vice President in charge of Union Carbide's Community and Employee Health, Safety and Environmental Protection Department.

Persons thus far identified as having performed, or having some knowledge of, the medical or industrial hygiene functions at the Texas City, Texas plant include the following:

1. Don Deese
2. Dr. Roy Joyner
3. Carolyn Hester
4. Carroll Perry

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 24 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/24**

5. Newt Ketcham

6. Perihan Yalcinkaya

7. Dick LaCour

8. Debbie Seid

9. Dr. David Glenn

10. Dr. Carl Dernehl

11. W.L. Pegeus

12. Newell Bolton

13. Robert Peele

14. J. Cressend Schonberg

15. Gran Townsend

_____Union Carbide is currently investigating this matter, accordingly, upon receipt of additional information, Union Carbide will supplement this Answer.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10:

Please identify all warnings given by Defendant, if any, to anyone at Defendant's Premises At Issue (including the Plaintiff) regarding the hazards of asbestos and the dangers inherent in the inhalation of asbestos fibers, and please include in your response:

a. to whom these warnings were given (and specifically state if Plaintiff was among them),
b. when they were given, if ever, and
c. in what manner they were given (e.g. written pamphlets, signs posted, oral/group meeting, individual discussions, etc.) and
d. state whether you have ever published, written, edited, or distributed any other printed materials. including brochures, pamphlets, catalogs, packaging, advertising, signs, statements, or other materials containing any warnings of the possibility of injury from the use or exposure to asbestos or asbestos-containing products, and

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 25 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/25

e. state whether any of the foregoing warnings were in Spanish or any other language besides English.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is vague and overly broad. Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it has not been reasonably limited to a particular Union Carbide premises or facility, and as a result this Interrogatory, as drafted, constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that improperly seeks the discovery of all factual assertions and a marshaling of proof supporting Union Carbide's contentions and as a result, this Interrogatory is inconsistent with Rule 197 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is unduly burdensome, and the time consuming, costly nature of this burden, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide Corporation may presently lack the availability of complete responsive information to this Interrogatory, the discovery processes and Union Carbide's own investigation into this matter remains ongoing. Union Carbide Corporation therefore reserves its right to supplement this response if Union Carbide obtains any additional pertinent information.

Union Carbide's knowledge concerning health hazards possibly associated with excessive exposure to asbestos fiber inhalation developed gradually and at some point in time during the early 70's, acting in accordance OSHA regulations, more importantly with the utmost concern for the safety of its own and contractor employees, Union Carbide began posting cautionary warning signs to advise workers of the presence of asbestos and/or asbestos containing materials. Union Carbide

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 26 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/26

believes that these general cautionary warning signs were posted at numerous locations within the Texas City facility in accordance with OSHA guidelines. The specific locations of these signs and dates and length of time these signs were posted is currently unknown. In addition to cautionary warning signs, Union Carbide disseminated health and safety information regarding the most current industrial and government knowledge concerning the potential adverse health effects which could possibly be associated with excessive inhalation of asbestos fibers, to insure that employees and contractors were well advised on ways to avoid the potential harm which could result from excessive exposure to asbestos dust. Union Carbide, as well as, the numerous amounts of contractors which have been present at the Texas City facility over the years, utilized various safety procedures which were enforced by the respective companies for the benefit of their own employees. According to the best information currently available, Union Carbide developed industrial hygiene and occupational health programs and policies which were implemented by Union Carbide and enforced by each of the respective contractors for the protection of all plant workers. Over the years, these policies and programs have been revised and expanded in order to accurately reflect the most current and accurate industrial knowledge. Furthermore, Union Carbide improved engineering controls and ventilation equipment to reduce the amount of particulate matter released into the air in a manner consistent with the applicable threshold limit values.

Additionally, Union Carbide states that it has always followed the practice of including all legally required and extra-legally prudent cautions of possible hazards from uses of its products, which often consisted of chemicals or other intermediate products sold to manufacturers or producers for specialized uses. Asbestos dust caution texts were concluded to be unnecessary on Union

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 27 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/27**

Carbide's heat-resistant phenolic resin packaging. The asbestos fibers in those products were modified by a bonding agent and thus exempt from the requirement to print caution labels on mixtures containing asbestos fibers published in the Federal Register, Vol. 37, No. 110-Wednesday, June 7, 1972. Nevertheless, in late 1972 or early 1973, Union Carbide handprinted asbestos cautions on bags or packages of phenolic resin. Starting May 1, 1973, Union Carbide may also have printed the following cautions on the packages of phenolic molding materials:

"CAUTION! Contains asbestos fibers; Avoid creating dust; Breathing Asbestos Dust May Cause Serious Bodily Harm"

Union Carbide ceased manufacturing and selling Bakelite phenolic resin in 1975. Doug Neal, a former industrial hygienist at the facility which produced the phenolic resin, is familiar with the history of the use of warning labels for Bakelite. Don Gould, the former chair of Union Carbide's warning label committee, is also familiar with the history of labels on the phenolic resin bags.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11:

If Defendant has or had or maintained in its possession any books, pamphlets, memoranda, or written material of any kind or character that would indicate that asbestos fibers, when inhaled, can be hazardous to the health of human beings, please identify

a. the individuals who received, maintained, reviewed, and disseminated the information contained in such written materials,
b. identify the written materials received, and
c. state how and why these materials came into Defendant's possession.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to the overly broad nature of this Interrogatory on grounds that it has not been reasonably limited in time or geographic scope, and as such this Interrogatory

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 28 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/28

constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is unduly burdensome, and the time consuming and costly nature of this burden, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that as drafted, this Interrogatory is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide will make all responsive, non-privileged documents within its possession available to the requesting party for inspection and duplication. If Union Carbide has access to information relating to who received, maintained, reviewed or disseminated such materials, it is reflected on those documents.

Additionally, Union Carbide maintains a repository of asbestos related documents. Any documents responsive to this request, or containing responsive information, still accessible to Union Carbide would be contained in Union Carbide's repository of asbestos-related documents and material. Upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its Repository available to Plaintiff for review and replication at a suitable time and place. The following is a responsive listing of books, studies, and limited issue reports which have at some point in time been collected in Union Carbide's corporate library in Danbury. Additional material may be also kept at more or other libraries:

1. Acrylamide - Exposure to N10SH - STD.
2. Agricultural Products - Emergency Response Plan - Union Carbide.
3. Agricultural Products - 1983 Chemical Guide.
4. Albanes (C5-C8) Exposure to N10SH.
5. Allyl Chloride - Exposure to N10SH STD.
6. American Hospital Association. Guide to Health Call Fiedl-1985.
7. The Apocalyptics - Edith Effron
8. Asbestos Standard

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 29 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/29**

9. Benyl Chloride - Exposure to NI10SH STD.
10. Benzoyl Perioxide - Exposure to N10SH STD.
11. British Journals of Industrial Medicine 2/86.
12. Carlon Black - Exposure to N10SH STD.
13. Carbaryl - Exposure to N10SH STD.
14. Carlon Disulfide: EHC10.
15. Carlon Disulfide: Exposure to N10SH STD.
16. Carciongins, First Annual Report on (July, 1980, Vol. 1, Vol. 11, Dept. of Health and Human Services.
17. Chemical Hazards of the Workplace, Hughes Proctor.
18. Chloraprene, Exposure to N10SH STD.
19. Clinical Diagnosis - by lab methods - Henry & Davidsohn
20. Clinical Handbook of Economic Poisons (Emergency Information and Treatment).
21. Clinical Toxicology of Commercial Products. Gasoline, Smitt & Hodge.
22. Clinical Symposia - CIBA.
23. Cobalt - Criteria for Controlling Occupational Exposure to N10SH STD.
24. Cobalt - Exposure to N10SH STD.
25. Contact Directory (UNION CARBIDE Chemicals & Plastics).
26. Corporate Medical Department - Background Information -UNION CARBIDE.
27. Dinitro-Ortho-Cresol - Exposure to N10SH STD.
28. Directory - U.S. Based Agencies involved in International Health Assistance - National Counsel for Int'l Health.
29. Directory of Medical Specialists - 22d Edition - (1985-86) (Marquis, Who's Who).
30. Disability Prevention: The Global Challenge - Wilson.
31. Diseases of the Heart (1, 111) Freidburg - 3d Edition.
32. Doctors of Medicine - Directory of Sept. 1985 - Div. of Health Related Boards.
33. Drug Abuse Program, Developing an Occupation.
34. Electronics Division - Occupational Health Manual.
35. Emergency Cardiac Care - Huszar.
36. Emergency Care (Course Planning Guide) Murray, Grant
37. Emergency Medicine, Attos of Rosen & Steinbach.
38. Employees Handbook - UNION CARBIDE.
39. Employee Health (Linde Shea) Linde Dive., UNION CARBIDE.
40. Environmental Affairs Manual - UNION CARBIDE.
41. Ether Oxide, Health Assessment Document for
42. Ethyl Oxide Worker Safety Issues (Rep. #83-2).
43. Ethylene Dibromide - Exposure to N10SH STD.
44. Ethylene Dichloride (1,2 Dichlordtrhane) Exposure to N10SH STD.
45. Ethylene Oxide Sterilization - Exposure to N10SH STD.
46. Ethylene Oxide Std.
47. Ethylene Oxide Sterilization - In Hospital.
48. Ethylene Oxide Worker Safety Issues.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 30 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/30**

49. Eveready Battery - Engineering Data.
50. Exposure to Mutagenic & Reproductive Hazards - Arthur Bloom, M.D.
51. Exposure Standard - UNION CARBIDE.
52. Follow-up of Cancer (Physicians Handbook) (2d Edition - 1983).
53. Foodlorne Disease & Food Safety - American Medical Association - 198 1.
54. Fractures & Dislocations, Management of, Vols. I & II, 3d Edition - Connolly.
55. Grain, Dust, Fire, Explosion - Exposure to NOSH STD.
56. Guide to evaluation of Permanent Impairment - 2d Edition - American Medical Association.
57. Howard Medical School Health Letter (1985-86).
58. Health Effects Review Board (Toxicology).
59. Health Fitness Center - Emergency Procedure (UNION CARBIDE Manual).
60. Health & Safety Manual - UNION CARBIDE.
61. Hearing Loss (2d Edition) - Drs. J. Sataloff and R. T. Sataloff and L. A Vassalo, M.S.
62. The Heart, J. Willis Hurst.
63. Help Manuals - UNION CARBIDE.
64. Hearing - Conservation & Noise Central Manual - UNION CARBIDE.
65. Home & Auto Products Division - Occupational Health Manual - UNION CARBIDE.
66. How to Choose a Medical Specialty. Anita Taylor.
67. Industrial Toxicology - Fairhall.
68. Industrial Toxicology - Hamilton & Hardy.
69. Industrial Toxicology - Plunhett.
70. Injured Patient, Management of - Norman & Males.
71. Internal Medical Alert - 1986.
72. International Travel Policies - UNION CARBIDE.
73. Kidney or Electrolytes - Norman Deane, M.D.
74. Loss of Hearing Claims - Background of - UNION CARBIDE.
75. Lung Disorders, Occupational - Parker -2d Edition.
76. Material Safety Data Sheets (Linde, Catalysts, Carbon Products, Battery, Home & Auto, Chemicals & Plastics, UMETCO, etc.).
77. Medical Benefits.
78. Medical Letter.
79. Medical Letter (1981 - Vol. 23)
80. Mobile Coronary Care (Fundamentals of Rose & Rose.
81. Medical Dictionary
82. Medical Policies, Procedures & Guidelines - UNION CARBIDE.
83. Metals Division - Occupational Health Manual
84. Mions Annual - 1985
85. Mutagenicity Test Procedures - Author/Editor B.J. Kilbey
86. New England Journal of Medicine - 7/85, 5/85, 12/85, 11/85, 7/85, 10/85, 6/85.
87. Neurologic Exam De Jong.
88. N10SH -Current Intelligence Bulletin (Reprints 1/1 8, 1975-1977).
89. N10SH - Occupational Health Guidelines for Chemical Hazards.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 31 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/31**

90. Nitrogen Oxides - Exposure to N10SH STD.
91. Nitroglycerin & Ethylene Glycol Dinitrate - Exposure to N10SH STD.
92. Nursing - Standing Orders & Procedure - UNION CARBIDE.
93. Occupational Health - 2 (Approaches To)
94. Occupational Health/Medicine Manuals - UNION CARBIDE.
95. Occupational Lung Diseases - Margon & Seaton.
96. Occupational Medicine - State of the art reviews R.N. Adams, M.D. - Editor.
97. OSHA Hazard Communication.
98. OSHA - Occupational Health Guidelines for Chemical Hazard.
99. Patty's Industrial & Hygiene Toxicology (3d Edition) Clayton, Vol's 1, 2A, 2B, 2C.
100. Permanent Impairment - Guide to Evaluation - 2d Edition American Medical Association.
101. Phenol - Exposure To - N10SH STD.
102. Physicians Desk Reference - 1986.
103. Phosphorus & Phosphine in Air - Exposure to N10SH Std.
104. Physicians Directory of Consultative Service (Yale).
105. Polychlorinated Bisphenyls (PCB's) Exposure To N10SH -STD.
106. Preventive Medicine (5/86).
107. Proctology, A method of - Macleod.
108. Product Safety/Liability Manual - UNION CARBIDE.
109. Public Health Code - 1980 - State of Connecticut.
110. Public Health & Preventive Medicine - 11th Edition - Lost, J.M.
111. Radionuclide Contamination, Management of -.
112. Red Book (1982) Representative of Committee on Infectious Disease - American Academy of Ped.
113. Refined Petroleum Solvents - Exposure to NOSH STD.
114. Reproductive System, Effects of Toxic Chemicals on American Medical Association - 1985.
115. Respiratory Disease, American Revolution of - (Volume 13 1, April 1985).
116. Respiratory Disease - Emergency Treatment of Acute Stinger.
117. Safety, Health & Accident Prevention Procedures (Basic Guide) UNION CARBIDE.
118. Safety, Health & Loss Control Manual - UNION CARBIDE.
119. Safety, Health & Related Affairs Technical Manual - UNION CARBIDE.
120. Safety Manual - UNION CARBIDE.
121. Site Visit Reports (Books 1-4 - By Division - UNION CARBIDE).
122. Sudden Coronary Death - NY Academy of Science - Volume 382.
123. Sulfur Oxides & Related Particulates - 1978 - Environmental Effects of
124. The 36 Hour Day - Mac/Robbins.
125. Tetrachlorethan - Exposure to - N10SH STD.
126. Tolioine - Exposure to N10SH STD.
127. Toxic Substance Control (Source Book) Center for Compliance Information.
128. Toxicology Assessment & Advisory Committee (Vols. 1-4).
129. Toxicology & Biochemistry of Aromatic Hydrocarbone, H.W. Gerarde.
130. Trauma Patient, Initial Management of - Frey.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 32 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/32**

131. Tropical Medicine - 5th Edition - Hunter/Swartzwelder/Clyde.
132. Tropical Medicine, New Developments is National Council for Health.
133. Vanadium - Exposure to N10SH STD.
134. Word Processing Manual - UNION CARBIDE.
135. Waste Anesthetic Gases & Vapors - Exposure to - N10SH STD.
136. The Journal of the Society of Occupational Medicine.
137. The Lancet
138. Mayo Clinic Proceedings.
139. The New England Journal of Medicine.
140. Occupational Hazards
141. Occupational Health & Safety
142. Preventive Medicine - American Health Foundation.
143. The Medical Letter - On Drugs & Therapeutics.
144. N10SH - Technical Reports.
145. N10SH - Research Reports.
146. N10SH - Criteria Reports.
147. N10SH - Survey Reports.
148. N10SH - Health Safety Guides.
149. N10SH - Self-Evaluation Reports.
150. Electric Power Research Institute Studies.
151. Jarc Monograph Series.
152. National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurement Series.

The following is a sample subscription list, containing some possibly pertinent periodicals which the library subscribed to in 1976. If information for other years or other particular information is specifically requested, Union Carbide will attempt to locate such information and provide it to the plaintiff.

Sample Subscription List

A. 1. Ch. E. Journal
A.I.M.E. Society of Mining Engineers Transactions
Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. - Earth Sciences Section
Acta Metallurgica
Air Pollution Control Association Journal
Aluminum and Supplement in English
American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin
American Ceramic Society Bulletin
American Ceramic Society Journal

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 33 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/33

American Chemical Society Journal
American Journal of Science
American Mineralogist
Analyst
Analytica Chimica Acta
Analytical Chemistry
Applied Spectroscopy
Archiv fur das Eisenhuttenwesen
Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy Proceedings
Australian Institute of Metals Journal
Australian Mining
Automotive Engineer
British Ceramic Society Transactions
Canadian Chemical Processing
Canadian Journal of Chemical Engineering
Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences
Canadian Metallurgical Quarterly
Canadian Mineralogist
Canadian Mining and Metallurgical Bulletin
Canadian Mining Journal
Cast Metals Research Journal
Chemical Engineering
Chemical Engineering Progress
Chemical Engineering Science
Chemical Geology
Chemical Instrumentation
Chemical Reviews
Chem Tech
Chemistry and Industry
Clays and Clay Minerals
Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology
Economic Geology
Electrochemical Society Journal
Energy Pipeline and Systems
Engineering
Engineering and Mining Journal
Environmental Science and Technology
Foundry
Foundry Trade Journal
Fuel
Geochemistry International
Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 34 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/34**

Giessereiforschung
Harvard Business Review
High Temperature
Indian Institute of Metals Transactions
Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, Fundamentals
Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, Process Design and Development
Industrial and Engineering Chemistry, Product Research and Development
Industrial Heating
Industrial Laboratory
Industrial Minerals
Inorganic Chemistry
Inorganic Materials
Institute of Metals Journal
Institution of Mining and Metallurgy A. Mining Industry
Institution of Mining and Metallurgy B. Applied Earth Science
Institution of Mining and Metallurgy C. Mineral Processing & Extractive Metallurgy
Instrumentation Technology
Internet Bulletin
International Chemical Engineering
International Journal of Mineral Processing
International Journal of Powder Metallurgy
International Metallurgical Reviews
Iron and Steel International
Iron and Steel Engineer
Iron and Steel Institute Journal
Iron and Steel Institute of Japan Transactions
Ironmaking and Steelmaking (formerly ISI Journal)
Journal du Four Electrique
Journal of Analytical Chemistry, USSR
Journal of Applied Chemistry and Biotechnology
Journal of Applied Chemistry, USSR
Journal of Chemical Thermodynamics
Journal of Colloid and Interface Science
Journal of Geochemical Exploration
Journal of Geology
Journal of High Temperature Science
Journal of Inorganic and Nuclear Chemistry
Journal of Materials Science
Journal of Metals
Journal of Petrology
Journal of Physical Chemistry
Journal of Scientific Instruments Journal of Scientific Instruments Journal of Steel Castings Res.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 35 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/35**

Journal of the Less Common Metals
Journal of Thermal Analysis International
Light Metal Age
Materials Engineering
Materials Research Bulletin
Metal Bulletin, London
Metal Progress
Metal Science Journal
Metallography, An International Journal
Metallurgia and Metal Forming
Metallurgical Transactions
Metallurgist
Metallurgist and Materials Technology
Metals and Materials
Metals Technology (London)
Mineralium Deposita
Microscope
Mineralogical Magazine
Mineralogical Record
Minerals Processing
Minerals Science and Engineer
Mines Magazine
Mining Congress Journal
Mining Engineering
Mining Magazine
Modem Castings
NIM - National Institute for Metallurgy
Nature
New Scientist
Norsk Geologisk Tidsskrift
Oil and Gas Journal
Oxidation of Metals
Physics of Metals and Metallography
Platinum Metals Review
Powder Metallurgy
Powder Metallurgy, International
Processing
Refractories
Remote Sensing of Environment
Research Management
Review of Scientific Instruments
Rocks and Minerals

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 36 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/36**

Russian Castings Production
Russian Chemical Reviews
Russian Journal of Inorganic Chemistry
Russian Journal of Physical Chemistry
Russian Metallurgy (Metally)
Scandinavian Journal of Metallurgy
Science
Scientific American
Separation Science
Simulation
Skillings' Mining Review
South African Institute of Mining and Metallurgy
Spectrochimica Acta
Stahl und Eisen
Steel in the USSR
Talanta
TAPPI
Thermochimica Acta
Thirty-three Magazine of Metals Producing
Tsvetnye metally (in English)
Vacuum
Water and Wastes Engineering
Welding Engineer
World Mining
X-Ray Spectrometry
Zeitschrift fur metallkunde

Additionally, Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Interrogatory may be derived from the documents produced in Cause No. 97CI-15498; *Amelia Garcia vs. Owens-Corning Corp., et al*; In the 150th Judicial District Court of Bexar County, Texas. Therefore, the burden of discovering responsive information is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 37 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/37

INTERROGATORY NO. 12:

Please describe in detail your manufacturing or industrial use of any asbestos or asbestos-containing products at Defendant's Premises At Issue. Please include in your response

a. the type of asbestos fiber used,
b. from whom you purchased the asbestos fiber used,
c. a description of the process in which the asbestos was used.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is vague and unduly burdensome, and the oppressive, time consuming and costly nature of this burden, to the extent that responsive information and/or documentation exists, substantially outweighs the probative value of any of the information sought by this Interrogatory. Furthermore, Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information which has not been limited in time, scope or for that matter, a particular facility or premises. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide did not manufacture asbestos-containing products at the Texas City facility.

Union Carbide used a variety asbestos-containing products at its Texas City facility over an extensive period of time, for a variety of reasons, in a variety of industrial units. Union Carbide began discontinuing the use of asbestos-containing products well over twenty-five years ago and as such, will be unable to produce an all-inclusive list of products by brand name, the location where these products may have been used or applied, or the time period in which they were present. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide states that it is diligently searching for the existence of any and all documents and/or other materials which identify the asbestos containing products which were utilized at the Texas City facility, but Union Carbide believes that the products used were generally installed on hot pipes, heat exchangers, boilers and distillation columns in a variety of locations throughout the plant.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 38 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/38

INTERROGATORY NO. 13:

Identify by name and location each plant, facility, location, or premises owned, operated, or controlled by you in which asbestos-containing products were assembled, stored, used, prepared for use, installed, or fabricated during the Time Period At Issue. For each plant, facility, location, or premises listed as responsive to the above request, specify

a. the functional dates for each plant, facility, location, or premises and
b. the period during which asbestos-containing materials were stored, used, prepared for use, installed or fabricated.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, to the extent that it has not been limited in time or scope, and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Additionally, Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that because it appears that Plaintiff's claims against Union Carbide are based solely on his alleged presence at Union Carbide's Texas City facility and not based on any alleged exposure to Union Carbide's asbestos-containing products, it would be burdensome to require Union Carbide to provide information which is clearly beyond the scope of discovery. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide no longer manufacturers, produces, or sells any asbestos or asbestos-containing products. According to the best information presently available to Union Carbide, the aforementioned products were manufactured at the following locations:

Calidria - King City, California; This product was never manufactured in any of Union Carbide's current or former facilities other than King City, CA. Union Carbide, therefore, objects

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 39 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/39

to Plaintiff's interrogatories insofar as they request information pertaining to Calidria asbestos as burdensome, oppressive, irrelevant, and immaterial, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Bakelite - Bound Brook, New Jersey; The version of Bakelite that contained asbestos was never manufactured in any of Union Carbide's current or former facilities other than Bound Brook, NJ. Union Carbide, therefore, objects to Plaintiff's interrogatories insofar as they request information pertaining to Bakelite as burdensome, oppressive, irrelevant, and immaterial, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

UDEL Polysulfone - Marietta, Ohio or Bound Brook, New Jersey; This product was never manufactured in any of Union Carbide's current or former facilities other than Marietta, Ohio or Bound Brook, NJ. Union Carbide, therefore, objects to Plaintiff's interrogatories insofar as they request information pertaining to LTDEL Polysulfone as burdensome, oppressive, irrelevant, and immaterial, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Acetylene Cylinders - Speedway, Indiana; This product was never manufactured in any of Union Carbide's current or former facilities other than Speedway, Indiana. Union Carbide, therefore, objects to Plaintiff's interrogatories insofar as they request information pertaining to acetylene cylinders as burdensome, oppressive, irrelevant, and immaterial, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

TRE-HOLD - California or Pennsylvania (originally made by a company acquired by Union Carbide); This product was never manufactured in any of Union Carbide's current or former facilities other than California or Pennsylvania. Union Carbide, therefore, objects to Plaintiff's

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 40 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/40**

interrogatories insofar as they request information pertaining to TRE-HOLD as burdensome, oppressive, irrelevant, and immaterial, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Automotive Radiator Products - Whiting, Indiana, Texas City, Texas, Torrence, California, or Lake River Terminal, Illinois;

Steel Scarfer Machine - Piscataway, New Jersey; This product was never manufactured in any of Union Carbide's current or former facilities other than Piscataway, NJ. Union Carbide, therefore, objects to Plaintiff's interrogatories insofar as they request information pertaining to the steel scarfer machine as burdensome, oppressive, irrelevant, and immaterial, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Polyethylene and Polystyrene Products Possible Containing Asbestos - Bound Brook, New Jersey; These products were never manufactured in any of Union Carbide's current or former facilities other than Bound Brook, NJ, except possibly for experimental or other limited purposes not relevant to this action (see below).

Union Carbide objects to responding further, with respect to the possible use of small quantities of asbestos in experimental laboratories or pilot plants. Such information is irrelevant to this action inasmuch as the plaintiff does not allege that he worked in or around any such facilities. Moreover, it would be unduly burdensome, if not virtually impossible, for Union Carbide to respond with respect to all such laboratory or pilot plant facilities.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 41 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/41**

INTERROGATORY NO. 14:

For any of Defendant's Premises At Issue, during the Time Period At Issue, if you, your affiliates, subsidiaries, or predecessor(s), arranged for any of your employees, labor inspectors, insurance company inspectors, industrial hygienists, or any other party, whether directly employed by you or otherwise, to count or measure quantity, quality or threshold limit values or concentrations of asbestos dust or particles or other dust at any of your plants, facilities, locations, or premises where asbestos or asbestos-containing products were used, assembled, installed, or removed, please describe such tests and indicate

a. the results obtained,
b. by whom such tests were performed and
c. identify and state the experience and qualifications, if applicable, of every person known to you, your agents, or contractors as the person most knowledgeable concerning such tests and their results.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is overly broad, in that it has not been limited to the relevant years at issue, nor has it been confined to the subject matter made the underlying basis for this lawsuit, and as such this Interrogatory constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is unduly burdensome. Union Carbide has not been provided with sufficient information regarding Plaintiff's alleged work history to enable Union Carbide to accurately respond to this Interrogatory. Therefore, without additional information, Union Carbide states that the time consuming, costly nature of this burden of production substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states that the discovery process, as well as Union Carbide's own investigation into this matter remain on-going. Union Carbide has not concluded its examination

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 42 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/42

of the Texas City facility asbestos files which might contain some information or documentation pertinent to the full breadth of this overly broad Interrogatory.

Additionally, Union Carbide maintains a repository of asbestos related documents, including those documents pertaining to the numerous dust studies and asbestos monitoring conducted during the relevant years at issue. Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Interrogatory may be derived from the records contained in the repository. Therefore, the burden of deriving the answer is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party. Union Carbide states that upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its repository available to Plaintiff for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

Additionally, Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Interrogatory may be derived from the documents produced in Cause No. 97CI-15498; *Amelia vs. Owens-Corning Corp., et al*; In the 150th Judicial District Court of Bexar County, Texas. Therefore, the burden of discovering responsive information is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15:

For the Time Period At Issue, if you provided or caused to be provided any safety equipment or medical programs (including, but not limited to, masks, respirators, other breathing devices, protective clothing, protective gloves, area air filtration systems, and area exhaust systems or barriers or enclosures or medical monitoring program, medical examination program, or other medical or safety program) to employees, contractors, or invitees at any of your plants, facilities, locations, or premises where asbestos and asbestos-containing products were manufactured, used, assembled, installed, or removed, please indicate

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 43 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/43

a. when such was first provided to your employees, contractors, and/or invitees and to whom.
b. under what circumstances such were provided, and
c. state whether you conducted safety meetings discussing the hazards of asbestos with employees, contractors, or invitees at any of Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue, and if so, when and what was discussed, and
d. identify and state the experience and qualifications, if applicable, of every person known to you, your agents, or contractors as the person most knowledgeable concerning such equipment and programs and their provision.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it is overly broad and is not reasonably limited to a specific time period, or for that matter, to a particular plant or premises and, as such, this Interrogatory, as drafted, constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is vague and unduly burdensome, and the oppressive, time consuming and costly nature of this burden, to the extent that responsive information and/or documentation exists, substantially outweighs the probative value of any of the information sought by this Interrogatory. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states that according to the best information which is currently available, Filter type respirators have, at least as far back as the late 1940's, been available to Carbide employees upon request or as required for specific tasks. However the use of such respirators has depended upon individual working conditions and the individuals own desire to utilize the various forms of protection readily available upon request. Since the early 1950's the Texas City facility has made various forms of personal protection available to its workers, including but not limited to safety goggles, masks, gloves, and hard hats. Since the early 1970's, and in accordance with all of the applicable government, state and industrial standards, the Texas City facility, maintained

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 44 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/44

numerous safety policies in regard to the usage of masks, protective clothings, protective gloves, area air filtration systems, and area exhaust systems or barriers or enclosures or respiratory devices for protection against exposure to asbestos dust. In addition, the contractors that worked on the premises of the Texas City facility during the years at issue, were obligated to provide safety equipment to their own employees, which included enforcing the use of the equipment in a manner consistent with Federal, State and plant guidelines. The imposition and the acceptance of this obligation, on the part of the contractors, to adhere to the applicable safety guidelines was considered a condition precedent to Union Carbide's decision to accept any of the various contractors proposals or bids which had been submitted for consideration. Over the years, Union Carbide has continued to modify and improve its policies and procedures pertaining to respiratory protection to strictly adhere to the guidelines and other industrial safety standards for all state and federal regulations. Union Carbide states that throughout the 50's and 60's, various models and types of respiratory protection were made available to both Union Carbide employees, in addition to various contractors over the years depending on the negotiated terms of the applicable purchase order. Union Carbide states that until the early 1970's, the use of respiratory protection was voluntary, but recommended. In 1972, use of respirators became mandatory, and continued to be made readily available to Union Carbide's employees as part of its general safety and health program. Therefore, in the early 1970's, following the inception of OSHA and the creation of federally mandated asbestos related guidelines, Union Carbide implemented various programs which required the following: (1) that specific respiratory protective devices will be designated for variable exposure levels; (2) that specific respiratory protection programs will be provided in accordance with the American National Standards Practice

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 45 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/45**

for Respiratory Protection; and (3) that all respiratory protection provided should meet the standards set out by all of the applicable provisions of both the Occupational Safety and Health Act and the standards set forth by the various U.S. Bureau of Mines schedules of approved respiratory protection. Countless monitoring was performed to ensure that the threshold limit value for asbestos was not exceeded.

Additionally, Union Carbide in compliance with the standards set forth by the Occupational Safety and Health Act, maintained numerous policies in regard to asbestos, requiring that all employees use company issued coveralls, underclothes and socks, which were to be laundered by daily by Union Carbide, and that all employees be required to take compulsory showering at the end of their workday or shift. The policies, as well as additional responsive information, can be located in the repository for asbestos related documents. The repository will be made available to the requesting party for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

With regard to medical examinations, around1950, Union Carbide instituted a program whereby chest x-rays were made available to the employees at the company's expense. This was originally accomplished as part of a periodic physical examination offered on a voluntary basis to all employees by the plant medical department. This program evolved throughout the 1950's and 60's to reflect the most current knowledge and the most state-of-the-art medical equipment. In December 1969, the x-rays were continued as a component of Multiphasic Health Screening, offered to all employees, again on a voluntary basis, every two years.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 46 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/46**

Pursuant to OSHA, in the early 1970's, Union Carbide implemented a program to identify employees who had been or were being exposed to asbestos. Any employee so identified was provided an annual asbestos review. Such review consisted of the following:

a. An asbestos survey questionnaire to be completed;

b. A chest x-ray was taken; and

c. A physical examination was conducted, which included an EKG, blood work up and urine analysis.

As a result of this review, if an asbestos-related disease was diagnosed, the employee was so informed. In certain circumstances, the employee may have been referred to a pulmonary specialist of his/her choice for further examination. Any documentation concerning the monitoring of the medical condition of employees at the Texas City facility would be maintained in the medical records of an individual and would have to be specifically requested and an appropriate release executed.

INTERROGATORY NO. 16:

Please state for each of Defendant's Premises At Issue, all relevant State and Federal regulations, laws, statutes, mandates, or other authority pertaining to industrial hygiene, safety, and health of which you were aware during the Time Period At Issue that governed, controlled, or applied to exposure to asbestos or asbestos-containing products, abatement or removal of asbestos-containing products, and transportation of asbestos containing waste from such removal or abatement activities.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to his Interrogatory on grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome, and the time-consuming nature of this burden, in light of Plaintiff's failure to even attempt to limit the scope of this discovery, substantially outweighs the probative value of the

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 47 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/47

information sought should discovery be allowed. Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that the various types of information sought to be discovered are a matter of public record, and as such these materials are as equally available to the requesting party as to the responding party. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide maintains a repository of asbestos related documents, including those documents pertaining all relevant State and Federal regulations, laws, statutes, mandates, or other authority pertaining to industrial hygiene, safety, and health to the purchase of asbestos products. Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Interrogatory may be derived from the records contained in the repository. Therefore, the burden of deriving the answer is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party. Union Carbide states that upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its repository available to Plaintiff for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

Additionally, Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Interrogatory may be derived from the documents produced in Cause No. 97CI-15498; *Amelia Garcia vs. Owens-Corning Corp., et al*; In the 150th Judicial District Court of Bexar County, Texas. Therefore, the burden of discovering responsive information is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 48 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/48

INTERROGATORY NO. 17:

For any of Defendant's Premises At Issue, detail every occasion during the Time Period At Issue when any State, Federal, or local regulatory agency, commission, or other examiner inspected or visited any of your plants, facilities, locations, or premises where asbestos and asbestos-containing products were used, manufactured, assembled, installed, or removed to ascertain whether you were in compliance with relevant State, Federal, or local health and safety regulations.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been reasonably limited in time or geographic scope, nor has this Interrogatory been confined to the subject-matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and as such this Interrogatory constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is unduly burdensome, and the time-consuming, costly nature of the burden entailed in identifying responsive information for this Interrogatory, on behalf of all of Union Carbide's facilities without any existing limitation in time or scope, other than those inspections which were related to "local health and safety regulations", substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that the various types of information sought to be discovered are a matter of public record, and as such these materials are as equally available to the requesting party as to the responding party. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide does not maintain a log of each and every government inspection which has taken place over the past fifty years, and therefore will be unable to thoroughly respond to the full breadth of this overly broad, oppressive Interrogatory. Union Carbide states that it maintains a repository of asbestos related documents, including those documents pertaining all relevant State

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 49 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/49

and Federal inspections for compliance with all of the applicable asbestos standards. Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Interrogatory may be derived from the records contained in the repository. Therefore, the burden of deriving the answer is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party.

Union Carbide states that upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its repository available to Plaintiff for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

Additionally, Union Carbide states that some of the information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Interrogatory may be derived from the documents produced in Cause No. 97CI-15498; *Amelia Garcia vs. Owens-Corning Corp., et al*; In the 150th Judicial District Court of Bexar County, Texas. Therefore, the burden of discovering responsive information is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party.

INTERROGATORY NO. 18:

If, before 1980, you had received notice that any individual or individuals had claimed for alleged injury against you resulting from exposure to asbestos, state for each:

a. The name and address of the claimant
b. A description of the claim.
c. The name and address of the attorney representing such claimant.

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been reasonably limited in time or geographic scope, nor has this Interrogatory been confined to the subject-matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and as such this Interrogatory constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 50 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/50

1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is unduly burdensome, and the time-consuming, costly nature of the burden entailed in identifying responsive information for this Interrogatory, on behalf of all of Union Carbide's facilities without any existing limitation in time or scope, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that the various types of information sought to be discovered are a matter of public record, and as such these materials are as equally available to the requesting party as to the responding party. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states that since the early 1970's, thousands of lawsuits have been filed against Union Carbide, alleging damages for asbestos-related exposure. It would be burdensome to require that Union Carbide review each and every complaint ever filed in order to determine which lawsuits were predicated on premises liability.

Union Carbide states that since the early 1970's, with the onset of asbestos-related litigation, Union Carbide has maintained a list of all asbestos-related cases against Union Carbide. Union Carbide will make this list available to the requesting party for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

INTERROGATORY NO. 19:

If you contend that you did not own or operate or control the Defendants' Premises during the Time Period At Issue, or if you contend you are not liable in the capacity alleged in the most recent petition, describe in detail the facts supporting your contention and include a detailed corporate history of Defendant and its ownership, sale, acquisition, or divestiture or any of Defendant's Premises At Issue and any relevant mergers, acquisitions, consolidation, or other events of similar nature that you believe bear on the issue of ownership, control, or assumption of liabilities for acts occurring on Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue and identify and

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 51 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/51

state the experience and qualifications, if applicable, of every person known to you, your agents, or contractors as having knowledge of facts relevant to this issue.

ANSWER: Union Carbide does not make such a contention at this time.

INTERROGATORY NO. 20:

If you contend that venue is not proper, identify by municipality and county the location you contend is your principal place of business within this state for purposes of venue, as well as your next three most significant business locations within this state. If you do not contend that any of your locations are a principal place of business, identify up to four of your places of business where your highest level decision makers within this state work.

ANSWER: Union Carbide does not make such a contention at this time.

INTERROGATORY NO. 21:

Identify by name each product containing asbestos fibers that Defendant or any of its predecessors or subsidiary companies manufactures, marketed or sold from 1969 to 1998.

ANSWER: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 13, including all of the objections set forth therein.

INTERROGATORY NO. 22:

If defendant from 1969 to 1998 manufactured, marketed or sold a product that contained asbestos fibers, state as to each product the following:

a. As to each product, state whether your product was manufactured, marketed and/or sold.
b. The trade or brand name of each of those products manufactured, marketed and/or sold.
c. The date each of the named products, if any, was placed on the market.
d. A description of the physical (chemical) composition of each of the named products, if any, including the type of asbestos contained in the product and the percentage of asbestos put in each product.
e. The date Defendant stopped manufacturing such asbestos-containing product.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 52 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/52

f. The date each of the products was removed from the market and no longer sold or distributed and the reason therefore;

g. The date asbestos was removed for such product, if ever, and the reasons for removing it.

ANSWER: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 13, including all of the objections set forth therein.

INTERROGATORY NO. 23:

Before manufacturing, selling or placing the products listed in Defendant's response to Interrogatory No. 21 into the stream of commerce, were any tests conducted to determine the potential health hazards involved in the use of, or exposure to,, the asbestos materials contained in that product or products?

ANSWER: Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and to the extent that it has not been limited in time, scope or for that matter, to a particular facility or premises, and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Interrogatory on grounds that it is unduly burdensome, and the oppressive, time consuming and costly nature of this burden, to the extent that responsive information and/or documentation exists, substantially outweighs the probative value of any of the information sought by this Interrogatory. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states that its knowledge concerning health hazards possibly associated with excessive exposure to asbestos fiber inhalation developed gradually. Union Carbide further states that over the course of its business it has operated a variety of facilities and as a result numerous

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 53 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/53

studies have been conducted, both at the corporate and local level, regarding the potential hazards which have been associated with excessive exposure to asbestos and asbestos containing products, making it virtually impossible to identify each and every test or study which has been performed, much less the specific researcher and work product generated. Subject to the information which has been explicitly qualified herein, two studies of Calidria asbestos were conducted by the Chemical Hygiene Fellowship of the Mellon Institute on behalf of Union Carbide:

1. The first study was entitled "The Fibrogenic Potential of Asbestos Products-Via Intraperitoneal Injection in Guinea Pigs, Rats and Rabbits and by the Intratracheal Route in the Rat." Although Union Carbide can not represent that it knows the names of the persons who conducted the study, the following individuals did sign the study: Edwin R. Kinkhead, B.S., Research Assistant, Urbano C. Pozzani, M.S. Senior Fellow and Charles P. Carpenter, Ph.D., Assistant Administrative Fellow. Also, the following persons received an acknowledgment in the study: Charles C. Hahn, B.S., Junior Fellow and John M. King, Ph.D., DVM, Fellow. The study was completed on July 8, 1966. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the degree of fibrogenicity of asbestos mined at Union Carbide's King City, California facility, as compared with other forms of asbestos.

2. The second study was entitled "Calidria Asbestos Resin Grade RG244, Tracheal Insufflation of Rat Lungs with Interpretation of Pathology After 20, 60, 90 and 180 Days." Although Union Carbide cannot represent that it knows the names of the persons who conducted the study, Charles P. Carpenter, Ph.D., Administrative

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 54 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/54**

Fellow, was the editor of the study's report. In addition, the following individuals were named as contributors to the study: D.L. Geary, Jr., E.R. Kinkhead, R.C. Myers and D.J. Nachreiner. The study was completed on September 3, 1971. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the degree of fibrogenicity of Union Carbide's RG244 as compared with other forms of asbestos.

In addition to the above described two tests, Union Carbide cooperated with the Pneumoconiosis Research Unit of the Llandough Hospital in the United Kingdom to conduct a "trace element analysis" of asbestos and provided samples of Calidria asbestos for such analysis. Union Carbide may also have conducted "patch tests" to determine the impact, if any, of Calidria on skin and other soft tissue. Union Carbide is currently attempting to ascertain the possible location of the reports of this testing.

Union Carbide states that according to the best information currently available, the repository and other possibly responsive documents have been made available to the requesting party for inspection and duplication on numerous occasions, therefore, the burden of ascertaining the answer is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party.

INTERROGATORY NO. 24:

If the answer to interrogatory No. 22 is in the affirmative, state:

a. The names of the products tested and the dates of such tests;
b. The name, address and job title of each person who conducted those tests.
c. The results or conclusions for those tests.
d. Whether any products were removed from the market as a result of these tests.
e. The name of all products removed from the market as a result of these tests.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 55 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/55

ANSWER: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 13 and 23, including all of the objections set forth therein.

INTERROGATORY NO. 25:

Identify by name and location each plant or manufacturing facility in which the products listed in Defendant's answer to interrogatory No. 21 were manufactured, assembled, or prepared for sale or marketing from 1969 to 1998, specifying which plants produced each items, the dates each plant is or was in operation, and time span during which each named item was produced or manufactured.

ANSWER: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 13 and 23, including all of the objections set forth therein.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 56 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/56

RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

Please produce all ordering, sales, and shipping documents pertaining to the purchase or acquisition of asbestos-containing products for use at Defendant's Premises At Issue at any time.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds it is overly broad and is not reasonably limited to a specific time period or to a specific plant or Union Carbide premises, and as such, this Request as drafted, constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague, and the oppressive, time consuming and costly nature of this burden of production, to the extent that responsive information and/or documentation exists, substantially outweighs the probative value of any of the information sought by this Request. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states some information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Request may possibly be derived from the documents contained in the Repository. Union Carbide states that it will make its Repository available to the requesting party for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

Additionally, Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Request may be derived from the documents produced in Cause No. 97CI-15498; *Amelia Garcia vs. Owens-Corning Corp., et al*; In the 150th Judicial District Court of Bexar County, Texas. Therefore, the burden of discovering responsive information is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 57 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/57

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:

Please produce all documents that relate to abatement of asbestos or asbestos-containing materials at Defendant's Premises At Issue and transportation of asbestos-containing waste.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been reasonably limited in time or scope, nor, for that matter has this Request been confined to the subject matter made the underlying basis for this lawsuit, and as such, this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is unduly burdensome, and the time consuming, costly nature of locating, much less producing each and every document relating to the abatement of asbestos, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:

Please produce all records identifying contractors and/or the employees of contractors who were on Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue, including but not limited to gate records, sign-in logs, visitor's logs. identification badge or "brassing" procedures, fingerprinting, or other documents of a similar nature.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that as phrased, this Request is unduly burdensome, and the costly,

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 58 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/58

time-consuming burden of production substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:

Please produce all records pertaining to the methods and manner of identification of individuals entering and/or leaving Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide object to this Request on the grounds that it is duplicative and unduly burdensome. Subject to and without waiving the forgoing objection, please refer to Union Carbide's Response to Request for Production No. 3, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:

Please produce the contract and work progress documents pertaining to the contractors who performed services at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue, including, but not limited to, invitations to bid, requests for proposals, bids, proposals, statements of scope of work, work orders, specifications, blueprints, plans, acceptances, contracts, amendments, addenda, change orders, inspection reports, work logs or contractor logs, including but not limited to all of the contractor documents referring to work to be done, underway, or completed by Plaintiff's employer at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that as phrased, this Request is unduly burdensome, and the costly, time-consuming burden of production substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 59 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/59

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:

Please produce all documents reflecting payments made to Plaintiff's employer for work contracted to do at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue, including but not limited to authorizations for payment, invoices, bills, check requests, requisitions, canceled checks, or other documents of a similar nature reflecting payment for services rendered by Plaintiff's employer.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Response to Request for Production No. 5, including all of the objections set forth therein. Furthermore, Plaintiff has not provided Union Carbide with any information that would indicate who Plaintiff's employer allegedly was during the relevant years at issue, and therefore, this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:

Please produce all photographs or videographic depictions or films depicting the use of any safety precautions (such as containment areas, warning signs, etc.) taken to protect bystanders from the hazards of airborne asbestos resulting from the use of asbestos-containing products Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: To the extent that responsive and relevant documentation and/or other materials exist and can be located, they will be made available to the requesting party at a mutually agreeable place and time for inspection and duplication.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:

Please produce all documents containing any warnings concerning the possibility of injury resulting from the use of asbestos-containing products or exposure to asbestos.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 10, including all of the objections set forth therein.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 60 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/60

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:

Please produce an photographs of warning signs or warning statements which are or have been in place at Defendant's Premises At Issue in the vicinity of asbestos-containing products.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 10, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:

Please produce an documents that relate to any inspections by any regulatory agency for the purpose of ascertaining whether health or safety regulations were being followed or adhered to at any of your plants. This request specifically seeks any and all such documentation referring to dust hazards, including but not limited to asbestos in your plants.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 17, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:

In the event that Defendant performed or had performed any dust level counts or measurements of any of its plants or industrial facilities with respect to asbestos dust, please produce any documents. memoranda, or other writings that in any way reflect the results of such studies or counts and actions taken as a result of such counts or studies.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 14, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

Please produce all documents relating to inspections by labor inspectors, insurance company inspectors or anyone from your company or hired by your company, that included the taking or measuring of "dust counts".

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 61 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/61

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is duplicative of various prior requests for information. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 14, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:

Please produce all documents that indicate that asbestos fibers, when inhaled, can be hazardous to the health of human beings.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:

Please produce all documents supporting the legal theories and factual bases of your defenses set forth in your response to Plaintiffs Request for Disclosure under Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 194.2, subparagraph (c).

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request because it is over broad and seeks all documents relating to its contentions and not specific documents. In re American Optical Corp., 988 S.W.2d 711 (Tex. 1998).

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

If you contend that Plaintiff was not exposed to asbestos dust at Defendant's Premises At Issue, please produce the documents supporting your contention.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent it contains an interrogatory and as such is not a true request for production as defined by Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Union Carbide further objects to this request because it is vague and does not describe

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 62 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/62

specific documents or specific categories of documents to which Union Carbide might respond. In re American Optical Corp., 988 S.W.2d 711 (Tex 1998). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that it is overly broad and improperly seeks the discovery of all factual assertions and a marshaling of proof supporting Union Carbide's contentions and as a result, this Request is inconsistent with Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

Please produce all documents used, referred to or relied upon in answering any Interrogatories.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is unduly burdensome and overly broad and does not seek specific items or categories of documents. In re American Optical Corp., 988 S.W.2d 711 (Tex. 1998).

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:

Please produce any and all documents and other tangible things which refer to the document retention (and/or destruction) policy of Defendant, including the following:

a. Any document retention and/or destruction policies for Defendant that pertain to documents and records, including but not limited to supplements, addenda, memoranda, operating bulletins, revisions, or any other superseding instructions that referred to the stopping, suspending or resuming of such retention or destruction policies.

b. Any record retention and/or destruction, dumping, or purging policies for Defendant that pertain to documents and records created, maintained or stored by electronic and/or magnetic means, including but not limited to records that have been microfilmed, microfiched, imaged, scanned, or stored on tapes, disks, diskettes, CD-rom, databases, etc. or on or within any computer hardware, backup system, download system, file dumping or other system of information management, whether on-site or off-site, including but not limited to supplements, addenda, memoranda,

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 63 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/63

operating bulletins, revisions, or any other superseding instructions that referred to the stopping, suspending or resuming of such retention or destruction policies.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that the discovery process and Union Carbide's own investigation into this matter remain on-going. Upon the completion of the discovery process Union Carbide will make all responsive documents and/or materials which exist and can be located, available to the requesting party for copying and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:

Please produce all documents, including but not limited to lists, inventories, indices, databases or printouts thereof, archives, storage inventories, logs, or other search aids that refer or relate to the existence, extent, type, organization, filing system. method of access or retrieval, and/or location of Defendant's documents (maintained or stored on-site or off-site) pertaining to any of the subject matter areas of Plaintiffs' Interrogatories.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request on grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome and the time consuming, oppressive nature of this Request, to the extent that responsive information exists and can be located, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide maintains a repository of documents and other material containing information pertaining to asbestos or asbestos products in accordance with the most advanced state-of-the-art industrial practices. All material or documents responsive to this request, or containing information responsive to this request, still accessible to Union Carbide would be contained in the office and Repository or the aforesaid files. Upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its Repository (not including privileged information) available to the Plaintiff for review and replication at a suitable time and place.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 64 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/64

Any existing indices for documents related to Union Carbide's Texas City facility have been reviewed for relevance and have been incorporated into Union Carbide's Repository referred to above, or included as exhibits to these responses. Specific indices of particular files previously maintained by officials or employees in the course of their business have been collected and incorporated into the Repository along with the files to which the indices respectively refer. According to the best information currently available, there exists no indices specifically pertaining to documents relevant to the use of asbestos at the Texas City facility. No master index for the Repository described above has been created. Union Carbide attorneys or legal assistants reviewed and logged in material as it was obtained and added to the Repository. Such logs, however, are privileged as attorney work product.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:

Please produce all books, pamphlets, memoranda. or written materials of any kind or character that were received by you and that would indicate that asbestos fibers, when inhaled, can be hazardous to the health of human beings.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

Please produce all documents that reflect, indicate or in any way relate to communications between you and any manufacturer of asbestos-containing products concerning or related to the asbestos contained in such products.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague, unduly burdensome and overly broad to the extent that it seeks information which has not been limited in time, scope or

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 65 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/65

for that matter, to a particular facility or premises. Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Additionally, Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that it is duplicative and repetitious of numerous prior requests for information.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

Please produce all documents in your possession disseminated or published by any trade association that contain information relating to the hazards of asbestos and an documents which refer to such documents and any documents pertaining to meetings of such trade associations that were attended by any of your employees or representatives.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that as phrased, this Request is unduly burdensome, and the costly, time-consuming burden of production substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 3, including all of the objections set forth therein.

Additionally, Union Carbide maintains a repository of asbestos related documents, including

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 66 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/66

those documents which have been disseminated or published by any trade association and contain information relating to hazards of asbestos. Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Request may be derived from the records contained in the repository. Therefore, the burden of deriving the answer is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party. Union Carbide states that upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its repository available to Plaintiff for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:

Please produce all of Defendant's safety meeting minutes that refer to the dangers of asbestos.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that as phrased, this Request is unduly burdensome, and the costly, time-consuming burden of production substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states that according to the best information currently available, there are no documents which exist, that might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad request. Union Carbide maintains a repository of asbestos related documents. Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Request may be

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 67 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/67

derived from the records contained in the repository. Therefore, the burden of deriving the answer is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party. Union Carbide states that upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its repository available to Plaintiff for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:

Please produce all documents related to the installation of asbestos-containing materials at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that as phrased, this Request is unduly burdensome, and the costly, time-consuming burden of production substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Union Carbide further objects to this request because it is vague and does not describe specific documents or specific categories of documents to which Union Carbide might respond. In re American Optical Corp., 988 S.W.2d 711 (Tex 1998). Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Request may be derived from the records contained in the repository. Therefore, the burden of deriving the answer is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 68 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/68

responding party. Union Carbide states that upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its repository available to Plaintiff for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:

Please produce all documents related to the medical condition of Plaintiff at any time during his work at Defendant's Premises At Issue. This request specifically includes any and all x-rays, x-ray reports, medical notes and/or medical records of any kind, annual physical forms, and any records relating to Plaintiff's health.

RESPONSE: To the extent that such documents exist and can be located, they will be produced to the requesting party at a mutually agreeable place and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:

Please produce all documents related to Plaintiff, including but not limited to Plaintiff's work performance and/or personnel records at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: To the extent that such documents exist and can be located, they will be produced to the requesting party at a mutually agreeable place and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:

Please produce all documents that reflect or depict in any way the layout of Defendant's Premises At Issue, including the location and dimensions of all buildings and the location and placement of asbestos-containing products, and specifically including an photographs, plats, maps, diagrams, blueprints, drawings, specifications or other architectural renderings.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and as such is not reasonably

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 69 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/69

calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that as phrased, this Request is unduly burdensome, and the costly, time-consuming burden of production entailed in producing each and every document which might in some way reflect or depict the layout of the Texas City facility, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27:

Please produce an demonstrative aids Defendant plans to use at trial in this matter.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that as phrased, this Request is unduly burdensome, and the costly, time-consuming burden of production substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Union Carbide further objects to this request because it is vague and does not describe specific documents or specific categories of documents to which Union Carbide might respond. In re American Optical Corp., 988 S.W.2d 711 (Tex 1998).

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28:

Please produce all photographs of asbestos products in place or asbestos-containing materials being installed, maintained, removed, replaced, repaired, or manipulated in anyway at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 70 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/70

the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:

Please produce all documents relating to any individuals' claimed injury as a result of exposure to asbestos at any facility of Defendant, including, but not limited to, workers' compensation claims and any documentation going to or received from any insurance carrier pertaining to such claims, and any documentation pertaining to the disposition of such claims.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and to the extent that it has not been limited in time, scope or for that matter, a particular facility, contractor or premises.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30:

Please produce all documents that in any way reflect corporate minutes, corporate records, departmental meetings or discussions, or meetings with agents or contractors that in any way discuss, note, or table a discussion of the hazards of asbestos or potential health hazards of asbestos. The documents sought in this request include those produced and/or maintained at a corporate level by those responsible for supervising or advising personnel at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and to the extent that it has not been limited in time, scope or for that matter, to a particular contractor.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 71 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/71

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31:

Please produce all documents of corporate, board of directors, Defendant Premises representatives, departmental persons, task force, or other meetings of members of Defendant from 1940 until the last year of the Time Period At Issue that contain discussion or information concerning asbestos, asbestos-related health hazards, or asbestos-containing products.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague, overly broad and unduly burdensome, and the time consuming, oppressive nature of the burden entailed in reviewing, much less locating, each and every document, to the extent that documents actually exist, of corporate, board of directors, Defendant Premises representatives, departmental persons, task force, or other meetings of members of Defendant from 1940 until the last year of the Time Period At Issue which relate to asbestos, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996).

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 32:

Please produce all documents which will be used at the time of trial, including all potential exhibits and those documents which may be used to cross-examine other witnesses or in rebuttal, and which you contend are relevant to any of Defendant's enumerated defenses in Defendant's most recently filed Answer.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request because it is inappropriate because it seeks the invasive disclosure of the mental impressions, conclusions, opinions and legal theories of Union Carbide's legal counsel. Texas Tech Univ. Health Sciences Car. V. Schooled, 828 S.W.2d 502, 504 (Tex. App. - El Paso 1992, orig. proceeding). Union Carbide further objects to this request for any documents supporting its allegations and contentions as over broad. In re American Optical Corp., 988 S.W.2d 711 (Tex. 1998).

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 72 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/72

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 33:

Please produce documents between Defendant and any of its worker's compensation insurance carriers or any other insurance carriers regarding the hazards of asbestos and asbestos-containing products.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and to the extent that it has not been limited in time, scope or for that matter, to a particular facility or premises, and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Additionally, Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that it is duplicative and repetitious of numerous prior requests for information. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Additionally, Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Request may be derived from the records contained in the repository. Therefore, the burden of deriving the answer is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party. Union Carbide states that upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its repository available to Plaintiff for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 34:

Please produce documents between Defendant and any of its insurance carriers relating to any inspections carried out by the insurance carrier in which asbestos or dust in general was mentioned.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 73 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/73

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Response to Request for Production No. 33, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 35:

Please produce a copy of all regulations, orders, rules and/or policies which have been used relating to the safety of the Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 16, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 36:

Please produce an documents which contain complaints by employees of Defendant at the Defendant's Premises At Issue regarding safety conditions and work place conditions at the Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that it is vague, overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information beyond the scope of the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and to the extent that it has not been limited in time or scope and as such is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Union Carbide states that according to the best information currently available, no such documentation exists.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 74 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/74

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 37:

Please produce all documents which contain complaints by Union representatives of Defendant's Premises At Issue regarding safety conditions and work place conditions at the Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: None.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 38:

Please produce all documents, organizational charts or rosters which identify the members of the management at the Defendant's Premises At Issue and their areas of responsibility during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on ground that it constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996).

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 39:

Please produce all documents which evidence Defendant's net worth, including, but not limited to, all "10-K" forms filed for the last five (5) years.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that it is unduly burdensome and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 75 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/75

Upon Plaintiff's request, copies of such documentation and/or other materials will be made available at a suitable time and place for inspection, review and copying at Plaintiff 's expense at a mutually agreeable place and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 40:

Please produce all documents which evidence Defendant's purchase, acquisition, sale, or transfer of ownership or of liabilities relating to Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and seeks information which is irrelevant and beyond the scope of discovery.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 41:

If you contend that you are not liable for any dangerous condition or activity taking place at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue, please produce all title documents supporting this contention.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent it contains an interrogatory and as such is not a true request for production as defined by Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Union Carbide further objects to this request because it is vague and does not describe specific documents or specific categories of documents to which Union Carbide might respond. In re American Optical Corp., 988 S.W.2d 711 (Tex 1998). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that it is overly broad and improperly seeks the discovery of all factual assertions and a marshaling of proof supporting Union Carbide's contentions and as a result, this Request is inconsistent with Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 76 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/76

Please refer to Union Carbide's Answers to Interrogatories Nos. 10 and 15, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 42:

If you contend that you did not own or control the facility(ies) during any portion of the Time Period At Issue, please produce all documentation that supports your contention, including, but not limited to documentation pertaining to the purchase, sale, acquisition, merger, or divestment of corporations, subsidiaries, divisions, or other corporate entities or assets that included the purchase, sale, acquisition, merger, or divestment of the facility(ies); such documentation to include, by way of example and not limitation, purchase or sale agreements, minutes, resolutions, annual reports, 10K reports or other state or federal agency filings, or deposition, trial testimony or affidavits of your corporate representatives who are the most knowledgeable individuals with respect to such matters.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent it contains an interrogatory and as such is not a true Request for Production as defined by Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Union Carbide further objects to this request because it is vague and does not describe specific documents or specific categories of documents to which Union Carbide might respond. In re American Optical Corp., 988 S.W.2d 711 (Tex 1998).

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 43:

If you contend that you have not been sued in the proper capacity as set forth in Plaintiff's latest petition, produce all documentation that supports your contention, including, but not limited to documentation pertaining to the history of Defendant and any relevant purchase, sale, acquisition, merger, or divestment of corporations, subsidiaries, divisions, or other corporate entities or assets that included the purchase, sale, acquisition, merger, or divestment of the facility(ies); such documentation to include, by way of example and not limitation, purchase or sale agreements, minutes, resolutions, annual reports, 10K reports or other state or federal agency filings, or deposition, trial testimony or affidavits of your corporate representatives who are the most knowledgeable individuals with respect to such matters.

RESPONSE: As it concerns this lawsuit, Union Carbide does not contend that it has not been sued in the proper capacity.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 77 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/77

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 44:

Please produce all indemnity agreements, assignments of liability, subrogation agreements and other similar documents relating to Defendant's Premises At Issue and liabilities arising from said ownership.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague, overly broad, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 45:

If you contend Defendant's Premises At Issue was asbestos-free during the Time Period At Issue, please produce all documents which support your contention.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent it contains an interrogatory and as such is not a true Request for Production as defined by Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Union Carbide further objects to this request because it is vague and does not describe specific documents or specific categories of documents to which Union Carbide might respond. In re American Optical Corp., 988 S.W.2d 711 (Tex 1998). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that it is overly broad and improperly seeks the discovery of all factual assertions and a marshaling of proof supporting Union Carbide's contentions and as a result, this Request is inconsistent with Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide does not make such a contention at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 46:

If you contend that some or all of Defendant's Premises At Issue are asbestos-free, please produce all documents, including but not limited to, specifications, blue prints and drawings supporting your contention.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 78 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/78

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent it contains an interrogatory and as such is not a true Request for Production as defined by Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Union Carbide further objects to this request because it is vague and does not describe specific documents or specific categories of documents to which Union Carbide might respond. In re American Optical Corp., 988 S.W.2d 711 (Tex 1998). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that it is overly broad and improperly seeks the discovery of all factual assertions and a marshaling of proof supporting Union Carbide's contentions and as a result, this Request is inconsistent with Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 47:

Please produce all documents relating to your manufacturing of any asbestos or asbestos-containing products, or products to which any amount of asbestos was added, for use at any of Defendant's facilities or for sale to others.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 13, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 48:

Please produce all documents relating to your use of any asbestos containing materials, asbestos containing products or tools with which asbestos is used, for any process taking place at any of Defendant's facilities.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that as drafted this Request is vague, confusing and unintelligible. Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that it is

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 79 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/79

unduly burdensome and the burden entailed, in light of Plaintiff's failure to state with any degree of specificity the particular types of documents sought to be discovered, forcing Union Carbide to speculate as to what information might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad request, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought, should discovery be allowed. Furthermore, Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 49:

Please produce all documents relating to your use, manipulation or handling of asbestos in any industrial processes at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that as drafted this Request is vague, confusing and unintelligible. Union Carbide objects to this request to the extent that it is overly broad and constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that it is unduly burdensome and the burden entailed, in light of Plaintiff's failure to state with any degree of specificity the particular types of documents sought to be discovered, forcing Union Carbide to speculate as to what information might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad request, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought, should discovery be allowed. Furthermore, Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 80 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/80

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 50:

Please produce all marketing and advertising materials related in any way to your manufacturing of asbestos or asbestos containing materials or your use of asbestos or asbestos-containing materials in your industrial processes.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it seeks the discovery of information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide states that according to Plaintiff's alleged work history, Plaintiff has not claimed that he was exposed to any asbestos-containing product manufactured by Union Carbide, and therefore, any information which might be responsive to this Request is irrelevant to this lawsuit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 51:

Please produce all documents relating to boilers at Defendant's Premises At Issue. This request includes owner manuals, maintenance manuals, purchase orders, and invoices.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been limited in time or scope, nor has this Request been limited to the subject-matter made the underlying basis for this lawsuit, and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is unduly burdensome, and the burden of producing each and every document pertaining to any of the numerous boilers contained on Union Carbide's premises substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed, in light of the fact that Plaintiff has not even claimed exposure to boilers on a Union Carbide premises.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 81 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/81

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 52:

Please produce an documents relating to any audits you conducted or caused to be conducted at Defendant's Premises At Issue in order to review some aspect of Defendant's safety program.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it has not been limited in time or scope and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it fails to identify with any degree of reasonable particularity the types or categories of documents sought to be discovered in a manner consistent with the meaning of Rule 196 if the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, and as a result, Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to what type of documentation might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad request. Additionally, Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is unduly burdensome, and the time consuming, oppressive nature of the burden entailed in locating and producing each and every safety audit ever conducted at the Texas City facility, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 53:

Please produce all documents provided by you to other plants or facilities relating to safety in the industry, audit procedures or means to eliminate dust exposure, including, but not limited to asbestos dust, at industrial facilities.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it seeks the discovery of information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it has not been limited in time or scope, or for that matter to the subject matter made the basis of this lawsuit, and as such this Request

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 82 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/82

constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996).

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 54:

Please produce depositions and trial transcripts of your current or former employees or other due to asbestos or insurance coverage for claims related to asbestos injury or property damage.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been limited in time or scope, nor has this Request been limited to the subject-matter made the underlying basis for this lawsuit, and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is unduly burdensome, and the burden of producing each and every deposition and trial transcript current or former employees or other corporate representatives, substantially outweighs the probative value of the information sought should discovery be allowed. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide was first named in 1972 in a law suit involving allegations of injury from exposure to asbestos. Since then, Union Carbide has been named in thousands of such cases. Accordingly, plaintiffs frequently dismiss Union Carbide from such law suits as plaintiffs discover the facts and focus on true culprits. Union Carbide also from time to time settles cases for nominal amounts to avoid cost of discovery or litigation.

In the history of the litigation, few cases (probably less than a couple of dozen) have raised specific allegations of injury from exposure to Bakelite products. No depositions or trials have placed Bakelite products at issue. Union Carbide does maintain a computer data base listing of all

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 83 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/83

asbestos cases, alphabetically listed. Upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make that listing available to Plaintiff for review and replication at a suitable time and place.

Union Carbide has presently identified the following testimony offered in asbestos-related law suits by Union Carbide employees:

1. **Dr. Bipin H. Ayashia**

   (A) Darrell Cook, et al. v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation, In the Circuit Court of Kanawa County, West Virginia; Cause No. 39-C-1227, taken on May 29, 1986.

   (B) Cecil Miller v. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation, In the Circuit Court of Kanawa County, West Virginia; Cause No. 83-C-1223, taken on December 9, 1986.

   (C) John Teliksko, Jr. v. Combustion Engineering, Inc., et al., In the United States District Court For the Southern District of West Virginia at Huntington; Cause No. 82-3190, taken on February 20, 1986.

2. **Bert K. Barton**

   (A) James W. Manisto v. American Brake Block Corporation. et al., District Court, First Judicial District, Dakota County, Minneapolis, Minnesota, NO. C-5-88-1008, January 26, 1989.

   (B) Robert P. Payne, Josphine Stala as Administratrix of the Estate of Stanley Stala v. Advocate Mines, et al., Supreme Court of N.Y. Law Div., Middlesex County, Doc. No. L-l 0917-85, October 27, 1988.

3. **Myron Bennett**

   (A) Keith Edwin Gibson v. Armstrong World Industries, Inc., et al., U.S.D.C., District of Colorado, Consolidated Civil Action No.83 -K- 1 756; Civil Action No. 84-K-912, May 18,1987.

4. **Newell Bolton**

   (A) Russell Allen v. American Petrofina, et al., District Court of Jefferson County, Texas, File No. B-126,986, January 11-12, 1993.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 84 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/84

(B) Russell Smith, et al. vs. Able Supply Company, et al.; Cause No. 99-C00-657; In the District Court of Galveston County, Texas on January 12, 2001.

(C) In Re: All Asbestos Personal Injury Cases filed by the Law Offices of Peter Angelos in Knox County, Tennessee Circuit Court, File No. 1-221-92, January 18, 2002.

5. **Donald Deese**

(A) Roosevelt Scott, et al. vs. American Optical Corp., et al.; Cause No. B-141,242; In the 60th Judicial District Court of Jefferson County, Texas on April 20, 1992.

6. **Carl U. Dernehl. M.D.**

(A) John Worm v. Rubicon Chemicals, Inc., et al., U.S.D.C., District of Minnesota, 4th Division, St. Paul, Minnesota, No. 4-81- 748,October 21, 1982.

(B) Henry Garry v. Union Carbide Corporation, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Arkansas, Western Division, Civil No. LR-C-83-921, February 11 1985.

(C) Arthur A. Frehse v. Anchor Packing Company, et al., Sixth Judicial District, County of Carlton, State of Minnesota, March l0th, 1989.

7. **Sam Footer**

(A) Melvin Ketchum vs: Owens Corning, et al.; Cause No. 97-08-5722-D; In the 103rd Judicial District Court of Cameron County, Texas on September 21, 1998.

8. **Thomas J. Hall. M.D.**

(A) James W. Manisto v. American ,Brake Block Corporation, et al., District Court, First Judicial District, Dakota County, Minneapolis, Minnesota, No. C-5-88-1008, January 10,1989.

9. **Dr. Roy E. Joyner**

(A) Creed T. Erwin v. Clemo Industries, Inc., U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Texas (Beaumont Division), Civil Action. No. B-86-1780-A, November 23, 1987.

(B) Russell Allen, et al. v. American Petrofina, et al., District Court of Jefferson County Texas, File No. B-126,986, June 6th and 7th, 1996.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 85 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/85

10. Joseph Keeler

(A) Doreen Adkins, Administratrix of the Estate of Donald Adkins, et al. vs. Combustion Engineering, Inc., et al.; Cause No. 77-3216; In the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia at Huntington on October 1, 1981.

11. Newton H. Ketcham

(A) State of West Virginia, Circuit Court of Mongolia County, West Virginia, File No. 86-C-458, November 8,1991.

(B) Russell Allen, et al v. American Petrofina, et al., District Court of Jefferson County Texas, File No. B-126,986, December 8-10, 1992.

(C) Pauline Adams v. E.I. Dupont De Nemours, District Court of Jefferson County Texas, Cause No. D-126,445, March 15, 1994.

12. Edward J. Kleber

(A) James W. Manisto v. American Brake Block, District of Minnesota - Dakota County, 1st Judicial District, File No. C5-88-1008, February 13, 1989.

13. Dr. Hilton C. Lewinsohn

(A) Marion B. Soignet v. Montello, et al., District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, File No. B-86-1193, March 9,1989.

(B) Conwed Comoration v. Union Carbide Chemicals and Plastics Company, Inc., District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Case No.5-92-88, February 15, 1994.

(C) Conwed Comoration v. Union Carbide Chemicals and Plastics Company, Inc., US District Court, Fifth Division, District of Minnesota, October 18, 1994.

(D) Chicago Board of Education v. A.C.S., Inc., Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, County Department Law Division, File No. 92-L-9934, October 5,1995.

14. Paul McDaniel

(A) Conwed v. Union Carbide Corporation, U.S.D.C., Eastern District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, File No. MDL-875, September 2, 1993.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 86 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/86

15. **William McManus**

(A) Melvin Ketchum vs. Owens Corning, et al; Cause No. 97-08-5722-D; In the 103rd Judicial District Court of Cameron County, Texas on October 21, 1998.

16. **Edgar Myers**

(A) Vernon Scott and Buford Scott vs. Johns-Manville Sales Corp., et al.; Cause No. A-81-CA-531; In the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Austin Division on June 22, 1982.

17. **John L. Myers**

(A) Lester Rice v. Union Carbide Corporation, U.S.D.C., District of South Carolina, Civil Action, No.81-977-9, April 9, 1982.

(B) Simon DeWard v. Johns-Manville, et al., Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles, Civil Action No. C-298717 (and related cases), August 30, 1984.

(C) Bobby R. Sanford v. Johns-Manville Sales Corp., et al., Southern District of Texas, Galveston Division, No. G-82-325, September 4, 1986.

(D) Shirley Tate v. Certain-Teed Corp., et al., District Court, 46th Judicial District, Hardeman County, Texas, No.7591.

(E) Shirley Tate v. 3 M Corporation, et al., District Court, 94th Judicial District, Nueces County, Texas, No. 85-1559-C, July 27,1987.

(F) Union Carbide Asbestos Removal Litigation, Pennsylvania Cases, Bridgeport, Connecticut, Apri1 28, 1988.]

(G) James W. Manisto v. American Brake Block, District Court, First Judicial District, State of Minnesota, County of Dakota, File No. C-5-88-1008, January 6,1989.

(H) Estate of Leonard Martin, Sr. v. Union Carbide Corporation, Circuit Court, County of Alger, State of Michigan, Case No. 93-2429-No., August 30, 1995.

(I) Bobbie Jean Dean v. Anchor Packing, District Court, 270th Judicial District, Harrison County Texas, Cause No.97-57627, [insert date]

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 87 of 118 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/87**

(J) Richard Ahrendt v. ABEX, Inc., Superior Court of California, San Francisco County, Civil Action No.95-3895 & Related Cases, January 25, 1995.

18. William Douglas Neal

(A) Conwed v. Union Carbide Corporation, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania, File No. MDL-875, November 8 & 20, 1996

19. Thomas Norris

(A) James Manisto v. American Brake Block, Minnesota District Court, Dakota County, 1st Judicial District, File No. C5-88-1008, January 16, 1989.

20. Robert E. Peele

(A) Asbestos Cases.
Huntington, West Virginia,
September 9-10, 1981.

(B) Asbestos Cases
Southern District of Georgia,
October 7, 1981.

(C) Freda K. Knight v. Union Carbide Corporation, U.S.D.C., Southern District of West Virginia, Huntington, W.VA., Civil Action No.84-3425, May 22, 1987.

(D) Abate, et al. v. A.C.S., Inc., Circuit Court for Baltimore County, State of Maryland, Consolidation File No.89-236704, July 9, 1991.

(E) Asbestos Cases, All Courts situated in the State of Ohio, January 26, 1990.

(F) Atkins v. Owens Corning Fiberglas, U.S.D.C., Western District of Virginia, Civil Action No. 90-0058-R, December 6,1990.

(G) Asbestos Cases, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Virginia, (Newport News and Norfolk Division), Docket No. C/P 77-1-N, September 26,1980.

(H) Noyle Aldridge v. Appalachian Power Co., Circuit Court of Putnam County, West Virginia, Civil Action No. 91-C-463, April 30, 1992.

(I) Lucette Alida Nelson v. Johns-Mansville Sales, U.S.D.C., District Court of Arizona, File No. CIV. 80-148 (TUC) (RMB), April6, 1983.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 88 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/88

21. **Jim Rapp**

(A) Vernon Scott and Buford Scott vs. Johns-Manville Sales Corp., et al.; Cause No. A-81-CA-531; In the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Austin Division on June 22, 1982.

(B) Mattie Goebel, Individually and as Representative of the Estate of Leonard Goebel, Deceased vs. Fibreboard Corp, et al; Cause No. B-85-591-CA; In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont Division on September 25, 1985.

23. **Harrison B. Rhodes. PhD.**

(A) Marion B. Soignet v. Montello, Inc., et al., U. S.D.C. for Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont Division, B-86-1193-CA, January 19, 1989.

(B) June Greer. Individually, and as Exec. of the Estate of John Lee Greer, U.S.D.C. for Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division, Civil Action No. CV 86-2882, August 10, 1989.

(C) Conwed Corporation v. Union Carbide Chemicals and Plastics, U.S.D.C., District of Minnesota, 5th Division, October 12, 1994.

23. **Richard J. Sexton. M.D.**

(A) Freda K. Knight v. Union Carbide Corporation, U.S.D.C., Southern District of West Virginia, Huntington, W. Va., Civil Action No.84-3425, May 14, 1987.

24. **Howard Stephens**

(A) Keith Edwin Gibson v. Armstrong World Industries, Inc., et al., U.S.D.C., District of Colorado, Consolidated Civil Action No. 83-K-1756; Civil Action No. 84-K-912, May 18, 1987.

25. **K. Gran Townsend**

(A) Melvin Ketchum vs. Owens Corning, et al; Cause No. 97-08-5722-D; In the 103rd Judicial District Court of Cameron County, Texas on October 12, 1998.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 89 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/89

26. Earl Vicknair

(A) Norbert Renaud, et al. vs. Owens Corning Corporation, et al.; Cause No. 97-CV0879; In the 122nd Judicial District of Galveston County, Texas on June 15, 1999.

27. William Paul Woods

(A) Keith Edwin Gibson v. Armstrong World Industries, Inc. et al., U.S.D.C., District of Colorado, Consolidated Civil Action No. 83-K-1756; Civil Action No. 84-K-912, May 18,1987.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 55:

Please produce exhibit lists produced to you by any other counsel for plaintiff in other cases involving claim of injury or property damage alleged to have been caused by asbestos exposure.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 56:

Please produce all correspondence from you to Plaintiff's employer and from Plaintiff's employer to you during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds it is overly broad and is not reasonably limited to a specific time period, a specific employer or to a specific plant or Union Carbide premises, and as such, this Request as drafted, constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague, and the oppressive, time consuming and costly nature of this burden of production, to the extent that responsive information and/or

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 90 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/90

documentation exists, substantially outweighs the probative value of any of the information sought by this Request.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 57:

Please produce all documents that indicate or reference in any way any decision or discussion related to the cessation of the use of asbestos or asbestos-containing products in any of your facilities.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds it is overly broad and is not reasonably limited to a specific time period or to a specific plant or Union Carbide premises, and as such, this Request as drafted, constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague, and the oppressive, time consuming and costly nature of this burden of production, to the extent that responsive information and/or documentation exists, substantially outweighs the probative value of any of the information sought by this Request. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Request may be derived from the records contained in the repository. Therefore, the burden of deriving the answer is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party. Union Carbide states that upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its repository available to Plaintiff for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 91 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/91

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 58:

Please produce an documents that indicate or reference in any way the catalog or index or subscriptions or holdings of any library or other research repository of Defendant containing magazines, journals, books, publications or other documents relating to asbestos (including, but not limited to, the effects of exposure to asbestos, industrial hygiene measures relating to asbestos dust, and medical information or research relating to asbestos or its effects on animals or humans, populations at risk, etc.).

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, including all of the objections set forth therein.

Additionally, Union Carbide states that any information which might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Request may be derived from the records contained in the repository. Therefore, the burden of deriving the answer is substantially the same for the requesting party as for the responding party. Union Carbide states that upon Plaintiff's request, Union Carbide will make its repository available to Plaintiff for inspection and duplication at a mutually agreeable place and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 59:

Please produce all inventory, stock-on-hand, warehouse or other documents pertaining to asbestos-containing products that were stored, maintained, stockpiled, or kept by Defendant for use at any facility of Defendant, including Defendant's Premises At Issue, at any time.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent it is overly broad and is not reasonably limited to a specific time period, or for that matter, to a particular plant or premises and as such, this Request as drafted, constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). In addition, Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and unduly burdensome, and the oppressive, time consuming and costly

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 92 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/92

nature of this burden, to the extent that responsive information and/or documentation exists, substantially outweighs the probative value of any of the information sought by this Request.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 60:

Please produce any letters, affidavits, or stipulations concerning authenticity of any of Defendant's documents provided by you in any other case involving claim of injury or property damage alleged to have been caused by asbestos exposure.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it has not been limited in time or scope and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it fails to identify with any degree of reasonable particularity the types or categories of documents sought to be discovered in a manner consistent with the meaning of Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, and as a result, Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to what type of documentation might be responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad request.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 61:

Please produce all workers' compensation policies which were in effect during the years that Plaintiff claims to have been on your premises. Please be sure to include the information page of the policy which describes who is covered by the policy.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it has not been limited in time or scope and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W. 2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence since Plaintiff has not alleged that he was ever directly employed by Union Carbide.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 93 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/93

RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION AND FURTHER REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1:

Admit that asbestos-containing products, asbestos-containing friction products, and/or machinery requiring the use of asbestos or asbestos-containing products were utilized on Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it has not been reasonably limited in time or scope. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states and generally admits that at some point in time, on certain portions of the Texas City facility, in limited operations, certain types of asbestos-containing products were utilized.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2:

Admit that Plaintiff was exposed to asbestos at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to the use of the terms "exposed to asbestos" on grounds that it is unclear and undefined. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it has not been limited in time, scope or subject matter. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states that it can neither admit nor deny this Request with any degree of specificity, because Union Carbide has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable regarding whether Plaintiff was ever actually present on the premises of the Texas City facility, much less the specific nature of Plaintiff's employment, is insufficient to enable Union

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 94 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/94

Carbide to admit or deny that Plaintiff was exposed to asbestos at the Texas City facility. Subject thereto, this Request is denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 62:

If your response to the foregoing request is anything other than "admit", produce all documents which support your response, including any documents which you believe support a denial of the foregoing admission or any documents showing what reasonable inquiry you undertook in connection with your inability to admit or deny the foregoing request.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide object to this Request on grounds that it has not been limited in time, scope or subject matter, and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it fails to specify with any degree of reasonable particularity the types or categories of documents sought to be discovered in a manner consistent with the meaning of 196.1(b) of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, and as a result Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to what types of documentation, if any, might contain information which is responsive to the full breadth of this overly broad Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3:

Admit that you have no air monitoring for asbestos taken on Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to the vague and confusing nature of this poorly worded Request, in addition to the use of improper use of negatives. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been reasonably limited in time or scope. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 95 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/95

Union Carbide states and generally admits that over the years countless air monitoring for asbestos has been performed at the Texas City facility.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4:

Admit that results of air monitoring for asbestos taken on Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue indicate Plaintiff was exposed to asbestos at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that there is no evidence that Plaintiff was ever on a Union Carbide premises, in addition to the fact that there is no evidence that Plaintiff would have ever been exposed to asbestos if he were ever present on a Union Carbide premises. Additionally, Union Carbide states that it can neither admit nor deny this Request with any degree of specificity, because Union Carbide has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable regarding whether Plaintiff was ever actually present on the premises of the Texas City facility, much less the specific nature of Plaintiff's employment, is insufficient to enable Union Carbide to admit or deny that Plaintiff was exposed to asbestos at the Texas City facility. Subject thereto, this Request is denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 63:

If your response to the foregoing request is anything other than "admit", produce all documents which support your response, including any documents which you believe support a denial of the foregoing admission or any documents showing what reasonable inquiry you undertook in connection with you inability to admit or deny the foregoing request.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Response to Request for Production No. 62, including all of the objections set forth therein.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 96 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/96

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5:

Admit that Defendant's employees were working with asbestos-containing materials at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide object to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been limited in time, scope or subject matter, and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states and generally admits that over the years, some of Union Carbide's employees, worked with certain types of asbestos-containing products in limited portions of the Texas City facility.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6:

Admit that contractors were working with asbestos-containing materials at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide object to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been limited in time, scope or subject matter, and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it has failed to specify the specific contractor(s) to which Plaintiff is referring, and as such Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to whether or not Union Carbide can admit or deny this vague Request with any degree of reasonable certainty. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 97 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/97

Union Carbide states and generally admits that over the years, some of Union Carbide's contractors, worked with certain types of asbestos-containing products, during certain periods of time, in limited portions of the Texas City facility.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7:

Admit that Defendant was aware of the presence of asbestos-containing products on Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to the use of the term "aware" on grounds that it is vague, unclear and undefined with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to whether or not it can admit or deny this Request with any degree of reasonable certainty. Union Carbide object to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been limited in time, scope or subject matter, and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states and generally admits, that during certain periods of time, it was aware that in particular portions of the Texas City facility, asbestos-containing products were present.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8:

Admit that Defendant was aware of the use of asbestos-containing products on Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to the use of the term "aware" on grounds that it is vague, unclear and undefined with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to whether or not it can admit or deny this Request with any degree of reasonable certainty. Union

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 98 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/98

Carbide object to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been limited in time, scope or subject matter, and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states and generally admits, that during certain periods of time, it was aware that in particular portions of the Texas City facility, asbestos-containing products were used.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:

Admit that you did not post a warning, caution or hazard signs concerning asbestos at Defendant's premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide object to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been limited in time, scope or subject matter, and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states that this Request is denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:

Admit that you did not post a warning, caution or hazard signs in Spanish concerning asbestos at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide object to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been limited in time, scope or subject matter, and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Coff... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 99 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/99

Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonably inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable is insufficient to enable Union Carbide to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Therefore, this Request is denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:

Admit that you specified the use of asbestos-containing material at Defendant's Premises At Issue prior to or during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is undefined and unintelligible. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that the overly broad nature of this Request renders it meaningless as to those issues which are relevant to this lawsuit, and as such, this Request seeks information beyond the scope of discovery. Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states and generally admits that during some of the years within the relevant time period, Union Carbide, in accordance with the information contained within the engineering specifications, specified the use of asbestos-containing products as to some, but not all parts of the Texas City facility.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:

Admit that asbestos-containing materials were in use at Defendant's Premises At Issue in the 1950s.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide object to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been limited in time, scope or subject matter, and as such this Request constitutes an

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 100 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/100

impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states and generally admits that various asbestos-containing products were used in some, but not all portions of the Texas City facility during the late 1950's.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:

Admit that asbestos-containing materials were in use at Defendant's Premises At Issue in the 1960s.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide object to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been limited in time, scope or subject matter, and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide states and generally admits that various asbestos-containing products were used in some, but not all portions of the Texas City facility during the 1960's.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:

Admit that asbestos-containing materials were in use at Defendant's Premises At Issue in the 1970s.

RESPONSE Union Carbide object to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad in that it has not been limited in time, scope or subject matter, and as such this Request constitutes an impermissible fishing expedition. K-Mart v. Sanderson, 937 S.W.2d 429, 430 (Tex. 1996). Subject thereto, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 101 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/101

Union Carbide states that in general, it began the discontinuation of the use or acquisition of asbestos-containing products in the early 1970s'. Therefore, this Request is admitted as to some, but not all portions, of the Texas City facility, during some, but not all portions of the 1970's.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that asbestos-containing materials were in use at Defendant's Premises At Issue in the 1980s.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it seeks the discovery of information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and ambiguous in that it does not specify the specific work site location about which Plaintiff is inquiring. Rule 192.3(a) of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, this request calls for information which is neither relevant nor reasonably limited in time or scope. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide admits that at some locations at the facility there may be undisturbed asbestos -containing products in place, but denies that such material is removed or disturbed in any way without full and complete personal and environmental protection.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that asbestos-containing materials were in use at Defendant's Premises At Issue in the 1990s.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it seeks the discovery of information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and ambiguous in that it does not

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 102 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/102

specify the specific work site location about which Plaintiff is inquiring. Rule 192.3(a) of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, this request calls for information which is neither relevant nor reasonably limited in time or scope. Subject to Union Carbide's objections, this request is denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:

Admit that you did not provide to contractors working at Defendant's Premises At Issue health and safety procedures relating to the use of asbestos at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

Admit that you did not provide to contractors working at Defendant's Premises At Issue health and safety procedures in Spanish relating to the use of asbestos at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable regarding whether or not the various contractors working at the Union Carbide Texas City facility translated the health and safety procedures which Union Carbide provided to them into Spanish, for the benefit of their Spanish speaking employees, is insufficient to enable Union Carbide to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, this Request is denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

Admit that you did not conduct with contractors health and safety meetings relating to the use of asbestos at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Denied.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 103 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/103

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 20:

Admit that you did not conduct with contractors health and safety meetings in Spanish relating to the use of asbestos at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that a reasonable inquiry has been made, but that the information known or easily obtainable regarding whether or not the contractor employers of the Spanish speaking contractor employees ever conducted their health and safety meetings in Spanish, is insufficient to enable Union Carbide to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, this Request is denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 21:

Admit that you did not take any steps to protect contractor employees from exposure to asbestos on Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Denied.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 64:

If your response to the foregoing request is anything other than "admit", produce all documents which support your response, including any documents which you believe support a denial of the foregoing admission or any documents showing what reasonable inquiry you undertook in connection with your inability to admit or deny the foregoing request

RESPONSE: Please refer to Union Carbide's Answers to Interrogatory Nos. 10 and 15, including all of the objections set forth therein.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 22:

Admit that asbestos is still in use at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 104 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/104

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it seeks the discovery of information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and ambiguous in that it does not specify the specific work site location about which Plaintiff is inquiring. Rule 192.3(a) of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, this request calls for information which is neither relevant nor reasonably limited in time or scope. Subject to Union Carbide's objections, this request is denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 23:

Admit that asbestos is still in place at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it seeks the discovery of information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and ambiguous in that it does not specify the specific work site location about which Plaintiff is inquiring. Rule 192.3(a) of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, this request calls for information which is neither relevant nor reasonably limited in time or scope. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide admits that at some locations at the facility there may be undisturbed asbestos -containing products in place, but denies that such material is removed or disturbed in any way without full and complete personal and environmental protection.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 24:

Admit that the United States government has contracted with Defendant for work at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 105 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/105

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable regarding whether or not the United States government ever contracted with Union Carbide for work at the Texas City facility, is insufficient to enable the responding party to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 25:

Admit that the United States government paid Defendant more than $10,000 for the work it contracted with Defendant for work at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable regarding whether or not the United States government ever contracted with Union Carbide for work at the Texas City facility, is insufficient to enable the responding party to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 26:

Admit that Defendant owned Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Admitted.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 27:

Admit that Defendant operated Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that the term "operated" is vague, ambiguous and overly broad, which renders this particular request unintelligible and renders a response impossible without speculation as to the meaning of the term. Union Carbide further objects to this Request to the extent that it calls for a legal conclusion. Subject thereto, admitted.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 106 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/106

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 28:

Admit that you did not conduct air monitoring for the presence of asbestos dust during the time period in question.

RESPONSE: Denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 29:

Admit that during the Time Period At Issue, you did not conduct air monitoring tests for levels of asbestos at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 30:

Admit that you were aware that business invitees at Defendant's Premises At Issue did not understand English.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to the vague, confusing and overly broad nature of this Request.

Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 31:

Admit that you did not take any steps to ascertain whether business invitees at Defendant's Premises At Issue understood English.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to the vague, confusing and overly broad nature of this Request.

Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 32:

Admit that you did not to provide safety orientations to contractor employees prior to their commencing work at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Denied.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 107 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/107

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 33:

Admit that you did not to provide safety orientations in Spanish to contractor employees prior to their commencing work at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable is insufficient to enable the responding party to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 34:

Admit that you hired or contracted with Plaintiff's employer to remove asbestos-containing materials from Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable is insufficient to enable the responding party to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 35:

Admit that you hired or contracted with Plaintiff's employer to replace asbestos-containing materials at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable is insufficient to enable the responding party to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 36:

Admit that you hired or contracted with Plaintiff's employer to install asbestos-containing materials at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 108 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/108

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable is insufficient to enable the responding party to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 37:

Admit that you hired or contracted with Plaintiff's employer to maintain asbestos-containing materials at Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable is insufficient to enable the responding party to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 38:

Admit that you hired or contracted with Plaintiff's employer to do new construction work at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable is insufficient to enable the responding party to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 39:

Admit that you hired Plaintiff's employer to do "turnaround" work at Defendant's Premises At Issue during the Time Period At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable is insufficient to enable the responding party to admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 109 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/109

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 40:

Admit that you communicated with Plaintiff's employer concerning the work to be performed on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that the term "communicated" is vague, ambiguous and overly broad, which renders this particular request unintelligible, and renders a response impossible without speculation as to the meaning of the term. Union Carbide further objects to this Request as it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous in that the request does not specify the specific task or activity about which Plaintiff is inquiring. Subject thereto, this Request is admitted to the extent that Union Carbide generally communicated with a contractor before the contractor began working on a particular project.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 41:

Admit that you instructed Plaintiff's employer concerning the work to be performed on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that the term "instructed" is vague, ambiguous and overly broad, which renders this particular request unintelligible, and renders a response impossible without speculation as to the meaning of the term.. Union Carbide further objects to this Request as it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous in that the request does not specify the specific task or activity about which Plaintiff is inquiring. Subject thereto, this Request is admitted to the extent that Union Carbide generally provided instruction to a contractor before the contractor began working on a particular project.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 110 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/110

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 42:

Admit that you instructed Plaintiff's employer concerning how the work was to be performed on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that the term "instructed" is vague, ambiguous and overly broad, which renders this particular request unintelligible, and renders a response impossible without speculation as to the meaning of the term. Union Carbide further objects to this Request as it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous in that the request does not specify the specific task or activity about which Plaintiff is inquiring. Subject thereto, this Request is admitted to the extent that Union Carbide generally provided instruction to a contractor before the contractor began working on a particular project.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 43:

Admit that you showed Plaintiff's employer how the work was to be performed on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that the term "showed" is vague, ambiguous and overly broad, which renders this particular request unintelligible, and renders a response impossible without speculation as to the meaning of the term. Union Carbide further objects to this Request as it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous in that the request does not specify the specific task or activity about which Plaintiff is inquiring. Subject thereto, this Request is admitted to the extent that Union Carbide generally showed a contractor the specifications on how the work should be performed before the contractor began working on a particular project.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 111 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/111

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 44:

Admit that your specifications indicated to Plaintiff's employer how the work was to be performed on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and overly broad, with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to which specific contract and purchase order Plaintiff is referring. Union Carbide states that without the benefit of knowing the specific years involved, the specific nature of the particular contract involved or the specific work to which Plaintiff is referring, that Union Carbide can not admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, admitted.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 65:

If your response to the foregoing request is anything other than "admit", produce all documents which support your response, including any documents which you believe support a denial of the foregoing admission or any documents showing what reasonable inquiry you undertook in connection with your inability to admit or deny the foregoing request.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it fails to describe with reasonable particularity the types or categories of documents sought to be discovered in a manner consistent with Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Union Carbide further objects to the vague and overly broad nature of this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 45:

Admit that your specifications indicated to Plaintiff's employer what materials were to be used in performing the work on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and overly broad, with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to which specific contract and

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 112 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/112

purchase order Plaintiff is referring. Union Carbide states that without the benefit of knowing the specific years involved, the specific nature of the particular contract involved or the specific materials to which Plaintiff is referring, that Union Carbide can not admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, admitted.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 66:

If your response to the foregoing request is anything other than "admit", produce any documents which support your response, including any documents which you believe support a denial of the foregoing admission or any documents showing what reasonable inquiry you undertook in connection with your inability to admit or deny the foregoing request.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it fails to describe with reasonable particularity the types or categories of documents sought to be discovered in a manner consistent with Rule 196 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Union Carbide further objects to the vague and overly broad nature of this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 46:

Admit that you told Plaintiff's employer or supervisor when to start work.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states and generally admits that Plaintiff's employer was informed that the Texas City facility opened between 7:00 to 8:00 a.m.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 47:

Admit that you told Plaintiff's employer or supervisor when to stop work.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states and generally admits that Plaintiff's employer was informed that the Texas City facility closed between 5:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 113 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/113

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 48:

Admit that you told Plaintiff's employer what materials to use when doing the work

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and overly broad, with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to which specific contract and purchase order Plaintiff is referring. Union Carbide states that without the benefit of knowing the specific years involved, the specific nature of the particular contract involved or the specific materials to which Plaintiff is referring, that Union Carbide can not admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 49:

Admit that you told Plaintiff's employer in what order the work should be done.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and overly broad, with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to which specific contract and purchase order Plaintiff is referring. Union Carbide states that without the benefit of knowing the specific years involved, the specific nature of the particular contract involved or the specific work to which Plaintiff is referring, that Union Carbide can not admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 50:

Admit that you told Plaintiff's employer the deadline by which the work on Defendant At Issue was to be completed.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and overly broad, with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to which specific contract and

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 114 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/114

purchase order Plaintiff is referring. Union Carbide states that without the benefit of knowing the specific years involved, the specific nature of the particular contract involved or the specific work to which Plaintiff is referring, that Union Carbide can not admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, admitted.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 51:

Admit that you had the power to correct the work performed by the employees of Plaintiff's employer on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request to the extent that the terms "power to correct" are vague, ambiguous and overly broad, which renders this particular request unintelligible, and renders a response impossible without speculation as to the meaning of the term. Union Carbide further objects to this Request as it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous in that the request does not specify the specific task or activity about which Plaintiff is inquiring. Subject thereto, this Request is admitted.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 52:

Admit that you had the power to require that the work performed by the employees of Plaintiff's employer on Defendant's Premises At Issue be redone to your satisfaction.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is undefined and unintelligible. Union Carbide further objects to this Request on grounds that it is overly broad and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject thereto, and assuming that Union Carbide understands Plaintiff's poorly worded Request for Admission, Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 115 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/115

obtainable is insufficient to enable the responding party to admit or deny this Request with specificity, therefore, this Request is admitted.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 53:

Admit that you had the power to stop the work performed by the employees of Plaintiff's employer on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide states that it has made a reasonable inquiry, but that the information known or easily obtainable is insufficient to enable the responding party to admit or deny this Request with specificity, therefore, this Request is admitted.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 54:

Admit that you observed the work performed by the employees of Plaintiff's employer on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and overly broad, with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to which specific contract and purchase order Plaintiff is referring. Union Carbide states that without the benefit of knowing the specific years involved, the specific nature of the particular contract involved or the specific work to which Plaintiff is referring, that Union Carbide can not admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 55:

Admit that you inspected the work performed by the employees of Plaintiff's employer on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 116 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/116

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and overly broad, with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to which specific contract and purchase order Plaintiff is referring. Union Carbide states that without the benefit of knowing the specific years involved, the specific nature of the particular contract involved or the specific work to which Plaintiff is referring, that Union Carbide can not admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, admitted.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 56:

Admit that you approved the work performed by the employees of Plaintiff's employer on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and overly broad, with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to which specific contract and purchase order Plaintiff is referring. Union Carbide states that without the benefit of knowing the specific years involved, the specific nature of the particular contract involved or the specific work to which Plaintiff is referring, that Union Carbide can not admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 57:

Admit that you retained the power to control all phases of the work being performed by the employees of Plaintiff's employer on Defendant's Premises At Issue.

RESPONSE: Union Carbide objects to this Request on grounds that it is vague and overly broad, with the result being that Union Carbide is called upon to speculate as to which specific contract and purchase order Plaintiff is referring. Union Carbide states that without the benefit of knowing the

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 117 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/117

specific years involved, the specific nature of the particular contract involved or the specific work to which Plaintiff is referring, that Union Carbide can not admit or deny this Request with specificity. Subject thereto, denied.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5222: Union Carbide Corporation's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff Larry Cof… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19703 · Page 118 of 118 asbestosclaims.law/library/19703/118