PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
UC-5354

CAUSE NO. 01CV0476

LAFONDA DIXON, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS THE PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF ESTATE OF KENNETH DIXON, ET AL.	§	**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF**
Plaintiff,	§	**GALVESTON COUNTY, TEXAS**
VS.	§	
A. P. GREEN INDUSTRIES, INC., ET AL	§	
Defendants.	§	**10th JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

DEFENDANT UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO CERTAIN REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS OF PLAINTIFF

TO: Plaintiff Lafonda Dixon, Individually and as the Representative of the Heirs and Estate of Kenneth Dixon, Deceased, by and through her attorney of record Ian P. Cloud, Robins, Cloud, Greenwood & Lubel, L.L.P., 810 Travis, Suite 2020, Houston, Texas 77002.

COMES NOW, UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION D/B/A UNION CARBIDE CHEMICALS AND PLASTICS, INC., ("Union Carbide"), Defendant, and makes and serves the attached Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Requests for Admissions.

SEP 03 2002

Respectfully submitted,

POWERS & FROST, L.L.P.

James H. Powers *by permission
Texas State Bar No. 16217400
Sharla J. Frost
Texas State Bar No. 07491100
2600 Two Houston Center
909 Fannin
Houston, Texas 77010
Telephone: (713) 767-1555
Telecopier: (713) 767-1799

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION D/B/A UNION CARBIDE CHEMICALS AND PLASTICS, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify, that on this date, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was forwarded via hand delivery to counsel for Plaintiff, and a copy of the transmittal letter was sent to all other counsel of record via First Class Mail on this 30th day of August, 2002.

Andrea M. Johnson
Texas Bar No: 10679600

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reques... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 2 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/2

UNION CARBIDE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO CERTAIN REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS OF PLAINTIFF

Specifically incorporating and relying on its previous responses and objections to Plaintiff's Requests for Admissions, and without waiving those responses and objections, Union Carbide supplements its objections and responses as follows:

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 4:

Union Carbide Corporation was not aware by 1957 that asbestos caused deadly diseases.

RESPONSE:

See Union Carbide's General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5, as set forth in its original responses to Plaintiffs' Requests for Admission; hereinafter referred to as "General Objections." Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous as to the meaning of the term "deadly diseases," and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Denied to the extent that Union Carbide was aware that some types of asbestos could cause disease. As referenced in the Asbestos Toxicology Report prepared by Union Carbide in 1964, the potential association between long-term exposure to some types of asbestos and certain diseases had been known for many years. There is no scientific basis today to conclude that Calidria caused or contributed to the causation of mesothelioma, lung cancer, asbestosis, pleural plaques, or any alleged asbestos associated disease or condition in humans.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 18:

Asbestos, or asbestos-containing products, sold or distributed by manufacturers or miners other than Union Carbide Corporation contributed to Kenneth Dixon's mesothelioma.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reques... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 3 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/3

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide admits that some types of asbestos other than its Calidria asbestos fiber can cause some types of mesothelioma. Union Carbide denies that Calidria asbestos fiber caused or contributed to Kenneth Dixon's mesothelioma.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 19:

Asbestos, or asbestos-containing products, sold or distributed by manufacturers or miners other than Union Carbide Corporation did not contribute to Kenneth Dixon's mesothelioma.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide admits that some types of asbestos other than its Calidria asbestos fiber can cause some types of mesothelioma. Union Carbide denies that Calidria asbestos fiber caused or contributed to Kenneth Dixon's mesothelioma.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 20:

Kenneth Dixon was not at fault for the causation of his mesothelioma.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous. Union Carbide also objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reques... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 4 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/4

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 21:

Kenneth Dixon was at fault for the causation of his mesothelioma.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous. Union Carbide also objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 23:

Smoking cigarettes whose filters do not contain asbestos contributes to the development of mesothelioma.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad. Union Carbide also objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 24:

A contributing cause in Kenneth Dixon's death was mesothelioma.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reques... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 5 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/5

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 25:

Mesothelioma was not a contributing cause of Kenneth Dixon's death.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 30:

Asbestos causes asbestosis.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Admitted that under certain conditions some types of asbestos fibers other than Calidria asbestos fibers can cause asbestosis under certain conditions. Union Carbide denies that Calidria asbestos fiber has caused or contributed to asbestosis.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 31:

Asbestos does not cause asbestosis.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad and not

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reques... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 6 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/6

reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Admitted that under certain conditions some types of asbestos fibers other than Calidria asbestos fibers can cause asbestosis under certain conditions. Union Carbide denies that Calidria asbestos fiber has caused or contributed to asbestosis.

REQUEST NO 32:

Five million particles per cubic foot of dust containing asbestos is invisible to the ordinary user in the absence of special lighting or instruments.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Admitted that five million particles per cubic foot of dust containing asbestos is generally not visible to the ordinary user in the absence of special lighting or instruments.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 33:

Five million particles per cubic foot of dust containing asbestos is visible to the ordinary user in the absence of special lighting or instruments.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide admits that five million particles per cubic foot of dust containing asbestos, under some circumstances, may be invisible to the ordinary user in the absence of special lighting or instruments.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reques... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 7 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/7

REQUEST NO. 34:

Union Carbide Corporation sold asbestos for use in joint compounds even after asbestos free joint compounds were on the market.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Admitted that Union Carbide sold Calidria asbestos fiber to various third party manufacturers from 1963 to 1985. During this period, the joint compound market contained many different kinds of competitive products, some of which did not contain asbestos. Calidria is a short-fiber chrysotile uncontaminated by tremolite asbestos, which Union Carbide extracted from an asbestos ore body in New Idria, California. Calidria was marketed and sold by Union Carbide or by Calidria distributors to manufacturers or producers who incorporated and used Calidria in their products or production processes. Union Carbide had no involvement in the manufacture of those products, had no control over the nature of the products in which the fiber was used, and had no authority over the manufacturers' use of the product. Nevertheless, Union Carbide consistently provided its customers with health and safety information regarding the health effects of asbestos so that, among other things, this information could be passed along to the third party manufacturers' customers.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 35:

Union Carbide Corporation did not sell asbestos for use in joint compounds after asbestos free tape joint compounds were on the market.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reques... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 8 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/8

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Admitted that Union Carbide sold Calidria asbestos fiber to various third party manufacturers from 1963 to 1985. During this period, the joint compound market contained many different kinds of competitive products, some of which did not contain asbestos. Calidria is a short-fiber chrysotile uncontaminated by tremolite asbestos, which Union Carbide extracted from an asbestos ore body in New Idria, California. Calidria was marketed and sold by Union Carbide or by Calidria distributors to manufacturers or producers who incorporated and used Calidria in their products or production processes. Union Carbide had no involvement in the manufacture of those products, had no control over the nature of the products in which the fiber was used, and had no authority over the manufacturers' use of the product. Nevertheless, Union Carbide consistently provided its customers with health and safety information regarding the health effects of asbestos so that, among other things, this information could be passed along to the third party manufacturers' customers.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 52:

By 1974 Union Carbide Corporation was aware that Dr. Irving Selikoff advised removing asbestos from joint compounds.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous as to the term

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reques... Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 9 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/9

"aware" and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Admitted to the extent that some employees of Union Carbide had knowledge of a study of 59 Tapers of Local Union 1974, Drywall Tapers and Pointers of Greater New York conducted by Mount Sinai Hospital, under the direction of Dr. Irving Selikoff in 1974.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 53:

By 1974 Union Carbide Corporation was not aware that Dr. Irving Selikoff advised removing asbestos from joint compounds.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous as to the term "aware" and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Admitted to the extent that some employees of Union Carbide had knowledge of a study of 59 Tapers of Local Union 1974, Drywall Tapers and Pointers of Greater New York conducted by Mount Sinai Hospital, under the direction of Dr. Irving Selikoff in 1974.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 56:

Union Carbide Corporation was aware that by 1974 Dr. Irving Selikoff advised that the two fiber limit as proposed by OSHA in the time weighted averages of its regulations governing asbestos was not adequate to protect against asbestosis.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous, and 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-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reque… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 10 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/10

After reasonable inquiry, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 68:

In 1957 Union Carbide Corporation believed that the Coalinga asbestos deposit was the largest single mineral deposit in the world.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is paraphrasing from an unidentified document. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

After reasonable inquiry, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 69:

In 1957 Union Carbide Corporation did not believe that the Coalinga asbestos deposit was the largest single mineral deposit in the world.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is paraphrasing from an unidentified document. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

After reasonable inquiry, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reque… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 11 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/11

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 70:

After discovering its asbestos deposit Union Carbide Corporation began research and development efforts that recommended asbestos for use in products that had not before contained asbestos.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide admits that it engaged in research and development efforts after discovering the Coalinga ore deposit in New Idria, California.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 72:

Union Carbide Corporation recommended using its asbestos in place of materials that were "inert" or generally considered less harmful than asbestos.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide objects on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous as to the phrase "generally considered less harmful." Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is paraphrasing from an unidentified document. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 74:

Union Carbide Corporation advised manufacturers of asbestos-containing joint compounds that the "construction industry was exempt from OSHA regulations."

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reque… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 12 of 22 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/12**

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is quoting from an unidentified document. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 78:

Union Carbide Corporation advised at least one purchaser of its asbestos on the language that should be used on the warning of products containing asbestos.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is paraphrasing from an unidentified document. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

After reasonable inquiry, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request at this time.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 88:

Union Carbide Corporation's own animal studies, or studies it had conducted on its behalf, demonstrated that in certain instances its asbestos "produced a more severe reaction" than did asbestos mined in Canada.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is paraphrasing from an unidentified document. Union Carbide further objects to this

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reque… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 13 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/13

Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Denied as worded. Plaintiff appears to be attempting to paraphrase and take out of context the results of the Mellon Studies. Union Carbide refers Plaintiff's to the written report of the Mellon Studies, which speak for themselves.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 90:

Union Carbide Corporation knew that paint containing its asbestos would be "sandblasted" off the surface on which it was painted.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is quoting from an unidentified document. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 92:

When two or more substances are present, both of which have been assigned a threshold limit value, the two threshold limit values must be considered together when calculating time weighted averages so that the resulting threshold limit value is lower than any it would be if each of the substances was used by itself.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Union Carbide further objects on the grounds that this Request is vague and ambiguous as to time. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reque… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 14 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/14

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny the Request, and would refer Plaintiff to the applicable standards in place during the time period to which the question is directed.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 93:

When two or more substances are present, both of which have been assigned a threshold limit value, the two threshold limit values must not be considered together when calculating time weighted averages so that the resulting threshold limit value is lower than any it would be if each of the substances was used by itself.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Union Carbide further objects on the grounds that this Request is vague and ambiguous as to time. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny the Request, and would refer Plaintiff to the applicable standards in place during the time period to which the question is directed.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 94:

Since the short-fiber asbestos could not be used in many conventional markets, Union Carbide Corporation dedicated resources to developing new applications for its asbestos.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects that the Request is vague and ambiguous. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Admitted that Calidria fiber had unique properties and could not be used in many applications. Union Carbide admits that it engaged in research and development efforts pertaining to Calidria fiber.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reque… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 15 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/15

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 95:

Although the short-fiber asbestos market could not be used in many conventional markets, Union Carbide Corporation did not dedicate resources to developing new applications for its asbestos.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects that the Request is vague and ambiguous. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Admitted that Calidria fiber had unique properties and could not be used in many applications. Union Carbide admits that it engaged in research and development efforts pertaining to Calidria fiber.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 96:

By 1977 Union Carbide Corporation predicted it would represent seventy percent of the asbestos used in tape joint compounds.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is paraphrasing from an unidentified document. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous as to the time period at issue. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Admitted that Union Carbide's "Asbestos 5-year Plan (1978-82)" which was prepared in October of 1977, predicted that by 1982 Union Carbide Calidria asbestos would represent seventy-percent of the asbestos used in joint compounds.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 100:

By 1980 asbestos sales by Union Carbide Corporation were at an all-time record high.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reque… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 16 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/16

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is paraphrasing from an unidentified document. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide refers Plaintiff to its sales records.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 105:

By 1980 Union Carbide Corporation did not consider adverse publicity or regulatory action in deciding when it would cease mining asbestos.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is paraphrasing from an unidentified document. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is confusing and misleading, vague and ambiguous. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 106:

Even as late as 1980 Union Carbide Corporation retained discretion to deny its employees access to their own medical records.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is paraphrasing from an unidentified document. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reque… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 17 of 22 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/17**

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 107:

Union Carbide Corporation did not consider denying its employees access to their own medical records.

RESPONSE:

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide also objects to the extent Plaintiff is paraphrasing from an unidentified document. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it is overly broad, vague and ambiguous, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

As worded, Union Carbide is unable to admit or deny this Request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS NO. 112:

Dust containing asbestos can be in excess of five million particles per cubic foot and not be visible in the absence of special lighting or instruments.

RESPONSE: -

See General Objections Nos. 1, 2, 4 and 5. Union Carbide further objects to this Request for Admission on the grounds that it asks Union Carbide to render an expert medical or scientific opinion. Subject to its objections, Union Carbide responds as follows:

Union Carbide admits that dust containing asbestos in excess of five million particles per cubic foot, under some circumstances, may be invisible to the ordinary user in the absence of special lighting or instruments.

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reque… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 18 of 22 **asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/18**

POWERS & FROST, L.L.P. ATTORNEYS AT LAW

2600 Two Houston Center • 909 Fannin • Houston, Texas 77010-1009
Telephone (713) 767-1555 • Facsimile (713) 767-1799

August 30, 2002

Via Hand Delivery
Mr. Troy Chandler
ROBINS, CLOUD GREENWOOD & LUBEL, L.L.P.
910 Travis, Suite 2020
Houston, Texas 77002

RE: Cause No. 01CV0476; *Kenneth N. Dixon, LaFonda Dixon, Individually and as Next of Friend of Dixie Belle Dixon vs. A.P. Green Industries, Inc., et al;* In the 56th Judicial District Court of Galveston County, Texas.

File No. 20083 – 2010

Dear Mr. Chandler:

Enclosed please find the following document for Defendant UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION D/B/A UNION CARBIDE CHEMICALS AND PLASTICS, INC.:

Defendant Union Carbide Corporation's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Certain Requests for Admissions of Plaintiff

Please do not hesitate to call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Andrea M. Johnson

AMJ/sms
Enclosures

SEP 03 2002

SEP 10 2002

POWERS & FROST, L.L.P. ATTORNEYS AT LAW
2600 Two Houston Center • 909 Fannin • Houston, Texas 77010-1009
Telephone (713) 767-1555 • Facsimile (713) 767-1799

August 30, 2002

Via Certified Mail: 7001 0360 0000 3595 8199
Ms. Evelyn Wells Robison
Galveston County District Clerk
722 Moody Avenue. 404 Courthouse
Galveston, Texas 77550

Re: Cause No. 00CV0476; *Lafonda Dixon, Individually and as the Representative of the heirs and estate of Kenneth Dixon, deceased vs. AcandS, Inc., et al;* In the 56th Judicial District Court of Galveston County, Texas.
File No. 20083– 2010

Dear Ms. Robison:

Enclosed please find the following document to be filed on behalf of Defendant **Union Carbide Corporation:**

Certificate of Written Discovery (Defendant's Responses and Objections to Certain Request for Admissions of Plaintiff)

Please acknowledge receipt of this instrument by placing your file mark on the enclosed documents and returning it in the envelope provided.

By copy of this letter, I am forwarding a copy of this instrument to Plaintiffs' counsel of record.

Sincerely,

Andrea M. Johnson

AMJ/sms
Enclosures

cc: **Robins, Cloud, Greenwood & Lubel** – *Via Hand Delivery*
All Counsel of Record – *Via First Class Mail*

\\PFN-APPS-1\T 4\CCP\Galveston\Dixon, Dixie Belle\clkcovltr-Certificate of Written Discovery-(Unc)supp.doc

CAUSE NO. 01CV0476

LAFONDA DIXON, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS THE PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF ESTATE OF KENNETH DIXON, ET AL.	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
Plaintiff,	§	GALVESTON COUNTY, TEXAS
VS.	§	
A. P. GREEN INDUSTRIES, INC., ET AL	§	
Defendants.	§	10th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

CERTIFICATE OF WRITTEN DISCOVERY

Defendant, Union Carbide Corporation d/b/a Union Carbide Chemicals and Plastics, Inc., has forwarded to all counsel of record in compliance with the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure the following item:

Defendant's Responses and Objections to Certain Request for Admissions of Plaintiff.

Respectfully submitted,

POWERS & FROST, L.L.P.

James H. Powers *By Permission
TBN: 16217400
Sharla J. Frost
TBN: 07491100
2600 Two Houston Center
909 Fannin
Houston, Texas 77010
Telephone: (713) 767-1555
Facsimile: (713) 767-1799

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION D/B/A UNION CARBIDE CHEMICALS AND PLASTICS, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing instrument has been forwarded to all counsel of record pursuant to the Texas Rules on this the 30th day of September, 2002.

ANDREA M. JOHNSON
Texas Bar No.: 10679600

Union Carbide trial exhibit UC-5354: Union Carbide's Supplemental Responses and Objections to Plaintiff's Reque… Published by AsbestosClaims.Law
ACL Doc 19804 · Page 22 of 22 asbestosclaims.law/library/19804/22