



IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO

ANTHONY MARIO GRECO et al.,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

A-BEST PRODUCTS COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NOS. 323629-323678
(HANNA, J.)

IN RE: ALL BARON & BUDD
ASBESTOS CASES

**DEFENDANT MINNESOTA MINING & MANUFACTURING
COMPANY'S SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS TO
PLAINTIFFS' MASTER SET OF INTERROGATORIES
PROPOUNDED TO MINNESOTA MINING a/k/a "3M"**

Defendant MINNESOTA MINING & MANUFACTURING COMPANY (hereinafter referred to as "3M"), by and through its attorneys, answers Plaintiffs' Master Set of Interrogatories as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

These responses are based upon an ongoing review of Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company ("3M") documents and information obtained from ongoing discussions with various 3M personnel over a period of years. Much of the information requested dates back many years and is difficult or impossible to reconstruct or retrieve. Pursuant to Rule 33(C) of the Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure, with respect to certain Interrogatories, 3M opts to produce documents maintained in the ordinary course of business in lieu of providing specific answers. Therefore, 3M reserves the right to amend these responses if more accurate information becomes available. No single employee, officer or agent of the Company has direct knowledge of the documents necessary to supply each and every answer. The persons signing these Answers to Interrogatories does so to satisfy whatever requirements may exist under the applicable Ohio

Interrogatories does so to satisfy whatever requirements may exist under the applicable Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure. The person does not, however, have direct knowledge regarding any specific answer, but is informed that the review of the documents and discussions referred to above support the answers based on the information available as of the date of the signature.

3M incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein its previous answers and all objections as filed in April 1997, however, and without waiving objections, 3M provides these supplemental responses in accordance with the Court's Order of October 8, 1997.

Plaintiffs have only identified Armco/A.K. Steel Middletown and Hamilton as sites where exposures have occurred. 3M answers these interrogatories on the basis of those sites and products that might have relation to the steel-making process.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. The Interrogatories ask 3M to disclose information, most of which may no longer exist or is readily available, which is unrelated to Plaintiffs' claimed work sites, the Plaintiffs in this matter, products which Plaintiffs allegedly used or to which they were allegedly exposed, the locations at which any 3M product was allegedly used the conditions under which the product were allegedly used, the time period during which any 3M product was allegedly in use at any of Plaintiffs' work sites, or the time periods during which Plaintiffs were allegedly exposed to a 3M product. Thus, the Interrogatories are overly broad in time, scope and location, seek information which is neither material nor relevant to the issues in this litigation, or are otherwise not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

2. The Interrogatories are oppressive and burdensome, and would require 3M to undertake a massive and extraordinary document search, the results of which would have little to

no demonstrable bearing on this matter given Plaintiffs' extremely vague and general description of the 3M product(s) allegedly at issue.

3. The Interrogatories are not susceptible to a response because they request information which dates back many years and is now virtually impossible for 3M to reconstruct or retrieve.

4. 3M objects to the Interrogatories because they were propounded to harass 3M and coerce a settlement despite the lack of verifiable product information, and the lack of evidence that Plaintiffs were injured as a result of alleged exposure to or use of any product which 3M may or may not have manufactured.

5. 3M objects to the Interrogatories because they were propounded for an additional improper purpose, namely as a "fishing expedition" for the purpose of obtaining information that may be taken out of context by Plaintiff's counsel to create allegations against 3M where none legitimately exist.

6. 3M objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek documents or information protected by the attorney client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, the party communication privilege, the privilege of self-critical analysis or any other applicable privileges

7. 3M reserves the right to assert additional objections and to clarify, amend, or modify these answers at any time, as deemed necessary and appropriate by 3M. 3M reserves the right to object to the use of any of these answers at trial or any other proceeding as deemed necessary and appropriate by 3M.

8. 3M objects to the Interrogatories on the extent that Plaintiffs' have failed to identify with specificity the 3M product(s) allegedly used by Plaintiffs at ARMCO/A.K. Steel Middletown and Hamilton.

9. 3M objects on the basis that these interrogatories are argumentative in that they assume that 3M products which contained asbestos create a health hazard which 3M denies. In particular, this objection applies to Interrogatories 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 31, 32, 45, 52.

10. 3M objects to these interrogatories on the basis that they are vague and ambiguous. Questions relating to certain diseases fail to provide facts relating to amount of exposure, duration of exposure, fiber type in exposure, and latency period. In particular, this objection applies to Interrogatories 25, 53, 54, 57.

11. 3M objects to these interrogatories on the basis that they are overly broad, burdensome, and harassing and not calculated to discover relevant and material evidence, in that they are not confined to the products to which the Plaintiffs claim exposure. In particular, this objection applies to Interrogatories 6, 12, 29, 53, 54, 57.

12. 3M objects to these interrogatories on the basis that they are overly broad, burdensome, and harassing as they are not confined to the products that contained asbestos nor the products to which the Plaintiffs claim exposure. In particular, this objection applies to Interrogatories 41, 42, 43.

ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES

1. For each Interrogatory below, please state the name and last known address of each person answering it, including whether he/she is employed by Defendant and if employed by Defendant include job title, length of time employed by Defendant and a year by year list of all other positions, titles, or jobs held when working for Defendant.

ANSWER:

See Preliminary Statement.

1.1 Please identify all documents used, related to, or referred to in connection with the preparation of or answers to these Interrogatories and state the number of the Interrogatory and its subpart to each such document.

ANSWER:

See Preliminary Statement. Pursuant to the limits set forth in Ohio Rule of Civil Procedure 26 and 34, defendant will produce for inspection and copying documents responsive to plaintiffs' requests.

2. Please state whether or not Defendant is a corporation. If so, please state:
- (a) Your correct corporate name;
 - (b) The state of your incorporation;
 - (c) The address of your principal place of business;
 - (d) Your registered agent for service in the State of Ohio.
 - (e) For each Defendant claiming that this Court lacks personal jurisdiction, list year by year the total amount of income received by the Defendant from entities in Ohio, any and all years that Defendant, as defined, has been licensed to do business in Ohio, and any real property owned at any time by Defendant or its present or past subsidiaries.

ANSWER:

The Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company currently is incorporated in the State of Delaware and its principal place of business is St. Paul, Minnesota. It was first incorporated in 1929. 3M is authorized to and has conducted business in Ohio. C.T. Corporation is 3M's agent for service in Ohio.

3. State Defendant's complete corporate or business history, including dates of incorporation, mergers, consolidations, reincorporations, and the like. Also provide historical information regarding all predecessors, prior names, asset purchase, acquisitions or spin-offs. In addition:

- (a) If Defendant or any of its predecessors or subsidiaries at any time purchased, assumed, or in any other manner acquired ANY of the assets and/or liabilities of any corporation or entity at any prior time engaged in any aspect of the placing of asbestos containing products into the stream of commerce or the insuring of asbestos related risks, then please state the following as to each acquisition:

- (b) the name or description of each corporation, entity or assets acquired by Defendant, that entity's state of incorporation and principal place of business, its date of incorporation, and the name of Defendant at the time of acquisition;
- (c) The manner by which each such corporation, entity or interest therein, was acquired (e.g., merger, consolidation, change of name, stock sale, transfer or purchase of assets or product line);
- (d) The date of each such acquisition;
- (e) The state in which each such acquisition was effected;
- (f) The state law governing each such acquisition if specified by contract;
- (g) Whether Defendant became legally responsible for the past torts of each such corporation or entity;
- (h) Identify each document reflecting or related to the history and/or transaction(s) set forth in answer to this Interrogatory.

ANSWER:

3M states that over the years it has purchased and sold many companies. 3M purchased Mica Insulator Company in 1953 and some of their electrical insulation devices might have contained asbestos. See answer to Question 5. Investigation continues. 3M objects to responding to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information relating to mergers, consolidations, asset purchases, acquisitions or spinoffs of companies that did not make or sell asbestos-containing products at the time of the merger, consolidation, asset purchase, acquisition or spinoff. 3M objects on the basis that it is virtually impossible to locate records that would allow 3M to identify every merger, consolidation, asset purchase, acquisition or spinoff since the time it was first incorporated in 1929.

4. Please state whether or not the Defendant has purchased, assumed, or in any other manner acquired any of the assets and/or liabilities of any corporation or entity (such corporations or entities being limited to those engaged in the mining, selling, manufacturing, marketing or distribution of asbestos-containing products). If so, please state the following:

- (a) The name of each such corporation, entity or assets acquired by Defendant, its state of incorporation and principal place of business, its date of incorporation, and the name of Defendant at the time of acquisition;
- (b) the manner by which each such corporation, entity, or interest therein, was acquired (e.g., merger, consolidation, change of name, stock sale, transfer or purchase of assets or product line);

- (c) the date of each such acquisition;
- (d) the state in which each such acquisition was effected;
- (e) the state law governing each such acquisition if specified by contract;
- (f) whether Defendant became legally responsible for the past torts of each such corporation or entity;
- (g) whether the acquisition concerned asbestos-containing products.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 3.

4.1 For each corporation, other than the answering defendant ("the entity"), that has at any time in the past been involved in the placing of asbestos containing products into the stream of commerce for which officers of the answering defendants corporation have also served as officers, directors or served in any managerial position while employed by the answering defendant, state:

- (a) the name of the entity involved in the placing of asbestos products into the stream of commerce;
- (b) the manner in which the entity was involved in the placing of asbestos containing products into the stream of commerce (i.e., mining, milling, manufacturing, distributing, installing, rebranding, etc.);
- (c) the specific products placed into the stream of commerce by the entity year by year and by brand or trade name;
- (d) the name, positions and a brief description of the responsibilities of the person or persons serving the answering defendant and the entity simultaneously including the positions held with the entity and with the answering defendant.

ANSWER:

3M has no records that reflect its officers as being officers of such corporation.

5. Has Defendant ever engaged in the mining, manufacturing, selling, marketing, installation or distribution of asbestos-containing products? If so, please state the following:

- (a) The name of the company engaged in the activity (whether it is Defendant, Defendant predecessor, or Defendant's subsidiary);
- (b) As to each product mined, manufactured, sold, marketed, installed or distributed, please state the following:
 - 1. The trade or brand name.
 - 2. Its identification number (model, serial number, etc.).
 - 3. The time period it was manufactured, mined, marketed, distributed or sold.
 - 4. Its physical description including color, general composition, and form.
 - 5. A detailed description of its intended use and purpose.
 - 6. A detailed description of the type package in which it was sold, listing the dates of each type of package used, a physical description of the package, and a description of any printed material or trademarks that appeared thereon.
 - 7. The percent of asbestos which it contained.
 - 8. The percent of asbestos by asbestos type (amosite, crocidolite, tremolite, anthophyllite).
- (c) The time period during which each of these products was on the market;
- (d) A description of the physical composition of each product;
- (e) How each of these asbestos-containing product can be distinguished from those of competitors;
- (f) A description of the physical appearance of such product;
- (g) A detailed description of the in intended use.

ANSWER:

3M objects to this question on the basis that it is overly broad and not calculated to lead to relevant and material evidence. At the date of the answer to these Interrogatories, no plaintiff has identified any 3M asbestos-containing product. 3M reserves the right to supplement these Answers to Interrogatories should an identification be made. Notwithstanding said objections, 3M has reviewed products that it manufactured, sold or distributed that contained asbestos as a component part and has determined that only ScotchShield Reflective Fabric has application in the

steel-making process. Therefore, 3M will provide detailed information relating to ScotchShield Fabric in these answers and will provide basic information regarding other products that contained asbestos, but, based on information and belief, are not related to the steel-making process.

The process of locating documents relating to these products is ongoing as these products have been discontinued and in fact many have been off the market for decades. 3M reserves the right to supplement these answers as new information might become available. Investigation continues.

ScotchShield Reflective Fabric: The Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company developed a heat-reflective aluminum film between 1952 and 1954. The film did not contain asbestos. Experiments were conducted during that time, vacuum applying the reflective material to cloth. 3M developed a Heat Bank Vacuum Applicator (HVA-2 and HVA-6) to transfer the film to the fabric. Originally, the film and the applicator were sold to companies wishing to manufacture their own heat reflective fabric for use in the protective apparel market.

By 1955, the demand for the reflective fabric was so great that 3M began purchasing fabric and applying the film to the fabric at its Chemolite plant in Cottage Grove, Minnesota. 3M has never manufactured the asbestos cloth.

3M employees involved in the development of the ScotchShield Reflective Film and the Applicator System include E.C. Burchell, E.M. Peters, F. Hampl, Phil Palmquist, E.L. McKenzie, Don Lee, C.T. Vangness, C.H. Alexander, J.L. Curtin, Wayne Odell, J.J. Mercheck, J.D. Breault, H.K. Kapell, C.V. Rylander, E.J. Flaten.

Reflective fabric was sold to manufacturers of protective apparel. These manufacturers were sophisticated purchasers who were aware of the asbestos content of the fabric. These manufacturers selected their own work practices to create protective apparel from the fabric.

Beginning in 1974, 3M experienced shortages of the cloth raw materials. Experimental products were created to solve this problem, but were found to be unacceptable to the qualities of Type 75.

In 1975, 3M determined that it was economically unfeasible to continue to market aluminized asbestos cloth. 3M attempted to fill orders outstanding. By 1977, the sale of aluminized fabric ceased.

3M continues to sell the reflective film and is aware of customers who own the application equipment. 3M does not have any records indicating the types of fabric that they might be coating.

Type 71	12/55 to 1/66	Commercial heat reflective material	1.2 lbs Underwriters grade herringbone asbestos cloth	Raybestos-Manhattan
Type 72	9/57 to 1/66	Commercial heat reflective material	1.65 lbs. Underwriters grade herringbone asbestos cloth	American Asbestos & Raybestos-Manhattan
Type 73	10/57 to 7/76	Airforce heat reflective material	Hess Goldsmith asbestos glass fibers or S-1212 asbestos glass fibers or S14747 glass asbestos cotton cloth	H.G. Asbeston U.S. Rubber J.P. Stevens
Type 74	9/57 to 2/59	Navy heat reflective material	S-915A asbestos fabric	H.G. Asbeston U.S. Rubber J.P. Stevens
Type 75	6/59 to 1977	Commercial heat reflective material	1.2 lbs Underwriters grade herringbone asbestos fabric primed for abrasion resistance	Raybestos-Manhattan
8687	9/64-	NASA experimental heat reflective material for space capsule	3.51 lbs Type 8687-29- AAAA grade asbestos fabric with nickel-based wire insert	Raybestos-Manhattan
LLB108	6/65	NASA experimental heat reflective material for electrical harness in space capsule	2.3 lbs asbestos cloth, Style 12P230 AAAA grade	Raybestos-Manhattan
	1974 to	Military spec heat reflective		

FEA752	1977	material		
FEA977	1974 to 1977			Laminated on rough side; 1,527 yards sold
FEB150	1974 to 1977	Potential replacement to Type 75--found unacceptable	Herringbone lightweight asbestos fabric	Potential replacement for Type 75 lightweight; 700 yards sold Gentex 1000-1
FEA800	1974 to 1977	Potential replacement to Type 75--found unacceptable		Attempted replacement of Type 75; 73 yards sold--"Unacceptable"
FEA870	1975 to 1977	Potential replacement to Type 75--found unacceptable		Attempted replacement of Type 75. "Unacceptable" Uniroyal 515 cloth

Other Products Not Relating to the Steel-Making Process: 3M manufactured and sold self-contained radiant heating panels between 1964 and 1969. The asbestos was bound in Kraft paper pulp which was in turn bound in resin and layered with polyester. The finished product contained less than one percent (1%) asbestos.

Between 1965 and 1984, 3M manufactured and/or sold or distributed various printing and/or copying machines that contained asbestos in the form of paper, corrugated paper, millboard, or foil-back insulation used as a heat shield or heat-protective device within the interior components of the copying machine. The asbestos product was within the cabinet of the copying device and not accessible to the user. The asbestos paper, corrugated paper, millboard, or foil-back insulation was not manufactured by 3M, but is believed to be a Johns Manville product. The models that contained the asbestos as a heat-protection within the interior of the machine include: the Quintimatic Printer; Model 183 Printer; Q3 Printer; Model 114 Transparency Maker; VHS-R Copier, also known as Model 238; VQC I Copier, also known as Model 191; VHS Copier, also known as Model 235; Secretary II Copier, also known as Model 360; Dual Spectrum Copier, also known as Model 146; Model 70 Copier; Model 71 Copier; and Model 88 Copier.

3M manufactured and sold the Pyrofax Office Machine used in the printing industry from 1972 to 1982. Asbestos sheeting was used to insulate the pre-heat oven of the heat fuser which was encased in the metal cabinet and not accessible to the operator.

3M manufactured and sold SteriVac Sterilizers. Model 400 contained a Johns Manville corrugated sheet with foil on one side as a chamber insulation. The chamber with the insulation was encased in the steel metal cabinet and not accessible to the user. The Model 400B and C contained one-inch (1") thick Johns Manville millboard as an insulation around the heat sink. The heat sink and millboard were contained within the sheet metal cabinet and not accessible to the user. The Model 100 and 200 contained one-sixteenth (1/16") inch asbestos paper used to insulate the inner chamber. The inner chamber and the insulation were contained within the sheet metal cabinet and not accessible to the user.

From 1963 to 1972, 3M marketed and installed a resilient track surfacing material known as Tartan Surfacing Material. The material was applied as a semi-liquid urethane mixture which contained paperbestos pulp. It is believed that the paperbestos pulp was manufactured by Johns Manville. When cured, the material created a resilient surface. An alternative process adhered an imitation grass to the urethane substrate to create the product known as Tartan Turf.

3M manufactured and sold Matina Decorative Laminate between 1973 and 1975. The product contained between .72% to 1.3% asbestos. The asbestos was bound in a resin. The decorative laminate was used as an accent piece, such as the wood grain appearing finish in automobiles.

3M manufactured and sold Sunset Resin between 1968 and 1986. This material contained less than 1% asbestos. Its Patent Number is 4,012,553. The asbestos was bound in a resin. The material was used to repair damaged vehicles or boats and was cured by use of an ultraviolet light.

3M manufactured and sold Lamicoid sheets, tubes, and rods from the mid-1950's to 1965. These highly specialized materials were used as an electrical insulation and contained between 30% to 75% asbestos bound in a phenolic resin and a laminated plastic.

From the 1940's to 1987, 3M manufactured "Centerlite" Pavement Paint which contained asbestos as a reinforcement within the paint. The paint was applied to the pavement in wet form.

From 1973 to 1986, 3M manufactured and sold Staymark Solid Roadway Marking Film. Some Staymark film contained 16% asbestos. The asbestos was bound in an elastomeric matrix.

3M manufactured and sold the Irvington Arc Proofing System from the mid-1950's to 1962. It was designed for protecting external splices from arcing in manholes. The system consisted of two wraps. The untreated first wrap was made of untreated asbestos cloth. The second wrap was asbestos cloth treated with a moisture-protective coating and a flame-retardant coating. The asbestos cloth itself was not manufactured by 3M, but purchased from Raybestos Manhattan or Johns Manville.

3M manufactured and sold certain dental products used to polish and grind dental appliances in 1979. These products contained 1.2% to 3.5% asbestos.

3M manufactured and sold to a few specific clients flourel-coated FA30936U, buna-coated BA309344, and neoprene-coated NA30934U asbestos cloth. The asbestos cloth was purchased from Ametex and was bound entirely within the elastomeric matrix. Based on information and belief, the Ametex cloth contained 50% asbestos, but its content is best learned from its manufacturer. The product was manufactured in Monrovia, California.

3M manufactured and sold multi-mold splicing kits: 85-10, 85-12, 85-14, 85-16, 4500, 4501, 4502, 8962, 8963, from 1965 to 1986. The mastic used to adhere the mold to electrical cable contained 13% asbestos. The asbestos was bound in an elastomeric matrix.

In the early 1930's, the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company began manufacturing and selling adhesives, coatings and sealers. After a thorough search of its records, 3M cannot state the exact date on which the first adhesive, coating or sealing contained asbestos. On the best available evidence, 3M believes that such products were first manufactured and sold toward the end of the 1930's. Various adhesives, coatings and sealers that contained asbestos went on and went off the market between the late 1930's and 1987. Adhesives are used to bind two substrates together. Coatings are used for four main purposes: to protect against corrosion and/or abrasion; to dampen sound and/or vibration; to insulate against heat or cold; and to perform special jobs such as skid resistance. Sealants prevent the leakage of fluids. The adhesives, coatings or sealers that contained asbestos had specific application. In each case, the asbestos was bound in an elastomeric matrix. The asbestos content varied from approximately 1% to 25%, depending on the specific product and its specific use.

Chrysotile is the only fiber type used by 3M in the manufacture of the products or believed to be the fiber type in the products in asbestos products purchased from other suppliers that went into a 3M product.

3M products were packaged based on the specific use for each individual product.

6. Does Defendant or any of its subsidiary companies claim that any patent would cover any product listed in answer to Interrogatory No. 5? If so, please state the following:

- (a) The date of each patent;
- (b) The date same was issued;
- (c) The number of each patent application that is pending.

ANSWER:

3M has obtained patents on products that might have contained asbestos as a component part. See Answer to Question 5. As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, there was no patent on the finished fabric.

7. Have any of the products listed above in answer to Interrogatory No. 5 been altered in chemical composition, since first being marketed? If so, please state the following:

- (a) The trade name of each such product;
- (b) The date each such product was altered;
- (c) The nature of the alteration;
- (d) The reason for the alteration.

ANSWER:

Over the years as technology and methods of manufacturing changed and as new raw materials became available, 3M modified, redesigned or redeveloped numerous products to keep them abreast with the then-existing technology. Many products became obsolete and were phased out as the new technology and materials became available. See Answer to Question 5. As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, 3M modified the fabrics as new fabrics became available or other fabrics became unavailable.

8. Have any of the asbestos-containing products listed in response to Interrogatory No. 5 ever been marketed, distributed, packaged, labeled, and/or sold by any other company or business? If so, please state the following:

- (a) The name and address of each such company;
- (b) The names and address of Defendants distributors in Ohio and Illinois since 1940.
- (c) The date of each sale.
- (d) The name of the person at each location with whom you primarily dealt.
- (e) A list of all asbestos-containing products that you sold to each location from 1945 to 1980.
- (f) The amount of each asbestos product sold to each location during this period.
- (g) Please identify all documents relating to this distributor for the particular location.

ANSWER:

3M asbestos-containing products have been marketed, distributed, packaged or labeled by other companies. See Answer to Question 5. As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, the finished material was sold to manufacturers of protective garments. A list of those manufacturers are: A-Best Products Co., Cleveland, Ohio; Asbestos Cloth Products Co./Star Glove & Leather Co., Los Angeles, California; A. Smith & Sons, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Custon Auto Tops, Inc., Richmond, Virginia; Holcomb Safety Co., Chicago, Illinois; Midwest Glove Co., Chicago, Illinois; Mine Safety Appliance Co, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Pittsburgh Glove Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Racine Glove Co., Inc., Racine, Wisconsin; Richmond Glove Co., Inc., Richmond, Indiana; Steel Grip Safety Apparel, Danville, Illinois; Wheeler Protective Apparel Co., Chicago, Illinois; Magid Glove Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Illinois; Sager Glove Corp., Chicago, Illinois; Charkate Glove; United Cerebral Palsy; Industrial Safety Specialists; Eastco. 3M has located no documents which indicate where these manufacturers might have sold their products. These sales were direct sales and 3M presently knows of no documents which reflect sales through distributors of ScotchShield Reflective Fabric.

8.01 Has this defendant ever purchased asbestos containing products from any other defendant?

ANSWER:

3M has purchased products from other manufacturers. As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, 3M manufactured the reflective film. The asbestos cloth was purchased from other sources. See Answer to Question 5.

8.02 If the answer to the preceding Interrogatory is yes, please state the following:

- (a) name each defendant from whom this defendant purchased any asbestos containing product;
- (b) list each product purchased from each co-defendant;
- (c) list the dates of each purchase of asbestos-containing products from each co-defendant.

ANSWER:

See General Objections and Answers to Questions 8.01 and 5.

8.03 Has this Defendant ever sold asbestos containing products to any other defendant?

ANSWER:

3M has no records of selling to other defendants in this litigation. As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, see Answer to Question 8.

8.04 If the answer to the preceding Interrogatory is yes, please state the following:

- (a) name each defendant to whom this Defendant sold any asbestos containing product;
- (b) list each product sold to each co-defendant;
- (c) list the dates of the sale of asbestos-containing products to each co-defendant.

ANSWER:

See Answers to Questions 8.03 and 8.

8.05 Has Defendant engaged in the manufacture and/or sale and/or distribution and/or marketing and/or supply and/or purchase and/or use of non-asbestos-containing products for use in connection with temperatures above 125° Fahrenheit since 1930. If so, please state:

- (a) the date such activity began;
- (b) the years during which such activity took place;
- (c) the date when such activity was terminated;
- (d) if such activity was terminated the reason(s) why;

- (e) the geographical area into which you claim the product(s) were sold, purchased, or used;
- (f) identify the organizational unit of defendant so engaged;
- (g) the site(s) at which each such product was manufactured;
- (h) the material components of the such product, giving specific or approximate percentage both by weight and by volume of each material component of each such product;
- (i) the temperature ranges for which each product(s) was intended to be used;
- (j) the product's generic name;
- (k) the product's trade or brand name;
- (l) the container in which the product was shipped (i.e., paper bags, cardboard boxes) including the size and amount of the container;
- (m) a description of any logos, writing impressions or identifying markings which appeared on the product, as well as a description of the package used, the dates that type of package was used, and any logos, product names, trademarks, etc. which appeared on the package;
- (n) whether the words "non-asbestos" or "asbestos free" were used on the package;
- (o) a detailed description of the intended method of preparation and application of the product;
- (p) a description of the physical appearance of the product, including size, shape, color and texture.

ANSWER:

ScotchShield Reflective Fabric with asbestos cloth substrate had specific application for heat conditions. To the extent available, the remaining information requested can be found in documents that will be made available for review at 3M, St. Paul, Minnesota at a mutually agreeable date and time.

8.06 Did Defendant ever market or distribute any asbestos-containing product manufactured in whole or in part by someone else? If so, please state the following for each such product:

- (a) the name and address of the manufacturer;
- (b) the products trade and brand name;
- (c) the organizational unit of Defendant who did so;
- (d) date(s) beginning, ending and during which the marketing or distributing took place;
- (e) whether the product was distributed through the same channels as those used for products manufactured by Defendant, and if not, please explain the exact channels of distribution;
- (f) identify all documents relating the marketing or distribution.

ANSWER:

See Answers to Questions 8, 8.01 and 5.

8.1 Does Defendant have reason to believe that the asbestos-containing products listed in response to Interrogatory No. 5 were used at any of the sites listed on Exhibit A, attached hereto. If your answer is "yes," please state:

- (a) The basis of your answer.
- (b) Please state which of Defendant's asbestos-containing products listed in Interrogatory No. 5 were used at each job site listed on Exhibit A.

ANSWER:

After a search of its available records, 3M has located no information which would identify any 3M asbestos-containing product being used at ARMCO/A.K. Steel Middletown or Hamilton.

8.2 For each company or business that Defendant knows may have marketed, distributed, installed, and/or sold, those products listed in response to Interrogatory No. 5, please state the following as to each job site listed on Exhibit A:

- (a) The name and address of each such company;
- (b) The date of each such sale from Defendant to such other company;
- (c) The name of the person at each other company with whom Defendant primarily dealt.

- (d) Names and quantities of the asbestos-containing products that you marketed, distributed, installed and/or sold to each such company from 1950 to 1974.
- (e) Please identify all documents relating to the sales to each such company.

ANSWER:

After a search of its available records, 3M has located no information which would identify any 3M asbestos-containing product being used at ARMCO/A.K. Steel Middletown or Hamilton.

8.3 If you don't know any business that may have marketed, distributed, installed and/or sold the products listed in to Interrogatory No. 5 to any of the job sites listed on Exhibit A, please state the names and last known addresses of those companies who Defendant knows marketed, distributed, and/or sold their asbestos-containing products in Ohio from 1950 to 1974. For each of those companies, please state the following:

- (a) Name and address of each such company;
- (b) The dates of each sale from Defendant to such other company;
- (c) The name of the person at each other company with whom Defendant primarily dealt;
- (d) The names of the asbestos-containing products that Defendant marketed, distributed, and/or sold to each such company from 1950 to 1974.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Questions 8, 8.1, and 8.2.

8.4 Does Defendant have records and/or any knowledge that reflects sales of their asbestos-containing products to any of the sites listed on Exhibit A, attached hereto? If so, please state the following as to each job site listed on Exhibit A:

- (a) The names and last known addresses of those people with such knowledge.
- (b) The location of such records.

ANSWER:

See Answer to 8, 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3.

9. Did Defendant or any of Defendant's distributors, as listed in response to Interrogatory Nos. 8.1, 8.2, and/or 8.3 have sales representatives who specifically called on the sites listed on Exhibit A, attached hereto, from 1945 to 1975? If your response is yes, as to each facility, please state the following:

- (a) The name and last known address of each such representative and whether they are still employed by Defendant;
- (b) The period of time they acted as your representative;
- (c) Their general responsibility as to each facility; and
- (d) Whether that person is still alive.

ANSWER:

After a search of its available records, this Defendant has no information which would identify any 3M sales representative calling on the Armco/A.K. Middleton or Armco/A.K. Hamilton plant. Furthermore, see Answer to Questions 8, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, and 8.4. Investigation continues.

9.1 Identify all managers and sales personnel responsible for your sales or installation of any asbestos-containing products in Ohio from 1930 to the present and state their position, last known address and the local or regional office through which they were employed.

ANSWER:

As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, 3M has no knowledge of the sales representatives of the companies referred to in Answer to Interrogatory 8.

10. Did Defendant ever have any division or subsidiary engaged in the contract business of applying asbestos-containing products? If so, please state:

- (a) The name of each subdivision;
- (b) The full address of the home office and the date such subdivision or subsidiary was engaged in this contracting business; and
- (c) Whether said division or subsidiary conducted such business at any of the sites listed on Exhibit A, from 1940 to 1975? If so, please state the following as to each job site listed on Exhibit A:
 - (1) The dates of such contracts;

(2) The specific asbestos-containing products that were used in each contract.

ANSWER:

No.

11. Did Defendant ever have any division or subsidiary engaged in the contract business of applying asbestos-containing refractory? If so, please give the name of each subdivision, the full address of the home office and the date such subdivision or subsidiary was engaged in this contracting business.

ANSWER:

No.

12. Please identify by location and product produced, each plant in which products in your answer to Interrogatory No. 5 have been manufactured and/or assembled and the dates said plants have been in operation.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 5. As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, the reflective film developed by 3M was applied to the fabric substrate at 3M's Chemolite Minnesota Plant.

13. Has Defendant, at any time, entered into a "rebranding" agreement with any other company, either as a buyer or a seller, concerning any asbestos-containing products and/or materials? If so, please state:

- (a) The name of the company manufacturing the asbestos products under such agreement.
- (b) The trade name affixed to such products;
- (c) The periods of time covered by each such agreement;
- (d) The volume (in dollar amounts) of each such transaction;
- (e) The purchaser of such products;
- (f) Does Defendant currently have in its possession any of the writings or contracts concerning such rebranding agreement?

ANSWER:

After a search of its available records, 3M has found no re-branding agreements. 3M has previously stated that it manufactured a number of asbestos-containing products that were relabeled and sold by other entities. See Answer to Question 5. As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, the material substrate with the 3M-developed reflective film was sold to manufacturers who made protective apparel. See Answer to Question 8.

13.1 Have you ever owned or operated a business or portion thereof which engaged in construction, erection or tear out of furnaces, pipes, boilers, turbines, lehrs, ovens, kilns, etc? If so, please state:

- (a) the name of said business;
- (b) the date of commencing business and cessation of business, if applicable;
- (c) type of construction or tear out performed;
- (d) state whether said business installed or supplied asbestos-containing products on the furnaces, pipes, boilers, turbines, lehrs, etc, i.e., gaskets, pipecovering, block, cement, rope, cloth, clothes, etc., containing asbestos, asbestos pipe, board, etc.;
- (e) state the trade name and/or manufacturer of any asbsetos containing product which you installed or supplied to any site on Exhibit A.
- (f) provide the dates for the applicable construction, installation or tear-out project.

ANSWER:

No

13.2 Do you have within your custody, possession, or control any packages that presently or formerly packaged asbestos-containing products or were produced for the purpose of packaging asbestos-containing products contemporaneous with your manufacture, sale or distribution of such asbestos-containing products? If so, provide the following:

- (a) a description of each such package;
- (b) the present location and custodian of each such package;
- (c) the date or approximate date on which each such package was produced.

ANSWER:

After a search, 3M has been unable to locate any packaging of ScotchShield Reflective Fabric. Investigation continues.

14. What is the name, address and job title of each individual who participated in the design and preparation of manufacturing specifications for each such Product listed above in answer to Interrogatory No. 5?

ANSWER:

See answer to Question 5 as it relates to products that contained asbestos and in particular to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric.

15. As to each product listed in response to Interrogatory No. 5, please describe how each product was to be cut, shaped, scribed, mixed and applied on the job. (In answering this question, give particular reference as to whether or not the materials were to be sawed or cut on the job, blown into confined areas, mixed with water in a cement or paste.)

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 5 relating to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric. The fabric treated with the reflective material was sold directly to manufacturers of protective apparel. 3M does not have specific knowledge as to the methods the individual manufacturers used to create protective garments.

16. Based upon the material contents of the asbestos-containing products, the method of manufacturing, and the method of application, please state which products listed in Interrogatory No. 5 could be applied by a worker without creating dust.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Questions 5 and 15. As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, the protective apparel made by other manufacturers would be worn and not applied.

17. Do any documents, including but not limited to, written memoranda, specifications, recommendations, blueprints or other written materials of any kind or character now exist relating to the design and preparation of the products listed in answer to Interrogatory No. 5? If so, please:

- (a) List each such written material or document;
- (b) Identify the person or persons presently in possession of each such document;
- (c) State where each such document is located.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 5. Documents relating to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric can be reviewed upon proper notice at 3M, St. Paul, Minnesota, at a mutually agreeable date and time.

18. Prior to releasing the products listed in Interrogatory No. 5 for sale and usage, were any tests (either animal or human) conducted on said products to determine potential health hazards involved in the use of, or exposure to, the materials and/or products? If so, please state:

- (a) The name of the products tested and the date of each test.
- (b) The name, address, and job classification of each individual who conducted such tests;
- (c) The results of such tests.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 5. As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, 3M has located no records relating to any tests that may have been conducted by 3M. 3M is aware of published studies regarding aluminized fabric.

18.1 Prior to releasing any products for sale and usage (whether asbestos-containing or not), were any tests (either animal or human) conducted on said products to determine potential health hazards involved in the use of, or exposure to, the materials and/or products? If so, please state:

- (a) the name of the products tested and the date of each test;
- (b) The name, address, and job classification of each individual who conducted such tests;
- (c) The results of such tests.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 18.

19. Does Defendant have or control any documents, including but not limited to, written memoranda, specifications, recommendations, blueprints or other written materials of any kind or character relating to the testing of the products listed in Interrogatory No. 5 hereinabove?

- (a) Identify each such written material or document;
- (b) Identify each person who presently has possession of each such document;

- (c) State where each such document is located.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 18.

20. Were any design changes or modifications made as a result of such tests listed in answer to Interrogatory No. 18 hereinabove? If so, please state:

- (a) The trade name of the product changed or modified;
- (b) The nature of the change made and the date of such changes or modifications;
- (c) The name, address, and job classification of each person in charge of making a change.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 18.

21. After releasing for sale, distribution or marketing the products listed in answer to Interrogatory No. 5, did Defendant conduct any tests (either on animals or human) to determine potential health hazards involved in the use of said materials and/or products?

- (a) The names of the products tested and the dates of said tests;
- (b) The name, address, and job classification of each person and/or agency conducting said tests;
- (c) The results of said tests;
- (d) Whether, as a result of any tests conducted, any products were removed from the market;
- (e) The names of all products removed from the market as a result of said tests.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 5. As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, see Answer to Question 18.

22. Has Defendant ever conducted or caused to be conducted any studies concerning the effects of the inhalation of asbestos dust and/or fibers on workers or other persons applying, using and/or working around any of the asbestos products manufactured, sold, distributed and/or relabelled for distribution by you or your predecessor? If so, please state:

- (a) The dates and nature of such studies;
- (b) The names and addresses of persons conducting such studies;
- (c) The purpose of such studies;
- (d) Identify and list those persons to whom such reports were given and the date of such dissemination;
- (e) State any publication or other written dissemination of the results of such studies;
- (f) State the nature of any action to eliminate or minimize the inhalation of asbestos dust fibers; and
- (g) Attach a copy of reports based upon such studies.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 5. As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, see Answer to Question 18.

23. Before placing in the market the asbestos-containing products that Defendant, mined, manufactured, sold, marketed, installed or distributed on the market, did Defendant make or cause to be made, any studies to determine whether their asbestos-containing products would be hazardous to people? If so, please state:

- (a) The date of said studies;
- (b) What studies were done; and
- (c) The titles of each study.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 22.

24. Please state whether or not Defendant ever conducted or caused to be conducted any tests in the field (where asbestos-containing products were applied, removed or utilized) to determine the nature and extent of asbestos dust and/or fiber exposure to insulators, applicators, fellow employees, or other workers removing and/or tearing out asbestos-containing products, and/or other workers in the vicinity thereof? If so, please identify:

- (a) The date, place and nature of each and every test;

- (b) The particular asbestos-containing products to which each test applied;
- (c) The results of each test with particular reference to the number of asbestos fibers per cubic centimeter of air found at each site; and
- (d) The persons to whom the results said tests were given and the date of such dissemination.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 22.

25. Please state whether or not Defendant ever obtained any knowledge concerning the likelihood of asbestos being hazardous to human health. If so, please state:

- (a) When Defendant first became aware of the hazardous potential of asbestos dust and asbestos fibers;
- (b) The manner in which the Defendant, Defendant's predecessor, or Defendant's subsidiary companies first obtained this knowledge and became aware of said hazards and from what source this information was obtained;
- (c) What information was disseminated within Defendant's company, or its subsidiary or predecessor regarding such adverse consequences or effects;
- (d) Whether any such information is still maintained by Defendant or its subsidiary or predecessor in any written form.
- (e) The name, address and job classification of the custodian of such information.

ANSWER:

3M, after making a search of its records, cannot give a specific date on which it became aware of issues concerning asbestos and health. However, 3M is aware that the Medical Department was familiar with the ACGIH guidelines and its threshold limit values. Documentation relating to 3M's knowledge of asbestos health issues can be reviewed at 3M, St. Paul, Minnesota, at a mutually agreeable date and time.

26. Please state when Defendant first became aware of the possible association between inhalation of asbestos dust and/or fibers and the contraction of asbestosis and cancers including, but not limited to gastrointestinal cancer, laryngeal cancer, renal cancer, lymphoma, lung and mesothelioma. As to each disease or condition, please state the source of that information, including a description of all tests conducted relative to the possibility of such a relationship.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 25.

27. Please identify all physicians, industrial hygienists, and other employees (including their names and addresses) who were employed, retained or otherwise engaged by Defendant for research, investigation or study concerning asbestos or asbestos-related diseases.

ANSWER:

Individual physicians, industrial hygienists, and other employees, were not hired specifically to research, investigate, or study asbestos or asbestos-related diseases. The following individuals from the Medical Department and Industrial Hygiene Department may have been involved with asbestos issues that arose at 3M during certain years:

3M Medical Directors

W.F. Hartfiel, M.D.	1960-1965
H.W. Schmidt, M.D.	1965-1966
C.H. Hodgson, M.D.	1966-1973
F.A. Ubel, M.D.	1973-1989
A.E. Sethre, M.D.	1989-1991
C.J. Hodgson, M.D.	1991-1993
L.R. Zobel, M.D.	1993-present

3M Industrial Hygiene Services Managers

John Pendergrass	1965-1973
John Feuk	1973-1980
Jim Sugg	1980-present

28. As to each person who acted in a medical advisory capacity (as it relates in any way to asbestos) to Defendant, please list their name, the date individual acted in this capacity, and that person's current address and job title.

ANSWER:

The Medical Department and its Industrial Hygiene Department dealt with asbestos issues over the years. The medical directors were listed in Question 27. Numerous Industrial Hygienists had responsibility for asbestos issues at various plants. Documents relating to asbestos at the plants from the Medical Department and the Industrial Hygiene Department can be reviewed at 3M, St. Paul, Minnesota, at a mutually agreeable date and time.

29. Please state if any medical officer or industrial hygienist or medical consultant ever made at any time any recommendations and/or suggestions to Defendant pertaining to the risks or hazards to persons involved in the manufacture or use of asbestos products and, if so, please state when, by whom or to whom such recommendations and/or suggestions were made and the substance of each recommendation.

ANSWER:

3M's Industrial Hygiene Department conducted numerous in-plant studies relating to asbestos exposure during the manufacture of products that contained asbestos as a component part. These tests were conducted from the 1960's through the time asbestos was no longer used in the products. The purpose of the tests was to determine compliance with Federal and state regulations relating to exposures arising from the manufacture of asbestos-containing products and other occupational exposures of 3M employees.

30. Please state the scientific and/or medical periodicals to which Defendant, its medical department, research department, industrial hygiene divisions, engineering department or consulting physicians subscribed between 1945 and 1975.

ANSWER:

The documents contained in the various 3M libraries are numerous and 3M will make available for inspection as comprehensive a list of materials as possible that have been located at 3M, St. Paul, Minnesota, at a mutually agreeable date and time.

30.1 Please state whether Defendant, its medical officer or industrial hygienist or medical consultant or physicians were ever involved in testing, or received literature or correspondence from the Mellon Institute.

ANSWER:

3M has not located any documents from the Mellon Institute relating to asbestos.

30.2 Has any engineer, industrial hygienist or physician in your employ been a member in any professional group, trade group or any of the following groups:

- Asbestos Textile Institute
- National Insulation Manufacturers Association
- Thermal Insulation Manufacturers Association
- Quebec Asbestos Mining Association
- Asbestos Information Association
- Industrial Health Foundation
- Industrial Hygiene Foundation
- Iron and Steel Institute

National Safety Counsel [sic]
Refractories Institute
Air Hygiene Foundation of America, Inc.
Sprayed Mineral Fiber Association

If the answer is yes, state the following:

- (a) The name of the group or groups in which the individual(s) were members;
- (b) The name and position individual(s) within the Defendant, as defined, who were members;
- (c) The years the individual(s) were members of the groups;
- (d) Whether the Defendant paid the individual(s) dues or membership fees or reimbursed the individual(s) for dues or membership fees in the group.

ANSWER:

3M has no records which reflect any employee being a member of such organizations.

31. State in detail what, if any, Defendant ever made with regard to the quantity, quality, or threshold limit values of asbestos dust, fibers or particles to which workers were exposed while using, working with and/or around, installing and/or applying your asbestos-containing products.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Interrogatory 18.

32. For each test described in Interrogatory No. 31, please give the name of the person conducting the test, the date of the test, and attach true copies of any documents, including but not limited to, reports, findings or memoranda concerning such tests or studies.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 31.

33. Please state the year that Defendant was first advised of either threshold limit values or maximum allowable concentrations of both asbestos dust and total dust by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists and state the name of the employee/official of the company receiving such advice.

ANSWER:

After a thorough search of available documents 3M cannot state specifically when it first became aware of the ACGIH TLV, but 3M believes that the Medical Department was aware of the ACGIH TLV's.

33.1 State whether this Defendant at any time caused to be conducted on any job site, any air sampling, dust counts, tests or other activities to determine air quality or worker safety? If your answer is in the affirmative, please indicate:

- (a) the date of any such air samples, tests, or activities;
- (b) by whom such activities were performed;
- (c) where such activities were performed;
- (d) the results of any such activities.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 18.

34. Does Defendant maintain library dealing with industrial hygiene, medicine, safety and engineering and/or research? If so, state:

- (a) The date each such library was established;
- (b) The location of each library;
- (c) The name(s) of the librarian(s) since 1930;
- (d) List all journals subscribed to by you concerning asbestos, industrial hygiene, medicine, safety, and/or engineering;
- (e) List all books and articles dealing with asbestos and asbestos-related diseases and the date acquired.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Interrogatory No. 30.

35. Did Defendant in the 1920's or 1930's commission, or participate in the arrangements with Metropolitan Life Insurance Company for studies at the Trudeau Foundation at Saranac Lake, New York, concerning the effect of inhalation or ingestion of asbestos fibers upon human and/or animal bodies.

ANSWER:

No.

36. When was Defendant first aware of reports of studies of the Trudeau Foundation at Saranac Lake, New York, entitled "Effects of the Inhalation of Asbestos Dust in the Lungs of Asbestos Workers" by A.J. Lanza, Assistant Medical Director published in the J. Public Health Report, Vol. 50, No. 1, dated January 4, 1935 ("Lanza Report")?

ANSWER:

To the best of its knowledge, 3M first became aware of this document through litigation.

36.1 Did you ever contract with Saranac Laboratories to study the hazards of any dust producing product manufactured by you (whether asbestos containing or not)? If so, identify by date and author all documents concerning or any way related to such study.

ANSWER:

3M has not located any documents making such a request.

36.2 Did you ever contract with Saranac Laboratories to analyze dust or products? If so, identify by date and author all documents concerning or any way related to such analysis.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 36.1.

37. Please state whether the Defendant at any time has been a member of any "trade organization" or "trade association" composed by other manufacturers, miners, distributors, and/or sellers of asbestos-containing products and, if so, please identify the name and address of each such association or organization, the dates of membership, and the names of any publications issued or written by such association or organization.

ANSWER:

3M has not located any records that indicate that it belonged to any trade organization that existed for the sale of asbestos-containing products. As to ScotchShield fabric, 3M has located no records that it or any of its employees belonged to any trade association focusing on reflective fabrics.

38. With respect to each trade organization or association listed in answer to Interrogatory No. 37, please state whether the minutes of the group's meetings and any correspondence between the members of such groups concerning the hazards of asbestos exposure are available.

ANSWER:

3M has not located any records that indicate that it belonged to any trade organization that existed for the sale of asbestos-containing products. As to ScotchShield fabric, 3M has located no records that it or any of its employees belonged to any trade association focusing on reflective fabrics.

39. Please identify by name the technical and trade association periodicals to which the Defendant subscribed, and state whether Defendant had knowledge of any articles being printed, or withheld from printing, in said periodicals pertaining to the potential hazards of asbestos. If so, please state the following:

- (a) The title of each such article;
- (b) The periodical in which each such article was published;
- (c) The date each such article was published;
- (d) A detailed explanation of the reason for withholding any such article for printing;
- (e) Produce documentation which refers, alludes or mentions articles which were withhold for publication.

ANSWER:

3M has not located any such documents.

40. Please state whether, prior to 1975, the Defendant sponsored, or attended any meeting, seminar, conference, convention or legislative hearing where the subject of occupational health and exposure to asbestos was discussed and, if so, please state the date and place of such meeting and the name and address of any speakers or participants.

ANSWER:

Individual members of the Industrial Hygiene Department and the Medical Department might have attended seminars and meetings where issues of asbestos exposure was discussed. However, 3M kept no centralized records of such meetings attended by individual employees. References to some such meetings may be contained in documents of the Industrial Hygiene Department. A search continues of such documents and those that are relevant and not privileged will be produced for review at 3M, St. Paul, Minnesota, at a mutually agreeable date and time.

41. As to each product listed in response to Interrogatory No. 5, please state whether Defendant, at any time, published and/or distributed any printed materials, including but not limited to brochures, pamphlets, catalogues, packagings or other written materials of any kind or

character that contain any warnings, cautions, caveats or directions concerning the possible health effects of the products on a person. If so, please state as to each product:

- (a) The name of each relevant product;
- (b) The wording of each such warning;
- (c) A description of each such printed material;
- (d) The method used to distribute the warning to persons who are likely to use the products;
- (e) The date each such warning was issued;
- (f) Whether any warning accompanied any of your asbestos-containing products' sales literature, handout or pamphlets;
- (g) Please attach a copy of the warning and date said warning was issued;
- (h) The name, address, and job classification of each person who presently has possession of the above-described documents;
- (i) The name or names and addresses of the company who provided, produced, or manufactured the boxes or containers on which the warning appeared and dates these boxes with the warnings appeared.

ANSWER:

3M published catalogues, brochures, pamphlets, etc. regarding products that it manufactured, sold or distributed. Some but not all of those products that contained asbestos are mentioned in those catalogues. Some products were manufactured for specific clients and do not appear in catalogues or brochures. Over the years, 3M published Material Safety Data Sheets regarding its products. See Answer to Question No. 5. Regarding ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, the documents, brochures, pamphlets, etc., relating to this product can be reviewed at 3M, St. Paul, Minnesota, at a mutually agreeable date and time.

42. Has sales material been prepared by Defendant or its agents for purposes of marketing or advertising the asbestos products listed in answer to Interrogatory No. 5? If so, please state:

- (a) The name and address of each person or entity who prepared same;
- (b) The name, address and job title of each person who presently has possession of same;

- (c) The date same was prepared;
- (d) The media used to disseminate the sales material.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 41.

43. Has any written material of any kind or character been prepared by Defendant, Defendant's predecessor or any of Defendant's subsidiary companies or their agents indicating how the products listed in answer to Interrogatory No. 5 should be used or maintained by the ultimate user? If so, please state the following:

- (a) The name, address and job classification of each person who prepared same;
- (b) The name, address and job classification of each person who presently has possession of same;
- (c) The dates and manner in which said material was distributed to purchasers of the products in answer to Interrogatory No. 5.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 41.

44. Was any written material of any kind prepared by Defendant and distributed to those individuals listed in response to Interrogatory No. 9? If so, please state the following:

- (a) Identify the written material by content and date;
- (b) To whom was it delivered.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 9.

45. Does Defendant contend that asbestos-containing products can be manufactured so as to eliminate all potential health hazards to persons working with or around, installing or applying same? If so, please state the following:

- (a) The date that Defendant first determined that another product could be used in place of asbestos;
- (b) The chemical of the substitute;

- (c) Whether the substitute is suitable for the purpose for which they are to be used;
- (d) Whether Defendant used the substitute for asbestos to 1971;
- (e) Whether Defendant ever used the substitute for asbestos for high or low heat insulation.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 5. As to ScotchShield fabric, 3M sold the fabric substrate with its treated aluminized coating to sophisticated manufacturers who created protective garments. The end user received a finished product. 3M is aware that the published literature shows no substantial release of fibers from aluminized fabric.

46. Did Defendant give any warnings to any individuals at the sites listed on Exhibit A, including any individuals who owned, operated, or managed the facilities at the sites listed on Exhibit A, regarding the potential health hazards of any product listed in response to Interrogatory No. 5. If yes, please state:

- (a) Name of person most knowledgeable about this communication.
- (b) Name of person at the sites listed on Exhibit 1, attached hereto most knowledgeable about this communication.
- (c) Dates of each communication.
- (d) Contents of each communication.

ANSWER:

See Answers to Questions 8, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 and 9.

47. Did any person prior to 1970, file a claim against any Workers' Compensation carrier covering Defendant alleging that he or she contracted a disease as a result of exposure to asbestos? If so, please state the following:

- (a) A list of each such claim by claimant's name, date filed, the caption and jurisdiction involved;
- (b) The disease alleged in each such claim;
- (c) A brief summary of the disposition of each such claim; and

- (d) The name, address and job classification of the person or persons having custody of the records pertaining to each such claim.

ANSWER:

3M has located no records that indicate any employee filed a worker's compensation claim of this type prior to 1970.

47.1 Please identify all documents concerning or in any way related to any decisions made by you to cease manufacturing asbestos-containing products.

ANSWER:

Documents relating to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric can be reviewed at 3M, St. Paul, Minnesota at a mutually agreeable date and time. The decision to cease manufacturing ScotchShield Reflective Fabric was not related to health concerns.

47.2 Has any person or company from which you purchased asbestos containing products ever issued a recall of their products or taken any action to take those products off the market after said products were in your possession? If so, provide:

- (a) the date of said recall;
- (b) the name of the company which issued the recall;
- (c) a copy of the recall.

ANSWER:

As to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric, 3M only applied the film to previously manufactured cloth. See Answer to Question 5.

47.3 State what action, if any, you have ever taken since 1930 to minimum [sic] or eliminate any risk of occupational disease or pneumoconiosis to those at any time engaged in the manufacture or production of asbestos-containing products.

ANSWER:

3M has complied with all Federal and state regulations relating to the manufacture of products that contained asbestos as a component part.

47.4 State what action, if any, you have ever taken since 1930 to minimize or eliminate any risk of occupational disease or pneumoconiosis to those at any time engaged in the use, as

distinguished from the manufacture, or exposed to the use of asbestos-containing or industrial insulation products or who were otherwise exposed to asbestos-containing or industrial insulation products.

- (a) describe such action;
- (b) state when such action was taken;
- (c) state what written material exists related to such action;
- (d) state the names, job titles and last known address of the individuals who undertook such actions.

ANSWER:

3M is aware of documents in the published scientific and medical literature indicating that no risks are associated with aluminized asbestos cloth.

48. Did Defendant receive notice prior to 1968 that any person was claiming injury as a result of using asbestos products manufactured, sold installed, and/or distributed by Defendant? If so, please state:

- (a) The name and address of each claimant;
- (b) The date of notice of each claim;
- (c) A description of the claim;
- (d) The type of injuries allegedly sustained;
- (e) The name and address of each attorney representing the individuals making such claims;
- (f) The style and court number of each such claim;
- (g) The resolution of each claim.

ANSWER:

No.

48.1 Describe the method by which you have maintained records concerning the manufacturer, sale, supply, distribution, use, advertising, delivery and/or installation or tear-out of each of asbestos-containing products. for each description provide the following:

- (a) each present and former company or corporate department, division or subdivision responsible for maintaining such records;
- (b) the manner in which the records are kept (e.g., boxes, computer tape, microfilm, etc.);
- (c) the inclusive dates of any such manufacture sale, supply distribution, use, advertising, delivery, and/or installation or tear-out which such record keeping system covers;
- (d) the present location at which all such records are maintained;
- (e) the identity of each person employed by you at any time from 1930 to the present who is or was responsible for the collection and maintenance of such records.

ANSWER:

Records that are available relating to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric can be reviewed at 3M, St. Paul, Minnesota.

48.2 State whether any records concerning the manufacture, sale, supply, distribution, advertising, delivery, use or installation or tear-out of asbestos-containing products have been destroyed or discarded and if so, indicate:

- (a) the date and location of such destruction or discard;
- (b) the custodian and location of such records prior to their destruction or discard and the identity of each employee, representative, official or agent who ordered, authorized or supervised such destruction or discard.

ANSWER:

3M has no records to determine if such records have been destroyed.

48.3 For all documents, other than invoices, work orders and/or purchase orders, which relate to matters relevant to all the preceding interrogatories:

- (a) Is there any kind of index for the documents?
- (b) How many pages is the index of documents?
- (c) How many documents are referred to in the index?

- (d) Is the index maintained in electronic format (i.e., database, word processing or other computerized format)?
- (e) What manner of electronic format is used?

ANSWER:

See Answers to preceding questions. Documents relating to ScotchShield Reflective Fabric can be reviewed at 3M, St. Paul, Minnesota.

48.4 For all invoices, work orders and/or purchase orders, which relate to matters relevant to all the preceding interrogatories:

- (a) Is there any kind of index for the documents?
- (b) How many pages is the index of documents?
- (c) How many documents are referred to in the index?
- (d) Is the index maintained in electronic format (i.e., database, word processing or other computerized format)?
- (e) What manner of electronic format is used?

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 48.3. No index exists.

49. Has Defendant obtained statement from any witnesses including the Plaintiffs? If so, please:

- (a) list each witness who has given a statement and the name, address, and job title of each person having custody of any such statement.

ANSWER:

This Defendant has obtained only that information received in discovery and made available to all defendants.

50. Do you contend that the Plaintiff/Decedent improperly used those products listed in response to Interrogatory No. 5? If so, please set out in detail in what respect the product was improperly used.

ANSWER:

As of the filing of these Answers to Interrogatories, no plaintiff has identified any 3M product that contained asbestos. Therefore, investigation continues.

51. As to the sites listed on Exhibit A, and as to each Plaintiff/Decedent, please state whether Defendant contends that there was any substance other than asbestos which contributed or caused Plaintiff/Decedent's injuries. If your answer is yes, please state the following:

- (a) The facts upon which you rely;
- (b) The identity of the sources upon which you rely which substantiate these facts.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 50.

52. Would any respirator, mask or other breathing devices prevent inhalation of the asbestos dust and fibers contained in products listed in answer to Interrogatory No. 5? If so, state:

- (a) When the respirator was sold;
- (b) A detailed description of such respirator or other breathing devices, including name of manufacturer and model number;
- (c) The basis of your claim that such respirators or other breathing devices will prevent the inhalation of such dust and fibers;
- (d) Identify any tests performed regarding the efficaciousness of such respirators and other breathing devices in preventing the inhalation of asbestos dust and fibers including date, title, author and number;
- (e) List all documents which mention, allude or refer to tests performed on breathing devices which prevented the inhalation of asbestos dust and/or fibers.

ANSWER:

3M is aware of OSHA regulations regarding the use of respiratory protective equipment in certain circumstances and in certain exposures. This Defendant is also aware that the Bureau of Mines and NIOSH approved certain respiratory protection devices for use in certain asbestos exposures.

53. Does Defendant expect to call expert witnesses at the trial of this case? If so, please state the following:

- (a) Their identity, last known address;
- (b) The subject matter on which the expert is expected to testify;
- (c) The expert's specific conclusion and specific opinions and the specific basis therefore;
- (d) The expert's qualifications to render the opinions set forth above;
- (e) Whether any person identified in subparagraph (a) above has provided a report or other documentation to you, and if so, identify such document or report;
- (f) Identify all documents that you have provided to each person identified in response to subparagraph (a) above; and
- (g) Describe in detail the education and work history of, and identify any books, treaties, article, published and unpublished reports, studies or other scholarly works authored by any individual identified in response to subparagraph (a) above. Alternatively, in lieu of said response, attach a copy of a resume or curriculum vitae and a list of publications to your answer.

ANSWER:

3M finds it impossible to identify experts without plaintiff's identifying specific products manufactured, sold or distributed by 3M to which they allege exposure. 3M will comply with the scheduling orders of this court, but does not waive its rights to seek appropriate court relief related to plaintiff's failure to disclose and identify specific products to which each claims exposure.

54. Please state the name and last known address of each expert witness who is not retained or employed for that purpose who is an employee of Defendant and will render an opinion within his expertise at the time of trial?

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 53.

55. Does Defendant admit that service of process was properly had on it in these cases? If not, please state why.

ANSWER:

Yes.

55.1 For each and every affirmative defense asserted in the answering defendant's Answer to Plaintiffs' Complaint, the Cross-Claims or Counter-Claims of any party against this answering defendant state:

- (a) the facts upon which the answering defendant relies for each and every affirmative defense;
- (b) each and every document which will be offered to prove each and every affirmative defense; and
- (c) each and every witness who will testify in support of each and every affirmative defense.
- (d) the substance and subject matter of the anticipated testimony of each witness identified in the preceding response.

ANSWER:

3M cannot identify such evidence until an asbestos-containing product manufactured, sold or distributed by 3M has been identified. Investigation continues.

56. Does Defendant have policies of insurance that might cover the claims that have been made by the Plaintiffs herein?

- (a) if so, please list the name of each insurance carrier who may have coverage, the amount of such coverage, and the dates of each such policy.

ANSWER:

3M states that it has continuously purchased commercially available insurance protection, the terms of which are set forth in many insurance policies, from literally hundreds of commercial insurers and excess insurers over a number of decades, including, but not limited to, the periods of time Plaintiffs claim they were exposed to respirable asbestos in amounts sufficient to produce a claimed asbestos-related disease. 3M is satisfied that it is capable of satisfying any contingent liability presented by these cases. Should the many thousands of pages of insurance policies be relevant, they are available for review at 3M, St. Paul, Minnesota, at a mutually agreeable date and time.

- (a) 3M does not possess a complete listing of the hundreds of insurance policies, coverage amounts or dates of coverage.

56.1 Have you ever been involved in any litigation concerning potential insurance coverage for asbestos products liability matters? If so, please state:

- (a) the case caption, court and date of filing of each case in which you have been involved;
- (b) whether you were plaintiff or defendant;
- (c) a brief statement of the issues;
- (d) identify by date, author and recipients, (including recipients of carbon copies) all documents listed as exhibits by either party in this litigation;
- (e) identify by deponent and date all individuals who were deposed in these cases;
- (f) identify by date, author and recipient(s) all documents that have been placed on a protective order in such litigation;
- (g) identify all expert witnesses retained for use at trial in any of the above-litigation by name, address and telephone number.

ANSWER:

See Answer to Question 56.

57. Please state the name and address of each person who has knowledge of relevant facts regarding claims and defenses of this lawsuit.

ANSWER:

3M incorporates by reference all witnesses identified in this case to date. 3M finds it impossible to identify other witnesses until such time as the plaintiffs identify specific products of 3M to which they allege exposure.

58. State the last date that this Defendant sold, distributed, manufactured, installed, and/or otherwise placed asbestos-containing products into the stream of commerce.

ANSWER:

3M believes that it ceased the manufacture of its last asbestos-containing products sometime before 1987. However, 3M also believes that during 1987, it might have sold off some of the remaining inventory of asbestos-containing products.

AS TO OBJECTIONS:

Paul K. Vey per authority letter
Paul K. Vey
Pietragallo, Bosick & Gordon
38th Floor, One Oxford Centre
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219
(412) 263-2000
R.D. Skeels

STATE OF MINNESOTA)
) SS.
COUNTY OF RAMSEY)

VERIFICATION

Hildy Bowbeer, being first duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

That she is Senior Counsel of Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company, defendant in the above-entitled action; that she has read the foregoing Responses to Interrogatories, by her subscribed and knows the contents thereof, that said responses were prepared with the assistance and advice of counsel and the assistance of employees and representatives of Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company upon which she relied; that the responses set forth herein, subject to inadvertent or undiscovered errors, are based on and therefore necessarily limited by the records and information still in existence, presented or recollected and thus far discovered in the course of the preparation of these responses, that consequently defendant reserves the right to make any changes in the responses if it appears at any time that omissions or errors have been made therein or that more accurate information is available; that subject to these limitations set forth herein, said responses are true to the best of her knowledge, information and belief.

Hildy Bowbeer
Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Company

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this _____ day of March 1998.

Notary Public

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served upon plaintiffs' counsel via facsimile and via regular U.S. mail, and noticed upon all known defense counsel of record via regular U.S. mail this 27th day of March, 1998.

Richard D. Schuster