

5 Defendant objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they purport to require Defendant to provide information pertaining to any time period other than the relevant time period which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant.

6. Defendant reserves the right to supplement or amend its responses as appropriate.

INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: At any time prior to 1980 did Defendant or anyone at the direction of Defendant conduct an investigation, survey or other process to identify the primary emission sources of airborne asbestos fibers and/or to assess and/or sample for the detection of, the quantity of, or threshold limit value of airborne asbestos fibers in relation to Defendant's railroad? If so, please identify with particularity the entity and/or persons conducting such investigation(s), survey(s), or test(s), the dates conducted and the results.

ANSWER: Defendant is aware of current permissible exposure limits for exposure to asbestos fibers and its predecessors promulgated by the OSHA. Investigation with regard to TLVs and the date upon which Defendant first became aware of this "concept" has not been established.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Did Defendant ever arrange for any labor agency, insurance company, government agency, inspectors or anyone from your company to go into any of Defendant's railway car(s) and/or engine(s) and/or locomotive(s) and/or roundhouses and/or shops to take dust level counts related to asbestos dust? If so, identify with particularity the party(ies) conducting such procedure(s), the dates conducted, the purpose of such procedure(s), and all results of such (s).

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period in which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant nor is it limited to the job site or facilities on which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Moreover, this Interrogatory seeks information, if any exists, which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3: Did Defendant obtain facts, knowledge or information from any industry, insurance company, governmental agency, union, and/or any other entity regarding the potential health effects and/or health hazards created for persons exposed to airborne asbestos dust? If so, please list all sources of such information and the dates received.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period in which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Moreover, this Interrogatory seeks information if any exists, which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Defendant has not located any documents from the time period during which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant which are responsive to this Interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: List each person who has acted in a medical advisory capacity to your company at any time during the past 40 years, including, but not limited to, physicians (including those physicians who would have been responsible for conducting physicals, evaluations or screenings of Defendant's employees) and industrial hygienists, and the current address, telephone number and job title of each of those individuals who has had or may have had any knowledge regarding the hazards of airborne asbestos dust.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period during which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant.

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Ernest T. Rouse, 710 Hanley, St. Louis, MO 63105, was Medical Director for Missouri Pacific Railroad Company from approximately 1969 until approximately 1986.

Dennis Richling is Union Pacific Railroad Company's current medical director. He began at the railroad in 1986. His business address is 1416 Dodge, Omaha, Nebraska 68179. Dr. L.C. Bevilacqua was with the Union Pacific from 1978 to 1989. Dr. Bevilacqua lives in the Omaha area. Dr. R. D. Sellers was a contract physician with the Union Pacific

Railroad from approximately 1974 to 1978. It is believed that Dr. Sellers is in the Council Bluffs, Iowa area.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5: Does Defendant have in its possession any books, pamphlets, memoranda, or written materials of any kind or character that would indicate that asbestos fibers, when inhaled, can be hazardous to the health of human beings? If so, state:

- A. The name of each such publication;
- B. The date of publication and the names of the author and publisher (if any);
- C. The date received by Defendant;
- D. The name, job title, and address of each person who currently has possession of each publication and its present location.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period in which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Moreover, this Interrogatory seeks information, if any exists, which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: Has Defendant at any time been a member of any trade organization or association that published or disseminated any documents or information relating to the hazards of airborne asbestos? If so, state:

- A. The name and address of each such association or organization;
- B. The dates during which Defendant member (Sic);
- C. The names and dates of any publications, minutes, or reports published, written, or disseminated by any of the named associations or organizations;
- D. Whether any of those publications are still in your possession, and if so:
 - 1. A description of the publications, including the date;
 - 2. The current location of such publications;
 - 3. The custodian of such publications;
 - 4. The method or manner in which such publications are maintained.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period in which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Defendant has been a member of the Association of American Railroads since 1934. Prior to 1934, Defendant was a member of the American Railway Association. Defendant does not currently have in its possession any records which indicate whether it had representatives at the Medical and Surgical Section of the Association of American Railroad for the years listed. Counsel for Defendant has obtained minutes of the proceedings of the Medical and Surgical Section of the American Railway Association and the American Association of Railroads for certain years through the course of other asbestos litigation. These records indicate that the following individual were in attendance at the following meetings. Defendant has no records which indicate that these individuals were employed by Defendant.

1921	P.F. Vasterling
1922	P.F. Vasterling, J. O. Graves, A. Isom, G. M. Snellings
1926	W.B. Burns, J. B. Caharton, W. P. Coyle, T.B.M. Craig, H.W. Cummings, J.N. Greene, C.C. Hawke, S.C. Murray, E.B. Parsons, L.L. Purefoy, E.H. Skinner
1929	O.B. Zeinert
1930	O.B. Zeinert
1931	O.B. Zeinert
1932	O.B. Zeinert
1933	O.B. Zeinert
1934	O.B. Zeinert

1935 O.B. Zeinert
 1936 O.B. Zeinert
 1937 O.B. Zeinert, J.A. Lembeck, D.S. Long
 1939 O.B. Zeinert
 1940 O.B. Zeinert
 1941 O.B. Zeinert, A.J. Brown
 1946 O.B. Zeinert
 1947 O.B. Zeinert
 1949 O.B. Zeinert
 1950 O.B. Zeinert
 1951 O.B. Zeinert
 1952 J.A. Lembeck
 1953 J.A. Lembeck
 1955 J.A. Lembeck
 1956 J.A. Lembeck, G.W. Bale
 1957 J.A. Lembeck
 1958 J.A. Lembeck
 1965 J.M.L. Jensen

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: As to the disease asbestosis, state:

- A. The date on which Defendant first learned that such disease was caused by inhalation of asbestos fibers;
- B. How Defendant became aware of the existence of the disease;
- C. Who within the company first discovered, recognized or understood the adverse consequences or effects of the disease;
- D. What information was disseminated within Defendant's company or its subsidiary or predecessor regarding such adverse consequences or effects;
- E. Whether any such information is still maintained by Defendant or its subsidiary or predecessor in any written form;
- F. Who is the custodian of such information;
- G. The date on which you first received knowledge or information that asbestosis was caused by inhalation of asbestos fibers alone or in conjunction with second hand smoke.

ANSWER:

Objection. This Interrogatory is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period in which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant and does not reference any condition of which Plaintiff allegedly suffered. Moreover, this Interrogatory seeks information, if any exists, which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, it is not known what year Defendant first became aware of this issue; however, as possibilities became more probable based on more concrete medical information, Defendant's awareness of these possibilities increased. To the best of our knowledge, it appears that the company was reasonably aware of these issues by approximately 1977.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: As to the disease lung cancer, state:

- A. The date on which Defendant first learned that such disease was caused by inhalation of asbestos fibers;
- B. How Defendant or its subsidiary or predecessor became aware of the disease and its relationship to asbestos exposure;
- C. Who within the company or its subsidiary or predecessor first discovered or recognized the adverse consequences or effects of asbestos exposure;

- D. What information was disseminated within Defendant's company or its subsidiary or predecessor regarding such adverse consequences or effects;
- E. Whether any such information is still maintained by Defendants or its subsidiaries or predecessors in a written form;
- F. Who is the custodian of such information;
- G. The date on which you first received knowledge or information that lung cancer was caused by inhalation of asbestos dust and fibers.

ANSWER: See Defendant's Objections and Response to Interrogatory 32.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: As to the disease mesothelioma, state:

- A. The date on which Defendant first learned such disease was caused by inhalation of asbestos fibers;
- B. The date on which Defendant first suspected that mesothelioma was caused by inhalation of asbestos dust and fibers;
- C. How Defendant or its subsidiary or predecessor became aware of the disease and that it was caused by exposure to asbestos;
- D. Who within the company or its subsidiary or predecessor first discovered or recognized the adverse consequences or effects of asbestos exposure;
- E. What information was disseminated within Defendant's company or its subsidiary or predecessor regarding such adverse consequences or effects;
- F. Whether any such information is still maintained by Defendants or its subsidiary or predecessor in a written form;
- G. Who is the custodian of such information;
- H. Whether Defendant agrees that there is no known medical cure for mesothelioma.

ANSWER: See Defendant's Objections and Response to Interrogatory 32.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: As to gastrointestinal cancer, laryngeal cancer, pharyngeal cancer and/or lymphatic cancer, state:

- A. The type of cancer and the date on which Defendant first learned that such diseases were caused by inhalation of asbestos fibers by humans;
- B. What cancers has the Defendant become aware can be caused by exposure to asbestos fibers;
- C. The date on which Defendant first suspected other cancers were caused by asbestos inhalation;
- D. Who within the company or its subsidiary or predecessor first discovered the adverse consequences or effects of asbestos exposure;
- E. What information was disseminated with Defendant's company or its subsidiary or predecessor regarding such adverse consequences or effects;
- F. Whether any such information is still maintained by Defendant or its subsidiary or predecessor in a written form;
- G. Who is the custodian of such information.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period in which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Moreover, this Interrogatory seeks information, if any exists, which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11: Did Defendant maintain written minutes of corporate meetings, either board of directors, departmental, or otherwise, which reflect discussions pertaining to any subject matter related to asbestos, asbestos health hazards or asbestos products? If so, for each such set of minutes, state:

- A. The dates of each such meeting;

- B. The general subject matter discussed at each meeting;
- C. Who was in attendance at each meeting;
- D. Where and by whom the written minutes are presently maintained;
- E. By whom the minutes were taken and put into final format;
- F. Whether the minutes were abstracted and reports disseminated to other individuals, and if so, the names and job titles of those individuals.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period in which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Moreover, this Interrogatory seeks information, if any exists, which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Defendant has not located any information responsive to this Interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: Does Defendant intend to call a company representative as a witness at the trial of this case? If so, list:

- A. The name, address, and job title of each company representative who may be called;
- B. A summary of the testimony expected to be given by each such witness;
- C. List any and all previous times that the named witnesses have either given deposition or trial testimony in an asbestos-related case, including the jurisdiction, style of the case, case number, date of testimony, and the name of the attorney taking the deposition for the Plaintiff(s) in that case.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Moreover, this Interrogatory seeks information, if any exists, which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Defendant does not presently intend to call a company representative as a witness at the trial of this matter.

INTERROGATORY NO. 13: Does Defendant have, or has it ever had, a Medical Department or Medical Section? If so, state:

- A. The year such Medical Department or Section was established;
- B. Whether or not such Medical Department or Section has operated continuously since being established;
- C. The name of each director, chief, or head of your Medical Department or Section year by year, beginning with the first year of its existence and the last known address and phone number of each;
- D. State the duties and responsibilities of such Medical Department.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period in which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, see Defendant's response to Interrogatory No. 29.

INTERROGATORY NO. 14: Please state whether written warnings were placed at any locations adjacent to or near asbestos in place on Defendant's railroad(s), at anytime from 1930 to the present. If so, please describe with specificity such signs, including size, color, wording, etc. Additionally, please state the number of such signs that were installed and indicate the specific location of each such sign and the dates such sign was at that location.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it does not reference any time period during which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant nor is it limited to the job site or facilities on which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15: Does Defendant have, or has it ever had, a Safety Department? If so, state:

- A. The year such Safety Department was established;
- B. Whether or not such Safety Department has operated continuously since being established;
- C. The name of each director, chief, or head of your Safety Department year by year, beginning with the first year you had a Safety Director or Safety Department, and the last known address and phone number of each;
- D. State the duties and responsibilities of such Safety Department.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to but without waiver of the foregoing objections, all Railroad Departments are conscious of safety issues.

INTERROGATORY NO. 16: Please state whether a medical monitoring program, medical examination program or other medical surveillance was provided to your employees and specifically to Plaintiff. If so, please indicate what records of such program, examination or surveillance concerning Plaintiff exist at this time, including but not limited to reports, x-rays and medical notes.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. This Interrogatory seeks information which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Defendant has not located any documents which would indicate that medical monitoring and/or surveillance was conducted by Defendant on Plaintiff.

INTERROGATORY NO. 17: Please state whether Defendant has at any time provided safety equipment to the Plaintiff and/or the railroad workers of Defendant present at any time during Plaintiff's employment by Defendant for protection against the inhalation of airborne asbestos dust, including but not limited to masks, respirators, or other breathing devices, protective clothing, protective gloves, etc. For each such item of equipment, please indicate when such item was first provided, under what circumstances, and the name, address and telephone number of the person most knowledgeable concerning such provision.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the job site and facilities on which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, respiratory protection has been available to Defendant's employees for a number of years.

INTERROGATORY NO. 18: Please state whether Defendant ever agreed by contract, agreement, negotiation, collective bargaining or otherwise, to provide masks to Plaintiff and other crew members and/or employees of Defendant working with or around asbestos products. If so, please state verbatim the specific agreement or contract and/or other document by which Defendant agreed to provide such masks. Include the date the agreement was entered into, the period of time covered by the agreement and the parties to the agreement.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period in which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant nor limited to the job site or facilities on which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Defendant has not located any information which would indicate that Defendant entered into such an agreement during the years of Plaintiff's employment with Defendant.

INTERROGATORY NO. 19: Please state the precise State and/or Federal regulations, laws, statutes, or other authority pertaining to industrial hygiene or worker safety and health that governed, regulated controlled and/or were applicable to airborne asbestos exposure in your operations and/or in relation to Defendant's railroad.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period during which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Further the information requested is public record and is equally available to Plaintiff and Defendant.

INTERROGATORY NO. 20: Please describe each and every occasion during the past thirty years when any regulatory agency or other governing body inspected Defendant's railroad to ascertain whether health and safety regulations were being followed or adhered to, including the date of such inspection and/or meeting, the results, and whether a written report was produced.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period during which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant nor is it limited to the job site or facilities on which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant.

INTERROGATORY NO. 21: Please state whether any asbestos-containing products in place or in use on Defendant's railroad, has been removed or abated at any time from 1965 to the present. If so, please answer the following: ..

- A. List each and every abatement company or other contractor involved with the removal of asbestos, including address and telephone number, dates of such removal, and whether a contract for such removal exists;
- B. Indicate the total amount in dollars spent by Defendant to abate or remove asbestos from the railroads.
- C. State whether any "removal plan" or organized written criteria or other document related to asbestos removal on the railroad(s) was ever prepared by Defendant;
- D. State whether corporate documents discussing or relating generally to the removal of asbestos are in existence and, if so, where they are maintained;
- E. State precise dates and locations when and where such removal or abatement took place for each railroad.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it does not reference any time period during which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Moreover, this Interrogatory seeks information, if any exists, which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Defendant has been involved in the abatement of asbestos in use on the railroad.

INTERROGATORY NO. 22: As to either the threshold limit values or maximum allowable concentrations of both asbestos dust and total dust provided by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists, state:

- A. The year in which Defendant was first advised of such limits or concentrations;
- B. The name of the employee or official of the company receiving such advice;
- C. How Defendant received notice of such limits or concentrations.

ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Moreover, this Interrogatory seeks information which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Defendant is aware of current permissible exposure limits for exposure to asbestos fibers and its predecessors promulgated by the OSHA. Investigation with regard to TLVs and the date upon which Defendant first became aware of this "concept" has not located any documents which address this issue. Additionally, investigation continues on this issue, and this answer will be supplemented as appropriate.

INTERROGATORY NO. 23: Please state whether and when Defendant received a copy of the Fleischer/Drinker Report published in 1945/1946.


ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period during which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, counsel for Defendant has obtained this document through the course of other asbestos litigation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 24: Please describe all actions taken by Defendant to comply with the Boiler Inspection Act, previously 45 U.S.C. §23 during the past thirty-five (35) years, now designated at 49 U.S.C. §20701 et seq.


ANSWER: Objection. This Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it is not limited to the time period during which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant nor is it limited to the job site or facilities on which Plaintiff was allegedly employed by Defendant. Moreover, this Interrogatory seeks information, if any exists, which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine. Finally, this Interrogatory requires Defendant to make a legal conclusion in order to respond to it.

Respectfully submitted,

PHELPS DUNBAR

By 
Deborah Newman
Texas State Bar No. 01237257
Maria Ragazzo
Texas Bar No. 00783564
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Suite 900
Houston, TX 77056
(713) 626-1386
(713) 626-1388 FAX


THOMPSON COBURN

By 
Allan McD. Goodloe, Jr.
Missouri State Bar No. 23983
Tracy J. Cowan
Missouri State Bar No. 40229
One Mercantile Center
St. Louis, Missouri 63101
314-552-6000
FAX 314-552-7000
Attorneys for Defendant
Union Pacific Railroad Company

*Signed by Permission

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff's Second Set of Interrogatories has been sent via Federal Express and Facsimile to Kimberly A. Castles, Baron & Budd, 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 1100, Dallas, Texas 75219-4281 and via First Class Mail to all parties of record on attached service list and this 27th day of June, 1997.


Maria Ragazzo

NO. 96-62699

STEVE EVANS.
Plaintiffs.

IN THE DISTRICT COURTS OF

vs.

HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS
CORPORATION, ET AL
Defendants.

334TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

VERIFICATIONSTATE OF NEBRASKA)
COUNTY OF DOUGLAS)


Comes now A.L. Schroeder, Manager of Discovery for Union Pacific Railroad Company, being first duly sworn on her oath, and states that she is authorized on behalf of Union Pacific Railroad Company to make the foregoing Objections and Responses to Plaintiff's Second Set of Interrogatories Directed to Defendants, and that while she does not have personal knowledge of all facts cited therein, the information has been collected and the answers made after a reasonable search of all available records and that she has read the foregoing Objections and Responses to Plaintiff's Second Set of Interrogatories, and that the information contained therein is true and accurate based on her best knowledge, information and belief. Therefore, the foregoing responses are verified on behalf of Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company.

A. L. Schroeder
A. L. Schroeder

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of June, 1997.

James H. Busenbark
Notary Public

My commission expires:



PDS:72188.1

RECEIVED TIMEJUL 3 1:09PM

PHELPS DUNBAR, L.L.P.
COUNSELLORS AT LAW

TELEPHONE CENTER - 408 PETERMAN STREET
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70130-3348
(504) 566-1311
FACSIMILES (504) 566-0100 AND (504) 566-0007
TELEX 308123 WU AND 688139 WUI
CABLE HOWSPENCER

SUITE 701 - CITY NATIONAL BANK BUILDING
P. O. BOX 5412
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70821-4412
(504) 348-0265
FACSIMILE (504) 381-9187

SUITE 900 - 3040 POST OAK BOULEVARD
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77056
(713) 626-1386
FACSIMILE (713) 626-1388

SUITE 600 - HOTEL CENTRE
200 S. LAMAR STREET
P. O. BOX 240000
JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39202-0000
(601) 382-2300
FACSIMILE (601) 382-9777

SEVENTH FLOOR - ONE MISSISSIPPI PLAZA
P. O. BOX 1520
TUPELO, MISSISSIPPI 38802-1520
(601) 642-7807
FACSIMILE (601) 642-3873

SUITE 731 - LEVEL 7
LLOYD'S
1 ABBEY STREET
LONDON EC4M 7DB ENGLAND
TELEPHONE 01447-7000-1385
FACSIMILE 01447-7000-0048
TELEX 987321

June 27, 1997

MARIA RAGAZZO
Houston Office
(713) 877-5513

11740-0182

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Mr. Charles Bacarisse
Harris County District Clerk
301 Fannin
Houston, TX 77002

Re: Cause No. 96-62699; Steve Evans vs. Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corporation, et al; In the 334th
Judicial District Court of Harris County, Texas

Dear Mr. Bacarisse:

Enclosed please find an original and one file stamp copy of the following documents for the above-referenced matter:

1. Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories;
2. Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff's Second Set of Interrogatories; and
3. Defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company's Objections and Responses to Plaintiff's Request for Production.

Due to the voluminous copying involved, enclosures have been furnished exclusively to Plaintiff's attorney. All other parties have been furnished with this letter only and should they wish to obtain a copy of this pleading, they may contact Barry Hollingshead at (713) 626-1386 ext. 242.

Very truly yours,

PHELPS DUNBAR, L.L.P.

Maria Ragazzo
Maria Ragazzo *in by permission*

MA/mml
Enclosure
cc: attached service list

PD5:72562.1

RECEIVED TIME JUN. 27. 10:27AM

PLAINTIFFS

Kimberly A. Castles
Baron & Budd
The Centrum
3102 Oaklawn Avenue
Suite 1100
Dallas, TX 75219
Phone No. (214) 521-3605
Fax No. (214) 520-1181

OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS CORPORATION

Rick Thamm
BEAN & MANNING
5847 San Felipe, Suite 1500
Houston, Texas 77057
Phone No. (713) 783-7070
Fax No. (713) 783-7157

PITTSBURGH-CORNING

Steven S. Livingston
Thompson & Knight
First City Center
1700 Pacific Ave., Ste. 3300
Dallas, Texas 75201
Phone No. (214) 969-1253
Fax No. (214) 969-1751

GARLOCK, INC.ANCHOR PACKING COMPANY

Al Conant, Jr.
CONANT, WHITTENBURG, WHITTENBURG &
SCHACHTER
600 North Pearl, Suite 2300
Dallas, Texas 75201
Phone No. (214) 999-5700
Fax No. (214) 999-5748

CROWN CORK AND SEAL COMPANY, INC.

Frank Harmon, III
CAIN, CATON & JAMES
3300 Two Houston Center
Houston, TX 77010
Phone No. (713) 658-2323
Fax No. (713) 658-1021

METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

John L. Hill, Jr.
Liddell, Sapp, Zivley, Hill & LaBoon
3300 Texas Commerce Tower
Houston, Texas 77002
Phone No. (713) 226-1200
Fax No. (713) 223-3717

FOSTER WHEELER ENERGY CORPORATION

Lawrence A. Lyane
COATS, ROSE, YALE, HOLM, RYMAN & LEE
800 First City Tower
1001 Fannin
Houston, Texas 77002-6707
Phone No. (713) 651-0111
Fax No. (713) 651-0220

W.R. GRACE & COMPANY-CONN.

Sandra F. Clark
MEHAFFY & WEBER
2615 Calder Ave., Ste. 800
Beaumont, TX 77702
Phone No. (409) 835-5011
Fax No. (409) 835-5729

THE ANCHOR PACKING COMPANY

T. John Ward
BROWN, MCCARROLL & OAKS, HARTLINE
1300 Wortham Tower
2727 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019-2100
Phone No. (713) 529-3110
Fax No. (713) 525-6295

NORTH AMERICAN REFRACTORIES COMPANY

Debra S. Fitzgerald
CROUCH & HALLETT, LLP
717 North Harwood, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Phone No. (214) 953-0053
Fax No. (214) 953-3154

PROKO INDUSTRIES

Thomas F. Dougall
BOWERS ORR & ROBERTSON
1401 Main Street, Suite 1100
Columbia, SC 29201
Phone No. (803) 252-0494
Fax No. (803) 252-1068

SYNKOLOID CO.THIOKOL CORP.PLIBICO COMPANYCONGOLEUM

Kathryn Hermes
DEHAY & ELLISTON, L.L.P.
1500 Maxus Energy Tower
717 North Harwood Street
Dallas, Texas 75201-6508
Phone No. (214) 953-5454

MINNESOTA MINING AND MANUFACTURING CO.

Stan McMurtry
LOCKE PURNELL RAIN HARRELL
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Phone No. (214) 740-8585
Fax No. (214) 740-8800

GEORGIA PACIFICU.S. MINERAL PRODUCTS COMPANY

Mel Ballew
DEHAY & ELLISTON, L.L.P.
1500 Maxus Energy Tower
717 North Harwood Street
Dallas, Texas 75201-6508
Phone No. (214) 953-5454
Fax No. (214) 953-5455

FLINTKOTE

James M. Harris
HOLMES HARRIS & JEFFREY
550 Fannin St.
Beaumont, Texas 77704
Phone No. (409) 832-8382
Fax No. (409) 833-4240

HARRISON-WALKER CORPORATIONINDRESCO INC.ROME CABLE CORPORATION (Gambrell case)

Lewis C. Miltenberger
BOURLAND, KIRKMAN, SEIDLER & EVANS,
L.L.P.
201 Main Street, Suite 1400
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
Phone No. (817) 336-2800
Fax No. (817) 820-0373

UNIROYAL, INC.UNIROYAL HOLDING COMPANY

Richard L. Forman
FORMAN, PERRY, WATKINS & KRUTZ
Suite 1200, One Jackson Place
188 East Capitol Street
Jackson, Mississippi 39225-2608
Phone No. (601) 960-8600
Fax No. (601) 960-8613

KELLEY MOORE PAINT

Michael J. Truncale
ORGAIN BELL & TUCKER
470 Orleans Street
Beaumont, Texas 77701
Phone No. (409) 838-6412
Fax No. (409) 838-6959

CLEAVER BROOKS, A Division of Aqua-Chem

David Livingston
LIVINGSTON & MILLER
Paragon Center One
450 Gears Rd., Suite 625
Houston, Texas 77067-4529
Phone No. (281) 876-3393
Fax No. (281) 876-3599

RAPID AMERICAN

Tom Taylor
ANDREWS & KURTH, L.L.P.
600 Travis Street, Suite 4200
Houston, Texas 77002
Phone No. (713) 220-4200
Fax No. (713) 220-4285

RAYMARK CORPORATIONRAYMARK INDUSTRIES

William J. Skepnek
SKEPNEK & MADDOX
Mercantile Bank Tower
900 Massachusetts, Suite 601
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
Phone No. (913) 331-0300
Fax No. (913) 331-0303

HARRISON-WALKER CORPORATIONINDRESCO INC.ROME CABLE CORPORATION (Gambrell case)

Lewis C. Miltenberger
BOURLAND, KIRKMAN, SEIDLER & EVANS,
L.L.P.
201 Main Street, Suite 1400
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
Phone No. (817) 336-2800
Fax No. (817) 820-0373