



CAUSE NO. 95-12979-C

JOE RUFUS MCCARTY, ET AL

vs.

OWENS-CORNING, NORFOLK
SOUTHERN CORP., ET AL

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

68TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

**DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS
TO PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

TO: Plaintiff Willie B. Johnson, by and through their attorney of record, Peter A. Kraus
/Kimberly A. Castles, Baron & Budd, P.C., 3102 Oak Lawn Ave., Suite 1100, Dallas,
Texas 75219

Defendants Norfolk Southern Railway Company (NSRC) and Norfolk Southern Corp. (NSC),
pursuant to Rules 166b and 168 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedures, hereby serve their Objections
to Plaintiffs' Second Set of Interrogatories as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The following responses are being provided after diligent investigation and inquiry by
Defendant. However, because some of the evidence relating to the matters inquired about by
Plaintiffs' Second Set of Interrogatories occurred more than fifty (50) years ago, the availability of
persons involved and the existence of applicable documents has been limited.

As a result of the foregoing factors, many of the individuals who might have had personal
knowledge of the matters to which Plaintiffs' Second Set of Interrogatories relate are deceased,
retired, or are otherwise unavailable to NSRC, and investigations to date indicate that at least some
documents which relate to matters inquired about by these interrogatories may have been destroyed
in keeping with normal corporate record retention policy. Accordingly, some answers are possibly

incomplete. NSRC's investigation is continuing and should additional information surface, supplemental responses will be submitted. The following is a part of and is incorporated by reference in every response provided hereinafter:

This response is accurate as of the date of the Answers of Defendant Norfolk Southern Railway Company to Plaintiffs' Second Set of Interrogatories. However, NSRC's investigation is continuing, and NSRC cannot exclude the possibility that it may be able to obtain more complete information or even information which indicates that the answer being supplied is incorrect. NSRC objects to responding to this interrogatory in regard to any period of time other than the period during which it allegedly employed Plaintiff. NSRC objects to providing information about geographic locations and operating units within the system other than those at which and for whom Plaintiff worked. The basis for such objections are that any responses would be irrelevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation, would not be reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and would be burdensome and oppressive to NSRC.

The answers that follow, unless otherwise apparent from the context, are limited to the specific period (1939-1941) that NSRC allegedly employed Plaintiff as a laborer, and to the area in and around Mobile, Alabama the place where Plaintiff allegedly worked for NSRC.

Defendant, Norfolk Southern Corporation, objects to answering each and every Interrogatory in this Second Set of Interrogatories due to the fact that the Plaintiff was never an employee of this Defendant and it was not in existence at the time of the Plaintiff's alleged employment. Effective June 1, 1982, Southern Railway Company and Norfolk and Western Railway Company became sister corporations and the stock of each became owned by the Norfolk Southern Corporation, a non-carrier holding company which had never operated a railroad. Each of the carriers continued to operate as separate legal entities, a practice which continues to date. Southern Railway Company

subsequently changed its name to Norfolk Southern Railway Company, but never employed the Plaintiff. Norfolk Southern Railway Company remains a separate and distinct entity.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

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 procedure(s).

ANSWER:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; the request

exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of time; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

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;
- 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

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of time; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; and, the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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 or Section.

ANSWER:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of time; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; and, the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; and, the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; and, the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; and, the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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, 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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; and, the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is vague; and, the request is ambiguous.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of time; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; and, the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of time; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; and, the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory for the reason that it requests information about a time period subsequent to Plaintiff's alleged employment. Without waiver NSRC states, it is unknown whether any such inspections may have been made during the time of Plaintiff's alleged employment at the location of his alleged employment. To NSRC's knowledge there are no records of any such inspections which gave rise to negative reports.

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 tile 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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of time; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; and, the request seeks information which is private, confidential and/or proprietary.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; the request infringes on the attorney work product privilege; the request infringes on the investigative/party communication privilege; the request infringes on the attorney-client privilege; and, the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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

ANSWER:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the ground the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

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:

Defendants object to the form and substance of this request on the following grounds: the request is overly broad; the request is unlimited in terms of geographic scope; the request is vague; the request is ambiguous; the request seeks information which is not relevant and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; the overly broad nature of the request is such that it would be unduly burdensome and prohibitively expensive to gather the information necessary to respond to this request; and, the request exceeds the scope of discovery permitted by Rule 166b of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendants further object to this interrogatory on the grounds that the number of interrogatories submitted exceed the number permitted by Rule 168.

Respectfully submitted,

JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.
112 East Pecan Street, Suite 2100
San Antonio, Texas 78205
Telephone (210) 978-7700
Telecopier (210) 978-7796


By: 
James L. Walker
State Bar No. 20708500
Leo D. Figueroa
State Bar No. 06984100

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT, NORFOLK
AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY AND
NORFOLK SOUTHERN CORPORATION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing was served by certified mail, return receipt requested, to Mr. Peter A. Kraus / Kimberly A. Castles, Baron & Budd, The Centrum, Suite 1100, 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75219, on this the 27th day of August, 1997.

All defense counsel may request a copy of this document.


LEO D. FIGUEROA


1617688

JOE RUFUS MCCARTY; WILLIE JOHNSON) IN THE DISTRICT COURT
GRIFFIN; WILLIE B. JOHNSON; et al.)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.) DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS
)
)
OWENS-CORNING FIBERGLAS)
CORPORATION, et al.,)
)
)
Defendants.) 68th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

VERIFICATION OF DEFENDANTS NORFOLK
SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY AND NORFOLK SOUTHERN
CORPORATION TO PLAINTIFF'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES
PROPOUNDED BY PLAINTIFF, WILLIE B. JOHNSON

NOW COMES Defendants NORFOLK SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY and
NORFOLK SOUTHERN CORPORATION, by and through their attorney of record and files this
their Verification to ANSWERS AND OBJECTIONS OF DEFENDANTS NORFOLK SOUTHERN
RAILWAY COMPANY AND NORFOLK SOUTHERN CORPORATION TO SECOND
INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED BY PLAINTIFF WILLIE B. JOHNSON which were served
on October 23, 1997.

Respectfully submitted,
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.
112 East Pecan Street, Suite 2100
San Antonio, Texas 78205
(210) 978-7700
(210) 978-7796 facsimile


By: 
LEO D. FIGUEROA
State Bar No. 06984100
JAMES L. WALKER
State Bar No. 20708500

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing was served by hand-delivery to Peter A. Kraus/Kimberly Shauck, Baron & Budd, The Centrum, Suite 1100, 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75219-4281, on this the 34th day of October, 1997.

All defense counsel may request a copy of this document.


LEO D. FIGUEROA

1653672.1

