MF 500
Papageorge #72

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| NEVADA POWER COMPANY, | ) | |
| | ) | |
| Plaintiff, | ) | |
| -vs- | ) | |
| | ) | # CV-S-89-555-LDG (LRL |
| | ) | |
| MONSANTO COMPANY, et al., | ) | |
| | ) | |
| Defendants. | ) | |

CONTINUATION OF THE 30(b)(6) DISCOVERY
DEPOSITION OF WILLIAM B. PAPAGEORGE

On the part of the Plaintiff

VOLUME II

July 21, 1993

Concannon & Jaeger
General Court Reporters
705 Olive Street, Suite 604
St. Louis, Missouri 63101
(314) 421-1000

WATER_PCB-SD0000074082

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

NEVADA POWER COMPANY, )
)
Plaintiff, )
-vs- ) # CV-S-89-555-LDG (LRL)
)
)
MONSANTO COMPANY, et al., )
)
Defendants. )

* * *

I N D E X

WITNESS: WILLIAM B. PAPAGEORGE Page:

Direct Examination
Questions by Mr. Bradley (7-20-93) . . . . . 4
Questions by Mr. Bradley (7-21-93) . . . . . 24
Questions by Mr. Morgan. . . . . 70
Cross Examination by Mr. Bauer. . . . . 77

E X H I B I T S

30(b)(6) Deposition Exhibit A. . . . . 4
Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibit # 417 . . . . . 69
Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibit # 422 . . 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 27, 28, 33, 34, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 68, 69, 75, 77
Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibit # 1118. . .4, 5, 13, 24, 28, 33, 34, 44, 45, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 68, 69, 75
Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibit # 1194. . . .31, 35, 40, 43, 50, 59, 60, 61, 67
Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibit # 1253. . . . . .61, 62
Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibit # 1454. . . . . 29
Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibit # 2927. . . . . 30
Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibit # 2979. . . . . .32, 43
Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibit # 3054. . . . . 63
Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibit # 3055. . . . . .26, 68, 70
Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibit # 3056. . . . . 66



WATER_PCB-SD0000074083

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

NEVADA POWER COMPANY, Plaintiff,
-vs-
MONSANTO COMPANY, et al., Defendants.
# CV-S-89-555-LDG (LRL)

30(b)(6) DISCOVERY DEPOSITION OF WITNESS, to be used in an action pending in the District Court of the United States, for the District of Nevada, wherein NEVADA POWER COMPANY is Plaintiff, and MONSANTO COMPANY, et al. are Defendants, pursuant to Notice, under the provisions of Rule 26 of the Rules of Civil Procedure, taken on July 20 and 21, 1993, at the law offices of Messrs. Husch, Eppenberger, Donohue, Cornfeld & Jenkins, 100 N. Broadway, Ste. 1300, St. Louis, Missouri 63102, before Mark D. Concannon, a Notary Public within and for the State of Missouri.

A P P E A R A N C E S

The Plaintiff was represented by Attorney Ralph A. Bradley of the law firm of Jones, Jones, Close & Brown, Chartered, 700 Bank of America Plaza, 300 South Fourth Street, Ste. 700, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101.

The Defendant, Monsanto, was represented by Attorney Scott R. Bauer of the law firm of Kirkland & Ellis, 1999 Broadway, Ste. 4000, Denver, Colorado 70202.

The Defendant, Westinghouse, was represented by Robert P. Morgan, In-House Counsel, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222.



WATER_PCB-SD0000074084

WILLIAM B. PAPAGEORGE,

of lawful age, being first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, deposes and says on behalf of the Plaintiff, as follows:

MR. BRADLEY: I am going to mark as Deposition 30(b)(6) Deposition Exhibit A regarding Exhibits 422 and 1118, the Notice of Deposition regarding today's 30(b)(6) deposition.

(Thereupon, the reporter marked 30(b)(6) Deposition Exhibit A, for identification.)

DIRECT EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. BRADLEY:

Q. Mr. Papageorge, you have in front of you Plaintiff's Exhibit 422, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Let me also put in front of you Plaintiff's Exhibit 1118.

Let's begin with this question. Have you seen Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 before today's date?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you seen Plaintiff's Exhibit 1118 before today's date?

A. Yes. I hesitate, because, to me, they are copies of the same document with some missing pages, but that is the only difference I see.

Q. Which pages are missing and in which document?

A. Well, this is a quick observation. For example, Exhibit 422, the first two pages are an outline of the text that follows; that outline is missing on Exhibit 1118. Also, the text in Exhibit 422 is identical to the text that is included in 1118, but following page four of Exhibit 422 there are two pages relating to the chemical graphical representation of several chlorinated hydrocarbon chemicals, and also a analytical instrument chart showing graphs which represent different pesticides. I haven't had time to look at each and every page, but those are the two examples in the exhibits that I have spotted so far.

Q. Did Monsanto maintain one or both of these exhibits within their files as part of their regularly-conducted business?

A. Well --

Q. Let me ask it a different way, Mr. Papageorge: When you viewed Plaintiff's Exhibit 422, did it have the two charts that you referred to following page four as part of that document?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you reviewed Plaintiff's 422, did it have the outline, the two-page outline which are the first two pages of that exhibit?

MR. BAUER: Objection. Vague. We looked at

these documents in preparation for the deposition. Are you talking about when he first saw them, or --

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) When did you first see Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

Q. January of 1970.

Q. Was Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 shown to you by somebody?

A. Yes.

Q. Who showed it to you?

A. Mr. Elmer Wheeler.

Q. Was Exhibit 422 shown to you as part of your tutorial with Mr. Wheeler?

A. Yes.

Q. Is Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 a rough draft dated November 10, 1969, of an outline of PCB Environmental Pollution Abatement Plan?

A. Yes.

Q. Is Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 a true and accurate copy of the document shown to you by Mr. Wheeler in January of 1970?

A. I don't recall that when I saw the document in Mr. Wheeler's office that it had the marginal handwritten notes. I don't recall that. It may or may not have existed then.

Q. And would that include notes at the bottom of

the page, for example, on page four?

A. Yes. I don't recall any marginal notes, and, of course, the highlighting that is in this exhibit was not on the document that I saw back in 1970.

Q. Who authored Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

A. It's my understanding Mr. Wheeler was the principal author, with contributions made by other members of the ad hoc committee.

Q. What do you mean when you say that Mr. Wheeler was the principal author?

A. He is the person that prepared the handwritten rough draft and saw to it that his secretary put the report together and did whatever it took to get the final product issued.

Q. You also indicated that contributions were made by the ad hoc committee regarding the preparation of Exhibit 422. What did you mean, contributions were made by the ad hoc committee?

A. Well, of course I'm in no position to know each and every paragraph in the document, but an example I can give is, there are some handmade charts included in this exhibit that Mr. Wheeler did not prepare. He told me that. He got these charts, as best as I remember, from Dr. Richard, and these reflect Dr. Richard's impression of the business, since he is not a manager in a business sense.

Q. In November of 1969, what position did Dr. Richard have at Monsanto?

A. He was the director of research that related to the products marketed by the functional fluids business group. The PCB materials and blends of PCB's were part of that business group's product line.

Q. What was his title in November of 1969?

A. Director of research, functional products group.

Q. What responsibilities, as best you can recall, did Dr. Richard have as director of research of the functional fluids group?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form of the question. I think he said functional products group. Did you say functional fluids group?

THE WITNESS: Either one would apply, depending on the time. The name changed at different times.

His responsibilities centered on providing the necessary technical effort that would lead to an improved product line, or to new products, or to improving methods for producing existing products. By "methods," I'm referring primarily to the technology involved in producing these products.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) In November of 1969, did Monsanto have any group or individual responsible for the

profit and loss of its Aroclor business?

A. Yes. The functional fluids group, as a business entity, had that responsibility.

Q. Was there a title of someone within the functional fluids group in November of 1969 for any one individual who was responsible for the profit and loss of Monsanto's Aroclor products?

A. Yes.

Q. What was that title?

A. The director of the business group.

Q. In November of 1969, who was the director of the business group of the functional fluids group?

A. Howard S. Bergen.

Q. In November of 1969, did Dr. Richard report to Howard S. Bergen?

A. Yes.

Q. Did your knowledge of the preparation of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 come exclusively from what Elmer Wheeler told you?

A. At what point in time?

Q. Any point in time.

A. Eventually, in the early part of '70, I had conversations with Mr. Bergen, who was then my supervisor, and he made comments regarding this.

Q. Do you recall roughly when you had those con-

versations with Mr. Bergen?

A. Roughly, February, March, 1970.

Q. And describe for me the circumstances under which you had the conversations with Mr. Bergen regarding Plaintiff's Exhibit 422.

A. This was part of the discussion that we had regarding my new assignment, and he was attempting to share with me his understanding of the whole situation, and some of what he told me was a repetition of what Mr. Wheeler had already reviewed with me. And he used the exhibit we're talking about as an example of the kind of information that he was getting and the kind of information he used in preparing presentations to upper management and communicating to his bosses.

Q. Did Mr. Bergen tell you during these discussions whether he was making presentations based up on Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 to any member of Monsanto's board of directors?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form of the question. I think it may be vague, based on whether it was a verbatim meeting or whether he used his own work based upon that information and others that he had.

MR. BRADLEY: Well, then, let me make it clear.

You indicated that Mr. Bergen told you that he

based some of his presentations to upper management on Exhibit 422.

A. Yes.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Did Mr. Bergen indicate to you whether any of those presentations that you referred to were made to any member of Monsanto's board of directors?

A. Indirectly, yes.

Q. And how did -- What do you mean when you say "indirectly" he did?

A. He didn't tell me, "Bill, I spoke to Mr. so and so, who is a member of the board of directors." He said, "I made a presentation to Monsanto's corporate management committee." I'm in the position where I knew most of the members on that committee, some of whom were also members of the board of directors.

Q. Did Mr. Bergen indicate to you when he made presentations to Monsanto's corporate management committee that, as you indicated, were based on Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. And when did he make those --

A. That was November 17th, 1969. Yes, November 17, 1969, he did.

MR. BAUER: Off the record a second.

(Thereupon, a short colloquy was had.)



WATER_PCB-SD0000074092

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Other than the presentation made by Mr. Bergen on November 17, 1969 to Monsanto corporate management committee, did Mr. Bergen make any other presentations to Monsanto's corporate management committee from any source of information that was based on Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

A. I am not aware of that.

Q. Are you aware of anyone other than Mr. Bergen making a presentation to Monsanto's corporate management committee that was based upon Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

A. No.

Q. Are you aware of --

A. Let me correct that. There are portions here that were presented -- some of the document was presented by Elmer Wheeler at that same meeting. Most portions that are medically related were presented by Mr. Wheeler.

Q. And were the portions that were legally presented given by Mr. French, or Dr. French?

A. Mr. French was an attorney. Yes. He was also a speaker at that meeting, yes. I don't personally know whether topics of his discussion are reflected in Exhibit 422. I don't see that. It could be on page five, but I just don't know.

Q. Who were the members of Monsanto's corporate management committee on November 17th, 1969, as best you

can recall?

A. Edward Bach was president of Monsanto and chairman of the board; and Mr. John Gillis, a vice-president --

Q. Was Mr. Gillis also a member of the board?

A. I don't remember. There were other vice-presidents there; I'm trying to remember their names. There was a vice-president in charge of manufacturing and administration. There was John Ehlers, E-h-l-e-r-s; he was the secretary of that committee.

Q. Was he a member of the board?

A. No.

A. I would have to see some documents to refresh my memory. I don't have the names at the present time in my mind.

Q. Okay. At the time that Mr. Wheeler showed you Exhibit 422, what was his title at Monsanto?

A. I am not certain of the timing. Mr. Wheeler was assistant director of the corporate medical department. He later became manager of industrial health. I have forgotten just when that change occurred.

Q. You gave testimony regarding Plaintiff's Exhibit 1118 on July 12th, 1993, correct?

A. And at page forty-nine you were asked when he showed you this document, referring to Elmer Wheeler, what

title did he have at Monsanto, and you answered, "He was the manager. His title was manager, industrial health. He was the assistant director of Monsanto's medical department." Do you recall that testimony?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall, now, when Mr. Wheeler showed you this document whether he was both the manager of industrial health and the assistant director of Monsanto's medical department, or whether he was one or the other, or what title he had?

A. The title he was using in his correspondence, and all, was manager of industrial health. He was also perceived and referred to as the assistant director of the department.

Q. Of the medical department?

A. Yes.

Q. Monsanto's corporate medical department?

A. Correct. Until an individual with a medical degree joined the group, who in turn became the assistant. So Mr. Wheeler was in a transitionary position at that time.

Q. He was not a medical doctor at that time?

A. That is true.

Q. He was not a person with a doctorate degree in toxicology?

A. No.

Q. He didn't have a doctorate degree in November of '69.

A. That is correct.

Q. Did he have a master's degree?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. Was that degree in chemistry?

A. No. He had a master of science in public health.

Q. Do you know how Exhibit 422 was written, and by that I mean, were bits and pieces of it submitted to Mr. Wheeler, or were reports submitted to him? Was information given to him orally and he wrote it up? What information do you have about that?

A. To the best of my understanding, it was all of the things you mentioned. The committee sat around a table, and some of them had their notes that they gave to Mr. Wheeler, who acted as sort of the editor, and this all comes from Mr. Wheeler, and some of them had to go back to their files to get, for example, the chart that shows after page four, and send it to Mr. Wheeler for inclusion in the report. Dr. Richard scribbled off the hand charts that are shown in this document. It didn't all happen at one sitting, either. This was a several-day period that was covered.

Q. Did Mr. Wheeler ever share with you any written documents that were used in the preparation of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

A. He did not.

Q. Did Mr. Bergen ever share with you written documents that were used in the preparation of Plaintiff's Ehxibit 422?

A. No.

Q. Did anyone -- Let me ask it this way: Did you ever review any written material that was used in the preparation of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422.

MR. BAUER: Object to the form. It's unclear whether you're talking about earlier drafts, or the pieces that were put together, or, for example, animal studies that Monsanto has in its files, some of which is reflected in this document. But, Mr. Papageorge, you can answer, if you know.

A. The question was, did I review any reports that led to information that was included in the exhibit?

MR. BRADLEY: Why don't we have the question read back.

(Thereupon, the reporter read back the question.)

A. Yes. I saw, for example, the Widmark-Jensen work in Sweden that was covered in an article, as I recall, that was in a newspaper column. I did review that. And



WATER_PCB-SD0000074097

it's referred to in here. I saw the report by a doctor out in California, with his pelican bird studies. That was a written report that I saw. I saw the document that reflected the, as best I remember, the work done at Gulf Breeze Laboratory and its study of shrimp, the sensitivity of shrimp. Those are some of the examples that I saw.

Q. Did you review any written material prepared by any of the members of the ad hoc committee that are referenced on the third page of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 that were used in the preparation of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

A. I reviewed some documents prepared by Dr. Richard in which he covered some of the topics, but I have no way of knowing whether those specific documents related directly with Exhibit 422.

Q. Did you ever view a file that you believed was, or excuse me, you believed contained documents that were used in the development of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

A. If I did, I was not aware that they were related to this exhibit. There is no way for me to tie that in.

Q. What written material did you view of Dr. Richard's that you think may have related to the development of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form of the ques-

tion. He didn't say it may have been. He said he no way of knowing whether it was. But you can certainly answer the question.

A. For example, we saw, as I recall, some previous exhibits that we looked at today, and Dr. Richard was the author. That kind of document comes to mind. I don't recall any other specific -- seems to me at least a couple of documents Dr. Richard put together in his attempt to summarize what he understood was the PCB environmental issue in '69.

Q. On October 15th, 1969, the members of the ad hoc committee that developed Plaintiff's Exhibit 422, are those persons listed on page three of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

A. That is my understanding.

Q. Were there other members of the ad hoc committee that are not referenced on page three of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 who participated in the development of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. On October 15th, 1969, what was N. Farrar's position within Monsanto?

A. He was the director of research for the plasticizers business group.

Q. On October 15, 1969 what title did P. Hodges

have at Monsanto?

A. As I indicated earlier, I've forgot Mr. Hodges' official title, but he was assigned to environmental matters. He was the manager of environmental matters, or some such title, in the manufacturing department of the organic division of Monsanto Chemicals Company.

Q. On October 15, 1969, what title did E. John have at Monsanto?

A. Mr. John was a manager of public relations.

Q. Was he manager of public relations for the entire Monsanto United States operation, or of a limited division, or a group, or do you know?

A. He was one of several managers of public relations, and he was assigned certain business groups as coming under his responsibility, and the plasticizer group and the functional fluids group were among the groups assigned to him.

Q. And in October of 1969, Monsanto's PCB production came within either the plasticizers or the functional fluids group; is that correct?

A. PCB production came under the manufacturing department's responsibility.

Q. And what role, then, did the plasticizers and functional fluids group have, if any, regarding Monsanto's production of PCB's in October of 1969?

A. They were responsible for predicting the needs, productionwise, and advising the manufacturing department of what their needs are. They were responsible for financing any expansions, improvements, any changes required to produce the products that these two groups sold. That's about it in the production department.

MR. BRADLEY: All right. Let's go off the record.

(Thereupon, a short colloquy was had.)

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) All right. What position did W. Richard have at Monsanto in October of 1969?

A. Director of research for the functional fluids group.

Q. And what position did E. Wheeler have -- I'm sorry. We already talked about Elmer Wheeler and his position in October of '69; is that correct?

A. Yes, we did.

Q. Okay. Was there a draft of 422 that preceded 422?

A. I do not know.

Q. Was there a draft of 422 that succeeded 422?

A. I don't know.

Q. Did the ad hoc committee referred to at page three of Exhibit 422 have any responsibility other than making a presentation to Monsanto's corporate management

committee in November, 1969?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form of the question. Assumes a fact not in evidence, that the ad hoc committee made a presentation, and I think he's testified that Mr. Bergen made the presentation.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Did the ad hoc committee make the presentation to the corporate management committee in November of '69?

A. No.

Q. When Mr. Bergen and Mr. Wheeler and Mr. French appeared in the front of the corporate management committee, it was not as members of the ad hoc committee as referred to on page three of Exhibit 422?

A. That is correct.

Q. What, if anything, did the ad hoc committee do following preparation of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

A. I cannot speak for their activities in the period October 15 to January, 1970, but when I was assigned the new position of manager, environmental control, all of the individuals listed as being the members of the ad hoc committee became members of my PCB committee. They were people who assisted me in my new assignment, along with others.

Q. What was the title of your PCB committee that you formed when you began working in January of 1970?

A. That was the PCB group. It didn't have any designation.

Q. How is it that the ad hoc committee members referred to on page three of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 became members of your PCB group?

A. I asked them to join.

Q. Did you ask them to join in part because they were part of the ad hoc committee that is referred to at page three of Exhibit 422?

A. I think the reason I asked them was because of their expertise in the area of PCB and PCB products production, and so on.

Q. When you invited them to join your PCB group, were you aware that they were members of this October 15, 1969 ad hoc committee that you referred to?

A. Yes.

Q. Who else joined your PCB group besides the people who were members of the ad hoc committee?

A. There was a James Savage -- I'm sorry. At the time it was William Kuhn, K-u-h-n, who was the manager of manufacturing; There was a Robert Kountz, K-o-u-n-t-z, manager of engineering; Robert Keller, Dr. Keller, who was the chief analytical chemist at Monsanto; Don Olson, director of marketing for functional fluids; Walter Schalk, I believe it's S-c-h-a-l-k, director of marketing for

plasticizers; Phocian Park, P-h-o-c-i-a-n, an attorney. Also invited to attend as time permitted, of course, were Mr. Bergen and Mr. Springgate, who were the top individuals in the two business groups.

Q. And by "business groups," you mean plasticizers and functional fluids groups?

A. That is correct.

Q. And what was their title in January of 1970?

A. They were business group directors.

MR. BRADLEY: Because of the time and because of the weather, let's adjourn this until tomorrow morning at 8:30.

MR. BAUER: Fine.

(Thereupon, the deposition was adjourned until 8:30, Wednesday morning, July 21, 1993, at which time the following proceedings were where had:)

CONTINUATION OF DIRECT EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. BRADLEY:

Q. Mr. Papageorge today is July 21, 1993. It's a continuation of the 30(b)(6) Deposition regarding Exhibits 1118 and 422 that was begun yesterday. And you understand that you are still under oath today; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And if you don't understand one of my questions, just tell me and I'll restate it. Okay?

A. Yes.

Q. And if you want to take a break, just let us know and we will try to accommodate you. Okay?

A. Yes.

Q. For the purposes of my examination, whenever I refer to the ad hoc committee, it's the ad hoc committee that's referred to on page three of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422.

A. Yes. I understand.

Q. Who created the ad hoc committee?

A. Bergen and Springgate.

Q. Did Mr. Bergen or Mr. Springgate indicate to you what events, if any, led to the creation of the ad hoc committee?

A. All of the known events, starting with the report from Sweden in 1966 up to the date of this document,

1969, and related to PCB's, their presence in the environment, and their suspected effect on the environment.

Q. What was the purpose of the ad hoc committee?

A. The ad hoc committee was asked to pull together, in as concise a form as possible, all of the information that the committee felt was appropriate to be used in preparing for a presentation to upper management, to be able to have upper management understand the situation and understand the need for any proposed recommendations that would follow.

Q. Do you know whether upper management requested that information?

A. I do not. I have never heard that. I don't know.

Q. Do you know how frequently, if any, the ad hoc committee met before October 15, 1969?

A. I do not.

Q. Do you know if there are minutes of the meetings of the ad hoc committee?

A. I personally don't know. I saw a document the other day that covered one of those meetings.

Q. The document that you saw is one that I showed you during your deposition?

A. Yes.

Q. The -- According to the introduction, which is



WATER_PCB-SD0000074106

at page three on Exhibit 422, a report was prepared by the committee on October 15, 1969; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. Do you know whether in fact a report was issued by that committee on October 15, 1969?

A. This is the document. The pages that follow that introduction page is the report.

Q. Well, look at the next sentence of the introduction. It says, "Out of this report came considerable information, conclusions and recommendations which we have attempted to tie together into a plan of action in this document."

A. Yes. There is a section, as I remember, entitled "Plan of Action," that I understand that particular sentence --

MR. BAUER: Off the record a second.

(Thereupon, a short colloquy was had.)

MR. BAUER: We are now entering an area of this deposition where Mr. Papageorge did not have personal knowledge prior to today about the report being referenced, but, as a corporate representative for Monsanto, he now has further information with respect to answering your questions, Mr. Bradley.

MR. BRADLEY: Before I ask you about that I will show you Exhibit 3055, which is a July 16, 1993 letter

from John Tatlock to Paul Merrell regarding the report which claims privilege, which I am going to have made a part of this deposition.

Are you now familiar with whether a separate report was prepared by the ad hoc committee?

A. I was shown one by the attorney, a document. I was privileged to see the cover page only, and I noted that it was marked attorney/client privilege, addressed to an attorney at Monsanto, the subject related to the one we're discussing here, PCB abatement, and it was authored by the same individuals that appear on page three of Exhibit 422.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Is it the report that's referred to in the first sentence of page three of Exhibit 422?

A. It had the same date, October 15th; it was marked, "Second draft."

MR. BRADLEY: Off the record for a moment.

(Thereupon, a discussion was had.)

MR. BRADLEY: Back on the record. There is now a stipulation between Monsanto and Nevada Power Company that the report referred to in the first sentence of page three of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 is not the same document as Plaintiff's Exhibit 422; is that correct?

MR. BAUER: That is correct. There is some

similarity between some of the information, but they are distinctly different reports. Exhibits 422 and 1118 are different. That is not what we're claiming privilege to. We're claiming privilege to a different document.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Have you viewed the cover sheet of the report that's referred to in the first paragraph of page three of Exhibit 422?

A. I reviewed the cover sheet of a report dated October 15th, 19 -- I don't know if it's the same report that is referred to in Exhibit 422.

MR. BRADLEY: Well, is it the same report, Mr. Bauer?

MR. BAUER: I don't know anyone currently on behalf of the corporation that could make a definitive statement to that affect. It certainly would be a reasonable inference, and we don't know of any other -- I can state that we don't know of any other document that would fit the description there.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) The cover sheet of the report that you just viewed outside of this deposition room with your attorney, did it have a distribution list on the cover sheet that you saw?

A. It was a list of names at the bottom. I have to assume it was a distribution list.

Q. Tell for me what names you recall being on the

cover sheet that you viewed.

A. I will try to remember as many as I can. Mr. Bergen and Mr. Springgate were on it. The five members of the ad hoc committee were listed. I remember a Dr. Robinson from the research department being listed. Mr. Minckler, who was the general manager of the organic division to which the plasticizer and functional fluids groups belonged. Mr. T.K. Smith, who was a vice-president to whom Mr. Minckler reported. Mr. William Kuhn, who was the manager of manufacturing. That's all I remember at the moment.

Q. Were any of the individuals whose names appeared on the cover sheet of the report that you reviewed, members of Monsanto's board of directors in October of 1969?

A. I don't know about Mr. Thomas K. Smith. He was a vice-president. I don't know, or recall if he was a member of the board of directors, or not.

Q. I am now going to show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 1454 and ask you if you have seen that document before today.

A. Yes, I have. This is a document I prepared, as I remember.

Q. When did you prepare that document?

A. It consists, really, of several parts here. I prepared this document in March and April of 1970.

Q. Upon what information -- Well, did you rely on any written reports or documents, not studies, but written reports or documents, in your preparation of that exhibit?

A. No.

Q. Did any Monsanto employees supply to you any written documents that you used in preparing that exhibit?

A. As distinguished from publications, news articles, and so on?

Q. As distinguished from studies and news articles.

A. No.

Q. After the -- I am now going to show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 2927 and ask you to identify that document, absent the fax information at the top. Is that a document you have seen before?

A. I have seen this before, yes.

Q. What is it?

A. This a copy of the text used by Elmer Wheeler in making his part of the presentation before the corporate management committee in November of 1969.

Q. Is it a true and accurate copy of the text used by Mr. Wheeler in making that presentation, absent the fax information on the top?

A. It is, except for some handwritten notes that this copy has on page two.

Q. Do you know if the handwritten notes are in Mr. Wheeler's handwriting?

A. I don't recognize that as Mr. Wheeler's handwriting.

Q. And did Mr. Wheeler author that document as part of Monsanto's regular business activity?

A. Yes.

Q. Was it Monsanto's regular practice to generate documents of that sort?

A. Yes.

Q. And did Monsanto maintain a copy of that document as part of its regularly-conducted business?

A. Yes.

Q. I am now going to show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 1194, and ask you to review that document.

A. I have reviewed the document.

Q. Is it a document you have seen before today?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. What is it?

A. It's a copy of the text and the slides used in a presentation before the corporate management committee on November 17th, 1969, used by Mr. Bergen and Mr. Springgate.

Q. Is that a true and accurate copy of the text and slides that those gentlemen used during that presentation?

A. It appears to be, yes.

Q. Does that document contain information that was made known to the authors on or about the date of the presentation?

A. Yes.

Q. Was the document prepared as part of Monsanto's regularly-conducted business?

A. Yes.

Q. Was it Monsanto's regular practice to generate documents of that sort, on the date of the exhibit?

A. Yes.

Q. Was a copy maintained in Monsanto's files as part of its regularly-conducted business?

A. Yes.

Q. I am going to take you back for a moment to Plaintiff's Exhibit 2927. Is that a document that contains information that was made known to the author on or about the date the of the presentation to the corporate management committee on November 17th, 1969?

A. Yes.

Q. What relationship, if any, did the ad hoc committee have with the presentations made by Mr. Bergen, Mr. Springgate and Mr. Wheeler to the corporate management committee that you referred to?

A. The ad hoc committee served as a source of the

latest information to be used by Mr. Bergen and Mr. Springgate in the making of that presentation, and also was the, in a way, the source of the input that Mr. Wheeler contributed as part of that presentation.

Q. Do you have Plaintiffs Exhibit 1118 and Plaintiff's Exhibit 422?

A. I do.

Q. Is Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 a true and accurate copy of the outline for the Environmental Pollution Abatement Plan that was prepared by the ad hoc committee in 1969?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form of the question. The first two pages is the outline.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Okay. Is Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 a true and accurate copy of the outline and plan of the ad hoc committee that was operating in 1969?

A. Except for the yellow highlighting and the marginal notes, it appears to be a true and accurate copy.

Q. And does the information contained in that exhibit reflect information that was current and made known to the authors of the document on or about November of 1969?

A. Yes.

Q. Was that document authored as part of Monsanto's regular business activity?



WATER_PCB-SD0000074114

A. Yes.

Q. And in November of 1969 was it Monsanto's regular practice to author documents of that sort?

A. Yes.

Q. And did Monsanto maintain a copy of that document in its files as part of its regularly conducted business?

A. It did.

Q. As I understand the difference between 1118 and 422, 1118 doesn't have the outline attached to it, nor does it have the charts between pages four and five, and in addition there may be some marginal notes; is that correct?

A. That is correct, as far as I can tell, yes.

Q. Excepting those differences, is Plaintiff's Exhibit 1118, minus the charts, a true and accurate copy of the abatement plan prepared by the ad hoc committee in 1969?

A. It appears to be, yes.

Q. And like 422, was -- is the information contained in 1118 reflective of information that was made available to the authors on or about October of 1969?

A. Yes.

Q. And was the document authored as part of Monsanto's regular business activity?

A. Yes.

Q. And on the date the document was authored was it Monsanto's regular practice to have its employees author documents of that type?

A. Yes.

Q. Was a copy of that document maintained in Monsanto's files as part of its regularly-conducted business?

A. It was.

Q. What, if anything, happened after the -- after Mr. Bergen, Mr. Springgate, Mr. French, and Mr. Wheeler made their presentation to the corporate management committee of Monsanto regarding the topics that they discussed with the corporate management committee in October of 1969?

A. The recommendations made by the presenters were approved by the corporate management committee. As I recall, there were at least twelve points that were recommended, and those recommendations were implemented.

Q. Now, I am going to show you Plaintiff's Exhibit -- Well, do you have in front of you Plaintiff's Exhibit 1194?

A. Yes.

Q. Are the recommendations that you referred to, those twelve items that appear under the heading "Recommended Action Plan," pages twenty and twenty-one?

A. Yes.

Q. Under number one it says, "Appoint a Project Manager," correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you the project manager that was referred to under item one of the Recommended Action Plan?

A. Yes.

Q. And you became the project manager in January of 1970?

A. Correct.

Q. A month and a half or two months after the presentation of the corporate management committee?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form. Are you now talking about the date he was appointed or the date he started his job?

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) When were you appointed project manager?

A. I interviewed for the job in the third week of December of '69 and I was informed the following week that I had been selected, and I officially was designated as starting the new assignment on the 1st of January.

Q. With whom did you interview for that position?

A. Mr. Bergen and Mr. Springgate.

Q. And as project manager in January of 1970 were you assisted by a tasks force from members of each of Monsanto's business groups working with PCB's, plus the

medical, law, engineering, and manufacturing departments?

A. Yes.

Q. Under item two, were containers relabeled?

A. Under item two? Yes. Yes.

Q. And what did the relabeling consist of?

A. The inclusion of the paragraph that described the then-known information regarding PCB's and the environment.

Q. In November of 1969, did Monsanto -- was Monsanto discharging PCB's as effluents?

A. Yes.

Q. And in what quantities?

MR. BAUER: Objection. Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) Notice, and lacks foundation. And it's also compound, since we're talking about more than one place, presumably.

A. I don't recall the exact numbers.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Do you recall some general numbers, or rough numbers, for any of the Monsanto plants that were discharging effluents containing PCB's?

A. Yes.

MR. BAUER: Same objection.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Which plants do you recall?

MR. BAUER: Same objection.

A. I had in mind the Anniston, Alabama plant, and

the Suaget, Illinois plant, and the Newport, Wales plant.

Q. And do you recall roughly what the amount of daily effluent discharge was in November -- October and November of 1969 at Monsanto's Anniston plant?

MR. BAUER: Objection. Outside the scope.

A. I don't recall exact numbers, but I have a recollection that it was in the hundreds of pounds per day.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Do you have a recollection of roughly what the daily discharge was at the Suaget plant of effluents containing PCB's?

MR. BAUER: Can we have a continuing objection that its outside of the 30(B)(6) Notice until we get off the effluent numbers containing PCB's. The objection is that it's outside the scope.

MR. BRADLEY: Yes.

A. I don't recall the numbers. It was in the hundreds-of-pounds-a-day kind of category.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) And was the effluent containing PCB's at the Newport plant also roughly in the hundreds-of-pounds-per-day area?

A. I would say yes, I think so.

Q. Under item eleven of the Recommended Action Plan it says "Study incineration projects," and then it has the date 3-70 next to it. Do you see that?

A. Yes.



WATER_PCB-SD0000074119

Q. Was the date 3-70 intended as the completion date, or initiation date, or some other date?

A. I interpret that as a completion date.

Q. Were there studies of incineration products completed by Monsanto at any time in 1970 regarding its PCB's?

A. They were completed by a company for Monsanto.

Q. And did the company that did the study that is referred to in item eleven of the Recommended Action Plan determine the presence or absence of any chlorinated dibenzofurans?

A. No.

Q. Did they look for the presence of any chlorinated dibenzofurans?

A. No.

Q. Did they look for the presence of chlorinated dibenzodioxins?

A. No.

Q. Did they look for any form of dioxins?

A. No.

Q. Did they look for any form of furans?

A. No. The methodology was not available.

MR. BRADLEY: I'll object to the last -- Nobody's discussed that yet.

Were you an expert in the methodology of in-

cinerators in 1970 regarding the incineration of PCB's?

A. Incinerator methodology? What do you mean by that question.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Well, in 1970 were you an expert in what abilities laboratories or anybody else had to determine the incineration products of Monsanto's PCB products.

MR. BAUER: Object to the form of the question.

A. I am not an expert. It's common knowledge.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) On page three of Exhibit 1194 about a third of the way down the page it has the number one hundred preceded by a dollar sign and has the letter M after it, which is capitalized. Does that figure and number refer to one hundred thousand dollars?

A. It does.

Q. On page fourteen it says, "PCB Threat to..." -- Do you have page fourteen there?

A. It's the one originally typed fifteen and marked over with a four, yes.

Q. "PCB Threat to Functional Fluid Business and Profit." Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. And there's nothing further on that page, but on the following page do you see a section entitled "Fluid

Business Threatened, (170 Budget)"?

A. Yes.

Q. Is the information contained on page fifteen what is referred to on page fourteen as the PCB threat to functional business and profit, or is there information missing?

A. The information on page sixteen is projected on the screen, and the spokesperson spoke from the slide.

Q. When you say "page sixteen," my copy indicates it was originally typed as sixteen and had a five written over it?

A. That is correct.

Q. Okay. Under item two on page twenty-three under item two it says, "Expose us to continued adverse publicity and possible law suits"?

A. Yes.

Q. What possible lawsuits were contemplated when those words were used in the development of this document? If you know.

A. I don't know.

Q. Did you discuss with Mr. Bergen or Mr. Springgate or Mr. Wheeler or Mr. French what was meant by the words at page twenty-three which indicates that the program would "Expose us," being Monsanto, "to continued adverse publicity and possible lawsuits"?

MR. BAUER: I caution you, Mr. Papageorge, don't reveal any privileged conversations in answering that question. And I believe you told us that Mr. French was an attorney?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) I didn't ask you what the contents of the conversations were, just whether you had any conversations with any of those gentlemen regarding that language.

A. I had conversations, but not with the attorney.

Q. With whom did you have those conversations?

A. Mr. Bergen and Mr. Wheeler.

Q. And what did they tell you what they meant by the phrase, "Expose us to continued adverse publicity and possible law suits"?

A. Primarily, it was their concern that the effects noted in the environment would be attributed to both DDT and PCB's. DDT, being in the limelight, so to speak, as being an undesirable pesticide, seemed to have a poor reputation publicly, and Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Bergen were concerned that, without good hard information, PCB's would be implicated just by similarity chemically.

Q. Of course, this document doesn't mention DDT at all, does it?



WATER_PCB-SD0000074123

A. It doesn't, except up front, as I recall.
Q. Where is that?
A. Well, the first page, the second paragraph.
Q. All right. And was DDT mentioned in Exhibit 2927?
A. 2927?
Q. Actually, I'll rephrase the question. That exhibit says what it says. Did either of those gentlemen indicate to you what else they meant when they indicated that there were possible lawsuits if the program that they were recommending was implemented?
MR. BAUER: Object to the form in that the people referred to, Mr. Bergen and Mr. Wheeler -- and Mr. Wheeler did not author the statement. But you can answer the question.
A. I don't recall any specific point raised regarding lawsuits other than that that is always a potential here when the product becomes -- is perceived as causing problems.
Q. (by Mr. Bradley) I am now looking at number two of the Recommended Action Plan, and I am looking at Plaintiff's Exhibit 422, page five, under Roman Numeral V, capital A. Isn't it true that, when Exhibit 1194 was authored, that the lawsuits contemplated included lawsuits based upon claims that customers using Monsanto products

had not been officially notified about known effects, nor did Monsanto's labels carry that information?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form of the question. Lacks foundation.

A. Well, that is what the document says. That is that author's opinion.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) And did the author of that opinion discuss that opinion with you?

A. I don't recall any -- I just don't recall a conversation with anyone on that specific subject.

Q. In Exhibit 422, page five, Roman Numeral V, capital A, "Legal Liability," is that a section that was authored in either rough draft or final form by Mr. French?

A. I don't know.

Q. Do you know whether it was authored by anyone within Monsanto's legal department?

A. I don't know.

Q. Do you know whether Mr. French or anyone else from Monsanto's medical department participated in ad hoc committee meetings that resulted in the preparation of Plaintiff's Exhibits 422 and 1118?

A. Did you say medical department? Did you say Mr. French or anyone in the medical department?

Q. If that's what I said, then I didn't ask the question as I intended, so let me rephrase it. Do you know



WATER_PCB-SD0000074125

whether Mr. French or anyone from Monsanto's legal department participated in the ad hoc committee meetings that resulted in preparation of Plaintiff's Exhibits 1118 or 422?

A. I do not.

Q. Do you know whether Mr. French's presentation to Monsanto's corporate management committee in a report that he may have prepared for that corporate management committee addressed the topics raised in Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 at page five, Roman Numeral V, capital A?

A. I don't recall any reference to labels.

MR. BAUER: Don't go into any details, Mr. Papageorge. That document would appear to me to be privileged.

A. Well, as I understand the question, did Mr. French or anyone from the legal department address the thoughts included in paragraph A of section V, on page five, of Exhibit 422.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) To the corporate management committee.

A. I don't recall the details of that.

Q. Were you present when the -- Mr. French or anyone from the legal department made a presentation to the corporate management committee?

A. I was not.

Q. Did you review any document that would indi-

cate to you what the subject matter was of the presentation of Mr. French or anyone from Monsanto's legal department to the corporate management committee in 1969?

A. Yes.

Q. What did you review?

A. As I recall, I saw a copy of the minutes of that meeting.

Q. Did you review anything else?

A. Anything else regarding what?

Q. Regarding the topics discussed by Mr. French or anyone from Monsanto's legal department to the corporate management committee in late 1969.

A. No.

Q. Did you report to Monsanto's corporate management committee as part of your job responsibility beginning in January of 1970?

A. No.

Q. Did anyone within Monsanto report to Monsanto's corporate management committee regarding your work as project manager?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form. It's vague as to whether you are talking about formal-responsibility reporting or presentation-type reporting. But go ahead and answer to the extent you understand the question.

A. I had that confusion, also. I don't know what

is meant by reporting.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Were any meetings held by any Monsanto employees with the corporate management committee following January, 1970, where your activities as project manager and the activities of your task group were discussed?

A. Yes.

Q. And was that done -- How was that done?

A. I don't think you mean people standing up and talking, not that kind of "how."

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) No. I mean, who arranged the meeting? Was there an agenda? Who spoke?

MR. BAUER: Object. Compound. Start with the first one.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Okay. Well, let me ask it specifically, then. Were there agendas for those kinds of presentations? And by "those kinds of presentations," I'm referring to my last set of questions where we talked about presentations made to the corporate management committee following January of 1970, where you discussed your work as project manager and the work of the task force that worked underneath you and with you.

A. Certainly there are agendas prepared, that the topic presented by my activities was put on the agenda by the general manager of the division involved, and that was

Mr. Minckler.

Q. What individual, then, made a presentation regarding the agenda item that addressed your work and the work of your task force?

MR. BAUER: Objection. It is compound. I think it changed over time and various meetings. He has already identified one presentation he made, but there were others.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) That's what I want to know.

A. I made a presentation in April of 1970.

Q. Who else, if anyone, made presentations to the corporate management committee regarding your work as project manager and the task force that was working under neat you or with you?

A. Mr. John Mason made a presentation in May of 1970; and Mr. Mason made presentations, at least two, in the latter part of 1970, and early '71, as best I remember. Those dates are not exact.

Q. I see. Were there any presentations following Mr. Mason's presentation in the latter part of '70 or the early part of '71 to the corporate management committee regarding your work as project manager or your work with the task force that was working with you or underneath you?

A. Not that I'm aware of.

Q. Is there a reason why those presentations to

the corporate management committee ceased?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form. Lacks foundation.

A. I can share with you my understanding.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) All right.

A. The program launched by Monsanto to phase out some of the business and to market to the dielectric business was well established. The corporate management committee was kept up to date by the normal lines of communication within the company where the vice-president, Mr. Smith, would inform Mr. Bach and his team where things stood, so to speak. The corporate management committee was in a position where they reserved their formal meetings for the more extended presentations rather than the quick updates. So the communication continued, but it was less formal.

Q. Looking now at page five of 422, which is, I take it, the same as page five of 1118, under Roman Numeral V, capital A, "Legal Liability," were you ever informed what was meant when the author indicated, "All customers using these products have not been officially notified about known effects nor do our labels carry this information"? What were the known effects that the author indicated the customers had not been officially notified about?

A. These are the effects that were reported on

marine creatures, wild birds, in other words, effects on environmental wildlife.

Q. Would it include the effects that resulted from the official studies of Professors Jensen and Widmark?

A. Yes. That was one of the sources of this information.

Q. Did anyone within Monsanto quantify the costs of the direct lawsuits that are possible that is referred to at page five of 1118 and 422? Let me ask that, first.

A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Did anyone quantify the costs of possible lawsuits referred to at page twenty-three of Plaintiff's Exhibit 1194?

A. I have never seen any and I don't know of any.

Q. And the report, again, that was prepared by Mr. French, you haven't reviewed that; you have only reviewed the cover page?

MR. BAUER: I'm sorry. Which report?

MR. BRADLEY: The report by Mr. French that was presented to -- All right. Excuse me for a moment.

Have you prepared a -- Have you reviewed a report prepared by Mr. French that he made to Monsanto's corporate management committee in November of 1969?

A. No.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Have you reviewed a report

of Mr. French or anyone within Monsanto's legal department that was made in late 1969, or any time during 1970, regarding the possibility of lawsuits or the legal implications involved in Monsanto's blending of PCB's?

A. I have never seen any such report.

Q. Looking now at the charts on the back of Plaintiff's Exhibits 422 and 1118, do you see the two pages that have at the top "Profit and Liability vs. Time"?

A. I do.

Q. And I am referring to the last two pages where the charts are handwritten. Do you see that?

A. I do.

Q. Do you know whether the costs of any lawsuits were included in the profit-and-liability projections reflected in those graphs?

A. I do not.

MR. BRADLEY: Let's take a five-minute break.

(Thereupon, a short recess was taken.)

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Would you now turn to page six of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 and page six of Plaintiff's Exhibit is 1118?

A. I have it.

Q. All right. Those pages are identical, are they not?

A. Yes.

Q. Under Roman Numeral VII there is the statement made, "Although Monsanto is most probably responsible for the U.S. contamination and jointly responsible with MCL for the United Kingdom problem, we cannot accept responsibility for the world." Is that what it says?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you review any documents prepared by any members of the ad hoc committee or anyone else that would indicate what was meant when it was claimed that Monsanto was most probably responsible for the U.S. contamination?

A. I did not.

Q. Did any of the ad hoc committee members indicate to you what was meant by the language indicating that Monsanto is most probably responsible for the U.S. contamination?

A. I don't recall any discussion that addressed that particular sentence with any of the members of the ad hoc committee.

Q. Do you remember any discussions with any other Monsanto employee regarding what was meant when it was written that Monsanto is most probably responsible for the U.S. contamination?

A. Indirectly, in discussions that touched on that, wherein Monsanto very likely was the source of the materials, since a high percentage of the PCB's used in the

United States was perceived to be produced by Monsanto.

Q. Well, in fact, some of the members of the Monsanto PCB business group believed that Monsanto was the sole supplier of PCB's in the United States; isn't that true?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form of the question, and it's outside of the scope.

A. Yes. There are some individuals that had that definite impression.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) As I recall your -- Let me rephrase that. There are no business records -- Let me start all over again. There are no records of the business group that Monsanto, regarding PCB's, that you're aware of, that would -- that state that Monsanto was not the sole supplier of PCB's throughout the United States?

A. I am not aware of any such record or document.

Q. Do you know whether any financial analyses were prepared to determine the costs of any of the courses of action that were discussed, beginning at page ten of Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 and Plaintiff's Exhibit 1118?

A. I saw no such analyses.

Q. And I take it nobody told you such analyses existed?

A. That is correct.

Q. On page thirteen of Plaintiff's Exhibits 422

and 1118, under C.4., at the bottom of the page, did anyone indicate to you what was meant by the short term program that would define Monsanto's present position, recommend reasonable actions that will not unduly alarm the market, but reduce the exposure in terms of liability?

A. No one explained what they meant by that.

Q. Did you review any documents prepared by anyone at Monsanto, including members of the legal department, that addressed that topic?

A. I did not.

Q. Do you know what "reduce the exposure in terms of liability" refers to, the section at page five of that same exhibit under Roman Numeral V, capital A, on legal liability?

A. No, I do not.

Q. On page fourteen of Plaintiff's Exhibits 1118 and 422, at the very top, under number five, "Public Relations," it says, "Public actions where believed advantageous." Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. As part of the public relations and part of the group of this ad hoc committee, was there any public relations effort intended to publicize actions that were believed not advantageous or where the actions were believed to be disadvantageous?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form of the question.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Let me ask you this: Did anyone indicate to you in 1970, or '69, whether the ad hoc committee or the presenters to Monsanto's corporate management committee were recommending that Monsanto should publicize information regarding PCB's that would be disadvantageous to Monsanto's profits?

A. I know nothing of that type of publicizing.

Q. Did you learn in 1969 or 1970 whether any members of the ad hoc committee or any of the presenters to Monsanto's corporate management committee regarding the PCB problem and the planned PCB Environmental Pollution Abatement Plan discussed with the corporate management committee a recommendation to publicize actions that were believed to be disadvantageous to Monsanto's legal position?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form. Vague. Are you talking about having the public relations department do that, which is what this was talking about, or anyone at Monsanto?

MR. BRADLEY: My question dealt with the public relations department.

MR. BAUER: Okay.

A. I don't know of any discussions, activities or statements.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Do you know whether anyone within Monsanto was charged with the responsibility of publicizing actions that were believed to be disadvantageous to Monsanto's profits?

A. I do not.

Q. Do you know anyone within Monsanto who was charged with publicizing actions that were believed to be disadvantageous to Monsanto's legal position regarding the subject matter of this deposition?

A. I do not.

Q. Now, looking at page sixteen of Plaintiff's Exhibits 422 and 1118, under Roman Numeral XV, where it says, "Develop costs for the duplementation of Recommended course of action." I assume "duplementation" was a misspelling and it was intended to be "implementation"?

A. That is the way I read it.

Q. Were costs develop for the implementation of the recommended course of action?

A. I recall some costs that were developed.

MR. BAUER: Point of clarification: Specifically, the recommended course of action at this time or for the extent it was involved by the time Mr. Springgate and Mr. Bergen made their presentation, are you talking about either one of those? Because I think that may change the answer.

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you for your help.

Did you review any documents indicating what costs were developed for the implementation of the recommended course of action that was discussed in Plaintiff's Exhibit 422 and Plaintiff's Exhibit 1118?

A. Did I review any documents relating to that?

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Yes.

A. Or just the document making the statement?

Q. Did you review any document that discussed the costs that were developed for the implementation of the recommended course of action that was discussed in Plaintiff's Exhibits 422 and 1118?

A. The only costs I saw were on page sixteen of Exhibit 422.

Q. Do you know whether any costs were developed regarding the implementation of the recommended course of action that is discussed at Plaintiff's Exhibits 422 and 1118?

A. Do I know of any costs that were developed? All I know is that the report contains some cost numbers. They must have been developed in order for the authors to arrive at those numbers.

Q. Do you know whether the numbers that were developed regarding the costs for the implementation of the recommended course of action as discussed on page sixteen

of Plaintiff's Exhibits 422 and 1118 included the costs of direct lawsuits that is referred to on page five of those same documents?

A. I do not.

Q. Do you know whether costs were developed for the implementation of any recommended course of action presented by Mr. Bergen, Mr. Springgate, Mr. Wheeler, Mr. French, and any other presenters to Monsanto's corporate management committee, in November, 1969?

A. Costs were developed and reported in the presentation.

THE WITNESS: Would you read that back, please.

(Thereupon, the reporter read back the question.)

A. Costs were developed and reported in the presentation.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) And do you know whether the costs reported in the presentation included the cost of direct lawsuits that were referred to on page five of Plaintiff Exhibits 422 and 1118, during that presentation in November of 1969?

A. I'm confused. The exhibits you mentioned --

Q. Let me --

A. -- were not used in the presentation in November.

Q. Since I have confused you, let me try the question again. Do you know whether the costs presented as part of the presentation to the corporate management committee in November, 1969 included the costs of any lawsuits?

A. It did not.

Q. And how do you know that?

A. On page twenty-three of Exhibit 1194, under item number one, are listed some costs that the speakers associated with the recommended program.

Q. And on that same page it indicates that the recommended program would expose Monsanto to continued adverse publicity at this time and possible lawsuits; is that correct?

A. Yes. But I thought we were talking about the costs of the program.

Q. We are. Do you know whether the cost -- the costs of possible lawsuits referred to on that same page twenty-three of Plaintiff's Exhibit 1194 were presented to the corporate management committee in November of 1969, or at any time?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. On page sixteen of Plaintiff's Exhibits 422 and 1118, the last sentence under Roman Numeral XV, entitled, "Future," it says, "Prepare for the 'precipitious

pullout' or drastic legislative action although we do not feel this is a likely possibility." Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Was there a preparation for precipitous pullout or drastic legislative action by anyone or any group within Monsanto as it's described at page sixteen of Plaintiff's Exhibits 422 and 1118?

A. I am not aware of any.

Q. Are you aware whether Monsanto informed any customers of transformer and capacitor manufacturers that used PCB dielectric fluid, that in 1969 Monsanto recommended the -- or a group within Monsanto recommended the preparation for precipitous pullout or drastic legislative action regarding PCB's?

A. No.

Q. By "drastic legislative action," does that indicate to you that that would include a ban on PCB's?

A. That is an interpretation one can make, yes.

Q. Or a drastic restriction in the use of PCB's?

A. The use, the conditions under use, and so on, yes.

Q. And, in fact, in 1970 drastic legislative action was introduced by Congressman Ryan that would have restricted the use of PCB's; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And he reintroduced drastic legislative action in 1971 that would have restricted the use of PCB's; is that true?

A. Yes.

Q. I am now going to show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 1253 and ask you to identify that for me.

Let me rephrase the question. I want you to review that for me.

A. I have reviewed the document.

Q. As best as you are able, is that document what is referred to as "attached Appendix A" on page six of Plaintiff's Exhibit 1194?

A. It is.

Q. Is that a true and accurate copy of that appendix?

A. It appears to be, yes, sir.

Q. Does the information contained in that exhibit reflect information that was then made available to its author on or about the date that it was authored?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form. Some of it is long-known data. But you can answer if you are able.

A. It was available to the author as of the date of the report, yes.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) And was that document authored as part of Monsanto's regular business activity?

A. It was.

Q. And was it part of Monsanto's regular business activity in 1969 to generate documents of that sort?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Monsanto maintain a copy of that report as part of its regularly-conducted business?

A. It did.

MR. MORGAN: What is the number on that again?

MR. BRADLEY: 1253.

Did you ever discuss Plaintiff's Exhibit 1253 with Elmer Wheeler?

A. Yes.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Did Elmer Wheeler ever indicate to you that Plaintiff's Exhibit 1253 was authored by him?

A. Yes.

Q. Did he indicate to you that Plaintiff's Exhibit 1253 was provided to Monsanto's corporate management committee in 1969?

A. I don't recall any mention of giving the members of that committee copies of it, no.

Q. Do you know whether he indicated to you that he presented the information contained in Plaintiff's Exhibit 1253 to Monsanto's corporate management committee in November of 1969?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. Did Mr. Wheeler indicate to you that he provided any report whatsoever to the corporate management committee of Monsanto in November of 1969?

A. He did not.

Q. I am now going to show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 3054. As I recall from your testimony yesterday, this is a document that you hadn't seen before yesterday?

A. That is correct.

Q. Is it a document that you reviewed in preparation for today's testimony as Monsanto's designated witness on the 30(b)(6) topic for which we're all here today?

A. I did not.

Q. Are these the -- Strike that. Did you refer to the minutes of the Aroclor ad hoc committee, first meeting, in any of your testimony here today?

A. No.

Q. Okay. My memory is foggy on this issue: You had indicated that you reviewed some documents regarding the minutes of either the ad hoc committee or of the corporate management committee. So let me ask this: Did you, during your deposition in this lawsuit, review any minutes of the Aroclor ad hoc committee other than Plaintiff's Exhibit 3054?

A. No.

Q. Have you reviewed during this deposition any minutes of Monsanto's corporate management committee?

MR. BAUER: When you say "reviewed during the deposition," he looked at the one you showed him.

THE WITNESS: He said, "other than."

MR. BAUER: Okay. And then the question is, did you she him other -- Well --

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Did you review any documents during your depositions in this lawsuit that you believe were minutes of the Monsanto corporate management committee?

MR. BAUER: Well, I thought -- Off the record a second.

(Thereupon, a short colloquy was had.)

MR. BAUER: Back on the record.

A. I did, during this deposition, see a copy of minutes of the corporate management committee of a meeting of November 17, 1969.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) I am now going -- Well, before I discuss another exhibit with you, the -- During your deposition we have discussed different exhibits that refer to the PCB environmental problem; is that true?

A. Yes.

Q. Were the minutes -- or, excuse me. Were the documents that we reviewed that referenced the PCB environ-

mental problem documents that were prepared as part of your work as project manager?

A. Yes.

MR. BAUER: Object to the form. I am not sure that every document that was referred to was prepared by him. But go ahead and answer.

A. I was involved in the preparation of those documents.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) And they involved your work as project manager and the work of the task force that worked with you or underneath you?

A. Correct.

Q. And would that include minutes of meetings with General Electric regarding the PCB pollution problem, including the minutes of a meeting January 21 and 22, 1970? Where those created as part of your work as project manager beginning in January, 1970?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form of the question. That is a document authored by Mr. Benignus.

A. My answer is no.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) As part of your job responsibility as project manager, did you meet with General Electric in January of 1970 regarding the PCB pollution problem?

A. I did.

Q. Did you have similar March meetings with Westinghouse?

A. Yes.

Q. Did those occur in January of 1970? Let me rephrase the question. Did those occur during the first three months of 1970?

A. When you use "those," that means plural. A meeting with Westinghouse individuals did take place, and I attended in the early part of 1970.

MR. BRADLEY: Off the record for just a moment.

(Thereupon, a short colloquy was had.)

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) I am now going to show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 3056 and ask you to review that exhibit for me.

A. I have reviewed the exhibit.

Q. Is that a document you have seen before today?

A. I have.

Q. What is it?

MR. BAUER: Object to the form. Outside of the scope of the 30(b)(6) deposition.

A. It's a letter written under the letterhead of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, authored by J.J. Kark, K-a-r-k, addressed to Mr. Donald L. Peyton, P-e-y-t-o-n, of the American National Standards Institute.

The letter is dated November 19, 1970.

Q. As part of your work as project manager that is referred to in Exhibit 1194 at page twenty, did you provide information, either to ANSI or to NEMA, regarding the PCB pollution problem?

MR. BAUER: Object to the scope. Outside of the scope of the 30(b)(6) Notice. Obviously, just because the project manager topic was described in the document, it doesn't mean that we're going to assume everything that he did in that position is within the scope of the 30(b)(6) Notice.

If you would like to give me a continuing objection to everything that is asked about this document, that's fine with me.

MR. BRADLEY: Okay.

A. You asked me if I provided invornomental-type data relating to PCB's in the environment to NEMA and ANSI. I provided that type of data to committees that were functioning under the auspices of NEMA or ANSI, not to the organizations and their board of directors, per se.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Was that a true and accurate copy of the letter that was written by Mr. Kark to Mr. Peyton on 11-19-1970?

A. It appears to be, yes, sir.

Q. Do you know whether in 1970 you informed any-

one within NEMA or ANSI, as part of your work as project manager -- and you can have an objection to scope on this question -- whether, as of November, 1970, that there were still, unquestionably, a substantial number of users of PCB dielectric fluid that were not reached by letters from Monsanto, or transformer or capacitor manufactures, and from other publicity sponsored by Monsanto regarding the hazards of PCB's?

A. Did I know that?

Q. Yes.

A. I knew that because of my communications with the author of that document.

Q. Did you provide that information to the author of this document?

A. I did not.

MR. BRADLEY: Without waiving any right to Nevada Power Company's legal right to review the report that is referred to in Plaintiff's Exhibit 3055 and to question you as Monsanto's corporate designee regarding the contents of that report, I have no further questions of you on this topic.

Any questions from any other attorneys?

MR. MORGAN: On Exhibits 422 and 1118?

MR. BRADLEY: The 30(b)(6) deposition regarding those exhibits.



WATER_PCB-SD0000074149

MR. MORGAN: Yes, I do.

MR. BAUER: Can I ask that we take a comfort break before we do that?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes.

(Thereupon, a short recess was taken.)

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) Mr. Papageorge, I didn't ask you about one exhibit, and I am going to do that here before I close with you.

MR. BAUER: Still continuing the 30(b)(6) deposition on Exhibits 1118 and 422?

MR. BRADLEY: That is correct.

I am now going to show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 417 and ask you to review that document.

Wait a minute. Is that a document I have shown you before?

MR. BAUER: In his personal deposition, yes.

A. I have reviewed the document.

Q. (by Mr. Bradley) What is that document?

A. It consists of a Monsanto memorandum authored by John Mason, addressed to Messrs. Bergen and Springgate, dated May 11, 1970. Attached to that memorandum are copies of slides used by Mr. Mason at a presentation before the corporate management committee on May 11th, 1970.

Q. And is Plaintiff's Exhibit 417 a true and accurate copy of the memo and slides presented by Mr. Mason



WATER_PCB-SD0000074150

to the corporate management committee on or about May 11, 1970?

A. As best I can tell, yes.

Q. Does that exhibit contain information that was then currently conveyed to Mr. Mason?

A. Yes.

Q. And was that exhibit prepared by Mr. Mason as part of Monsanto's regular business activity?

A. It was.

Q. And in 1970 was it Monsanto's regular practice to generate documents of that sort?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Monsanto maintain a copy of that as part of its regularly-conducted business?

A. It did.

MR. BRADLEY: Now I have no further questions, Thank you. Other than -- without waiving my right to question you about the document referred to in Plaintiff's Exhibit 3055.

QUESTIONS BY MR. MORGAN:

Q. Mr. Papageorge, did Monsanto, to your knowledge, provide Westinghouse notification of the work done by Jensen and Widmark in connection with PCB's prior to 1970?

MR. BRADLEY: Objection to the form. Beyond

the scope of examination.

A. Widmark and Jensen's report was shared with representatives of Westinghouse, by Monsanto representatives, at or about the time Monsanto heard about it, early on. So, in a way, in an informal way, the progress of the work relating to PCB's in the environment was shared with individuals within Westinghouse from the period, '66, when Monsanto first heard about it, until the 1970 date you mentioned.

Q. (by Mr. Morgan) When you say, "informal," sir, what do you mean to convey by that?

MR. BRADLEY: Same objection. Beyond the scope.

MR. MORGAN: You want a continuing objection?

MR. BRADLEY: Please, on that topic. Thank you.

A. By "informal," I'm talking about such things as field salesmen, Randy Graham stopping by and sharing what he knew, or Mr. Paul Benignus, who was the marketing manager, in his visits or telephone conversations would review the latest that he was made aware of regarding the studies and the progress of the studies. The director of marketing, when he made his visits to a key customer like Westinghouse, as part of the many topics they discussed was the review of the environmental situation. That would be

the informal type of communications that I would be referring to.

Q. How were you made aware of the communications that you just told me about?

A. I was told by all the people I just mentioned, and it was reinforced when I reviewed personally with individuals like Mr. Sloat and Mr. McClain, that, yes, they knew about these studies, what's the latest. In other words, they picked up the conversation very easily.

Q. Is that Mr. Sloat and Mr. McClain of Westinghouse?

A. At least those two, and others.

Q. Apart from these people that you just named from Monsanto, were there any others that had informal contact, that you're aware of, with Westinghouse?

A. Mr. Bergen, I'm sure.

MR. BAUER: With respect to the topic of the environmental presence from the '66-to-'70 time period?

MR. MORGAN: That's correct?

A. That is all I am aware of.

Q. (by Mr. Morgan) But you yourself did not have such contact?

MR. BRADLEY: Object to the form.

A. That is correct.

Q. (by Mr. Morgan) Were there any, to your know-



WATER_PCB-SD0000074153

ledge, prior to 1970, efforts to formally notify Westinghouse?

MR. BRADLEY: Objection to the form of the question. Notify them of what?

Q. (by Mr. Morgan) Of the information that was the subject of the informal contacts that you previously testified about.

A. I don't recall, nor do I -- I just don't know. I don't recall it. I don't think I ever saw anything personally.

Q. Could I ask you -- Let me back up. Do I understand you correctly that you are not able to pinpoint any particular date as to when the first such informal contact that you described might have occurred?

A. No, I can't.

Q. Or who made that initial informal contact?

A. That is true.

Q. Now, you earlier described in response to a question by Mr. Bradley, a meeting with Westinghouse which took place in the early part of 1970. Do you recall that?

A. Yes.

Q. What was the purpose of that meeting?

MR. BAUER: For the purpose of the record, I will make continuous objections.

MR. MORGAN: Okay.

A. The meeting was one of sharing with Westinghouse representatives the latest that Monsanto knew about the evolving PCB and environmental issue.

Q. Who attended that meeting on behalf of Monsanto?

A. Monsanto? I was there, Mr. Benignus was there. Mr. Wheeler. Someone from Monsanto's analytical chemistry department; I don't recall whether it was Dr. Keller or Dr. Tucker. As I best recall, Dr. Richard and Dr. Munch. I can't recall any others.

Q. Who attended on behalf of Westinghouse? That you can recall.

A. There were so many Westinghouse meetings through the years, and the audience was about the same and yet not exactly the same, so I have a hard time recalling definitely who was there. I am confusing my meetings. I know Mr. McClain was present at some meetings, Mr. Sloat, I recall Dr. Dakin. I am not certain about Mr. Wilburn, whether it was that meeting or other meetings. There was an individual with Westinghouse's transformer operations; I can't recall his name. He was a big football-player-type guy. That is all I can remember. I just don't remember very vividly anymore.

Q. Was this meeting in connection with Monsanto's PCB Environmental Pollution Abatement Plan that we dis-

cussed in connection with Exhibits 422 and 1118?

A. Many of the parts of the plan were shared with them, but the specific program, as finally developed by the time it was presented to the CMC, I don't think it had crystalized enough to able to tell the Westinghouse people exactly what was going to happen.

Q. Well, who called this meeting in early 1970, do you recall?

A. All I recall is Mr. Benignus coming around and asking if I would be available to attend a meeting. I do not know what the arrangements were before that.

Q. Was that meeting held at Monsanto?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall -- Mr. Bradley may have asked you, but do you recall if there were meeting minutes prepared?

A. I don't recall.

Q. Do you know if similar meetings concerning PCB's had been held between Monsanto and Westinghouse previous?

MR. BAUER: Objection. Vague. Are you talking about the specific topic of environmental presence as opposed to dielectric strength?

MR. MORGAN: Yes.

MR. BRADLEY: And you mean absent the discus-



WATER_PCB-SD0000074156

sion of the PCB Abatement Plan that was developed in November of '69?

Q. (by Mr. Morgan) I would like to know whether, to your knowledge, sir, prior to this meeting you have just described, Monsanto and Westinghouse had a similar meeting where they discussed the environmental presence of PCB's.

A. I am not aware of any such meeting prior to the one I recall.

Q. Okay. At this meeting in the early 1970's, generally what do you recall being discussed?

A. We shared with them the reports we had from outside laboratories, such as the Swedish work, Dr. Reisborough's work. We shared with them Monsanto's program aimed at developing the best analytical methods possible, the toxicity testing underway, and what had transpired up to that point, and some of the reactions and comments we had been getting from some of the regulatory agencies, The Food and Drug Administration, for example, and the Department of Agriculture. It wasn't very much at the time, but what we had we shared with them.

Q. That is about it?

A. Yes.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, sir. I have no further questions.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.



WATER_PCB-SD0000074157

MR. BAUER: On behalf of Monsanto, I have a few questions for you.

CROSS EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. BAUER:

Q. I'd like to hand you what has been previously marked as deposition Exhibit 422 which you were asked a series of questions about earlier. Specifically referring to page fourteen, there is the title, "Public Relations," at the top of the page. Do you recall being asked some questions about that portion of the report earlier today?

A. Yes.

Q. What was the function of the public relations department in late 1969 and early 1970?

MR. BRADLEY: Objection to the form of the question. He testified that there were quite a few public relations departments, as I recollect his testimony.

A. I testified there were several public relations managers, but one department that they all belonged to. I hope that I didn't confuse anyone.

The responsibility of the public relations department was really centered on communicating Monsanto information with the news media of all kinds, the typical radio, TV, newspapers, as well as the various magazines, and so on, the public kind of information, as distinguished from, say, scientific journals.

Q. (by Mr. Bauer) In late 1969 and early 1970 did the responsibilities of the public relations department include providing information and facts and other information about PCB's to Monsanto's customers?

A. No.

Q. In late 1969 and early 1970 did the function of the public relations department of Monsanto include providing facts and information about PCB's to government agencies?

MR. BRADLEY: Object to the form of the question. Foundation.

A. No.

Q. (by Mr. Bauer) During the entire time that you were working on the PCB issues, starting from 1977 forward, was there ever any suggestion from anybody to you that Monsanto conceal information and facts about PCB's, whether those facts were advantageous or disadvantageous to Monsanto's profit?

MR. BRADLEY: Objection to the form. Compound and vague.

A. No. Just the opposite. I was encouraged to share it all.

MR. BAUER: That is all I have.

MR. BRADLEY: Nothing. That concludes --

MR. BAUER: Oh. I have to make a statement

for the record. I understand Mr. Bradley made a reservation, but it's obviously Monsanto's position that the one outstanding issue is dealing with a privileged document, and we consider the deposition closed. I need to state for the record that, also, I think Mr. Bradley stated that he was holding the market share of the 30(b)(6) open pending resolution of some issue there, and, again, it's our position that the deposition is closed, as well.

MR. BRADLEY: I'll object to the statement in this deposition regarding another deposition that that deposition is open or closed.

Now, I suggest that we move into a completion of his first deposition in February. I think it's going to take the shortest amount of time.

MR. BAUER: Okay.

_____

WILLIAM B. PAPAGEORGE

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, A. D., 1993.

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES:

_____

Notary Public, within and for the State of Missouri



WATER_PCB-SD0000074160

STATE OF MISSOURI )
) SS
COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS )

I, Mark D. Concannon, a Notary Public within and for the State of Missouri, duly commissioned, qualified and authorized to administer oaths and to take and certify to depositions, do hereby certify that pursuant to Notice in the civil cause now pending and undetermined in the District Court of the United States, within and for the District of Nevada, entitled NEVADA POWER COMPANY, Plaintiff, -vs- MONSANTO COMPANY, et al., Defendants, to be used in the trial of said cause in said Court, I was attended at the law offices of Messrs. Husch, Eppenberger, Donohue, Cornfeld & Jenkins, 100 N. Broadway, Ste. 1300, in the City of St. Louis, State of Missouri, by Ralph A. Bradley, attorney for the Plaintiff; by Scott R. Bauer, attorney for the Defendant Monsanto; by Robert P. Morgan, In-House Counsel for the Defendant Westinghouse; and by WILLIAM B. PAPAGEORGE, the witness, in said office on July 20 and 21, 1993.

The said witness, WILLIAM B. PAPAGEORGE, being of sound mind and being by me first carefully examined and duly cautioned and sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the case aforesaid, thereupon testified as is shown in the foregoing transcript, said testimony being by me reported in shorthand



WATER_PCB-SD0000074161

and caused to be transcribed into typewriting, and that the foregoing pages correctly set out the testimony of the aforementioned witness, WILLIAM B. PAPAGEORGE, together with the questions propounded by counsel and the remarks and objections of counsel thereto, and is in all respects a full, true and complete transcript of the questions propounded to and the answers given by said witness; and that said testimony, so transcribed, was subscribed to by the witness on the _____ day of _____, A.D., 1993.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not of counsel nor attorney for any of the parties to said suit, nor related, nor interested in any of the parties or their attorneys.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that Plaintiff's Deposition Exhibits marked for identification and attached to and made a part of this deposition are the identical exhibits referred to and identified by the witness in the foregoing deposition.

WITNESS MY HAND and Notarial Seal, given this _____ day of _____, A. D., 1993, at St. Louis, Missouri.

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES MARCH 21, 1994.

_____
MARK D. CONCANNON,
Notary Public, within and
for the State of Missouri



WATER_PCB-SD0000074162

Concannon and Jaeger
General Court Reporters
705 Olive Street, Ste. 604
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

August 10, 1993

Mr. Scott R. Bauer
Kirkland & Ellis
1999 Broadway
Denver, Colorado 80202

Re: Nevada Power Vs. Monsanto

Dear Mr. Bauer:

This letter, incorporated as the last page of Mr. Papageorge's deposition, taken on July 20 and 21, 1993, will serve as notice to you that Mr. Papageorge's testimony is now ready for his reading and signing of same.

Enclosed, please find your copy of the deposition, along with the original signature page, (pg.79), and errata sheets. Please have Mr. Papageorge read his deposition at his earliest possible convenience, making whatever changes he feels necessary on the errata sheets, along with his reason for making same. Have him sign the original signature page and eratta sheets before any notary, and return the original signature page and eratta sheets to me at the above address so that I may file the original transcript in Court and notify opposing counsel of the changes.

Thank you for your cooperation in this regard.

Sincerely,

MARK D. CONCANNON

MDC:mk
encls.



WATER_PCB-SD0000074163

WILLIAM B. PAPAGEORGE

- DEPOSITION CORRECTION SHEET -

In Re: NEVADA POWER Vs. MONSANTO

Upon reading his deposition transcript and before subscribing thereto, the deponent indicated the following:

Page Line should read:

Reason assigned for change:

Page Line should read:

Reason assigned for change:

Page Line should read:

Reason assigned for change:

Page Line should read:

Reason assigned for change:

Page Line should read:

Reason assigned for change:

Page Line should read:

Reason assigned for change:

Page Line should read:

Reason assigned for change:

Page Line should read:

WILLIAM B. PAPAGEORGE



WATER_PCB-SD0000074164