

FILE NAME: Ferro Engineering (FER)

DATE: 2013 Aug 8

DOC#: FER007

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Legal - Plaintiffs' 1st Interrogatories & Requests for Production with Answers

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
9 IN AND FOR KING COUNTY

10 JAMES B. TURNER and JOANNE K. LIPSON,)
husband and wife,)

11 Plaintiffs,)

12 v.)

13 FRASER'S BOILER SERVICE, INC., et al.,)

14 Defendants.)

NO. 13-2-17075-2 SEA

PLAINTIFFS' FIRST INTERROGATORIES
AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF
DOCUMENTS TO DEFENDANT ON
MARINE SERVICES COMPANY, LLC,
FERRO ENGINEERING DIVISION
(INCORRECTLY NAMED AS OGLEBAY
NORTON COMPANY) **WITH ANSWERS**

15
16 TO: ON MARINE SERVICES COMPANY, LLC FERRO ENGINEERING DIVISION

17 AND TO: Counsel for Defendant ON MARINE SERVICES COMPANY, LLC FERRO
ENGINEERING DIVISION

18 YOU ARE HEREBY SERVED with Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories and Requests
19 for Production of Documents propounded to Defendant ON MARINE SERVICES COMPANY,
20 LLC, FERRO ENGINEERING DIVISION. These interrogatories must be answered, under oath,
21 within thirty (30) days of service pursuant to CR 33(a) and the General Style Order governing
asbestos litigation in this jurisdiction. Please type the answers in the space provided, adding
22 additional pages if necessary. Return the original to the office of Plaintiffs' attorney,
23 BERGMAN DRAPER LADENBURG, 614 First Avenue, 4th Floor, Seattle, Washington, 98104.
24
25
26

INSTRUCTIONS

1. These discovery requests are to be regarded as continuing in nature, and You must supplement Your responses promptly if You obtain additional or different material before trial in this action.

2. These discovery requests cover all documents and information within the possession, custody, or control of, or reasonably available to, the responding defendant and its predecessor, successor, parents, subsidiaries, officers, directors, employees, agents, consultants, servants, attorneys, assigns, or any other representatives.

3. If any response, or portion thereof, is withheld or objected to on the basis of a claim of privilege or for any other reason, identify, with enough particularity to support a motion to compel, the discovery request for which the response, or portion thereof, has been withheld or objected to, the information that has been withheld or objected to, the specific claim or privilege or other reason for withholding the information and the basis for Your claim.

4. For each document produced in response to a discovery request, indicate on the document or in some other reasonable manner the number of the request(s) to which it responds.

5. If anything is deleted from a document produced in response to a discovery request, indicate the fact of deletion on the face of the document and state in Your response to such request:

- (A) the reason for the deletion; and
- (B) the subject matter of the deletion.

6. If any document otherwise responsive to any request is withheld under claim of privilege, furnish a list containing for each such document the following information:

- (A) the date of the document
- (B) the name and title of its author(s);
- (C) the name and title of each person to whom it was addressed;
- (D) the name and title of each person to whom it was sent;
- (E) the name and title of each person to whom it was disclosed in whole or in part;
- (F) the number of pages;
- (G) a brief description of its subject matter;
- (H) the request to which it is otherwise responsive; and
- (I) the nature of the claimed privilege.

7. For any documents produced in response to a request that are not now within the defendant's possession, custody or control, state in such response in whose possession, custody or control such documents may be found. If a document responsive to a request no longer exists, identify it and explain the circumstances of its loss or destruction. If no documents exist that are responsive to a request, so state.

8. Discovery requests calling for numerical or chronological information shall be deemed, to the extent that the precise figures or dates are not known, to call for estimates. In each instance in which an estimate is given, identify it as such and specify the source of information and the basis for the estimate.

1 9. All discovery requests which are stated in the conjunctive are to be read as if
2 also stated in the disjunctive, and vice versa (i.e., answer each request as if requiring an
3 "and/or" response). Similarly, in all discovery requests, the singular form of a noun is to be
4 read as including the plural form, and vice versa, and all verbs shall be construed to include all
5 tenses.

6 10. Unless otherwise specified, the time period for each discovery request shall
7 include the period from 1940 to 1979.

8 11. Pursuant to Rule 33(a), these Interrogatories are to be answered separately and
9 fully in writing under oath, unless objected to, in which event the reasons for objection are to be
10 stated in lieu of an answer in accordance with Instruction 3 above. The answers are to be
11 signed by the person making them and the objections signed by the attorney making them.

12 12. Where an Interrogatory requests the identity of each person with responsibility
13 over certain matters, the request shall be deemed to include each person, other than those with
14 wholly clerical duties, who has responsibility over the matter. The request shall not be limited
15 to the head of a department, division or branch, but shall include subordinate employees other
16 than clerical staff who have responsibility over the matter.

17 13. Where an Interrogatory seeks identification of documents, the defendant may in
18 lieu thereof attach a copy of the document(s) to its response to the Interrogatory pursuant to
19 Rule 33(c) of the Civil Rules. For each document produced, indicate on the document or in
20 some other reasonable manner the Interrogatory to which it responds.

21 14. If any Interrogatory cannot be answered fully, provide as complete an answer as
22 possible, state the reason for the inability to provide a complete answer, and provide any
23 information, knowledge or belief defendant has regarding the portion unanswered.

24 15. This discovery request requires production of drafts of documents covered by a
25 request as well as all non-identical copies of the documents, e.g., they would require the
26 production of a draft letter, the letter as sent and a copy of that letter on which there are
additional markings or writings.

27 DEFINITIONS

28 Unless otherwise defined herein, the following definitions apply to these discovery requests:

29 1. "You" means defendant ON MARINE SERVICES COMPANY, LLC FERRO
30 ENGINEERING DIVISION, its officers, directors, employees, parent corporations, subsidiary
31 corporations, affiliates, predecessors in interest, including specifically LINK-BELT
32 CORPORATION, agents, consultants, contractors, attorneys, representatives, and all other
33 persons acting or purporting to act on behalf of said defendant.

34 2. "Document" means any and all material that is written, printed, typed,
35 photographed, recorded (whether electrically, electronically, magnetically, graphically, or
36 otherwise) or which is capable of being recorded in any form. It includes, but is not limited to
papers, books, records, letters, photographs, tangible things, correspondence, communications,
telegrams, cables, Telex messages, memoranda, laboratory work papers, batch sheets, other

1 work papers, ledger sheets, transcripts, minutes, reports, and recordings of telephone or other
2 conversations or of interviews, conferences or other meetings, affidavits, statements,
3 summaries, opinions, reports, studies, drafts, drafts of studies, analyses, bulletins, notices,
4 announcements, advertisements, instructions, charts, manuals, brochures, publications,
5 schedules, journals, statistical records, desk calendars, appointment books, diaries, lists, logs,
6 well logs, field logs, tabulations, sound recordings, computer files, computer tapes, computer
7 printouts, gas chromatograms, mass spectra, data processing in-put and out-put, microfilm,
8 books of account, records, invoices, checks, notes, diagrams, maps, graphs, graphs or materials
9 with handwriting or other printing on them, books, library reference, textbooks, treatises, and
10 other tangible material.

11
12 3. "Component" means any internal or external part of one of Your products, items,
13 or pieces of equipments even if such part was not originally manufactured by You, including
14 but not limited to brake and clutch friction material.

15 4. "Relate to" or "relating to" means referring to, constituting, defining,
16 concerning, containing, embodying, reflecting, identifying, stating, illustrating, dealing with, or
17 in any way pertaining to.

18 5. "Identify" or "identity" means:

19 (A) with respect to a natural person, to provide the person's (i) full name, (ii) present
20 or last known business and home addresses and phone numbers, (iii) present or last known
21 employer and position with that employer; and (iv) employer and position at the time relevant
22 to the interrogatory involved;

23 (B) with respect to an entity other than a natural person, to provide (i) the full name
24 of the organization or entity; (ii) the present or last known address of the organization or entity,
25 and (iii) the name, title and address of its chief executive officer;

26 (C) with respect to a document, to provide the document's (i) date; (ii) author and
signatory; (iii) type (e.g., letter, memorandum); (iv) title and subject matter; (v) addressee and
all other persons receiving copies; (vi) custodian; and (vii) its present or last known location;

(D) with respect to an act, action, or activity, to provide: (i) a description of the act
or activity; (ii) the date it occurred; (iii) the place it occurred; (iv) the identity of each document
relating to the act or activity; and (v) the identity of each person who participated or engaged in
the act or activity;

(E) with respect to a communication, to provide: (i) the date of the communication;
(ii) the place it occurred; (iii) the identity of each person who originated, received, participated,
or was present during the communication; (iv) the type of communication (e.g., letter, telegram,
telephone conversation); (v) the identity of each document relating or referring to or comprising
such communication; and (vi) the substance of the communication.

1 INTERROGATORIES and REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION submitted this 10th day of
2 June, 2013.

3 BERGMAN DRAPER LADENBURG

4 s/Vanessa Firnhaber Oslund
5 _____
6 Vanessa Firnhaber Oslund, WSBA #38252
7 Counsel for Plaintiffs
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1 Defendant Ferro Engineering Division of ON Marine Services Company, LLC, a
2 Delaware limited liability company (Defendant), incorrectly named in the Plaintiffs' Complaint
3 as Oglebay Norton Company a/k/a Oglebay Norton Engineered Materials, a/k/a ON Marine
4 Services, Inc., and its division The Ferro Engineering Division, by and through its undersigned
5 attorneys, hereby submits the following answers and objections to Plaintiffs' First Set of
6 Interrogatories and Requests for Production to the above-named Defendant.
7

8 GENERAL OBJECTIONS

9 At no time did Defendant manufacture, sell, distribute or supply any asbestos-containing
10 products, other than through its former division, Ferro Engineering. Any and all products,
11 including those containing asbestos, were manufactured by and sold through the Ferro
12 Engineering Division. Defendant therefore responds to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories and
13 Requests for Production of Documents on behalf of its former division, Ferro Engineering.
14 Notwithstanding the above, Defendant objects to the following First Set of Interrogatories and
15 Requests for Production insofar as they seek information which is subject to attorney-client
16 privilege or work-product doctrine, or which is otherwise not discoverable under the provisions
17 of the Washington Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant also objects to any Interrogatories and
18 Requests for Production that seek production of any information consisting of a trade secret,
19 confidential financial data or other confidential research, development or commercial
20 information. Discovery is still continuing in this case and Defendant will supplement its answers
21 as any additional information becomes available.
22
23

24 ADDITIONAL OBJECTIONS

25 Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production are directed to
26 Oglebay Norton Company a/k/a Oglebay Norton Engineered Materials, a/k/a ON Marine

1 Services, Inc., and its division, The Ferro Engineering Division. Plaintiff has improperly named
2 Oglebay Norton Company as a defendant. The proper entity is Ferro Engineering Division of
3 ON Marine Services Company, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, which is a wholly
4 owned subsidiary of Oglebay Norton Company, LLC, an Ohio limited liability company.
5 Present-day Oglebay Norton Company had no involvement in any activities relating to Plaintiffs'
6 claims and holds no legal liability for any activities of the Ferro Engineering Division of ON
7 Marine Services Company, LLC. Accordingly, the First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for
8 Production are improperly issued to Oglebay Norton Company, which is not in a position to
9 respond to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production. The proper party
10 to which such Interrogatories and Requests for Production should be directed is the Ferro
11 Engineering Division of ON Marine Services Company, LLC, which entity hereby responds to
12 Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production as follows:

13 INTERROGATORIES

14 1. Did you ever sell, supply, and/or distribute hot tops to Bethlehem Steel in Seattle,
15 Washington during the years 1970 to 1976?

16 RESPONSE: Defendant incorporates its General Objections and Additional Objections
17 listed above in connection with its subsequent responses. Defendant further objects on the
18 grounds that "hot tops" is a generic term with several meanings and thus this Interrogatory is
19 technically unanswerable. Defendant further objects as Plaintiffs have provided no evidence that
20 Mr. Turner ever worked with, or in the vicinity of, any products manufactured, sold or
21 distributed by this Defendant. Therefore, this Interrogatory is overly broad, unduly burdensome,
22 and not designed to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving its
23 objections, Defendant did manufacture and sell certain asbestos-containing products for use with
24 hot tops to Bethlehem Steel in Seattle at various times during the years 1970 to 1976.

25 2. Did you ever manufacture, assemble, sell, supply, or otherwise put in the stream of
26 commerce hot tops that contained asbestos after 1969?

1 RESPONSE: Defendant incorporates its General Objections and Additional Objections
2 listed above in connection with its subsequent responses. Defendant further objects on the
3 grounds that "hot tops" is a generic term with several meanings and thus this Interrogatory is
4 technically unanswerable. Defendant further objects as this Interrogatory is not limited in time
5 or scope to the time periods or locations related to this lawsuit. Defendant further objects as
6 Plaintiffs have provided no evidence that Mr. Turner ever worked with, or in the vicinity of, any
7 products manufactured, sold, or distributed by Defendant. Therefore, this Interrogatory is overly
8 broad, unduly burdensome, and not designed to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
9 Without waiving its objections, Defendant did manufacture and sell certain asbestos-containing
10 refractory products for use with hot tops to Bethlehem Steel in Seattle at various times during the
11 years 1970 to 1976.

12 3. If your answers to interrogatories No. 1 or 2 are anything other than an unqualified
13 "no", please describe with particularity every asbestos-containing hot top product that you
14 manufactured, assembled, sold, supplied, or otherwise placed in the stream of commerce
15 during the years 1970 to 1976. Include in your answer the brand name and/or model name of
16 the product, its physical description and its asbestos content (percentage and fiber type).

17 RESPONSE: See objections to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Without waiving its
18 objections, Defendant may have manufactured and sold the following asbestos-containing
19 products to Bethlehem Steel in Seattle, WA from 1970 to 1976:

20 Ferroboard Liners

21 Certain Ferroboard Liners contained 6% amosite or combination amosite
22 and chrysotile asbestos, depending on customer needs and requirements.
23 Asbestos-containing Ferroboard Liners were stacked on a wooden pallet
24 then covered with a 6 mil shrink wrap. Shipping labels with the
25 designation "C&D" and "Ferro Engineering" may have accompanied the
26 product. Asbestos-containing Ferroboard Liners were tannish in color,
brick-like in texture, rectangular in form which varied in length and
width depending upon the size of the Hot Top and were manufactured
with crease lines for folding the liner into the proper shape. There were
no markings on this product other than product number.

4. If your answer to interrogatory No. 2 is anything other than an unqualified "no", please
list the suppliers of the asbestos fibers incorporated into your hot top products during the years
1970 to 1976.

1 RESPONSE: See objections to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Without waiving its
2 objections, Defendant responds as follows:

3
4 In general, asbestos fibers contained in certain of Defendant's products were purchased
5 from Carey Canadian, Canadian Johns-Manville Corporation, National Gypsum, North
6 American Asbestos Corporation, Clark Asbestos and International Fiber Corp.

7 5. Describe the expected use of your hot top products by your customers.

8 RESPONSE: See objections to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Without waiving its
9 objections, Defendant responds as follows: Some asbestos-containing Ferroboard Liners may
10 have been used to line the inside of certain hot top castings.

11 6. Do you contend that the asbestos-containing hot tops that you manufactured or
12 otherwise placed in the stream of commerce were not "friable" and/or did not release respirable
13 asbestos fibers during their expected use? If yes, please describe the factual and scientific
14 basis for that contention.

15 RESPONSE: See objections to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Without waiving its
16 objections, Defendant responds as follows: Ferroboard liners were a refractory board product
17 and no significant dust would have been created in its normal use.

18 7. When did you learn that asbestos was hazardous to human health?

19 RESPONSE: See objections to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Defendant further objects to
20 the form of this Request in that it assumes that the release of dust and/or fibers was inherent with
21 use of Defendant's products, and that Defendant's products presented a hazard. Defendant
22 further objects on the grounds that this Request assumes that Defendant had control of such
23 products and their use after leaving Defendant's possession, which it did not. Further, these
24 products were sold to sophisticated companies who controlled the workplace and its employees.
25 Defendant also objects on the grounds that at no time was Plaintiff James Turner employed by
26 this Defendant. Accordingly, this Request is overly broad, unduly burdensome, harassing and
seeks information that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of

1 admissible evidence. Without waiving its objections, and to the best of this Defendant's
2 knowledge, information and belief, the late James Bogner of Ferro Engineering's research
3 department learned that asbestos fibers posed a possible risk of asbestosis to asbestos miners in
4 the late 1960s or early 1970s. According to earlier deposition testimony of Mr. Bogner, at no
5 time did Defendant believe that the asbestos content in Defendant's products was hazardous.
6 Further, Defendant possesses articles from the Times of London from 1966. Defendant has no
7 reason to believe that receipt of the articles, which speak for themselves, was in any way
8 "notice" as to any potential increased risk of any health hazards related to Defendant's products.
9 Also, there is a one-line reference to asbestosis in the minutes of a 1969 Engineering Department
10 meeting. Such reference was non-specific and does not appear directed toward any Ferro
11 Engineering Division product or process. Defendant has no further information concerning these
12 minutes or any discussion that took place at the meeting. Defendant has no information that
13 indicates Defendant ever believed that the proper use of any of its asbestos-containing products
14 potentially posed any increased risk or any health hazards from the use of the products.

15 8. Did warnings or instructions of any kind accompany any of your hot top products
16 described in your answer to Interrogatory No. 3? If yes, please describe the content of the
warning or instruction.

17 RESPONSE: See objections to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Without waiving its
18 objections, in 1971 Defendant commenced a labeling program using the following label:
19 "Caution contains asbestos fibers - avoid creating dust - breathing asbestos dust may cause
20 serious bodily harm." It is believed that the color of the label was in red and that the label was
21 approximately 2 inches by 2 inches in size. The label was in conformance with federal
22 regulations. There is no record of the precise dates of implementation of the caution label with
23 regard to individual products. Defendant has no information as to persons involved in drafting
24 the language used in the caution label, although to the best of Defendant's knowledge,
25 information and belief the language chosen was in conformance with federal regulations.
26

1 9. Did you ever warn any of your customers about the hazards of asbestos at any time?
2 Why or why not?

3 RESPONSE: See objections and response to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 2 and 8. Without
4 waiving its objections, Defendant never believed asbestos, as used in its products, created any
5 increased health risks from the use of its products to its customers.

6 10. Provide the names of each individual who provided information to answer these
7 interrogatories.

8 RESPONSE: Dennis H. Markusson, Esq., of Markusson, Green & Jarvis, P.C.,
9 950 17th Street, Suite 1050, Denver, Colorado 80202, Ferro Engineering Division's National
10 Coordinating Counsel, who has held this position since March 2002, supervised the answering of
11 these Interrogatories and Requests for Production by Bruce Inglis, CFO of ON Marine Services
12 Company, LLC. Mr. Inglis' answers are based solely upon documents and information made
13 available to him by others and upon which he relied.

14 11. Provide the names and contact information (if known) of each person who you believe
15 may possess information regarding the use of asbestos in your hot top products in the 1970s.

16 RESPONSE: Bill Gabriel, consultant and former employee. Mr. Gabriel can be
17 contacted through National Coordinating Counsel.

18 12. Provide the names and contact information (if known) of each person who you believe
19 may possess information regarding your sale/supply of hot top products to Bethlehem Steel in
20 the 1970s.

21 RESPONSE: See response to Interrogatory No. 11.

22 13. Provide the names of each trade or professional organization that you were a member
23 of prior to 1976.

24 RESPONSE: See objections to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Without waiving its
25 objections, Defendant states that it recently became aware of documents that indicate that
26 Defendant was a member of the American Ceramic Society during the years 1942, 1944, 1945,
1947-1949, 1951, 1958 and 1961. Prior to becoming aware of said documents, Defendant had

1 no knowledge that it may have been a member of the American Ceramic Society. Defendant
2 further states that based upon records to which Defendant was referred, it appears for the years
3 1960 to 1962, 1964, and 1968 to 1970 Robert E. Kratzert, Vessel Personnel Manager for the
4 Columbia Transportation Division, was a member of the National Safety Council. The
5 Columbia Transportation Division was a separate entity from the Defendant Ferro Engineering
6 Division. Defendant also states that it was recently referred to a document that indicates that
7 Oglebay Norton Company, which as a result of a series of mergers is now ON Marine Services
8 Company, LLC, was a member of the National Safety Council from 1949 to 2005. Defendant
9 Ferro Engineering was not a member of the National Safety Council. Further, Defendant was a
10 member of the Iron and Steel Institute. Defendant is unaware of the exact dates of its
11 membership.

12 14. When was the first time that a person brought a lawsuit against you for allegedly
13 causing an asbestos-related injury?

14 RESPONSE: See objection to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Additionally, this
15 Interrogatory is not related to any claim or defense in this matter and is, therefore, overly broad,
16 unduly burdensome and not designed to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

17 15. When was the first time that an employee or former employee brought a claim against
18 you for compensation for an injury allegedly related to asbestos?

19 RESPONSE: See objection to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Additionally, this
20 Interrogatory is not related to any claim or defense in this matter and is, therefore, overly broad,
21 unduly burdensome and not designed to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

22 16. Prior to 1976, did you ever employ an industrial hygienist or someone similar charged
23 with health and safety at your company? If yes, please provide the individual(s)' name(s), job
24 description, and contact information.
25
26

RESPONSE: See objection to Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Additionally, this Interrogatory is not related to any claim or defense in this matter and is, therefore, overly broad, unduly burdensome and not designed to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

17. Did you ever sell, supply, and/or distribute equipment used to make hot tops to Bethlehem Steel in Seattle, Washington prior to 1976? If yes, please describe the equipment and how it was used.

RESPONSE: See objections to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 2 and 3. Without waiving its objections, Defendant manufactured and sold certain asbestos-containing products for use with hot tops at Bethlehem Steel in Seattle, Washington prior to 1976.

REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

1. Produce every document in your possession or control that relates or refers to any sale/supply of hot tops that you made to Bethlehem Steel in Seattle, Washington during the years 1970 to 1976.

RESPONSE: Defendant incorporates its General Objections and Additional Objections listed above in connection with its subsequent responses. Defendant further objects to this Request for Production on the grounds that, according to deposition testimony, Mr. Turner never worked with any of Defendant's products. Accordingly, this Request seeks information that is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving its objections, Defendant states that it maintains and will produce copies of the Ferro Engineering Division's "In-road books" sales records for sales of its asbestos-containing refractory products sold to Bethlehem Steel, Seattle, WA, during time period 1970 to 1976. Additionally, Defendant states that it possesses and will produce copies of representative "mix formulas" for any asbestos-containing products listed in the objections and answers to Interrogatory No. 3. The mix formulas are exemplars of those used for the manufacture of Ferro Engineering Division products. Defendant manufactured its products to each of its customers' own needs and requirements, which were dependent upon many factors, including but not

1 limited to the customers' specific yield requirements. Defendant possesses no information by
2 which it may determine whether the mix formulas in its possession are in fact the exact mix
3 formulas used for the production of each product as listed in its answer to Interrogatory 3.
4 Additionally, Defendant will produce representative product catalogs relevant to Defendant's
5 asbestos-containing products manufactured and sold to Bethlehem Steel, Seattle, WA, from 1970
6 to 1976.

7 2. Produce every document in your possession or control that relates or refers to
8 communications between you and Bethlehem Steel regarding your sale/supply of hot tops
during the years 1970 to 1976.

9 RESPONSE: See objections and answers to Request for Production No. 1 and
10 Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Without waiving its objections, Defendant is unaware of any such
11 documents. However, documents may exist responsive to this request in Defendant's document
12 storage facility at Iron Mountain in Cleveland, OH. Plaintiffs may inspect such documents upon
13 reasonable request.

14 3. Produce every document in your possession or control that relates or refers to asbestos-
15 related human health hazards.

16 RESPONSE: See objections to Interrogatory Nos. 1, 2 and 7. Without waiving these
17 objections, Defendant will produce the articles and meeting minutes referenced in Interrogatory
18 No. 7.

19 4. Produce every document in your possession or control that relates or refers to
20 communications prior to 1976 on the subject of the government's regulation of asbestos.

21 RESPONSE: See objections and answers to Request for Production No. 1 and
22 Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Without waiving its objections, Defendant is unaware of any such
23 documents. However, documents may exist responsive to this request in Defendants document
24 storage facility at Iron Mountain in Cleveland, OH. Plaintiffs may inspect such documents upon
25 reasonable request.
26

1 5. Produce all records in your possession or control that refer or relate to any claims filed
2 or made by your employees or former employees for compensation relating to asbestos-related
injuries or illnesses.

3 RESPONSE: See objections to Request for Production No. 1 and Interrogatory Nos. 1, 2
4 and 15. Additionally, this Request is not related to any claim or defense in this matter and is,
5 therefore, overly broad, unduly burdensome and not designed to lead to the discovery of
6 admissible evidence.

7 6. Produce all records in your possession or control that refer or relate to your
8 procurement of asbestos-containing materials for incorporation into your hot top products
9 during the years 1970 to 1976.

10 RESPONSE: See objections and answers to Request for Production No. 1 and
11 Interrogatory Nos. 1 and 2. Without waiving its objections, Defendant is unaware of any such
12 documents. However, documents may exist responsive to this request in Defendants document
13 storage facility at Iron Mountain in Cleveland, OH. Plaintiffs may inspect such documents upon
14 reasonable request.

15 7. Produce every document in your possession or control that relates or refers to any
16 sale/supply of equipment used to make hot tops that you made to Bethlehem Steel in Seattle,
Washington during the years 1970 to 1976.

17 RESPONSE: See objections to Request for Production No. 1 and Interrogatory Nos. 1
18 and 2. Defendant further objects on the grounds that this request is nonsensical and cannot be
19 answered. Defendant never sold any equipment used to make hot tops to Bethlehem Steel in
20 Seattle, Washington. It did sell products to Bethlehem Steel that may have been used in
21 connection with the use of hot tops. Without waiving its objections, attached as Exhibit A (Bates
22 Nos. OMW00001-00043) are documents that pertain to products that Defendant may have
23 manufactured and sold to Bethlehem Steel in Seattle, Washington during the years 1970 to 1976,
24 as well as documents pertaining to the Ferroboard product lines. Discovery is still continuing in
25 this case and these documents may be supplemented as discovery continues.
26

ANSWERS AND RESPONSES SUBMITTED this 8th day of August, 2013. The undersigned attorney has read the foregoing answers and responses to these discovery requests, and they comply with CR 26(g).

OGDEN MURPHY WALLACE

OGDEN MURPHY WALLACE


Robert G. André, WSBA #13072
Counsel for Defendant
On Marine Services Company, LLC Ferro
Engineering Division (incorrectly named as
Oglebay Norton Company)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

AFFIDAVIT


STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY)


BRUCE INGLIS, Chief Financial Officer of ON Marine Services Company, a Delaware limited liability company, and designated by ON Marine Services Company, LLC, to execute the answers and responses to these answers and objections to Plaintiffs' First Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents based upon information or documents made available to him by others and upon which he relied, and being first duly sworn on oath and deposes and states that he has read the foregoing answers and objections to Plaintiffs' First Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, and that the statements of fact contained in the attached answers and objections to Plaintiffs' First Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.



Bruce Inglis

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me on the 2ND day of August 2013.





Printed Name Karen DiCaprio
NOTARY PUBLIC in and for the State of
Pennsylvania, residing at
Allegheny County
My Commission Expires: Sept. 17, 2016

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

Carole Henry hereby makes the following declaration pursuant to CR 5(b)(B) and RCW 9A.72.085:

1. I am now and was at all times material hereto over the age of 18 years. I am not a party to the above-entitled action and am competent to be a witness herein.

2. I certify that I served via e-mail a copy of the foregoing Plaintiffs' First Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to Defendant ON Marine Services Company, LLC, Ferro Engineering Division (incorrectly named as Oglebay Norton Company) With Answers to counsel as follows:

Matthew P. Bergman
Bergman Draper Ladenburg
614 First Avenue
Third Floor
Seattle, Washington 98104
service@bergmanlegal.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Randy Aliment
Williams Kastner & Gibbs
601 Union Street
Suite 4100
P.O. Box 21926
Seattle, Washington 98111-3926
wkgasbestos@williamskastner.com
Attorneys for Seegott Holdings, Inc.

Marissa Alkhazov
Betts Patterson Mines
701 Pike Street
Suite 1400
Seattle, Washington 98101
betts-asbestos@bpmlaw.com
Attorneys for Pfizer, Inc.

Mark J. Fucile
Fucile & Reising
115 Northwest 1st Avenue
Suite 401
Portland, Oregon 97209-4024
mark@frllp.com
Attorneys for Owens-Illinois, Inc.

Richard Gawlowski
Wilson Smith Cochran & Dickerson
901 Fifth Avenue
Suite 1700
Seattle, Washington 98164
metlifeasbestos@wsd.com
Attorneys for Metropolitan Life Insurance Company

Terry Hall
Wolfstone Panchot & Bloch
1111 Third Avenue
Suite 1800
Seattle, Washington 98101
asbestos@wpblaw.com
Attorneys for Lone Star Industries, Inc.

1 Bree H. Kame'enui-Ramirez
2 Betts Patterson Mines
3 701 Pike Street
4 Suite 1400
5 Seattle, Washington 98101
6 betts-asbestos@bpmlaw.com
7 **Attorneys for McCann Shields Paint Co.**

8 Diane Kero
9 Gordon Thomas
10 600 University Street
11 Suite 2100
12 Seattle, Washington 98101
13 service@gth-law.com
14 **Attorneys for Foseco, Inc., Union Carbide
15 Corporation**

16 Melissa K. Roeder
17 Forsberg & Umlauf
18 901 Fifth Avenue
19 Suite 1400
20 Seattle, Washington 98164
21 asbestos3@forsberg-umlau.com
22 **Attorneys for Fraser's Boiler Service, Inc.**

23 Timothy K. Thorson
24 Carney Badley Smith & Spellman
25 701 Fifth Avenue
26 Suite 3600
Seattle, Washington 98104
asbestos@carneylaw.com
Attorneys for Saberhagen Holdings, Inc.

Mike Mattingly
Rizzo Mattingly Bosworth
411 Southwest 2nd Avenue
Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97204
recordsmanagement@rizzopc.com
**Attorneys for Kelly Moore Paint
Company, Inc.**

Barry N. Mesher
Sedgwick LLP
520 Pike Street
Suite 2200
Seattle, Washington 98101
asbestos.seattle@sedgwicklaw.com
**Attorneys for Crown Cork & Seal
Company, Inc., Georgia-Pacific
Corporation**

Katherine M. Steele
Williams Kastner Gibbs
601 Union Street
Suite 4100
Seattle, Washington 98101
wkgasbestos@williamskastner.com
**Attorneys for C.H. Murphy/Clark-Ullman,
Inc., P-G Industries, Inc., Insulco, Inc.**

Mark Tuvim
Gordon & Rees, LLP
701 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2130
Seattle, Washington 98104
asbestos-sea@gordonrees.com
**Attorneys for Asbestos Corporation
Limited, Hedman Resources Limited**

1 Jeffrey Wolf
2 Williams Kastner & Gibbs
3 601 Union Street
4 Suite 4100
5 P.O. Box 21926
6 Seattle, Washington 98111-3926
7 wkgasbestos@williamskastner.com
8 **Attorneys for Hanson Permanente Cement,**
9 **Inc., Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc.**

10 on the 8th day of AUGUST, 2013.

11 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the
12 foregoing is true and correct.

13 Aug 8/13 Seattle WA
14 Date and Place

15 Carole Henry
16 Carole Henry