

INTERROGATORY NO. 75: State the year the Defendant or any predecessor(s) was first advised of either threshold limit values or maximum allowable concentrations of both asbestos dust and total dust, promulgated by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists, and identify the specific persons) receiving such advise [sic], and any and all documents communicating such advise.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 75:

Abex objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is over broad, unduly burdensome, compound, vague and ambiguous and calls for speculation.

Abex also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that the information or materials it purports to seek lack relevance to the issues arising in these cases and are not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. To the extent it purports to seek information or materials regarding the working conditions of Abex employees, this interrogatory is further objected to on the grounds that such information or materials lack relevance to the issues arising in these cases and are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Abex objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it assumes the truth of matters not established or matters not in evidence.

Abex also objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it is speculative inasmuch as it fails to distinguish among raw asbestos, asbestos contained in building insulation products and/or asbestos-containing automotive friction products, and/or among the different types of asbestos fibers. Because the asbestos fiber contained in Abex's asbestos-containing automotive friction products was chrysotile, the only type of