



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK AND
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x
:
In. Re: JOINT EASTERN and
SOUTHERN DISTRICT : NYAL
ASBESTOS LITIGATION :
:
-----x

:
This Document Applies to All Cases
:
-----x

DEFENDANT GAF CORPORATION'S ANSWERS
TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST STANDARD SET OF
LIABILITY INTERROGATORIES AND REQUEST
FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Defendant GAF Corporation ("GAF"), responds to
plaintiffs' First Standard Set of Liability Interrogatories
and Request for Production of Documents as follows:

- (a) GAF answers these interrogatories served pursuant to the terms of Case Management Order No. 1, to the best of its ability notwithstanding that they are, as a whole, burdensome and oppressive, and with the understanding that, in accordance with Case Management Order No. 1, paragraphs X-A and C, GAF will not have to answer any other sets of general interrogatories in these coordinated litigations. Pursuant to the terms of paragraph X-C(2), GAF will object to any further supplemental interrogatories to the extent they are either repetitive or of a general nature or inappropriate with respect to a specific plaintiff's case. Similarly, GAF will make available for inspection and copying those documents requested herein, as indicated below, on a one-time only basis.
- (b) The information supplied in these answers is not based solely upon the knowledge of the person executing them but includes the knowledge of GAF, its representatives and attor-

neys, unless privileged or subject to protections under the work product doctrine;

- (c) The word usage and sentence structure used in these answers may be that of attorneys assisting in preparing these answers and does not necessarily purport to be the precise language of the executing person;
- (d) GAF will respond to the interrogatories by individual written responses or, pursuant to Rule 33(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, by specifying the records from which the answer may be derived or ascertained and by affording plaintiffs a reasonable opportunity to examine or inspect the records at the offices of its attorneys, Anderson Russell Kill & Olick, P.C., 666 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. GAF objects to these interrogatories to the extent that they are unduly burdensome, including without limitation that they seek to require GAF to: (a) provide information other than that which may be obtained through a reasonably diligent search of its records; (b) respond other than in accordance with the applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; (c) locate or interview former employees, insurance carriers, consultants or any other person not presently employed or engaged by GAF; (d) synthesize documents or generate documents not in existence at present; (e) describe its unsuccessful efforts to answer any interrogatory; (f) identify an unknown custodian or the current custodian of documents

not in GAF's possession; (g) identify the file designation and other identifying designation, the present location or the source of documents identified unless specifically requested in the interrogatory; (h) add to or change the meaning of any interrogatory; (i) respond to any aspect of an interrogatory not described with reasonable particularity by the express language of the interrogatory; (j) provide medical opinions or other expert opinions beyond the scope of GAF's business; (k) gather and summarize information contained in voluminous papers that are already a matter of public record; (l) provide information which is equally available to plaintiff as to GAF; or (m) respond on behalf of any other entity. GAF will respond with such knowledge as it possesses as to The Ruberoid Co. ("Ruberoid") prior to its merger with GAF on May 26, 1967, and on behalf of GAF thereafter.

2. GAF objects to these interrogatories to the extent they are irrelevant or unduly broad including without limitation that they seek to require GAF to respond to questions about or to identify or produce documents relating to: (a) products other than asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products (the products at issue in these actions); (b) dates outside of the period from 1928 to 1981

when GAF ceased manufacturing asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products; (c) non-employees of GAF and other persons having no connection with GAF's manufacture and sale of products at issue in this litigation such as consultants; (d) mining and manufacturing operations or any safety precautions or tests undertaken in connection with these operations whether in compliance with OSHA or otherwise, inasmuch as the occupational level exposures of asbestos miners and manufacturers are different from the occupational level exposures of secondary users, such as plaintiffs, working with and around finished asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products; (e) the sale of products by GAF to any entity in any chain of distribution from GAF to plaintiffs' employers except independent dealers, distributors, wholesalers or contractors with which GAF did business since (i) as a manufacturer and seller only, GAF had no discretion to determine the method and manner of use of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products, and (ii) GAF has no knowledge of whether any asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation product was resold to jobsites where plaintiffs may have worked; or (f) any geographical or political region other than that comprised of the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York. Further,

inquiry into such areas is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3. GAF objects to these interrogatories to the extent they are vague, unintelligible, insufficiently specific, use undefined terms capable of more than one interpretation or which require GAF to speculate as to the specific information demanded by plaintiffs.

4. GAF objects to these interrogatories to the extent they are redundant, argumentative, inflammatory or otherwise unfair or which require GAF to assume facts not in the record of these litigations.

5. GAF objects to these interrogatories pursuant to Rule 26(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to the extent they seek to require GAF to provide information or to identify any documents or other tangible things prepared or obtained in anticipation of litigation or for trial where plaintiffs have not shown that they: (a) have a substantial need for the materials in the preparation of the cases; and (b) are unable to obtain the substantial equivalent of the materials by other means without undue hardship.

6. GAF objects to these interrogatories to the extent they seek to require GAF to disclose privileged attorney-client communications or information otherwise protected

from discovery on grounds of privilege or the work product doctrine.

7. GAF objects to the definitions and instructions preceding these interrogatories on the ground that they are beyond the scope of the applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

8. GAF adopts the motions and objections of the other defendants and reserves the right to adopt future motions and objections relating to plaintiffs' First Standard Set of Liability Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents.

INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

State the full name, address, telephone number and position of the corporate officer answering these interrogatories.

ANSWER NO. 1:

For the purpose of this answer, GAF construes the term "answering" to include editing, reviewing and compiling information and as based on something other than personal knowledge. Subject to the foregoing qualification, GAF responds that counsel for GAF, various local counsel for GAF, and their paralegal professionals have assisted in the prep-

aration of these responses. In the course of answering similar interrogatories over several years, various persons have provided information and referred to documents, which persons and documents GAF is presently unable to identify individually or in relation to specific items of information.

The following current and former GAF employees are known to have supplied information used in the preparation of answers to these interrogatories:

Phillip Bettoli: (Retired) Technical Director, Research Department, GAF Corporation, formerly employed at South Bound Brook, New Jersey 08880;

William Schwingen: Vice President, Research and Commercial Development, GAF Building Materials Corporation, employed at 1361 Alps Road, Wayne, New Jersey 07470;

Duane A. Davis: (Retired) Building and Industrial Manager of Research and Development, GAF Corporation, formerly employed at South Bound Brook, New Jersey 08880;

Richard Fisanick: Supervisor of Office Services of General Accounting, GAF Corporation, formerly employed at South Bound Brook, New Jersey 08880; and

Wayne Page: former Vice President of Manufacturing of Consumer Products Group, GAF Corporate Headquarters, formerly employed in New York, New York.

In addition, counsel for GAF Corporation, various local counsel for GAF, and their paralegal professionals have assisted in the preparation of responses from which these responses have been drawn, or these responses themselves, or both.

The name, title and address of the person signing these interrogatories is as follows: Joshua J. Ward, Assistant Secretary, GAF Corporation, 1361 Alps Road, Wayne, New Jersey 07470.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

Have any documents and records of the defendant been used or referred to, in connection with the preparation of or answers to these interrogatories? If so, for each documents referred to, state the following:

- a. the number of the question and its subpart;
- b. the identity and title of the document;
- c. the name and location of the file in which the document was found;
- d. the name and location of the file in which the document is presently located;
- e. the originator of the document.

ANSWER TO NO. 2:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (b), (c), (d), (g) and (k) and 3. GAF has been a defendant in over 56,000 personal injury actions allegedly involving its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products. Thousands of pages of documents have been produced, by this and other defendants in the course of these litigations. Subject to the foregoing objections, see GAF's answer to interrogatory No. 1.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

State the names of each person who was spoken to or who provided information to assist in answering these interrogatories and for each person state the following:

- a. The number of each question and its subpart for which such personnel provided information;
- b. for each question identified in a., state the name, title and position description of the personnel supplying information;
- c. the present location and address of the personnel supplying information;
- d. the contents of the information provided.

ANSWER TO NO. 3:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (b), (c), (d), (g) and (k). Subject to the foregoing objections, see GAF's answer to interrogatory No. 1.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

Please state in which state or states of the United States or what foreign countries your business is incorporated and where its principal place of business is located.

ANSWER TO NO. 4:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2. Subject to the foregoing objection, GAF Corporation states that it is incorporated in Delaware, with its principal place of business located at 1361 Alps Road, Wayne, New Jersey 07470.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

Please state whether:

- a. Your company is authorized to do business in:
- (1) New York
 - (2) New Jersey
 - (3) Connecticut

b. your company does business in:

- (1) New York
- (2) New Jersey
- (3) Connecticut

ANSWER TO NO. 5:

GAF objects to this interrogatory because it is irrelevant. GAF does not dispute that it is generally subject to personal jurisdiction in New York in these actions or that venue in these actions is proper in the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

State the full and complete legal name under which your company or any predecessor is now doing business and has done business at all times from the date when it began mining, processing, manufacturing and/or selling asbestos products or thermal insulation products and materials up until the present time.

ANSWER TO NO. 6:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2(a). GAF further objects to the term "predecessor", as it is not defined in the

interrogatories and is susceptible to a variety of interpretations, legal conclusions and consequences. Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF states that it is incorporated in Delaware, with its principal place of business in New Jersey.

GAF was incorporated in Delaware in 1929 as American I.G. Corporation. Its name was changed in 1939 to General Aniline & Film Corporation. From its inception until May of 1967, General Aniline & Film Corporation was not engaged in any aspect of the asbestos industrial thermal insulation business and, in fact, manufactured no products whatsoever containing asbestos.

On May 26, 1967, General Aniline & Film Corporation merged with The Ruberoid Co. The Ruberoid Co. was originally incorporated in New York in 1886 as the Standard Paint Company. This company was succeeded by a company of the same name, which was incorporated in West Virginia in 1889; that company was succeeded by the Standard Paint Company, incorporated in New Jersey on June 16, 1905. The name of the company was changed to The Ruberoid Co. on March 10, 1921. The Ruberoid Co. began the manufacture of industrial thermal insulation products containing asbestos in 1928 when it acquired the H.F. Watson Co. The Ruberoid Co. made various other acquisitions, including a Vermont mine.

In 1942, 98 percent of the stock of General Aniline & Film Corporation was seized, pursuant to a wartime legislative enactment, by the U.S. Treasury Department which assumed control over the company management and operations. In 1965, the U.S. Government relinquished control over General Aniline & Film Corporation and its stock was sold at public auction. The merger with The Ruberoid Co. took place on May 26, 1967. In 1968, the name of the entity was changed to GAF Corporation. By 1981, GAF Corporation was not manufacturing any asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

Have you ever acquired, by way of a consolidation, merger, purchase of assets, or otherwise, any company which manufactured or sold any asbestos-containing products? If so, as to each such acquisition:

- a. State the name and state of incorporation of the company which was acquired?
- b. State the reasons for the acquisition;
- c. State the date of the acquisition;
- d. State the terms of the acquisition, including but not limited to the consideration paid (e.g., amount of stock, cash, etc.) if any;
- e. Identify all of the company's assets which were acquired (e.g., plants, machinery, stock

in trade, trademarks, patents, goodwill, etc.);

- f. Identify all of the company's liabilities which were assumed by you in the acquisition;
- g. Identify each of the company's asbestos-containing product lines;
- h. Identify each asbestos-containing product line of the acquired company which you continued to manufacture after the acquisition;
- i. State the number of employees of the acquired company which were retained by you after the acquisition;
- j. State the names of the directors, officers, and major stockholders of your company and the acquired company at the time of the acquisition and the names of the directors, officers, and major stockholders of your company and, if it continued to exist, of the acquired company, after the acquisition;
- k. State the total number of shares of the acquired company which you held before and after the acquisition;
- l. Identify and produce a copy of the agreement between you and the acquired company, the pertinent minutes of your Board of Directors and all other related documents.

ANSWER TO NO. 7:

(a) Yes; GAF Corporation merged with The Ruberoid Co. on May 26, 1967.

(b)-(1) GAF objects to the remaining subparts of interrogatory No. 7 on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General

Objections 1(a), (b), (d) and (k) and 2(a) and (f) in that each subpart is overly broad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant to any issue in this case and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to the foregoing objections, see GAF's answers to interrogatories 6 and 9.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

State the names and positions of all corporate officers or officials having the responsibility for creating, directing or setting the policy of your firm with regard to the mining, manufacturing, processing, sale and/or packaging of asbestos products since 1930.

ANSWER TO NO. 8:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2(a) and 5.

Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF states that the policies of GAF were determined generally by its board of directors and corporate officers. The following current or former GAF employees or representatives were engaged in setting policy:

William Schwingen - Vice President, Research and
Commercial Development
GAF Buildings Materials
Corporation
1361 Alps Road
Wayne, New Jersey 07470

Philip Bettoli - (Retired) - Technical Director
Research Department
GAF Corporation
Formerly employed at South Bound
Brook, New Jersey 08880

Duane A. Davis - Retired - Building and Industrial
Manager of Research and Development
Formerly employed at South Bound
Brook, New Jersey 08880

Wayne Page - Former Vice President of
Manufacturing of Consumer Products
Group
GAF corporate headquarters
Formerly employed at GAF former
corporate headquarters in New
York, New York

INTERROGATORY NO. 9:

Have you or any of your predecessors or subsidi-
aries ever mined, processed, refined, sold or distributed
asbestos or asbestos containing products. If so, for each
such product, complete an "Asbestos Product Information
Sheet, Attachment #1.

ANSWER TO NO. 9:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds
set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including

without limitation General Objections 1(a), (b), (d) and (1), 2(a), (e) and (f) and 3. Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF responds as follows:

Calsilite® pipe covering and block products were first manufactured by The Ruberoid Co. on a commercial basis, beginning on March 7 (sometimes stated as April 1), 1949 and then by General Aniline & Film Corporation in 1967 and by GAF Corporation in 1968. Prior to 1949, Calsilite® pipe covering and block was manufactured by The Ruberoid Co. on a limited pilot/test basis, with the support and at the behest of the U.S. Government, from around November, 1944 until March 1947, when the facility was classified as a "research project," which classification continued until April 1, 1949.

Subsequent to 1960, Calsilite®-Hi was developed; it was manufactured with a higher clay content and could withstand temperatures up to 1800° F. In the mid-1960s, Calsilite® SS, an "inhibited" product, was developed to prevent stress corrosion and chloride cracking in austenitic stainless steel piping.

In 1970, GAF developed asbestos-free Calsilite®, known as Calsilite® II or Calsilite® A-F, and advised the General Services Administration ("GSA") of GAF's asbestos-free Calsilite® product. This information was provided in

response to a letter from GSA to GAF regarding purported potential health effects associated with asbestos. GAF's response was contained in a letter from R.W. Henry, Marketing Manager, Insulation & Construction Products, Industrial Products Division, to George R. Tucker, Chief, Hardware and Construction Branch, Standardization Division, General Services Administration.

On March 5, 1971, R.W. Henry and W.C. Schwingen visited the U.S. Naval Ship Engineering Center in Hyattsville, Maryland. Their purpose was to discuss GAF's asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation. On May 12, 1971, W.C. Schwingen discussed with Henry Murad of the Naval Ship Engineering Center, Hyattsville, Maryland, GAF's new asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation product. At or about the same time, W.C. Schwingen spoke with Commander Barboo of the Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and also contacted Ralph Wands of the National Academy of Sciences regarding GAF's asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation.

The United States Navy, however, refused to approve the asbestos-free product for use on government vessels. In light of this development, GAF determined to cease manufacture of Calsilite®. The entire Calsilite® operation was terminated in October, 1971.

115 Insulation Cement was produced for sale from 1937 to 1975. This product was a chrysotile asbestos product. The product designation indicated compliance with the standard Quebec Test for a certain grade of fiber, in this case, the 0-0-1-15 Quebec Test. Asbestos insulation cements produced at this defendant's Vermont facility could generally be distinguished from asbestos insulation cements produced by other manufacturers because the Vermont product was generally of a lower grade and contained a greater percentage of impurities, such as dirt and rock particles. It is believed that the "115" designation was employed from approximately 1950 to 1975. Prior to 1950, a similar insulation cement may have been sold by this defendant under a different alphabetical or numerical designation.

214 Insulation Cement was produced for sale from 1937 to 1975. This cement was a chrysotile asbestos product. The product designation as "214" Insulation Cement was based on the product's compliance with the standard Quebec Test for a certain grade of fiber, in this case, the 0-0-2-14 Quebec Test. The Vermont product was a lower grade cement which contained a greater percentage of impurities, such as dirt and rock particles, making it slightly mottled and giving it an overall darker appearance. It is believed that the

"214" designation was employed from approximately 1950 to 1975. Prior to 1950, a similar insulation cement may have been sold under a different alphabetical or numerical designation.

313 Insulation Cement was sold from 1960 until 1971. It was for use with High-Temperature Calsilite[®], which was produced from 1960 until 1971. The product was a composition of asbestos fiber and clay. The asbestos employed in this product was a chrysotile fiber meeting the 0-0-3-13 specification of the Quebec Test.

412 Insulation Cement was sold only subsequent to 1960, until 1971, although this cement may have been sold until 1975. The product was a chrysotile asbestos product. The product designation as "412" Insulation Cement was based on the product's compliance with the standard Quebec Test for a certain grade of fiber, in this case, the 0-0-4-12 Quebec Test.

Insulation cements were manufactured from approximately 1937 to 1975 when the plant was sold.

Calsilite[®] Insulation Cement was first produced in 1951, after two years of development subsequent to commencement of the commercial operation of Ruberoid's Calsilite[®] plant on April 1, 1949. Production of the product ceased in

or around 1960, due to lack of demand, although the product continued to be advertised for sale in various Ruberoid brochures.

T/NA-100 was manufactured from 1962 until 1971. This asbestos paper product was a thin, fully bound two-ply laminated product consisting of an interior layer of asbestos paper bonded with Neoprene to a layer of polyvinylfluoride (Tedlar) plastic film on the exterior of the product. T/NA-100 was also sold with a back surface vapor barrier of Dow "Saran" film. T/NA-100 was manufactured from 1962 to 1971 when it was discontinued. The product never had commercial acceptance.

Flat and corrugated asbestos paper, rollboard and millboard products were manufactured at various times, primarily from 1936 to 1960, but to some degree from 1928 until 1981, when the facility where the product was produced was sold to the Quin-T Corporation, Joliet, Illinois.

The Ruberoid Co. also manufactured: Imperial laminated pipe covering (1928-1954), discontinued due to a lack of commercial success; Watcocell insulation sheets and blocks (1942-1962), discontinued due to improvements in insulation technology such as the introduction of fiberglass pipe coverings; spongefelt (1936-approximately 1960) and woolfelt (1928-1959), discontinued due to lack of commercial success.

For each of these products, asbestos was used for its excellent fire-retardant and heat-resistant qualities.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10:

If your company ever manufactured or sold any of the following types of asbestos products, please identify each product and describe how it is cut, shaped, mixed and applied on the job:

- a. Asbestos cement mixes;
- b. asbestos pipe covering;
- c. asbestos bricks or blocks;
- d. asbestos sheeting, boards or marinite;
- e. asbestos insulation used to protect against extremes of heat as well as cold;
- f. asbestos insulation in loose form which may be blown into homes or buildings;
- g. asbestos applied in spray form;
- h. asbestos tape, cloth, yarn, thread or tape;
- i. asbestos felt or blanket;
- j. asbestos paper;
- k. asbestos gaskets;

giving particular reference as to whether or not the materials have to be sawed or cut on the job, blown into confined areas, or mixed with water into a cement or paste.

ANSWER TO NO. 10:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2(a), (b), (e) and (f). Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF responds as follows:

With respect to the identity of GAF asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products, see GAF's answer to interrogatory 9. With respect to the rest of this interrogatory, GAF responds that it was not a user of these materials, was not an applicator of these materials and has no knowledge concerning the manner of use or application of these products. Each product listed was intended to be used as an industrial thermal insulation product, but the actual field use was undertaken by purchasers or their designees.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11:

Please state if there is any way known to you that the products listed in questions 9 and 10 can be used, applied or installed without the worker involved inhaling any asbestos dust or fibers.

ANSWER TO NO. 11:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General

Objection 4, this defendant responds that it was not a user of these materials, was not an applicator of these materials, and has no knowledge concerning the manner of use or application of these products. Actual field use was determined and undertaken by purchasers or their designees.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12:

Is it possible to distinguish the asbestos products listed by you in Answers 9 and 10 from those manufactured or distributed by a competitor?

- a. If so, please describe how you contend your product can be distinguished and identify each of your products by trade and generic name.
- b. If there are products which, in your opinion, cannot be distinguished from products of a similar kind manufactured by a competitor, please state the name of each such similar product, who manufactured it, as well as the trade name of the product manufactured by your competitor.

ANSWER TO NO. 12:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (b), (d), (j) and (m), 4 and 5. In addition, GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information which is protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege and improperly seeks disclosure under Rule 26(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 26(b)(3) expressly protects mater-

ials prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial, including materials prepared by a party's representatives, from disclosure. Any analysis of GAF's products by GAF, its attorneys, or its attorneys' representatives, would have been or would be prepared in anticipation of litigation or for pending litigation. As such, these materials are protected under Rule 26(b)(3).

GAF further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks discovery of facts known or opinions which may have been or may be held by experts retained by GAF who have not been identified by GAF as trial witnesses.

GAF further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad and seeks discovery of information concerning analyses not related to the present actions. Such information is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

GAF is not an expert in the distinction of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products from those of other entities and therefore cannot state whether such distinction is possible to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. GAF further objects to this interrogatory because it is overbroad to the extent it seeks information about asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products mined, processed, refined, manufactured, sold

or distributed by entities other than GAF of which GAF may be unaware, and because it requires GAF to speculate as to every hypothetical circumstance which would permit distinction of this defendant's products to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty from those of other manufacturers, processors, sellers, marketers or deliverers of such products. Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF responds, on information and belief, that it may be possible to distinguish this defendant's asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products from those of other entities with information obtained from chemical, mineralogical, or other scientific testing and analysis of the asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products by competent, neutral scientists using proper protocol and equipment.

INTERROGATORY NO. 13:

For each asbestos product listed by you in Answer 9 and 10, state whether the product could be used interchangeably with products of other manufacturers, distributors, or sellers; and if so, please identify such product and manufacturer.

ANSWER TO NO. 13:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 4, 5 and 6, and

specifically on the grounds that it seeks information which is protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege and improperly seeks disclosure under Rule 26(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 26(b)(3) expressly protects materials prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial, including materials prepared by a party's representatives, from disclosure. Any analysis of GAF's products by GAF, its attorneys, or its attorneys' representatives, would have been or would be prepared in anticipation of litigation or for pending litigation. As such, these materials are protected under Rule 26(b)(3).

GAF further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks discovery of facts or opinions which may have been or which may be held by experts retained by GAF who have not been identified by GAF as trial witnesses.

GAF further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overly broad and seeks discovery of information concerning analyses not related to the present actions. Such information is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

GAF is not an expert in the distinction of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products from those of other entities and therefore cannot state whether such distinction is possible to a reasonable degree of

scientific certainty. GAF further objects to this interrogatory because it is overbroad to the extent it seeks information about asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products mined, processed, refined, manufactured, sold or distributed by entities other than GAF, of which GAF may be unaware, and because it requires GAF to speculate as to every hypothetical circumstance which would permit distinction of this defendant's products to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty from those of other manufacturers, processors, sellers, marketers or deliverers of such products. Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF responds that certain of this defendant's asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products performed the same generic function as certain of its competitors' asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products.

INTERROGATORY NO. 14:

For each asbestos product listed by you in Answer 9 and 10, state the names and addresses of each New York customer who purchased the product and each New York job site to which the products were delivered by year, and complete a Worksite/Purchase Sales Information Sheet (Attachment II) for each purchaser or worksite.

ANSWER TO NO. 14:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a) and (f), and additionally on the grounds that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The only relevant shipments of this defendant's asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products could be those made to job sites at which a particular plaintiff actually worked during the years in which he worked there. Subject to this objection, GAF responds that it has available certain shipping records of asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products. The information contained in those records is retrievable by reference of year, company shipped to and/or job site shipped to. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(c), this defendant will permit plaintiffs' counsel to review those records at a mutually convenient time at the office of GAF's local counsel.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15:

For each asbestos product you manufactured or sold, state the total dollar, linear feet and/or number of pounds of the product:

- a. Sold in New York State;

b. Sold in the United States.

ANSWER TO NO. 15:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (k) and (l), 2(a) and (f) and 3. GAF also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that theories of liability which shift the burden of proof to defendants, such as market share liability, do not apply to personal injury actions such as the instant cases involving asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products and, therefore, this interrogatory is irrelevant to any issue in these cases and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY NO. 16:

Identify for the period from 1935 to 1980, each distributor, dealer, wholesaler and contractor who sold, distributed or used your asbestos-containing products in New York City and within a 75 mile radius of New York City. For each such distributor, dealer, wholesaler and contractor, state:

- a. The name, last known address and person who you did business with;
- b. The years of your relationship with the distributor, dealer, wholesaler and contractor;

- c. Whether there was a written agreement. If so, identify it (or them) by date, title, signatories and present location;
- d. Whether the relationship was exclusive, i.e., whether the distributor was not allowed to carry competing brands of some or all of the relevant products. If exclusive as to any particular product, identify that product;
- e. The annual volume in pounds and linear feet and dollar amount of each type of asbestos product sold;
- f. The names and ultimate recipients of the asbestos products sold to or through each dealer, distributor, wholesaler, sales agent and contractor.

ANSWER TO NO. 16:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2(a) and (f) and 3. Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant states that it entered into no distributor agreements, although there were credit agreements which may have used the word "distributor". However, GAF believes it entered into no such agreements with distributors, dealers, wholesalers or contractors who purchased this defendant's asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products in the geographical region comprised of the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York.

INTERROGATORY NO. 17:

Identify each of your sales personnel responsible from 1935 to 1980 for sales of asbestos products in New York City and within a 75 mile radius of New York City. For each such person state the years of such employment, his job title, the last known addresses and whether he is still your employee?

ANSWER TO NO. 17:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1 and 2(a) and (f). Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF responds that it is unable to determine the names of sales personnel responsible for sales to the geographical region comprised of the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York other than the following individuals:

Joseph E. Brown, Regional Sales Mgr., Eastern
Region, 1971-72

David D. Jenkins, District Sales Mgr., New
York, 1973-79

Clifford A. Orleman, District Sales Mgr., New
York, 1980-81.

GAF has documents which indicate that a salesman named "Gallagher" made at least one sale of asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products in this region in

1967, and that other salesmen named "James Casella", "Thaney" and "Lutz" each made at least one similar sale in this region in 1969, 1975 and 1976, respectively. In addition, Victor J. Laskosky, now deceased, was Manager, Asbestos Sales, for Ruberoid for an unknown period of time. GAF has no knowledge of whether Mr. Laskosky ever made sales to customers in the geographical region comprised of the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York.

INTERROGATORY NO. 18:

Did you at any time manufacture asbestos-containing products which were sold to another manufacturer for resale by that company under its own name? If so:

- a. Identify each manufacturer to whom such sales were made and the date of such sales;
- b. Identify the product or products involved in each such agreement;
- c. If such sales were made pursuant to an agreement, identify the dates that each such agreement was in effect and produce a copy of the agreement.

ANSWER TO NO. 18:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2(a) and (f) and 3.

Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant believes that The Ruberoid Co. and GAF had two agreements

with other companies from time to time between 1930 and 1979, which agreements may have involved the furnishing of asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products for resale or distribution and which may possibly have been, but are believed not to have been, applicable to sales of products in New York: a relabeling agreement with the Grant Wilson Company, apparently made in the 1930's, which was generally applicable to the sales of certain products, primarily in the midwestern area of the United States; and, a 1963 agreement with Armstrong Contracting and Supply Company, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, under which Ruberoid agreed to sell certain products to that company and attach that company's labels, as and when directed. GAF also is aware of testimony indicating that raw asbestos was sold to Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc. and that some Calsilite® may have been rebranded as an Eagle-Picher product for sale in the Midwest. Other such arrangements may have been undertaken from time to time, for brief periods of time, but apparently none in the New York area.

INTERROGATORY NO. 19:

Did you ever purchase any asbestos or any asbestos-containing products of any other manufacturer for distribution or sale under your name or trademark? If so:

- a. Identify each manufacturer from whom products were purchased;
- b. Identify the name of each product purchased;
- c. Identify the dates of each such purchase and distribution.
- d. Produce a copy of each purchase agreement.

ANSWER TO NO. 19:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2(a) and (f) and 3. Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF believes that Ruberoid and later GAF had an agreement under which Baldwin-Ehret-Hill produced 313 and 412 insulating cements nationally for GAF from time to time from 1960 until 1971, although GAF has no copy of such an agreement. In addition, GAF purchased raw asbestos from Johns-Manville, the United States Government and others from time to time for resale.

INTERROGATORY NO. 20:

Did you ever enter into distribution or licensing agreements with any manufacturer of asbestos-containing products? If so:

- a. Identify each manufacturer with whom such agreement was entered into;
- b. State the dates, products and geographical areas involved;
- c. Produce a copy of each such agreement;

ANSWER TO NO. 20:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2(a) and (f). Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant believes that The Ruberoid Co. and later GAF had two agreements with other companies from time to time between 1930 and 1979, which may possibly have been, but are believed not to have been applicable to sales of GAF products in New York: a relabeling agreement with the Grant Wilson Company, apparently made in the 1930's, which was generally applicable to the sales of certain products, primarily in the midwestern area of the United States; and a 1963 agreement with Armstrong Contracting and Supply Company, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, under which Ruberoid agreed to sell certain products to the Company and attached that Company's labels, as and when directed. GAF also is aware of testimony indicating that raw asbestos was sold to Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc. and that some Calsilite® may have been rebranded as an Eagle-Picher product for sale in the Midwest. Other such arrangements may have been undertaken from time to time, for brief periods of time, but apparently none in the New York area. In addition, this defendant had no "licensing agreements" with other companies in the New York area.

INTERROGATORY NO. 21:

For the period 1928 to the present, state the address of each miner, manufacturer or processor of asbestos or asbestos fibers used in your products and for each such miner, manufacturer or processor state:

- a. The date, amounts and delivery point for each shipment of asbestos you received;
- b. The products in which the asbestos was used.

ANSWER TO NO. 21:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (b), (d), (i) and (m), 2(a), (d) and (f) and 3. Subject to these objections, this defendant responds that it does not have a complete listing of the companies supplying asbestos contained in its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products. However, the following is a partial list of known asbestos suppliers:

Johns-Manville Corporation	United States Government
Vermont Asbestos Group	Carey Canadian Mines, Ltd.
Canadian Johns-Manville Corporation	Asbestos Corporation
Lake Asbestos of Quebec, Ltd.	Bell Mines
	Cape Asbestos
	Union Carbide

INTERROGATORY NO. 22:

With respect to each asbestos product (including loose asbestos fiber) you manufactured, refined, processed, sold or delivered, state whether you claim any caution, warning, caveat or other statement about health involved in using the product and/or dust generated by the product was ever given to purchasers of the product or directed to the users of the product. If so, state separately for each product:

- a. The precise wording of each caution or set of instructions;
- b. For each asbestos product, the exact date you claim each caution was first used on that product;
- c. The inclusive dates you contend any alleged warning was affixed to each of your asbestos-containing products;
- d. Whether the wording of the alleged warning has been altered since its first appearance, and if so, when and how amended;
- e. Specifically what prompted you to first affix such caution, warning, caveat, statement or explanation, and what prompted amendments, (i.e., if medical reports were relied upon, if so, identify such reports).
- f. The name, title and present address of the author of each such warning and/or instructions;
- g. Whether the warning and instructions were physically attached to the product itself when sold and/or delivered by you, and if so, the method of attachment;
- h. Whether you have a copy of the warning and/or instructions in your possession at the present time, and if so, where is it located;

- i. Whether any studies, evaluations or analyses of any potential hazards of your asbestos product were conducted by you prior to your use of each warning and/or instructions. If so, identify the study by date, author, title and file number and state its present location.

ANSWER TO NO. 22:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(j), (k) and (l), 2(a), 3 and 4, GAF responds that on or around April 14, 1964, W.G. Neel of The Ruberoid Co. attended a meeting of the Board of Directors of the National Insulation Manufacturers Association in Chicago, Illinois at which warning labels were discussed. In 1968, Phillip Bettoli attended a conference at which health aspects were discussed. In addition, GAF complied with Government specifications concerning product form, content, packaging and labeling for products to be used in Government-owned and sponsored projects and facilities.

In approximately 1964, The Ruberoid Co. began placing the following warning notices on packages of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products:

CAUTION

THIS PRODUCT CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER.
INHALATION OF ASBESTOS IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES
OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

IF DUST IS CREATED WHEN THIS PRODUCT IS HANDLED,
AVOID BREATHING THE DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION
CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED
BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS
PRODUCING DUST.

Prior to or during 1970, GAF changed the wording and placed the warning label on Calsilite® pipe covering and block, insulation cements, millboard, rollboard, asbestos paper products, and asbestos fiber. In addition, GAF relocated the warning label for these products from the sides to the front of the carton. This warning label read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER. INHALATION IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

AVOID BREATHING DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS PRODUCING DUST.

In approximately 1972, this warning was further changed to read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBERS. AVOID BREATHING DUST. BREATHING ASBESTOS MAY CAUSE SERIOUS BODILY HARM.

Until 1972, GAF's use of these warnings followed major manufacturers in the industry which used such cautionary notices after certain opinions were expressed by some members of the medical profession that there might be a health risk to certain persons who installed industrial ther-

mal insulation products containing asbestos from the inhalation of excessive quantities of asbestos fibers over prolonged periods of time under certain conditions. GAF conducted no studies in connection with the notices set out above. Beginning in 1972, pursuant to the requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, GAF placed the last notice set out above.

All observers of this packaging, including without limitation purchasers, handlers, distributors or contractors or their respective employees, would have seen, and thus received, the warnings set forth above.

INTERROGATORY NO. 23:

State whether any of your distributors, dealers, contractors and/or customers were provided with any warnings, cautions, caveats or instructions regarding the usage of your asbestos-containing products. If so, please state:

- a. By whom and when these instructions were first made;
- b. Whether the instructions were written or oral; if written, attach a copy; if oral, state the contents thereof;
- c. Whether your company carried out follow-up inspections to ascertain whether such instructions were adhered to and if so, please state when, where and by whom such inspections were made and the results of each such inspection.

ANSWER TO NO. 23:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(m), 2(a), (c), (e) and (f). Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant responds that all observers of this defendant's packaging, including without limitation purchasers, handlers, distributors, or contractors, or their respective employees, would have seen, and thus received, the warnings as set out below.

In approximately 1964, The Ruberoid Co. began placing the following warning notices on packages of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products:

CAUTION

THIS PRODUCT CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER.
INHALATION OF ASBESTOS IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES
OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

IF DUST IS CREATED WHEN THIS PRODUCT IS HANDLED,
AVOID BREATHING THE DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION
CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED
BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS
PRODUCING DUST.

Prior to or during 1970, GAF changed the wording and placed the warning label on Calsilite® pipe covering and

block, insulation cements, millboard, rollboard and asbestos paper products and asbestos fiber. In addition, GAF relocated the warning label for these products from the sides to the front of the carton. This warning label read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER. INHALATION IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

AVOID BREATHING DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS PRODUCING DUST.

In approximately 1972, this warning label was further changed to read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBERS. AVOID BREATHING DUST. BREATHING ASBESTOS MAY CAUSE SERIOUS BODILY HARM.

Until 1972, GAF's use of these warnings followed major manufacturers in the industry which used such cautionary notices after certain opinions were expressed by some members of the medical profession that there might be a

health risk to certain persons who installed industrial thermal insulation products containing asbestos from the inhalation of excessive quantities of asbestos fibers over prolonged periods of time under certain conditions. Beginning in 1972, pursuant to the requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, GAF placed the last notice set out above.

With regard to subpart (c), this defendant responds that jobsites were under the control of their owners, employers or contractors. GAF believes that owners, employers or contractors present at jobsites on which this defendant's asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products were installed or otherwise used had a legal duty mandated by state and federal governments to inspect and monitor those jobsites, in the manner required by OSHA and other laws, and this defendant did not have any such legal duty at any time.

INTERROGATORY NO. 24:

State the first time any officers of your Company discussed putting a warning or caution on any asbestos containing product, and as to that first discussion, state:

- a. the names of the persons who were involved in the discussions and the date and place of the discussions;
- b. the identify [sic] and location of all documents memorializing the discussion;

c. the alleged substance of the discussion;

d. what action if any, the Company took as a result of the discussion.

ANSWER TO NO. 24:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2(a) and 4, GAF responds that on or around April 14, 1964, W.G. Neel of The Ruberoid Co. attended a meeting of the Board of Directors of the National Insulation Manufacturers Association in Chicago, Illinois at which warnings were discussed. In addition, GAF complied with Government specifications concerning product form, content, packaging and labeling for products to be used in Government-owned and sponsored projects and facilities.

In approximately 1964, The Ruberoid Co. began placing the following warning notices on packages of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products:

CAUTION

THIS PRODUCT CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER.
INHALATION OF ASBESTOS IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES
OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

IF DUST IS CREATED WHEN THIS PRODUCT IS HANDLED,
AVOID BREATHING THE DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION
CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED
BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS
PRODUCING DUST.

Prior to or during 1970, GAF changed the wording and placed the warning label on Calsilite® pipe covering and block, insulation cements, millboard, rollboard and asbestos paper products and asbestos fiber. In addition, GAF relocated the warning label for these products from the sides to the front of the carton. This warning label read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER. - INHALATION IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

AVOID BREATHING DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS PRODUCING DUST.

In approximately 1972, this warning label was further changed to read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBERS. AVOID BREATHING DUST. BREATHING ASBESTOS MAY CAUSE SERIOUS BODILY HARM.

Until 1972, GAF's use of these warnings followed major manufacturers in the industry which used such cautionary notices after certain opinions were expressed by some members of the medical profession that there might be a health risk to certain persons who installed industrial thermal insulation products containing asbestos from the inhalation of excessive quantities of asbestos fibers over prolonged periods of time under certain conditions. Beginning in 1972, pursuant to the requirements of the Occupational

Safety and Health Act of 1970, GAF placed the last notice set out above.

All observers of this packaging, including without limitation purchasers, handlers, distributors or contractors, or their respective employees, would have seen, and thus received, the warnings as set forth above.

INTERROGATORY NO. 25:

Do you know of any facts or documents to support a claim that you provided any warnings, instructions or information as to the dangers of asbestos inhalation to any insulator, construction worker, building trades worker or other user of your asbestos products in the New York area prior to 1972? If so, for each such alleged warning:

- a. Describe in detail each such warning, instruction or information given;
- b. State the exact date of each such warning;
- c. State whether such warning, instruction or information was oral or written;
- d. If oral, identify the substance of the warning instruction or information given and the date and name of the person to whom given;
- e. If written, or printed attach a copy of each warning, instruction and information, identify it by date given, title and reference number and state the manner and location whereby it was transmitted to users of the product.

ANSWER TO NO. 25:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2(a) and (e) and 4. Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant responds that all observers of this defendant's packaging, including without limitation purchasers, handlers, distributors, or contractors, or their respective employees, would have seen, and thus received, the warnings as set out below.

In approximately 1964, The Ruberoid Co. began placing the following warning notices on packages of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products:

CAUTION

THIS PRODUCT CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER.
INHALATION OF ASBESTOS IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES
OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

IF DUST IS CREATED WHEN THIS PRODUCT IS HANDLED,
AVOID BREATHING THE DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION
CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED
BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS
PRODUCING DUST.

Prior to or during 1970, GAF changed the wording and placed the warning label on Calsilite® pipe covering and block, insulation cements, millboard, rollboard and asbestos paper products and asbestos fiber. In addition, GAF relocated the warning label for these products from the sides to the front of the carton. This warning label read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER. INHALATION IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

AVOID BREATHING DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS PRODUCING DUST.

In approximately 1972, this warning label was further changed to read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBERS. AVOID BREATHING DUST. BREATHING ASBESTOS MAY CAUSE SERIOUS BODILY HARM.

Until 1972, GAF's use of these warnings followed major manufacturers in the industry which used such cau-

tionary notices after certain opinions were expressed by some members of the medical profession that there might be a health risk to certain persons who installed industrial thermal insulation products containing asbestos from the inhalation of excessive quantities of asbestos fibers over prolonged periods of time under certain conditions. Beginning in 1972, pursuant to the requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, GAF placed the last notice set out above.

INTERROGATORY NO. 26:

Do you claim that you ever recommended to purchasers or users of the asbestos-containing products you manufactured, processed, mined, distributed, or sold, that respirators, protective masks and/or protective safeguards be worn while working with, installing or removing your asbestos-containing product? If so, state separately for each product:

- a. The date or dates when each such recommendation was made;
- b. Who made the recommendation;
- c. When and precisely to whom the recommendations were made;
- d. If oral, the manner and substance of the recommendation;
- e. If written, identify the document by title, date, file designation and author of each such recommendation.

tion and the location and present custodian of each such recommendation.

ANSWER TO NO. 26:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a), (e) and (f), 3 and 4. Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant responds that all observers of this defendant's packaging, including without limitation purchasers, handlers, distributors, or contractors, or their respective employees, would have seen, and thus received, the warnings as set out below.

In approximately 1964, The Ruberoid Co. began placing the following warning notices on packages of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products:

CAUTION

THIS PRODUCT CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER.
INHALATION OF ASBESTOS IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES
OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

IF DUST IS CREATED WHEN THIS PRODUCT IS HANDLED,
AVOID BREATHING THE DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION
CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED
BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS
PRODUCING DUST.

Prior to or during 1970, GAF changed the wording and placed the warning label on Calsilite® pipe covering and block,--insulation cements, millboard, rollboard and asbestos paper products and asbestos fiber. In addition, GAF relocated the warning label for these products from the sides to the front of the carton. This warning label read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER. INHALATION IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

AVOID BREATHING DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS PRODUCING DUST.

In approximately 1972, this warning label was further changed to read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBERS. AVOID BREATHING DUST. BREATHING ASBESTOS MAY CAUSE SERIOUS BODILY HARM.

Until 1972, GAF's use of these warnings followed major manufacturers in the industry which used such cau-

tionary notices after certain opinions were expressed by some members of the medical profession that there might be a health risk to certain persons who installed industrial thermal insulation products containing asbestos from the inhalation of excessive quantities of asbestos fibers over prolonged periods of time under certain conditions. Beginning in 1972, pursuant to the requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, GAF placed the last notice set out above.

No list or other compilation of documents relating to this interrogatory exists in discoverable form.

INTERROGATORY NO. 27:

Did you at any time recommend that your own employees use respirators, protective masks or other precautionary safeguards when working with asbestos-containing materials?

If so, state:

- a. When and precisely to whom such recommendations were made;
- b. Whether you ever supplied respirators, face masks to your employees, and if so, the date when first supplied and whether you are supplying them now;
- c. From what specific source you have obtained such respirators and face masks (state address of company and dates obtained).

ANSWER TO NO. 27:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a) and (d).

INTERROGATORY NO. 28:

Have you stopped producing, distributing and/or selling or has asbestos been eliminated from any of the asbestos products listed in Answer 9 or 10? If so, state for each product:

- a. The reason and date you stopped producing the product, or eliminated asbestos;
- b. The names and titles of each person who recommended and who authorized or directed the action;
- c. Whether any studies were conducted before you directed that production and sale of the product be stopped, or asbestos eliminated from the product, and if so, identify each study by date, author, title and subject matter and attach a copy.

ANSWER TO NO. 28:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1 and 2(a), GAF responds:

Calsilite® pipe covering and block products were first manufactured by The Ruberoid Co. on a commercial basis, beginning on March 7 (often stated as April 1), 1949, and then by General Aniline & Film Corporation in 1967 and by GAF Corporation in 1968. Prior to 1949, Calsilite® pipe covering

and block was manufactured by The Ruberoid Co. on a limited pilot/test basis, with the support and at the behest of the U.S. Government, from around November, 1944 until March, 1947, when the facility was classified as a "research project," which classification continued until April 1, 1949.

Subsequent to 1960, Calsilite[®]-Hi was developed; it was manufactured with a higher clay content and could withstand temperatures up to 1800° F. In the mid-1960's, Calsilite[®] SS, an "inhibited" product, was developed to prevent stress corrosion and chloride cracking in austenitic stainless steel piping.

In 1970, GAF developed asbestos-free Calsilite[®], known as Calsilite[®] II or Calsilite[®] A-F, and advised the General Services Administration ("GSA") of GAF's asbestos-free Calsilite[®] product. This information was provided in response to a letter from GSA to GAF regarding purported potential health effects associated with asbestos. GAF's response was contained in a letter from R.W. Henry, Marketing Manager, Insulation & Construction Products, Industrial Products Division, to George R. Tucker, Chief, Hardware and Construction Branch, Standardization Division, General Services Administration.

On March 5, 1971, R.W. Henry and W.C. Schwingen visited the U.S. Naval Ship Engineering Center in Hyatts-

ville, Maryland. Their purpose was to discuss GAF's asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation. On May 12, 1971, W.C. Schwingen discussed with Henry Murad of the Naval Ship Engineering Center, Hyattsville, Maryland, GAF's new asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation product. At or about the same time, W.C. Schwingen spoke with Commander Barboo of the Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and also contacted Ralph Wands of the National Academy of Sciences regarding GAF's asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation.

The United States Navy, however, refused to approve the asbestos-free product for use on government vessels. In light of this development, GAF determined to cease manufacture of Calsilite®. The entire Calsilite® operation was terminated in October, 1971.

Insulation cements of different fiber sizes, commonly known as sizes 115, 214, 313 and 412, were sold by The Ruberoid Co. from 1937 until 1967 and by General Aniline & Film Corporation and then GAF Corporation, from 1967 to 1975 when the plant was sold.

Calsilite® Insulation Cement was first produced in 1951, after two years of development subsequent to commencement of the commercial operation of Ruberoid's Calsilite® plant on April 1, 1949. Production of the product ceased in

or around 1960, due to lack of demand, although the product continued to be advertised for sale in various Ruberoid brochures.

T/NA-100 was discontinued in 1971 due to a lack of commercial success.

Flat and corrugated asbestos paper, rollboard and millboard products were manufactured at various times, primarily from 1936 to 1960, but to some degree from 1928 until 1981, when the facility where the product was produced was sold to the Quin-T Corporation, Joliet, Illinois.

The Ruberoid Co. also manufactured: Imperial laminated pipe covering (1928-1954), discontinued due to a lack of commercial success; Watcocell insulation sheets and blocks (1942-1962), discontinued due to improvements in insulation technology such as the introduction of fiberglass pipe coverings; spongefelt (1936-approximately 1960) and woolfelt (1928-1959), discontinued due to lack of commercial success.

INTERROGATORY NO. 29:

Have any officers or employees of defendant ever discussed or evaluated whether sales of your asbestos products would be damaged if the public learned of the health hazards associated with asbestos exposure? If so, state the dates and names of participants of each such meeting and identify all documents relating to such meetings.

ANSWER TO NO. 29:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation 1(a), (b), (c) and (d) and 2(a) and (f), this defendant responds: no.

INTERROGATORY NO. 30:

At the time of the development of, and sale of each of your asbestos product did you attempt to determine whether the product complied with any allegedly applicable safety standards, orders or rules, regulations or design requirements promulgated by any professional society, association, or government body?

- a. If you did not, please state the reasons for not conducting such an analysis and identify the name of the person deciding not to conduct the analysis;
- b. If you did, identify the safety standards, safety orders, rules, regulations, which you claim you considered by naming the title, number, page, and date of the regulation, and identifying the place where a copy of said regulation can be obtained.

ANSWER TO NO. 30:

Subject to the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (b), (c), (k) and (l), 2(a), 3 and 4, GAF responds that from the beginning of the period during which Ruberoid manufactured asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products, such as Calsilite®, the standards for manufacture were con-

tained in specifications issued by the U.S. Government and other purchasers described below. Ruberoid complied with and produced its Calsilite® to meet these specifications.

Governmental and industrial hygienists adopted a safety standard of 5million particles per cubic foot, and Government studies indicate that asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products such as those manufactured by Ruberoid as used in shipyards and other work places were in compliance with the standard. Further, the President, Congress, and various executive departments adopted that safety standard in the Walsh-Healy Act and perpetuated it in subsequent regulations. In the early 1970's, the United States adopted the standards of the Occupational Safety and Health Act. GAF's products also complied with these standards.

Ruberoid manufactured its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products in compliance with specifications, including military specifications, of agencies and departments of the United States of America. The United States developed specifications for asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products which were used exclusively for Government purposes. The Government required that all products meet its specifications before these products were eligible for use on Government projects. Government

specifications were of two basic types -- military specifications and federal specifications. Military specifications (designated by the prefix "MIL") were applicable to products used on all military projects and installations. Federal specifications (designated primarily as "SS" and "HH") applied to products for use on other Government projects and facilities. These specifications, both military and federal, were periodically revised and reissued. The dates to which specifications apply were indicated on the top right corner of the first page for each specification. Often between revisions the Government issued amendments to specifications. Amendments were usually on one or two-page documents, and made minor changes to existing specifications. As promulgator of such specifications and, in effect, as designer of the products, the Government was principally responsible for defects or injuries caused by the products.

Beginning in 1934, the Navy began developing specifications for industrial thermal insulation products containing asbestos for use on its vessels and by 1937 required the exclusive use of such products. Subsequently, the Navy purchased from Ruberoid, and later GAF, asbestos-containing products meeting these and later-promulgated specifications specifically for use on Navy ships. At the time it supplied asbestos-containing materials to the Navy, neither GAF nor

Ruberoid was informed by the Navy either (1) that the Government's own studies demonstrated potential adverse health effects from airborne asbestos, or (2) that the Navy intended to use the products it purchased from GAF and Ruberoid in a manner whereby persons under the Navy's control would be exposed to harmful quantities of asbestos dust at the Navy's direction.

Government specifications applicable to GAF asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products sold to the United States Navy were promulgated or approved by various agencies and departments of the United States including:

1. General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.
2. Department of Defense
Washington, D.C.; and
3. Department of the Navy
Washington, D.C.

Each Government specification set product requirements applicable to a group or class of products. Upon meeting these requirements, a manufacturer's product could be placed on a "Qualified Product List," which listed all products in such group or class to which the standard applied and that met the requirements. Such products were then eligible for sale, by contract or otherwise, for use in federally-owned and federally-sponsored projects and facilities includ-

ing, but not limited to the construction, outfitting, reconstruction and overhaul of vessels owned and operated by the United States, including without limitation the Navy.

This defendant's asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products met applicable product specifications set by the Government, and were thereupon placed on certain Government "Qualified Product Lists." This defendant's products were thus eligible for purchase by the Government, including without limitation the Department of the Navy, and this defendant was eligible to bid on annual and spot supply and requirements contracts for purchases of asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products. This defendant in fact sold asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products on "Qualified Products Lists", in conformity with Government specifications, by contract and otherwise, for use on and in vessels and facilities constructed, outfitted, repaired and reconstructed by the Government. GAF is aware of no instance in which its products so sold or supplied to the Government did not meet applicable Government specifications in all material aspects.

These specifications are a matter of public record and are equally available to all parties to these actions. To the extent GAF has such specifications, they will be made available to plaintiffs' counsel for inspection and copying.

INTERROGATORY NO. 31:

For each asbestos-containing product, identify and produce all promotional and/or advertising material used by you with regard to the sale and/or promotion and distribution of such products.

ANSWER TO NO. 31:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (d), (k) and (l) and 2(a) and (f). Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF responds that no list or compilation exists in discoverable form of magazines or trade publications in which GAF advertised its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products. However, The Ruberoid Co. (and later GAF) presented product and technical information regarding such products in product brochures and trade and other magazines, and maintained entries in Sweet's Catalogue Files. To the extent GAF has such brochures, they will be made available to plaintiffs' counsel for inspection and copying.

INTERROGATORY NO. 32:

Identify and produce pictures and descriptions of each product.

ANSWER TO NO. 32:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2(a) and 5. In addition, GAF objects to this interrogatory to the extent it requires GAF to create pictures where none exist. Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF responds that to the extent it has product brochures of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products, they will be made available to plaintiffs' counsel for inspection and copying. In addition, see answer to interrogatory No. 9.

INTERROGATORY NO. 33:

Were any brochures, writings, or other materials made available to distributors, dealers, contractors, ultimate users, or the general public concerning the design, manufacture, use, quality and/or properties of the asbestos products referred to in Answer 9 and 10? If so, for each such brochure or other material:

- a. State the purpose of each brochure and given [sic] the name, present address, telephone number of the person responsible for the preparation and acceptance of the material for distribution on behalf of the company;
- b. Identify the brochure or material by author, date and present location and custodian, and attach copies of each.

ANSWER TO NO. 33:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a) and (f), 2(a) and (f), 3 and 4. Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF responds that its asbestos-containing thermal insulation products (described in response to interrogatory No. 9) were the subject of various brochures. No list or compilation of such brochures exists in discoverable form and, accordingly, GAF objects to this interrogatory as being unduly burdensome and oppressive to the extent it could be construed to require it to construct such a list or compilation. GAF, however, does have some examples of brochures regarding the products identified in response to interrogatory No. 9. To the extent it has such brochures, GAF will make them available to plaintiffs' counsel for inspection and copying.

INTERROGATORY NO. 34:

Have you at any time since 1930 bought from, sold to, delivered or supplied any asbestos products to any other defendant in this action or to any other manufacturer listed in Attachment 3? If so:

- a. Identify the products involved by name and description;
- b. List the dates, quantity and price of each sale and the names of the persons who placed or accepted the

order;

- c. Were any warnings regarding the health hazards of the product given or received and if so identify the warning by description, date, to whom it was given and by who received, and if oral state the substance and if written identify the document and state is [sic] present location.

ANSWER TO NO. 34:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a) and 3. Subject to these objections, this defendant responds that it believes that The Ruberoid Co. and later GAF had an agreement under which Baldwin-Ehret-Hill produced 313 and 412 insulating cements nationally for GAF from time to time from 1960 to 1971. The Ruberoid Co. purchased raw asbestos from Johns-Manville, the United States Government and others for resale. In addition, this defendant believes that The Ruberoid Co. and later GAF had two agreements with other companies from time to time between 1930 and 1979, which may possibly have been, but are believed not to have been applicable to sales of GAF products in New York: a relabeling agreement with the Grant Wilson Company, apparently made in the 1930's, which was generally applicable to the sales of certain products, primarily in the midwestern area of the United States; and, a 1963 agreement with Armstrong Contracting and Supply

Company, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, under which Ruberoid agreed to sell certain products to the Company and attached that Company's labels, as and when directed. GAF also is aware of testimony indicating that raw asbestos was sold to Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc. and that some Calsilite® may have been rebranded as an Eagle-Picher product for sale in the Midwest.

GAF further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that the only orders of asbestos products that could be relevant are those where the products were delivered to jobsites at which and during years in which plaintiffs actually worked. Subject to this objection, this defendant responds that all observers of this defendant's packaging, including without limitation purchasers, handlers, distributors, or contractors, or their respective employees, would have seen, and thus received, the warnings as set out below.

In approximately 1964, The Ruberoid Co. began placing the following warning notices on packages of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products:

CAUTION

THIS PRODUCT CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER.
INHALATION OF ASBESTOS IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES
OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

IF DUST IS CREATED WHEN THIS PRODUCT IS HANDLED,
AVOID BREATHING THE DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION
CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED
BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS
PRODUCING DUST.

Prior to or during 1970, GAF changed the wording
and placed the warning label on Calsilite® pipe covering and
block, insulation cements, millboard, rollboard and asbestos
paper products and asbestos fiber. In addition, GAF relo-
cated the warning label for these products from the sides to
the front of the carton. This warning label read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER. INHALATION IN EXCESSIVE
QUANTITIES OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

AVOID BREATHING DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION CONTROL
IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED BY THE U.S.
BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS PRODUCING DUST.

In approximately 1972, this warning label was further changed to read as follows:

CAUTION
CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBERS. AVOID BREATHING DUST.
BREATHING ASBESTOS MAY CAUSE SERIOUS BODILY HARM.

Until 1972, GAF's use of these warnings followed major manufacturers in the industry which used such cautionary notices after certain opinions were expressed by some members of the medical profession that there might be a health risk to certain persons who installed industrial thermal insulation products containing asbestos from the inhalation of excessive quantities of asbestos fibers over prolonged periods of time under certain conditions. Beginning in 1972, pursuant to the requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, GAF placed the last notice set out above.

INTERROGATORY NO. 35:

With respect to any product manufactured by you which does not contain asbestos, have you ever included a warning with the product indicating that it may in some way be harmful to human beings? If so, for each such non-asbestos containing product state:

- a. The name of the product, its intended use or purpose and the chemical composition or ingredients of the product;
- b. The manner in which it is thought that the product may cause harm to human beings;
- c. The size, color and contents of each warning;
- d. The date warning was first given to the public;
- e. The names, addresses and titles of the people responsible for or participating in the decision to provide the warning; and
- f. Identify every document which relates to the making of the decision to provide a warning.

ANSWER TO NO. 35:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (b), (c) and (j), 2(a) and (b), 3 and 4.

INTERROGATORY NO. 36:

Were any of the asbestos-containing products sold by you to private persons or companies (i.e., non-military or non-governmental sales) the same products you sold to the government pursuant to military or federal specifications? If so please state:

- a. Your name or designation for the product;
- b. The military or federal specification you claim is applicable;
- c. The person or company to whom sold and the

date and amount sold.

ANSWER TO NO. 36:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2(a). GAF further objects on the grounds that this interrogatory is irrelevant to the subject matter of these actions and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF responds that the United States Government purchased the vast bulk of this defendant's asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products. Accordingly, federal and military specifications controlled the manufacturing of such products and thus set standards for this defendant for the specification of such products. For further details regarding these specifications, see GAF's answer to interrogatory 30.

INTERROGATORY NO. 37:

Do you claim that you did anything prior to 1972 to notify users of asbestos-containing products of the possible dangers of inhalation of asbestos dust and fibers? If so, explain in detail what you did, to whom and give the dates.

ANSWER TO NO. 37:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including

without limitation General Objections 2(a), 3 and 4. Without waiving these objections, this defendant responds:

GAF complied with Government specifications concerning product form, content, packaging and labeling for products to be used in Government-owned and sponsored projects and facilities.

In approximately 1964, The Ruberoid Co. began placing the following warning notices on packages of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products:

CAUTION

THIS PRODUCT CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER.
INHALATION OF ASBESTOS IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES
OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

IF DUST IS CREATED WHEN THIS PRODUCT IS HANDLED,
AVOID BREATHING THE DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION
CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED
BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS
PRODUCING DUST.

Prior to or during 1970, GAF changed the wording and placed the warning label on Calsilite® pipe covering and block, insulation cements, millboard, rollboard and asbestos paper products and asbestos fiber. In addition, GAF relocated the warning label for these products from the sides to

the front of the carton. This warning label read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER. INHALATION IN EXCESSIVE
QUANTITIES OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

AVOID BREATHING DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION CONTROL
IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED BY THE U.S.
BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS PRODUCING DUST.

In approximately 1972, this warning label was fur-
ther changed to read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBERS. AVOID BREATHING DUST.
BREATHING ASBESTOS MAY CAUSE SERIOUS BODILY HARM.

Until 1972, GAF's use of these warnings followed major manufacturers in the industry which used such cautionary notices after certain opinions were expressed by some members of the medical profession that there might be a health risk to certain persons who installed industrial thermal insulation products containing asbestos from the inhalation of excessive quantities of asbestos fibers over pro-

longed periods of time under certain conditions. Beginning in 1972, pursuant to the requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, GAF placed the last notice set out above.

All observers of this packaging, including without limitation purchasers, handlers, distributors, or contractors, or their respective employees, would have seen, and thus received, the warnings as set forth above.

INTERROGATORY NO. 38

Had you at any time prior to 1973 performed, participated in, or financed any tests, studies, investigations or analyses to determine the asbestos level produced when your asbestos products were used, installed or removed from a prior installation?

ANSWER TO NO. 38:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(m) and 2(a), 3 and 4, this defendant responds: no, not to the best of our knowledge. GAF did not have a legal duty or responsibility to perform dust monitoring tests at jobsites.

INTERROGATORY NO. 39

Had you at any time prior to 1973 performed, participated or financed any tests, studies, investigations or

analyses to determine the effects of your product on workers using or working with any of your asbestos products?

ANSWER TO NO. 39

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(m) and 2(a), 3 and 4 this defendant responds: no, not to the best of our knowledge. GAF did not have a legal duty or responsibility to perform dust monitoring tests at jobsites.

INTERROGATORY NO. 40

Had you, at anytime prior to 1973 performed, participated in or financed any tests, studies, investigations or analyses which had the purpose to prevent, minimize, or eliminate inhalation of asbestos dust or fibers by those using or exposed to your asbestos products?

ANSWER TO NO. 40

Subject to the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2(a) and 3 GAF responds, no. However, in 1970, GAF developed asbestos-free Calsilite[®], known as Calsilite[®] II or Calsilite[®] A-F, and advised the General Services Administration ("GSA") of GAF's asbestos-free Calsilite[®] product. This information was provided in response to a letter from GSA to GAF regarding purported potential health effects associated with asbestos.

GAF's response was contained in a letter from R.W. Henry, Marketing Manager, Insulation & Construction Products, Industrial Products Division, to George R. Tucker, Chief, Hardware and Construction Branch, Standardization Division, General Services Administration.

On March 5, 1971, R.W. Henry and W.C. Schwingen visited the U.S. Naval Ship Engineering Center in Hyattsville, Maryland. Their purpose was to discuss GAF's asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation. On May 12, 1971, W.C. Schwingen discussed with Henry Murad of the Naval Ship Engineering Center, Hyattsville, Maryland, GAF's new asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation product. At or about the same time, W.C. Schwingen spoke with Commander Barboo of the Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and also contacted Ralph Wands of the National Academy of Sciences regarding GAF's asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation.

The United States Navy, however, refused to approve the asbestos-free product for use on government vessels. In light of this development, GAF determined to cease manufacture of Calsilite®. The entire Calsilite® operation was terminated in October, 1971.

INTERROGATORY NO. 41:

Had you at any time prior to 1973 performed, funded or participated in any investigation, study, test or analysis concerning asbestos-related diseases, asbestosis, pulmonary diseases or cancer.

ANSWER TO NO. 41:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2 and 3. Subject to these objections, this defendant responds, no, not to the best of our knowledge.

INTERROGATORY NO. 42:

Had you, at any time prior to 1973 performed, participated in or financed any tests, studies, investigations or analyses to determine the effects of inhalation of asbestos dust or fibers on anyone using or being exposed to asbestos products manufactured by your company?

ANSWER TO NO. 42:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2 and 3, this defendant responds: no, not to the best of our knowledge. GAF did not have a legal duty or responsibility to perform dust monitoring tests at jobsites.

INTERROGATORY NO. 43:

Have you ever performed, participated in or financed any studies to determine whether any type of respirator and/or protective mask would either eliminate or reduce asbestos inhalation to safe levels?

ANSWER TO NO. 43:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a) and (b), 3 and 4, this defendant responds, no.

INTERROGATORY NO. 44:

Have you ever undertaken or financed any tests or studies to determine whether any type of ventilator or ventilating system would eliminate or decrease the number of airborne asbestos fibers in confined spaces?

ANSWER TO NO. 44:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a), (b) and (d), 3 and 4, this defendant responds, no.

INTERROGATORY NO. 45:

For each study identified in response to Questions 38-44, state:

- a. The subject matter, title, date and names of

the persons who conducted and/or authored the study;

- b. The reason for the study;
- c. The date the study was completed;
- d. If the results were disseminated, where and to whom and if published the name and identity of the publication;
- e. The results of each study, and the date and assumptions relied on;
- f. If in writing, identify it by date, title, identification number, present location and custodian and attach a copy.

ANSWER TO NO. 45:

Not applicable.

INTERROGATORY NO. 46:

State whether you took any action as a result of any of the studies listed in answer to interrogatories 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 and 44. If so:

- a. Describe the date and action taken;
- b. Identify who authorized or directed the action;
- c. Why was the action taken;
- d. Identify all documents discussing the study the action considered and the action taken by date, title, subject, author and present custodian and location and produce the documents;
- e. If you have not taken any action state in detail, why not;
- f. If you have not given any consideration to taking such actions, state in detail the reasons why.

ANSWER TO NO. 46:

Not applicable.

INTERROGATORY NO. 47:

From the year 1920 to date, have you supported by gift, grant, direct cash or property payment any kind of medical research concerning asbestos? If so, state:

- a. The date or dates of such support;
- b. The dollar amount paid or contributed;
- c. The identity of the persons and/or organizations carrying out the research study;
- d. The title, name or other identification of each such study;
- e. Identify and produce all documents relating to each such study.

ANSWER TO NO. 47:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2, this defendant responds, no.

INTERROGATORY NO. 48:

Have you, at any time prior to 1975, conducted, financed, or had conducted for you any asbestos inspection or made any dust count in any facility where your asbestos products were used? If so, state the date, place and people involved in each such inspection or test and identify all records.

ANSWER TO NO. 48:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a) and (d) and 3, this defendant responds: no, not to the best of our knowledge. GAF did not have a legal duty or responsibility to perform dust monitoring tests at jobsites.

INTERROGATORY NO. 49:

Had you, at any time prior to 1975, conducted, financed, or had conducted for you any asbestos inspection or made any dust count in any of your own plants which are or were engaged in the manufacture of asbestos products. If so, state the date, place and people involved in each such inspection or test, the results of the tests and identify all records.

ANSWER TO NO. 49:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2 and 4. Conditions in this defendant's plants are not an issue in these litigations. Accordingly, this interrogatory is irrelevant and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY NO. 50:

Does your company recognize that workers in the following trades were foreseeable users of your asbestos products? If so, when did you come to such a recognition?

- a. Pipe Ladders;
- b. Pipe Fitters;
- c. Welders;
- d. Burners;
- e. Sheetmetal Workers;
- f. Tapers;
- g. Chippers;
- h. Plasterers;
- i. Riggers;
- j. Grinders;
- k. Inspectors;
- l. Shipwrights;
- m. Painters;
- n. Boilermakers;
- o. Insulators;
- p. Custodians;
- q. Planners;
- r. Testers;
- s. Teachers;

ANSWER TO NO. 50:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General objections 2(a), (b) and (c), 3 and 4. In addition, GAF's present knowledge is irrelevant to any issue in these cases. GAF further objects that as a manufacturer and seller only, it had no control or discretion over the use or application of its products. GAF further objects that this interrogatory is impossible to answer as framed, is impossible to answer outside of the context of a particular plaintiff's case and calls for speculation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 51:

Does your company recognize that the types of workers listed in Question 50 would be exposed to asbestos in the course of working on jobs where other trades would be using asbestos products?

ANSWER TO NO. 51:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a) and (j), 2(a) and (b), 3 and 4. This interrogatory seeks a medical conclusion which this defendant is unqualified to give. In addition, this defendant's present knowledge is irrelevant to any issue in these cases. GAF further objects that this interrogatory is impossible to answer as framed, impossible to answer outside of the context of a particular plaintiff's case and calls for speculation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 52:

Does your company recognize that it was foreseeable that people working in the same area where your asbestos products were being used or installed would inhale and/or ingest asbestos fibers emitted from your products?

ANSWER TO NO. 52:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including

without limitation General Objections 1(a) and (j), 2(a) and (b), 3 and 4. This interrogatory seeks a medical conclusion which this defendant is unqualified to give. In addition, this defendant's present knowledge is irrelevant to any issue in these cases. GAF further objects that this interrogatory is impossible to answer as framed, is impossible to answer outside of the context of a particular plaintiff's case and calls for speculation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 53:

Does your company recognize that it was foreseeable that trademen listed in Question 50 would inhale and/or ingest asbestos fibers released from your asbestos products?

ANSWER TO NO. 53:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a) and (j), 2(a) and (b), 3 and 4. This interrogatory seeks a medical conclusion which this defendant is unqualified to give. In addition, this defendant's present knowledge is irrelevant to any issue in these cases. GAF further objects that this interrogatory is impossible to answer as framed, is impossible to answer outside of the context of a particular plaintiff's case and calls for speculation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 54:

Do you contend that any respirators or other breathing devices would prevent inhalation of the asbestos dust and fibers released from your product? If so, state:

- a. When the respirator was sold;
- b. Give the detailed description of such respirator or other breathing device;
- c. The first date you reached the conclusion;
- d. The basis of your claim that use of the respirator will prevent the inhalation of such dust and fibers;
- e. Identify any relevant tests performed by date, title, author and number.

ANSWER TO NO. 54:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (j) and (l), 2(a) and (b), 3 and 4. Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF is aware that there are and have been respirators or other breathing devices whose manufacturers have claimed that if properly used are supposed to limit the inhalation of asbestos dust and fibers.

INTERROGATORY NO. 55:

From the year 1930 to the present, identify:

- a. The name of each physician in your employ and/or the employ of your subdivision or contract unit;

- b. The current and/or last known address for each such individual;
- c. The dates of employment of each such individual;
- d. The job duties and/or responsibilities for each such individual identified;
- e. The duration of each such individual's employment, the office address or duty assignment location held by each such individual, and the dates associated with each such assignment.

ANSWER TO NO. 55:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections and on the grounds that conditions in GAF's facilities, including provision for safety and health in same, are not at issue in these litigations and, therefore, this interrogatory is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is irrelevant to the subject matter of these litigations. Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant responds, not applicable. GAF did not employ physicians. From time to time during the period beginning in approximately 1930, this defendant called upon local physicians to perform routine physical examinations and to administer routine medical treatment when and if necessary.

INTERROGATORY NO. 56:

Have you, at any time since 1930, maintained any office or department dealing with medical research? If so, state:

- a. The name and location of such department; and
- b. The name, address and title of each person who has been in charge of the department.

ANSWER TO NO. 56:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2. Subject to the foregoing objections, GAF responds: no, this defendant never had a medical research office or department.

INTERROGATORY NO. 57:

From the year 1930 to the present, state:

- a. The address of each medical library maintained by you or your subdivisions and/or contract units;
- b. When each such library came into existence;
- c. The custodian of each such library facility records, such as individual's dates of employment and last known address or current address.

ANSWER TO NO. 57:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2, this defendant responds that neither GAF Corpo-

ration nor The Ruberoid Co. maintained a central corporate medical library although certain employees may have from time to time maintained or possessed personal files containing periodicals and other literature relating to asbestos, its use and qualities. For example, some information was kept by Mr. Harry Mesler while he headed corporate safety for the company from approximately the early 1960's into 1971. Mr. Mesler died on August 29, 1972. The whereabouts of any such materials is unknown.

INTERROGATORY NO. 58:

For each facility identified in response to the two preceding Interrogatories, state the name or title of each medical journal or periodical subscribed to and the inclusive dates of each such subscription.

ANSWER TO NO. 58:

Not applicable.

INTERROGATORY NO. 59:

Other than the medical library facilities referenced in the answers to the immediately preceding three Interrogatories, state the identity of each medical library, from 1930 to date, in which you held a membership, or funded by way of contribution, gift, grant, or any other direct cash or property payments.

ANSWER TO NO. 59:

Subject to the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2, this defendant responds, none.

INTERROGATORY NO. 60:

State the names and addresses of all professional, trade, industrial, safety, hygiene, or health associations and research foundations or organization you have been a member of since 1930 indicating for each association:

- a. The inclusive dates of your membership;
- b. The names of your employees who attended meetings and the dates and designations of such meetings;
- c. The positions held by any of your employees;
- d. The location of all minutes, digests, reports and documents received or concerning such association.

ANSWER TO NO. 60:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections and on the further grounds that it is overly broad and seeks information not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, including without limitation in that it seeks information not relating to asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products. Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant responds that, relative to the manufacture of

asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products,
this defendant was a member of the following industrial
groups or organizations:

National Insulation Manufacturer's Association,
Inc.
441 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017
Beginning sometime prior to 1962 until 1971

Thermal Insulation Manufacturers Associations
New York, New York
1979-1981

Asbestos Information Association/North America
Suite 914
1660 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
1971-1977

National Safety Council
New York, New York
Beginning sometime prior to 1966 - present

American Society for Testing Materials
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
1946-present

GAF is aware of documents reflecting that General Aniline & Film Corporation was a new member of the Industrial Health Foundation, New York, New York, during the years 1945 to 1947, a period when General Aniline & Film Corporation was under government ownership and was not involved in any business related to asbestos, and further reflecting that The Ruberoid Co. was a new member for a limited period in 1953-1954. GAF does not have any internal documents which reflect actual, as opposed to contemplated, membership at any time. Moreover, this defendant knows of no evidence that it ever received any IHF documents at any time.

Representatives of this defendant, of other companies and of the United States Navy served voluntarily on a number of ASTM committees and subcommittees. Specifically, this defendant's representatives served on subcommittee C-16, which dealt with high temperature thermal insulation, from 1950 to 1971.

At various times in this period, this defendant's representatives on subcommittee C-16 were J.M. High, Thomas J. Walters, Duane Davis, and William Schwingen. No list of documents relating to this interrogatory exists in discoverable form.

INTERROGATORY NO. 61:

When did you first learn that there were health hazards associated with the use and/or fabrication of asbestos containing products? State the date, source, nature and extent of such information.

ANSWER TO NO. 61:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a) and 3. In addition, GAF objects on the grounds that the phrase "use and/or fabrication" is too vague and ambiguous to permit reasonable interpretation. Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant responds that, prior to approximately 1964, Ruberoid officials were not aware of any potential health hazard from asbestos related to the use and/or fabrication of its industrial thermal insulation products. In approximately 1964, Ruberoid became aware of certain opinions expressed by

some members of the medical profession that inhalation of asbestos in excessive quantities from certain products over long periods of time could be harmful to certain persons, although the opinions did not relate to the use of Ruberoid products. At approximately the same time, Ruberoid commenced providing its warnings. In approximately 1968 or 1969, GAF received further information that inhalation of asbestos fibers could be harmful but GAF did not receive specific medical information on the results of such exposure. Upon the enactment of the federal Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, GAF became aware of tests and examinations made as a result of that legislation. No list or other compilation of documents relating to this interrogatory exists in discoverable form.

INTERROGATORY NO. 62:

Have you knowledge of any deaths or cases of lung disease or lung impairment prior to 1975 among your employees engaged in the manufacture or use of asbestos products which are attributable to, or were alleged to be caused by, the inhalation of asbestos dust or fibers? If so, please give the name and address of each such employee, identify all medical records possessed in relation to the employee and state whether reports of occupational disease were furnished to any bureau, branch or governmental body of the relevant

state; attach copies of the latter.

ANSWER TO NO. 62:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a) and (d), 5 and 6. The information requested is privileged and confidential. GAF further objects on the grounds that its current "knowledge" is irrelevant to this litigation. GAF further objects to this interrogatory on the ground that it calls for speculation on the part of GAF and seeks a medical conclusion. Furthermore, GAF objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information regarding GAF employees, which is irrelevant to this litigation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 63:

If any of your employees or officers have testified at trial or by deposition in any litigation or before any Congressional Committee or administrative agency concerning asbestos exposure, pulmonary or asbestos-related diseases or industrial hygiene relating to asbestos use, state:

- a. The name, address and title of each person who testified;
- b. The date, location and forum of such testimony;
- c. Whether the defendant has a copy of such testimony;

d. Whether the defendant will voluntarily produce a copy of such testimony.

ANSWER TO NO. 63:

GAF has been a defendant in over 56,000 personal injury actions allegedly involving its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products -- far too many to definitively answer this interrogatory. However, to the best of GAF's knowledge, the following is a list of GAF/Ruberoid personnel who have testified either at trial or deposition in actions involving its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products:

Herbert Abrons, Former Counsel

Michael J. Baker, Records Retention Mgr.

Herbert Baumstart, former Plant Purchasing/Traffic

Jonathan Berger, Former Vice President of Human Resources

Phillip S. Bettoli, Retired, Former Technical Director

Charles F. Bien, Retired, Former Chief Environmental Engineer

Pat Corbutt, Former Assistant Secretary

Philip Dalton, Retired, Former President

Leo Faneuf, Retired, Former Vice President and Director of Manufacturing and Building Materials

William Fassuliotis, Former Director of Safety & Occupational Health

R. Power Fraser, Jr., Deceased, Former Vice President and General Manager of Industrial Products Division

Thomas Gaddittis, Retired, Former Manager of Manufacturing Roof and Granule

Jack Gow, Retired, Former Senior Vice President of Personnel Relations

Joseph G. Hall, Retired, Former Senior Vice President for Corporate Relations

Richard W. Henry, deceased, Former Market Manager for Calsilite® products

Jack Holloway, Former Environmental Engineer

James J. Iaquinto, Former Manager of Sales Administration of the Industrial Products Division of GAF Corp.

Howard Johnston, Retired, Former Personnel Manager of Chemical Group Manufacturing

Harry H. Kaufman, Retired, Former Assistant Director of Quality Control

Robert Klein, Former Controller for Building Materials Plant

Stanley L. Leach, Former Payroll Clerk (Ruberoid)

Charles Limerick, Former Vice President of Operations (Ruberoid)

Bernard Lokuta, Former Staff Engineer of Technical Services (Ruberoid)

Lawrence E. Lyons, Retired, Former Purchasing Specialist (Ruberoid)

Wilbur G. Neel, Retired, Former Director of Sales/Trade Relations of Asbestos Fibre and Industrial Insulation

William Nelson, Retired, Former Plant Mgr.

E.J. O'Leary, Retired, Former President and Chief of Board of Directors (Ruberoid)

Wayne Page, Former Vice President, Manufacturing of Consumer Products Group.

Clell Pickens, Retired, Former Plant Supervisor

Louis Sarlo, Former Mfg. Coordinator

William C. Schwingen, Vice President, Research and Commercial Development, GAF Building Materials Corporation

Hazel Sutton, Former Plant Accountant

Phillip Teague, Retired, Former Plant Mgr.

Harold James Vickery, Safety Coordinator

Copies of testimony by the foregoing persons, where available, shall be provided upon request to plaintiffs at the offices of its local counsel.

INTERROGATORY NO. 64:

Have you or any employee or agent of yours ever communicated with an agency or department of the United States concerning specifications and/or standard for any asbestos product or thermal insulation product? If so state separately for each product or set of specifications:

- a. Identify each such product and its military or federal specification or standard;
- b. The intended purpose or use for the product so specified;

c. The date, time and place of each communication including:

- (1) The name of each of your agents or employees who participated in each communication;
- (2) The names, titles, and agencies of each individual with whom such communication was had;
- (3) The subject of the communication;
- (4) Whether any notes, minutes or memoranda in any form were recorded of such communication or of any meetings between you and the agency;
- (5) Whether any documents were submitted to the agency;
- (6) If (4) or (5) is answered in the affirmative state the name, and location of the custodian of such records.

ANSWER TO NO. 64:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (d), (f) and (k) and 2(a). Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant responds as follows:

Asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products manufactured or sold by this defendant for use in Government-owned, Government-sponsored and Government-controlled projects and facilities complied in all material respects with specifications promulgated by the United

States, its departments and agencies. Specifically, in order to be eligible to bid on, and contract to sell, products for use on and in Government vessels and facilities, it was necessary for a manufacturer to have its products placed on "Qualified Products Lists". Products placed on "Qualified Products Lists" were required to meet all military and federal specifications applicable to such products. GAF's asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products met applicable product specifications set by the Government, and were on the Government's "Qualified Products Lists." GAF's products were thus eligible for purchase by the Government, including without limitation the Department of the Navy, and this defendant was eligible to bid on annual and spot supply and requirements contracts for purchases of thermal insulation products on "Qualified Products Lists," in conformity with government specifications, by contract and otherwise, for use on and in vessels and facilities constructed, outfitted, repaired and re-constructed by the Government. GAF is aware of no instance in which its products sold or supplied to the Government did not meet applicable Government specifications in all material respects.

Asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products manufactured or sold for use in Government-owned, Government-sponsored and Government-controlled projects which

complied in material respects with specifications promulgated by the Government, its departments and agencies include the following:

- a. Calsilite® pipe covering;
- b. Calsilite® block;
- c. asbestos insulation cement; and
- d. certain asbestos paper and millboard products.

GAF's principal direct communications with the United States related to specifications for non-asbestos products intended for use on United States Navy vessels which would replace asbestos products required by the Navy. In 1970, GAF developed asbestos-free Calsilite®, known as Calsilite® II or Calsilite® A-F, and advised the General Services Administration ("GSA") of GAF's asbestos-free Calsilite® product. This information was provided in response to a letter from GSA to GAF regarding purported potential health effects associated with asbestos. GAF's response was contained in a letter from R.W. Henry, Marketing Manager, Insulation & Construction Products, Industrial Products Division, to George R. Tucker, Chief, Hardware and Construction Branch, Standardization Division, General Services Administration.

On March 5, 1971, R.W. Henry and W.C. Schwingen visited the U.S. Naval Ship Engineering Center in Hyatts-

ville, Maryland. Their purpose was to discuss GAF's asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation. On May 12, 1971, W.C. Schwingen discussed with Henry Murad of the Naval Ship Engineering Center, Hyattsville, Maryland, GAF's new asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation product. At or about the same time, W.C. Schwingen spoke with Commander Barboo of the Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and also contacted Ralph Wands of the National Academy of Sciences regarding GAF's asbestos-free calcium silicate thermal insulation.

The United States Navy, however, refused to approve the asbestos-free product for use on government vessels. In light of this development, GAF determined to cease manufacture of Calsilite®. The entire Calsilite® operation was terminated in October, 1971.

The United States Navy also initiated communications in the 1940's with respect to matters pertaining to the war effort and the expertise and assistance which commercial and industrial companies could lend to these efforts, including the manufacturing of products required by the Navy in the war effort. It is not known whether such inquiries related to the setting of specifications.

With respect to this defendant's development of a non-asbestos calcium silicate industrial thermal insulation

product, and the United States Navy's refusal to approve the non-asbestos product or adopt or promulgate specifications permitting the use of such a non-asbestos product, this defendant has a limited amount of correspondence between GAF and the Navy which demonstrates: (1) the Navy's pervasive knowledge of the properties of asbestos, including its potential for causing injury when used improperly by the Navy on naval vessels, and (2) the Navy's refusal to approve a non-asbestos product for use on naval vessels.

No list, compilation, summary or abstract of the documents sought by this interrogatory presently exists in discoverable form. GAF has in its possession: documents relating to military and federal specifications for products in which the United States required explicitly and implicitly the inclusion of asbestos; Government supply contracts; Government purchase and shipping orders; correspondence; and reports by officials and agents of the Government confirming that certain of this defendant's products were in conformance with applicable Government specifications and that products sold to the Government met such specifications in all material respects.

To the best of this defendant's knowledge, its products conformed with the following specifications, their predecessors, successors and amendments:

1. MIL-I-002819 (SHIPS)
2. MIL-I-24244
3. MIL-I-2781
4. -MIL-I-2819
5. MIL-C-2908
6. HH-I-00523
7. HH-I-523
8. HH-I-561

These government specifications were periodically revised by the United States, its agencies and departments. The dates on which revisions occurred are a matter of public record and are equally available to plaintiffs as to this defendant.

To the extent this defendant has responsive documents other than those which are a matter of public record, such documents will be made available to plaintiffs, subject to the foregoing objections. Certain documents identified above are a matter of public record and may be found at certain departments and agencies of the United States including:

1. General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.
2. United States Department of Defense
Washington, D.C.
3. Department of the Navy
Washington, D.C.

INTERROGATORY NO. 65:

Does your company recognize that:

- a. Asbestos causes asbestosis;
- b. Asbestos exposure leads to an individual contracting asbestosis;
- c. There is a correlation between exposure to asbestos and the occurrence of asbestosis;
- d. Asbestos causes lung cancer;
- e. There is a correlation between asbestos exposure and the occurrence of lung cancer;
- f. Asbestos contributes to the development of gastrointestinal cancer;
- g. That a portion of inhaled asbestos fibers remain in the lungs after being inhaled into the human body and are not destroyed?
- h. The symptoms of asbestosis and other asbestos-induced lung diseases or cancers may not manifest themselves until many years after the asbestos was inhaled into the body?
- i. Prolonged use of the asbestos material can cause or contribute to various occupational diseases, including asbestosis, mesothelioma, cancer and other lung and respiratory diseases?
- j. The use of asbestos insulating products listed in Answer (10) are dangerous and harmful to human health?
- k. There is a connection between the inhalation of asbestos dust and fibers and the disease mesothelioma?

If your answer to any part of this question is "Yes", explain when you came to this knowledge and what, if anything, you have done about it to notify the public or

users of your products. If your answer is that your products are not harmful then explain what facts and tests were made upon which you base such conclusion.

ANSWER TO NO. 65:

GAF objects to this interrogatory for the reasons set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. GAF also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks expert medical opinions. In addition, this defendant's present knowledge is irrelevant to any issue in the instant cases and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, GAF objects because it is impossible to answer this interrogatory as framed and is impossible to answer and irrelevant outside of the context of a particular plaintiff's case.

INTERROGATORY NO. 66:

Have any workman's compensation claims based on asbestosis, mesothelioma, lung cancer, other cancers, asbestos-induced diseases, or lung diseases been filed against you? If so, for each claim state:

- a. The date, place filed, reference numbers and outcome of each claim;
- b. Whether you advised your workers' compensation carrier of the claims;

- c. The location and custodian of all records of claims and correspondence with your compensation carrier.

ANSWER TO NO. 66:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1 and 2, on the grounds that it is overbroad and on the grounds that these actions do not involve workers' compensation claims and that documentation of workers' compensation claims is uniformly excluded from evidence, is not calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is confidential.

INTERROGATORY NO. 67:

Have you as part of your business ever employed any steam plant operators, boiler repair workers, insulator or had a division or unit which installed insulation materials on a contract by contract basis (e.g., a "contract unit")?

If so, state:

- a. The location where such persons or unit was based;
- b. The names of the operators or managers of the contract units;
- c. Whether there existed rules, regulations and/or work practices which were to be followed by such employees;
- d. Were such employees ever required to wear respirators. If so, please state:

- (1) Whether the requirement was by written regulation or oral direction;
 - (2) The names of the people in your firm originating such a requirement and/or in charge of enforcing it;
 - (3) The date the requirement was imposed for the first time.
- e. Have such former employees ever filed workmen's compensation claims due to lung or coronary illness. If so, for each such claim, state the date, jurisdiction and docket number and outcome of the claims.

ANSWER TO NO. 67:

No.

INTERROGATORY NO. 68:

State the total number of employees of yours or your contract unit receiving benefits under any Occupational Disease or Workers Compensation statute for asbestosis, mesothelioma, bronchogenic carcinoma and/or cancer of the stomach, colon or rectum for each year, from the date that you first manufactured, distributed or sold any asbestos-containing products until the present time.

ANSWER TO NO. 68:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1 and 2, and on the grounds that these actions do not involve workers' compensation claims and that documentation of workers' compensation

claims is uniformly excluded from evidence, is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is confidential.

INTERROGATORY NO. 69:

State by year the total dollar amount paid out by you, your contract unit and/or your insurance carrier as a result of claims under any Occupational Disease or Workers' Compensation statute for asbestosis, mesothelioma, bronchogenic carcinoma and/or cancer of the stomach, colon or rectum.

ANSWER TO NO. 69:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1 and 2, and on the grounds that these actions do not involve workers' compensation claims and that documentation of workers' compensation claims is uniformly excluded from evidence, is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is confidential.

INTERROGATORY NO. 70:

Identify any action, other than workers' compensation claims, brought against you by claimants injured as a result of exposure to asbestos and asbestos-containing products prior to 1970, stating the court in which the action was

brought, the date of filing, case style, and case number.

ANSWER TO NO. 70:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a) and (f), and on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and that the information sought is irrelevant to these cases and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to these objections, this defendant responds that the first asbestos-related personal injury lawsuit naming GAF as a defendant was Potter v. Fibreboard, et al., CV 6329 (E.D. Tex.) (filed July 29, 1969).

INTERROGATORY NO. 71:

State separately for each calendar year for the period 1928 to the present:

- a. The total amount of asbestos mined by your company;
- b. The total pound volume of asbestos fibre purchased by your company;
- c. The total pound volume of asbestos used by your company in its manufacturing processes;
- d. The total pound volume of asbestos sold by your company;
- e. The total pound volume of asbestos acquired by your company in any manner other than mining or purchase, and identify the manner of acquisition for each year;

- f. The total dollar value of asbestos mined by your company;
- g. The total dollar value of asbestos purchased by your company;
- h. The total dollar value of asbestos used by your company in its manufacturing process;
- i. The total dollar value of asbestos sold by your company;
- j. The total dollar value of all asbestos-containing products sold by you;
- k. The total number of pounds or linear feet of each asbestos product sold by you and the dollar value of such sales;
- l. The percentage of sales by dollar value and by linear foot weight of your asbestos as compared to all asbestos sold in the United States;
- m. The percentage of sales by dollar value and by linear foot and weight of your asbestos-containing material as compared to all asbestos-containing materials sold in the United States;

ANSWER TO NO. 71:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (k) and (l), 2(a), (b) and (f) and 3. GAF also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that theories of liability which shift the burden of proof to defendants, such as market share liability, do not apply to personal injury actions such as the instant cases involving asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products and, therefore, this interro-

gatory is irrelevant to any issue in these cases and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY NO. 72:

Did you in any way finance, assist or participate in:

- a. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company studies of asbestos conducted from 1929-1950;
- b. The Trudeau Foundation Saranac Lake studies from 1929-1960;
- c. The Quebec Asbestos Mining Association Study of Asbestos and Health between 1940 and 1970.

If so, state what role or action you took and identify all documents relevant to such activities by name, date, title, file number and present location.

ANSWER TO NO. 72:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, this defendant responds, no.

INTERROGATORY NO. 73:

Has your firm ever been cited or admonished by any government agency (federal, state or local) for dust levels in excess of any threshold limit value (TLV) or other predetermined number? If so, please state:

- a. The date the government agency and the dust and TLV or number involved;

- b. The means of identifying any document related to such an occurrence;
- c. Any action taken by the agency involved.

ANSWER TO NO. 73:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a) and (d) and 3.

INTERROGATORY NO. 74:

State whether from 1930 to date you promulgated any rules, written or oral for the handling of asbestos or asbestos products by your own employees? If so, state:

- a. When such rules were promulgated;
- b. The substance of the rules, if oral, and the name, address and title of the person who disseminated them;
- c. If in writing, either attach a copy of the rules or identify the written rules by date, title, identification number, present location and the name and address of the custodian thereof;
- d. Whether any such material was provided to any users of your asbestos products and, if so, when and to whom.

ANSWER TO NO. 74:

GAF objects to this interrogatory for the reasons set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2(a) and (d). Subject to these objections, this defendant responds that all ob-

servers of this defendant's packaging, including without limitation purchasers, handlers, distributors, or contractors, or their respective employees, would have seen, and thus received, the warnings as set out below.

In approximately 1964, The Ruberoid Co. began placing the following warning notices on packages of its asbestos-containing industrial thermal insulation products:

CAUTION

THIS PRODUCT CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER.
INHALATION OF ASBESTOS IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES
OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

— IF DUST IS CREATED WHEN THIS PRODUCT IS HANDLED,
AVOID BREATHING THE DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION
CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED
BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS
PRODUCING DUST.

Prior to or during 1970, GAF changed the wording and placed the warning label on Calsilite® pipe covering and block, insulation cements, millboard, rollboard and asbestos paper products and asbestos fiber. In addition, GAF relocated the warning label for these products from the sides to the front of the carton. This warning label read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBER. INHALATION IN EXCESSIVE QUANTITIES OVER LONG PERIODS OF TIME MAY BE HARMFUL.

AVOID BREATHING DUST. IF ADEQUATE VENTILATION CONTROL IS NOT POSSIBLE, WEAR RESPIRATORS APPROVED BY THE U.S. BUREAU OF MINES FOR PNEUMOCONIOSIS PRODUCING DUST.

In approximately 1972, this warning label was further changed to read as follows:

CAUTION

CONTAINS ASBESTOS FIBERS. AVOID BREATHING DUST.
--- BREATHING ASBESTOS MAY CAUSE SERIOUS BODILY HARM.

Until 1972, GAF's use of these warnings followed major manufacturers in the industry which used such cautionary notices after certain opinions were expressed by some members of the medical profession that there might be a health risk to certain persons who installed industrial thermal insulation products containing asbestos from the inhalation of excessive quantities of asbestos fibers over prolonged periods of time under certain conditions. Beginning in 1972, pursuant to the requirements of the Occupational

Safety and Health Act of 1970, GAF placed the last notice set out above.

No list or other compilation of documents relating to this interrogatory exists in discoverable form.

INTERROGATORY NO. 75:

Have any of your employees been reassigned to other duties because of pulmonary or coronary health problems? If so, please state for each such reassignment:

- a. The date and reason for reassignment;
- b. The jobs prior to and after reassignment;
- c. The age and health problem of the person reassigned.

ANSWER TO NO. 75:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, and on the further grounds that it is harassing, argumentative and inflammatory and that the information sought is irrelevant to these cases and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY NO. 76:

Prior to 1972, have your employees ever been subject to periodic medical examinations? If so, please state:

- a. Whether the examinations were performed by your firm, its agents or employees or by outside personnel either private or governmental;

- b. Whether the examinations were performed as a result of an internal corporate decision or to comply with some governmental rule;
- c. Whether any person was rejected for employment as a result of such examination. If so, state the date and reason for such rejection;
- d. Whether any employee was reassigned, terminated or pensioned as the result of such examination and the date and reason for each such occurrence.

ANSWER TO NO. 76:

GAF objects to this interrogatory for reasons set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1, 2(a) and 3, and on the grounds that conditions in GAF's facilities, including provision for safety and health in same, are not at issue in these litigations and, therefore, the information requested is irrelevant to the subject matter of these litigations and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant responds that this interrogatory is not applicable to GAF. GAF did not have facilities or equipment for medical testing or research and did not itself conduct tests or studies of a medical nature on its employees or on its products. From time to time during the period beginning in approximately 1930, this defendant called upon local physicians

to perform routine physical examinations and to administer routine medical treatment when and if necessary.

INTERROGATORY NO. 77:

Have you ever removed or had removed any asbestos insulation or other asbestos-containing material from any building, plant or facility which you owned, operated, leased or maintained? If so, identify the building or facility, state the date the asbestos material was removed and who removed the asbestos, and identify all documents relating to or referring to the removal.

ANSWER TO NO. 77:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2(a), (b) and (d), and on the grounds that it seeks discovery of information that is irrelevant and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY NO. 78:

Was the monitoring of dust levels required by any Government regulation or rule of any government, agency, or insurance company? If so, state the substance of the rule, the source imposing it and the date it was first imposed.

ANSWER TO NO. 78:

GAF objects to this interrogatory for reasons set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(k) and (l), 2(a), (b), (d) and (f) and 3.

INTERROGATORY NO. 79:

Do you agree that the possibility of exposure to asbestos dust and fibers extends not only to workers actually handling the asbestos products but also to:

- a. Other workers in the area where the asbestos products are being used;
- b. Members of the families of workers.

ANSWER TO NO. 79:

GAF objects to this interrogatory for the reasons set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(a), (b) and (j), 2(a), 3, 4 and 5. In addition, this defendant's present knowledge is irrelevant to any issue in these cases and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, GAF objects to this interrogatory because it is impossible to answer as framed, is impossible to answer and irrelevant outside of the context of a particular plaintiff's case and calls for speculation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 80:

Does your company have a record or document "retention" policy, plan or program? If so, please describe such plan. If the plan is different for separate categories of records, please describe the plan for each category. Please include in the descriptions the following:

- a. The name and title of the custodian of the records;
- b. The length of time for which records are retained;
- c. The titles and names of the personnel responsible for determining the policy or plan from 1935 to the present;
- d. The titles and names of the personnel responsible for the removal and destruction of any records, pursuant to any such plans from 1935 to the present.

ANSWER TO NO. 80:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1 and 2. GAF objects in particular on the grounds that the manner in which GAF's records are retained is not relevant, is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and that information sought by this interrogatory is privileged.

Subject to the foregoing objections, this defendant responds that Michael Baker is the present Records Retention

Manager and has served in this capacity since May 23, 1932.

The length of time for which records are retained varies according to the operational, financial, and legal requirements of the corporation. The time period for document retention varies according to the type of document. Documents are generally retained for seven years. However, corporate operational documents required to be preserved by applicable regulations are generally not kept for more than two years.

A list or other compilation of the names of all persons responsible for determining and implementing the policy or plan regarding record retention from 1930 to the present does not presently exist in discoverable form. All records which would be discoverable are retained in their original form.

INTERROGATORY NO. 81:

Have you destroyed any documents, records or writings pertaining to:

- a. Health hazards of asbestos;
- b. Workmen's Compensation claims arising out of asbestos, lung cancer, mesothelioma, cor pulmonale, pneumoconiosis, or pulmonary fibrosis;
- c. Placing warning labels on your products;
- d. Hazardous conditions in your plants or factories;

- e. Funding of studies about health hazards of asbestos;
- f. Lawsuits arising out of injuries alleged to having been caused by asbestos.

If so, list every such document destroyed by author, date and subject matter.

ANSWER TO NO. 81:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY NO. 82:

Have you ever had a division or subsidiary engaged in the business of abating, removing or encapsulating asbestos materials? If so, state:

- a. The name of the unit of all personnel involved;
- b. The location where such persons or units were based;
- c. The dates such person or units functioned;
- d. The sites where such abatement, repair, encapsulation or removal occurred.

ANSWER TO NO. 82:

Subject to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, this defendant responds, no.

INTERROGATORY NO. 83:

Identify and produce all Minutes of each meeting of the Board of Directors or of any committee of the Board at which meeting the hazards of asbestos exposure, and/or the possible application of warning labels on asbestos-containing products were discussed.

ANSWER TO NO. 83:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 2(a) and (b), and including without limitation on the grounds that the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome, is insufficiently specific, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

INTERROGATORY NO. 84:

If there is any person whom the defendant expects to call as an expert witness at trial, please provide a copy of the witness' curriculum vitae, or summary of the witness' qualifications if there is no vitae, and please state for each such expert witness:

- a. The person's identity, giving name, profession or occupation and address;
- b. The subject matter on which each such expert is to testify;

- c. The substance of all facts and opinions regarding which each such expert is to testify;
- d. A summary of the grounds for each opinion of each such expert;
- e. Whether the facts and opinions listed in (c) above are contained in a written report, memorandum or transcript and if they are, produce the same pursuant to the Rule 34 Notice of Production of Documents attached hereto;
- f. If the opinion of any expert listed above is based in whole or in part on any code or regulation, governmental or otherwise, identify said code or regulation and specifically set forth the section relied upon;
- g. Whether each such expert intends to base his or her testimony on any book, treatise, article, study, or any other document, and, if so, identify all such documents; and
- h. Whether the witness has testified at trial or by deposition in other asbestos-related personal injury or wrongful death cases, and if so, state for each such case:
 - (1) the name and docket number;
 - (2) the court in which each such case was pending; and
 - (3) the party for whom the witness testified.

ANSWER TO NO. 84:

GAF objects to this interrogatory for the reasons set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objection 1(b) insofar as it requests information regarding expert witnesses beyond that authorized in Rule 26(b)(4) of the Federal Rules of Civil

Procedure. In addition, GAF objects to this interrogatory because it is impossible to answer except in the context of a particular plaintiff's case and calls for speculation. Subject to these objections, GAF responds that it has not decided whether it will call any expert witness or witnesses at any particular plaintiff's trial. GAF will identify expert witnesses in accordance with the pre-trial scheduling order in each particular case.

INTERROGATORY NO. 85:

Identify the names and address of each non-expert witness whom you intend to call at trial, and specifically set forth the nature and substance of the matters to which each such person will testify and summarize the facts to which such person will testify.

ANSWER TO NO. 85:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections and including without limitation on the grounds that the information sought is beyond the scope of permissible discovery, is impossible to answer outside of the context of a particular plaintiff's case and calls for speculation. Subject to these objections, GAF responds that it will identify non-expert witnesses in accordance with the pre-trial scheduling order in each particular case.

INTERROGATORY NO. 86:

Identify and produce each exhibit that you intend to rely upon at trial.

ANSWER TO NO. 86:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections and including without limitation on the grounds that the information sought is beyond the scope of permissible discovery, is impossible to answer outside of the context of a particular plaintiff's case and calls for speculation. Subject to these objections, GAF responds that it will produce and identify exhibits in accordance with the pre-trial scheduling order in each particular case.

INTERROGATORY NO. 87:

Identify all persons, other than your attorneys, who provided you with any information used in answering these interrogatories, and state the particular information each person supplied.

ANSWER TO NO. 87:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation on the grounds that it is repetitive. Subject to these objections, see responses to interrogatories 1 and 3.

INTERROGATORY NO. 88:

At any time prior to 1972, did you learn of any recommended levels of asbestos proposed by The American Conference of Governmental and Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH)?

If so, state:

- a. The exact date you first learned of any ACGIH recommended levels;
- b. How you first learned of it;
- c. Which of your employees or agents first learned of it;
- d. The steps or action you took to advise your sales personnel of the recommendation;
- e. The steps or action you took to advise your customers, dealers, distributors and contractors of the ACGIH recommendation;
- f. Any comment you filed or submitted to ACGIH;
- g. Identify all documents related to ACGIH;

ANSWER TO NO. 88:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 2, 2(d), 3 and 4. Subject to those objections, this defendant responds that it became aware of the medical meaning of threshold limit value ("TLV") for asbestos in the course of litigation. GAF further answers that a TLV of 5 million particles per cubic foot was proposed by the United States Public Health Service

in 1938. The American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists apparently issued the same TLV in 1946.

In the 1960s, the Walsh-Healy Act endorsed and enacted the standard of 5million particles per cubic foot. In 1972, OSHA set standards for TLV for asbestos particles at five fibers per cc for TWA (time weight average) and ten fibers per cc for peak time. In 1976, the standard changed to two fibers per cc for TWA; the peak time asbestos exposure did not change. After 1981, other changes were made which are not relevant to these litigations.

INTERROGATORY NO. 89:

Do you contend that there is a minimum safe threshold_level of exposure to asbestos below which there is no risk in developing mesothelioma or lung cancer? If so, specify the minimum safe threshold level of exposure for each disease, the date you claim the threshold was arrived at, and the precise basis for your contention.

ANSWER TO NO. 89:

GAF objects to this interrogatory on the grounds set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(j), 2, 3 and 4. Further, this defendant objects to this interrogatory because it is impossible to answer as framed, is impossible to answer

and irrelevant outside of the context of a particular plaintiff's case and calls for speculation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 90:


Do you contend that there is any difference between chrysotile fiber, amosite fiber, crocidolite fiber, and/or tremolite fiber in the development of (a) mesothelioma; and (b) lung cancer? If so, explain in detail your contention as to the distinction between or among fiber types in the development of each disease and the medical authority you rely on.

ANSWER TO NO. 90:

In addition to the objections set forth in the foregoing General Objections, including without limitation General Objections 1(j), 2, 3 and 4, this defendant particularly objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is impossible to answer as framed, is impossible to answer and irrelevant except in the context of a particular plaintiff's case and calls for speculation. Subject to these objections, this defendant responds that it is generally aware of certain epidemiological studies which suggest that there are differences between types of asbestos fibers in terms of their association with asbestos-related diseases in humans.

Dated: March 8, 1988
New York, New York

ANDERSON RUSSELL KILL & OLICK, P.C.

By 
A Member of the Firm
Attorneys for Defendant
GAF Corporation
666 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10017
(212) 850-0700

