

STATE OF MICHIGAN)
)
COUNTY OF WAYNE) S.S.

OLIN B. JOHNSON being first duly sworn, deposes and says
that he is an authorized agent of Ford Motor Company and that he verifies
that the foregoing Responses to Plaintiff's First Interrogatories are
Responses for and on behalf of Ford Motor Company, and is duly authorized
so to do; that certain of the matters stated therein are not within the
personal knowledge of deponent; that the facts stated therein have been
assembled by authorized employees and counsel of Ford Motor Company and
deponent is informed that the facts stated therein are true.

Olin B. Johnson

Subscribed and sworn to before me

this 5 day of March 1984.
Kevin F. Teley

KEVIN F. TELEY
Notary Public for the State of Michigan
My Commission Expires December 30, 1985

SCF-FORD-3465

RECEIVED

MAR 16 1984

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DOOD, CONEY & BISHOP, P.S. FOR KING COUNTY

DONALD L. HORN,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

THE BENDIX CORP., et al.,

Defendants.

NO. 80-2-09935-3

RESPONSES TO
PLAINTIFF'S FIRST
INTERROGATORIES, REQUESTS
FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS
AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONSPREAMBLE

The responses provided herein have been prepared pursuant to a reasonable and duly diligent investigation and search for the information requested. For many years Ford has had several hundred thousand employees, many of whom have worked at several of the company's facilities and in conducting its business has every year created many millions of documents that have been kept in numerous different locations and have frequently been moved from site-to site as employees have changed jobs. Accordingly, Ford does not represent that the responses contained herein provide all of the information requested; rather, these responses reflect information obtained before this date by Ford pursuant to a reasonable and duly diligent search and investigation in those areas where the information is expected to be found. To the extent that the request purports to require any more, Ford objects on the grounds that compliance with the request would impose an undue burden or expense.

Further, if additional discovery requests are served upon Ford in this action, Ford will not review the present discovery requests to ascertain whether, subsequent to the serving of this response, new information that might be responsive to the present discovery requests has been obtained. To the extent that the present discovery requests purport to impose any such obligation, Ford objects on the grounds that the requests contravene the rules and in addition, seek to impose an undue burden and expense. Furthermore, in order to make responses to these Interrogatories feasible, it is generally appropriate to limit their scope to friction products and to Ford Motor Company, a Delaware corporation. Where Ford indicates that documents will be made available, those documents will be made available at a mutually convenient time in Dearborn, Michigan.

These comments and objections are incorporated into each of Ford's Responses set forth below as if they were set forth in their entirety as they apply to each response.

SECTION 1.0

1.01 Identify each person by name, address and position of each person who prepared answers or was consulted with regard to answering these interrogatories or supplying information used in answering these interrogatories, including experts, and as to each interrogatory,

please state either at the conclusion of the answer thereto or at the conclusion of all the answers the name, addresses and positions of the persons who answered, supplied the information and who drafted the answer.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The answers to these interrogatories constitute a corporate response. That the person signing these interrogatories is an employee of Ford who is an authorized agent of Ford for the purpose of verifying that the discovery responses are the corporate responses of Ford Motor Company. That that person works at Suite 911, Parklane Towers East, One Parklane Boulevard, Dearborn, Michigan, 48126. For that person's name, please refer to the attached verification.

The answers were drafted by Robert J. Donnellan, Office of the General Counsel, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, Michigan, 48126, and Barbara L. Ciaramitarao and Robert S. Krause of Dickinson, Wright, Moon, VanDusen & Freeman, 800 First National Building, Detroit, Michigan, 48226.

1.02 State:

- (a) Your correct corporate name;
- (b) The state of your incorporation;
- (c) The date of your incorporation;
- (d) The address of your principal place of business;

- (e) Whether or not you were registered to do business in the State of Washington during the Relevant Times, which has been defined as 1940 through the present;
- (f) Whether or not you had a registered agent for the purpose of accepting process in the State of Washington during any period of the Relevant Times and the name and present address of each such agent;
- (g) Whether or not you are challenging service of process;
- (h) Your corporate purposes;
- (i) Identify the person(s) who incorporated defendant.

RESPONSE:

- (a) Ford Motor Company.
- (b) Delaware.
- (c) July 9, 1919.
- (d) Ford's headquarters are at The American Road, Dearborn, Michigan.
- (e) Yes, since July 16, 1920.
- (f) Yes. C.T. Corporation System, 1218 3rd Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101.

(g) No.

(h) The primary purpose of the corporation is the manufacture and sale of motor vehicles.

(i) T.L. Croteau, P.B. Drew and H.E. Knox.

1.03 State in what form, if any, business was conducted by you or your corporate predecessor prior to incorporation.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.04 Identify each director of defendant from date of incorporation by name and last known address and dates of service.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.05 Identify the custodian of the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Directors and Articles of Incorporation of defendant and/or its corporate predecessors.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION A: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Directors referred to in the foregoing interrogatory.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.06 Identify each director known to you who served as a director, officer, employee or consultant to any other business, corporation or co-defendant which manufactured, distributed, sold, installed or otherwise dealt with asbestos products.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.07 As to the foregoing answer, list each such director, together with each such business, including the name and address thereof and the nature of its asbestos-related enterprise.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.08 State where defendant has maintained its principal offices, including its corporate headquarters, since its inception, including dates of such locations.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 1.02(d).

1.09 Does defendant maintain an organization table or tables? If you have answered this in the affirmative, identify the custodian of each table.

RESPONSE: Yes.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION B: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of each such identified table or organization.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.10 Has defendant or any of its subsidiary companies at any time engaged in the mining, manufacturing, marketing, assembling, rebranding, distributing or sale of any material or product containin asbestos fibers? See instruction 12, page 6, for definition of the terms "asbestos or asbestos product". The scope of this interrogatory includes the manufacture, distribution, assembling, marketing or sale of products into which asbestos-containing products were incorporated.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information

which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. As to Ford, Ford is not now and has not been involved with the manufacture of brake linings and clutch facings for production vehicles. These parts are purchased as assemblies and installed in vehicle components. These products are then sold as original equipment on vehicles and as aftermarket parts.

1.11 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state the following:

- (a) The names of the companies mining, manufacturing, marketing, distributing, rebranding, assembling and/or selling each of those products, and specify whether these companies mined, manufactured, marketed, distributed and/or sold material containing asbestos fibers;
- (b) The trade or brand name of each of those products mined, manufactured, marketed, distributed and/or sold;
- (c) The date each of the named products was placed on the market;
- (d) The date each of the named products was withdrawn from the market;
- (e) A description of the physical (chemical) composition of each of the named pro-

ducts, including the type and percentage of asbestos contained in each product and the purpose of each ingredient for each year said product was manufactured, sold, distributed, rebranded and/or sold;

(f) A description of the physical appearance of each of the named products, including any identifying color(s), stamp(s), stripe(s), texture, etc. for each year said product was manufactured, sold, distributed, rebranded and/or sold;

(g) The sources of the asbestos ingredients contained in each product;

(h) Where each asbestos ingredient was obtained;

(i) Where the asbestos ingredients were delivered;

(j) When the asbestos ingredients were obtained;

(k) A detailed description of the intended uses of each of the asbestos-containing products;

(l) The date you controlled, purchased or acquired any interest in any other corporation which mined, manufactured,

marketed, distributed or sold asbestos-containing products;

(m) The manner of acquisition, including percentage of ownership;

(n) The date of the sale of any such interest, or portion of such interest and the purchaser;

(o) The date any such predecessor or subsidiary corporation ceased doing business.

RESPONSE:

(a) & (b) Original equipment products have been sold under the name of Ford, Lincoln and Mercury. After-market or replacement products are sold under the name of the Ford Motor Company or Ford Authorized Remanufacturers.

(c) Ford vehicles have been on the market since approximately 1909.

(d) None.

(e) Ford purchases finished brake assemblies and clutch facings from suppliers. Because Ford does not manufacture the clutch facings or brake linings, it does not know the percentage of asbestos they contain. According to Ford's suppliers, the type of asbestos fibers in the clutch facings and brake linings is chrysotile.

(f) A brake lining is a narrow rectangle shaped to fit around a circle and most linings are believed to be

slate grey or tan. A clutch facing is a flat, round metal plate with two rings, one on each side of the friction material between the fly wheel of the engine and the pressure plate of the transmission.

(g) Ford objects to this Sub-Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. A supplier chart for the identity of many companies from whom brake linings and clutch facings were purchased can be made available.

(h) Because Ford does not manufacture brake linings or clutch facings, it does not know the source of the asbestos used.

(i) To various manufacturing and warehouse facilities.

(j) Various dates.

(k) The asbestos in brake linings assists in braking and friction. The asbestos in clutch facings assists in transmitting rotational force from the engine and fly-wheel to the rear wheels.

(l) to (o) Other than affiliated corporations which also sell vehicles containing parts having an asbestos content, Ford has no interest in any corporation which mines, manufacturers, markets, distributes or sells asbestos products.

1.12 Please identify by location and product produced each plant in which the asbestos-containing products listed in the previous answer were manufactured and/or assembled, rebranded or otherwise produced and for each plant state:

- (a) The dates each such plant was in operation;
- (b) The time span during which each named item was produced;
- (c) The amount of each product, expressed in pounds or ton which was produced by each plant during the Relevant Times;
- (d) The person(s) at each such plant in charge of producing each such asbestos product;
- (e) The person(s) in charge of packaging each asbestos product;
- (f) The person(s) in charge of labeling each such product.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.13 During the Relevant Times, did you maintain or distribute manuals, instructions, dealer handbooks or pricing information pertaining to the sale, use, installation or removal of asbestos or asbestos products?

RESPONSE: Limiting this Interrogatory to brake linings and clutch facings, the answer is yes. Ford objects to the remaining information requested by this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome.

1.14 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state the present location of records or other such materials and the name and address of the custodian.

RESPONSE: No one person is the custodian of such records and there is no single depository for them.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION C: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of each such manual, instruction, dealer handbook or pricing information.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as overly broad and burdensome.

1.15 During the period of time from 1940 to the present, were any sales materials prepared by defendant or its agents for the purposes of marketing or advertising defendant's asbestos or asbestos-containing products anywhere in the United States?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.16 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The name and address of each person or entity who prepared the same;
- (b) The name, address and job title of each person who presently has possession of same;
- (c) The date same was prepared;
- (d) The media used to disseminate the sales material. Specify the names of the magazines, trade publications catalogs, trade shows and/or sales staff involved in dissemination;
- (e) State whether any of the materials referred to in your answer to this interrogatory were mailed, circulated, distributed or otherwise made available in the State of Washington during the Relevant Times.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION D: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of each such item of sales or marketing information, including but not limited to books, movies, sales literature, training and/or marketing aids, and an index thereto.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

1.17 State whether any of your agents, employees, manufacturers, representatives or dealers during the Relevant Times were instructed to advertise, solicit, sell or otherwise encourage the purchase of your asbestos products or asbestos-containing products for use in motor vehicle brake linings, brake pads or brake facings.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Ford does not manufacture asbestos-containing products for use in brake linings. It purchases pre-assembled brake linings which are installed in vehicles or sold as replacement parts. Most promotional material concerning brake linings would pertain to the vehicle as a whole or pre-assembled replacement parts.

1.18 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state the location of said promotional materials and the name and address of the custodian.

RESPONSE: There is no single depository for all promotional materials and no single person has custody of these records.

1.19 Identify the location, existence and present custodian of any manuals, specifications or instructional materials pertaining to the use, installation or removal of asbestos or asbestos-containing products which were distri-

buted or made available to purchasers of your products during the Relevant Times.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 1.14.

1.20 If asbestos or asbestos-containing products were sold to or purchased from any of the other defendants in this suit state:

- (a) The name of each such defendant(s);
- (b) The date(s) of sale, purchase or re-branding of each said product, including the amount and kind of materials sold or purchased, specifying trade names for each year of the Relevant Times;
- (c) The name, address and job classification of the individual currently having possession of such records.

RESPONSE: It is Ford's practice to supply, distribute and sell service requirements through authorized dealers and Remanufacturers. Although it is not possible to say that no such product was sold by Ford to the other defendants, it is highly unlikely that there were any significant sales of this type.

A supplier chart for the identity of many companies from whom brake linings and clutch facings were purchased can be made available.

1.21 State the names and addresses of all distributors, dealers, agents or manufacturers' representatives of

any of your asbestos-containing products in the States of Washington, Oregon and California during the period of 1950 through the present, and for each such person you have identified, state the time period each such person represented you.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.21.1 If you are a defendant manufacturer, seller or distributor of motor vehicles, identify:

- (a) The name and address of each and every manufacturer from whom defendant or any of its subsidiary companies obtained brake linings or brake pads or brake facings for installation or use in any motor vehicles manufactured or sold by defendant from 1950 through 1978;
- (b) The name and address of the distributor or seller from whom defendant or any of its subsidiary companies obtained brake linings, brake facings or brake pads for use in any motor vehicles manufactured or sold by defendant from 1950 through 1978;

- (c) The type, including dimensions, and brand name of each brake lining, brake facing or brake pad defendant or any of its subsidiary companies purchased or obtained for use in any motor vehicles manufactured or sold by defendant from 1950 through 1978, and from whom each such product was purchased or otherwise obtained;
- (d) The dates (years) defendant or any of its subsidiary companies purchased or obtained such brake lining(s) or brake pad(s) from each manufacturer, distributor and/or seller, and the amounts expressed in pounds or tons which defendant or any of its subsidiary companies purchased or otherwise obtained;
- (e) The type and percentage of asbestos contained in each trade or brand named brake lining or brake pad identified above which you obtained from 1950 through 1978;
- (f) The physical characteristics of each kind of brake lining, brake pad or brake facing purchased or used by defendant or defendant's subsidiaries for use in

vehicles manufactured or sold by you, including size, dimensions, weight, color, identifying tags, stamps or markings on said brake liners, pads or facings;

(g) The name, last known address and telephone address of defendant's or defendant's subsidiaries' purchasing agent(s) responsible for obtaining brake linings and brake pads for use in any motor vehicles manufactured sold by you from 1950 through 1978;

(h) During the time period 1950 through 1978, did you maintain records relating to the purchase, sale and/or use of brake linings, brake pads or disc brake pads, including, but not limited to, records which indicate what brake linings were installed or to be installed on particular types or models of defendant's motor vehicles;

(i) Describe all such records referred to in subsection (h) above;

(j) Identify (by manufacturer, trade name, number and brand name) what brake linings, brake pads or brake facings were

installed, assembled, placed in, or otherwise used or furnished in each of the motor vehicles you manufactured, sold or distributed for the period 1950 through 1978. Otherwise stated, identify what brake pads, brake linings or brake facings went into which of your motor vehicles during the period 1950 through 1978;

- (k) State when and how you were first made aware of health hazards associated with the use of asbestos;
- (l) When did you first become aware that warnings were placed on asbestos products with respect to the health hazards associated with the use of asbestos;
- (m) When did you first learn in any manner or from any source that asbestos or asbestos products are hazardous or dangerous to the health of persons;
- (n) From whom did you learn the information referred to in the answer to the preceding interrogatory;
- (o) State what documents reflect the information given in answer to the two preceding interrogatories, their date, and the present custodian of said records;

(p) Did you at any time maintain or distribute manuals, instructions or information relating to the sale, use or removal of asbestos or asbestos products, including, but not limited to, the use or removal of asbestos-containing brake linings, brake pads or brake facings;

(q) If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state the present location of records or other such materials and the name and address of the custodian of said manuals, instructions directories or information.

RESPONSE:

(a)-(d) A supplier chart for the identity of many companies from whom brake linings and clutch facings were purchased can be made available.

e) According to Ford's suppliers, the type of asbestos fibers in the clutch facings and brake linings is chrysotile. Because Ford does not manufacture the clutch facings or brake linings, it does not know the percentage of asbestos they contain.

- f) Ford objects to this Sub-Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome.
- g) Ford objects to this Sub-Interrogatory as overly broad and burdensome. However, Mr. J.B. Ridenour, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, Michigan is knowledgeable in this area.
- h) Yes.
- i) Ford objects to this Sub-Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome. Further, insofar as this Sub-Interrogatory is directed at documents dated so long ago, they may have been destroyed pursuant to corporate record retention policies.
- j) Ford objects to this Sub-Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome.
- k) Ford cannot state when Ford or a Ford employee first had knowledge of the "health hazards associated with asbestos exposure". It is known, however, that the initial knowledge of a suggestion of potential hazards associated with asbestos lined brakes came in a telephone call from Dr. Selikoff of the Mt. Sinai School of Medicine to Roy Gealer of

Ford's Research and Engineering Department in August, 1975.

- l) Ford cannot state when Ford or a Ford employee first had knowledge of warnings placed on asbestos.
- m-n) See Response to Sub-Interrogatory k.
- o) Copy of the handwritten note pertaining to Roy Gealer's telephone call from Dr. Selikoff in August, 1975.
- p) On October 24, 1975, Ford Technical Service Bulletin 99 was distributed to all Ford and Lincoln-Mercury dealers. It recommended that a vacuum cleaner be used for cleaning brakes. In January, 1976, a Technical Service Bulletin was issued to the dealers indicating that Ford recommended the use of an industrial vacuum cleaner in brake cleaning operations. The 1977 edition of the Rotunda Catalog and Ford's Shop Manual for Dealerships recommended that brakes not be cleaned with an air hose and that a vacuum cleaner be used for this purpose. In November, 1983, Ford issued Bulletin No. 83-22 on asbestos brake and clutch servicing. Technical Service Bulletins

presently are distributed by mail to approximately 29,000 Ford and Lincoln-Mercury dealer technicians. These documents are the result of corporate activity and are not the work of any single author. These bulletins have not been superceded. Copies of these documents can be made available.

- q) No one person has custody of the described material as there is no single depository for these documents.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION E: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of all such purchase or sale records, and such information, written directions or instruction manual(s) identified in Interrogatories 1.21(h), (o), (i), (p) and (q).

RESPONSE: Other than as specifically noted in the Response to Interrogatory 1.21, Ford objects to this Request as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.22 Have any asbestos products identified in your answer to Interrogatory 1.11 been, or are any of such asbestos products now, distributed in interstate commerce?

RESPONSE: Yes.

1.23 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is affirmative, state:

- (a) Into which states of the United States of American such product has been distributed;
- (b) The quantity distributed into each state of the U.S. for every year of the Relevant Times;
- (c) The name and address of each company or other business entity, in the states of Washington, and Oregon to which such product has been distributed and the dates of the distribution.

RESPONSE:

- (a) All of them.
- (b) Ford objects to this Sub-Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- (c) It is not possible for Ford to identify each company or other entity in the State of Washington and Oregon to which its vehicles have been sold over a 44 year period.

1.24 During the time period from January 1, 1950 through December 31, 1978, have you, directly or indirectly, sold, distributed delivered, installed or consigned any

asbestos products for use in brake renovation and repair such as brake lining, molded or roll linings, disc brake pads, or adhesives to any of the following facilities, including their predecessors or successors:

- (a) Western Brake Industries Company, Seattle, Washington;
- (b) Western Brake Industries Company. Los Angeles, California;
- (c) Western Brake Industries Company, San Francisco, California;
- (d) Stewart-Western, Inc., Seattle, Washington;
- (e) Stewart-Western, Inc., San Francisco, California;
- (f) Stewart-Western, Inc., Los Angeles, California.

RESPONSE: Ford sells its products through franchised dealers and there is no indication the companies named are franchised dealers.

1.25 If any portion of your answer to the preceding interrogatory was in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The name of the agency, or facility identified in Interrogatory No. 1.24 to whom you sold, distributed, delivered, installed or consigned asbestos products;

- (b) Whether sold by you directly or through an agent manufacturers' representative, dealer or subsidiary;
- (c) The name and address of the agent manufacturers' representative, dealer and/or subsidiary;
- (d) Specifically state the amount and kind of all asbestos products sold, distributed, delivered, installed or consigned to each facility referred to herein, stating in detail for each facility identified in Interrogatory No. 1.24 for every year during the period 1950 through 1978:
 - 1. The brand or trade name of the asbestos products which were delivered;
 - 2. The date of delivery of the products;
 - 3. The volume of sales for every month during the period 1950 through 1978 for each product and facility expressed in pounds or tons;
 - 4. The dollar value of sales for every month during the period 1950 through 1978 for each product and facility;

(e) The ultimate purchaser or user of said products;

(f) State the name and present address of the person or persons responsible for providing the answer to this interrogatory.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 1.25.

1.26 Identify by name, job title, current or last known address, and phone number the persons that your records show to be the purchasing agents for the companies or agencies listed in your answer to Interrogatory No. 1.24 for each year during the period January 1, 1950 through December 31, 1978.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

1.27 During the period 1950 through the present, did you or any of your predecessors or subsidiaries at any time sell brake linings or brake lining components to companies engaged in the manufacture and/or sale of motor vehicles?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. It is Ford's practice to supply, distribute and sell service requirements through authorized dealers and distributors. Although it is not possible to say that no such product was sold by Ford to

other companies engaged in the manufacture and/or sale of motor vehicles, it is unlikely that there were any significant sales of this type.

1.28 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, identify the name and address of the companies engaged in the manufacture and/or sale to whom you sold asbestoscontaining brake linings or brake lining components to and the dates of such sales, and identify by trade and brand name exactly what product you sold and the quantity of the product you sold to said companies.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 1.27.

1.29 Identify each medical director of defendant by name, last known address, duration of service, and all previous and subsequent employers of each such medical director.

RESPONSE: Ford has employed the following medical directors as part of the Personnel Services Office of the Personnel and Organization staff to monitor the health and safety of its employees. They are located in Dearborn, Michigan. They have been:

Harley Krieger, M.D.: ? to 1954, now deceased;
E.A. Irvin, M.D.: 1954-1970, now deceased; and
Duane L. Block, M.D.: 1970 to present.

1.30 Identify by name and address the custodian of the records of the various medical directors.

RESPONSE: No one person is the custodian of such records and there is no single depository for them.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. E: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of the most current curriculum vitae for each and every medical director named in answer to the preceding interrogatory.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.31 Have you at any time requested and/or received information from medical officers, hygienists, or other employees of your company pertaining to the possible existence of a relationship between asbesto exposure and disease, or to the risks or hazards to persons involved in the manufacture, installation, or use of products containing asbestos?

RESPONSE: Yes.

1.32 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

- (a) Identify the person(s) involved;
- (b) State the dates relevant to the collection or receipt of such information described above;

(c) Describe in detail the nature of the study or information described above;

(d) Identify the custodian of the documents identified in subpart (d) by name and address.

RESPONSE: Ford cannot mention all such persons and objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and burdensome. However, without waiving such objection, several such persons are identified in these answers.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION G: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of all documents identified in your response to the preceding interrogatory.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

1.33 Have you at any time requested, received information from or participated in studies with persons outside your company pertaining to the possible existence of a relationship between asbestos exposure and disease, or to the risks and hazards to persons involved in the manufacture, installation or use of products containing asbestos?

RESPONSE: Yes.

1.34 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

(a) Identify the person(s) involved;

(b) State the dates relevant to the collection or receipt of such information described above;

- (c) Describe in detail the nature of the study or information;
- (d) Identify all documents related to the study or information described above;
- (e) Identify the custodian of the documents identified in subpart (d) with names and addresses.

RESPONSE: Commencing in 1972, Ford participated in and provided partial funding for studies done by Dr. Irving Selikoff and others at the Mt Sinai School of Medicine in New York which culminated in the publication of several papers. The work done by Dr. Selikoff originally was a study of environmental pollution caused by asbestos in brake linings. The studies later focused on the occupational exposure of mechanics during brake repair and maintenance work. Dr. Selikoff's 1976 publication expressly acknowledges the support his work received from Ford.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION H: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of all documents identified in your response to the preceding interrogatory.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.35 Do you have or have you ever had person(s) in your employ who were charged with responsibility for monitoring the state of domestic knowledge of the safety and health aspects of your industry?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.36 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

- (a) Identify all such person(s) with names and addresses;
- (b) State the dates of service of each such person(s);
- (c) State the formal title, if any, of the person(s) described above;
- (d) Identify all documents relevant to the position/ person described above.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION I: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of all documents identified in subparagraph (d) above.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

1.37 Do you have or have you ever had person(s) responsible for monitoring the state of current foreign knowledge of the safety and health aspects of your industry?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.38 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

- (a) Identify all such person(s) with names and addresses;
- (b) State the dates of service of each such person(s);
- (c) State the formal title, if any, of the person(s) described above;
- (d) Identify all documents relevant to the position/ person described above.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION J: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of all documents identified in subparagraph (d) above.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

1.39 Describe your record retention program from 1935 to the present date and state:

- (a) Where records are kept;
- (b) Location and existence of written materials concerning your program and date of adoption;

(c) Description of the information contained in such records;

(d) The length of time purchase, bid, shipping and/or sale records are maintained by your company.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.40 Did the defendant at any time assign, license or otherwise allow any of their asbestos-containing friction products, trademarks or copyrights to be used by any person, firm or corporation?

RESPONSE: No.

1.41 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

(a) State the name of the product, trademark or copyright so assigned or licensed;

(b) The time period of the assignment or license;

(c) The nature of the assignment or license (whether exclusive or not);

(d) The terms and conditions of each such agreement (you may attach said material to these interrogatory answers).

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

1.42 At the time of such assignment or license, was there any agreement between the parties concerning liability in the event of future litigation concerning the product?

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

1.43 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The nature and substance of such agreement;
- (b) The location of said agreement and/or copies.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

1.44 State the location of your national and Washington, California and Oregon State warehouse, warehouse facilities, or distribution centers for your asbestos-containing products during the Relevant Times.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

1.45 Specify the corporate relationship between you and local dealers and/or manufacturer's representatives of asbestos products who sold products containing your corporate identification or trademark during each year of the Relevant Times.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

SECTION 2.0

2.01 Have any of the asbestos-containing products listed in Interrogatory No. 1.11 been altered in chemical composition since first being manufactured, sold or marketed?

RESPONSE: Yes.

2.02 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, please state:

- (a) The trade name of each of those products;
- (b) The date each of the name products was altered;
- (c) The nature of the alteration;
- (d) The reason for the alteration.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 1.11(e). Some 1983 and subsequent Ford models utilize fiberglass and steel wool brakes. Other Ford vehicles utilize semi-metallic front disc brakes and asbestos-containing rear brake drums. This change was made to reduce the asbestos in brake linings. Mr. Arne Anderson, a Ford employee, is knowledgeable in many aspects of this response.

2.03 State the name, address and job title of each person who participated in the design and preparation of manufacturing specifications for each product listed in Interrogatory No. 1.11.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad. No one person was responsible for preparation of same.

2.04 Do any documents, including written memoranda, specifications, recommendations, blueprints or other written materials of any kind or character relating to the design and preparation of the asbestos products listed in Interrogatory No. 1.11 now exist?

RESPONSE: Ford prepared only performance specifications, not manufacturing specifications. The specifications would be issued, samples received, samples tested against the specifications and then purchase orders issued.

2.05 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

- (a) List each document; — —
- (b) State the name, address and job title of each person who currently has possession of each document, and where the documents are presently located.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION K: Pursuant to CR 34, you are hereby requested to produce and/or make available for inspection and copying all such correspondence or other material pertaining to your answer supplied in the previous interrogatory.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

2.06 Before releasing the products listed in Interrogatory No. 1.11 to the public, were any tests conducted on them to determine potential health hazards involved in the use of the asbestos materials contained in those products?

RESPONSE: Yes.

2.07 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The names of the products tested;
- (b) When the products were tested;
- (c) The name, address, and job title of each person who conducted those tests;
- (d) The results of those tests.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as vague and overly broad. Without waiving such objections, Ford states that in the early 1970's, Mr. Arne Anderson and Mr. Roy Gealer of Ford's Scientific Research Staff conducted tests to determine the quantity of asbestos fibers liberated from brake linings during the braking process. They concluded that over 99.98% of the asbestos fibers in brake

linings decomposed during the braking process into non-fibrous material. Their results were published in 1973. In 1973, Ford's Industrial Hygiene Department conducted air sampling tests on brake linings being cleaned by brake mechanics using air hoses. They determined that asbestos levels were well below existing or proposed OSHA standards. This testing was done by Mr. Anderson and Mr. Henry Lick under the supervision of Mr. Paul Toth, then manager of Industrial Hygiene. See, also, the response to Interrogatory 1.34.

2.08 Do any documents, including written memoranda, specifications, recommendations, blueprints, or other written materials of any kind or character relating to the testing of the products identified or in Interrogatory No. 1.11 now exist?

RESPONSE: Yes.

2.09 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) List each document;
- (b) State the name, address and job title of each person who currently has possession of each document, and where it is presently located.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 1.10.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION 1: Pursuant to CR 34, you are hereby requested to produce according to the above

instructions a copy of all documents identified in your response to the preceding interrogatory.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

2.10 Did defendant or any of its subsidiary companies make any design changes as a result of the tests referred to in Interrogatory No. 2.06?

RESPONSE: No.

2.11 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The trade names of the products changed;
- (b) The nature of the changes made;
- (c) The name, address and job title of each person responsible for having made a change.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

2.12 After releasing the products listed in Interrogatory No. 1.11 to the public, were any tests conducted on them or were any on-site inspections conducted to determine potential health hazards involved in the use and/or removal of the asbestos materials contained in those products?

RESPONSE: Yes.

2.13 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The names of the products tested;
- (b) The name, address, and job title of each person who conducted those tests;
- (c) The results of those tests.

RESPONSE: See Responses to Interrogatories 1.34 and 2.07.

2.14 Do any documents, including written memoranda, specifications, recommendations, blueprints or other written materials of any kind or character relating to the potential health hazards of the products listed in Interrogatory No. 1.11 now exist?

RESPONSE: Yes.

2.15 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) Name each product;
- (b) List each document;
- (c) State the name, address and job title of each person who currently has possession of each document and where it is presently located.

RESPONSE: These documents can be made available.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION M: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of each such document or test.

RESPONSE: These documents can be made available.

2.16 Did defendant or any of its subsidiary companies make any design changes as a result of those tests?

RESPONSE: No.

2.17 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The names of the products changed;
- (b) The name, address and job title of each person responsible for having made a change.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION N: Pursuant to CR 34, you are hereby requested to produce according to the above instructions a copy of all documents pertaining to design changes as identified in your response to the preceding interrogatory.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

SECTION 3.0

3.01 Did you provide instructions and/or warnings concerning the potential health hazards of asbestos exposure to plaintiff's employer Stewart-Western, Inc. or Western Brake Ind. Company at any time?

RESPONSE: Ford has no way of knowing what instructions or warnings were received by Plaintiff or Plaintiff's employer.

3.02 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state the following:

- (a) Whether the employer was expected or requested to transfer the instructions and/or warnings to its employees such as plaintiff;
- (b) The date(s) you provided instructions and/or warnings to plaintiff's employer;
- (c) Who prepared the instructions and/or warnings;
- (d) To whom the instructions and/or warnings were addressed;
- (e) The manner in which the instructions and/or warnings were transmitted to plaintiff's employers (i.e., orally, printed, pamphlets, printed on carton, etc.);
- (f) The precise wording used in the instructions and/or warnings, or in lieu thereof, attach an authenticated copy of the instructions and/or warnings.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

3.03 Did you, at any time, provide instructions and/or warnings concerning the potential health hazards of asbestos exposure to either (a) plaintiff and/or (b) his co-workers?

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.01.

3.04 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state the following:

- (a) The date(s) you provided instructions and/or warnings to each plaintiff and/or his co-workers;
- (b) Who prepared the instructions and/or warnings;
- (c) To whom the instructions and/or warnings were addressed;
- (d) The manner in which the instructions and/or warnings were transmitted to plaintiff and/or his co-workers (i.e., orally, printed, pamphlets, printed on carton, etc.);
- (e) The precise wording used in the instructions and/or warnings, or in lieu thereof, attach an authenticated copy of the instructions and/or warnings.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

3.05 Did you provide instructions and/or warnings concerning the potential health hazards of asbestos exposure to any persons at plaintiff's work place during the time period during which plaintiff was employed at Stewart-Western, Inc. or Western Brake Ind. Company, Seattle, Washington?

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.01.

3.06 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state the following:

- (a) The date(s) you provided instructions and/or warnings to plaintiff and/or his co-workers;
- (b) Who prepared the instructions and/or warnings;
- (c) To whom the instructions and/or warnings were addressed;
- (d) The manner in which the instructions and/or warnings were transmitted to plaintiff and/or his co-workers (i.e., orally, printed, pamphlets, printed on carton, etc.);
- (e) The precise wording used in the instructions and/or warnings, or in lieu thereof, attach an authenticated copy of the instructions and/or warnings. - -

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

3.07 Did you at any time place any kind of an instruction or warning label on any container, shipping tag, invoice or product of any kind which purported to warn a user of your product of the danger of using asbestos?

RESPONSE: Yes.

3.08 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) When the warning, notice or instruction first appeared;
- (b) On what asbestos-containing products did the caution, warning, notice or instruction appear, and where were such warnings located on each of the products or packages;
- (c) For each individual product when did the warning first appear;
- (d) The exact wording of each such warning, notice or instruction for each individual asbestoscontaining product;
- (e) The time period each such warning was used for each asbestos-containing product;
- (f) Who prepared the instructions or warnings;
- (g) Has the warning notice, statement or instruction ever been altered, amended or changed in any matter; of so:
 - 1. For each product warning that was altered or amended, indicate how and when it was amended and the reason for such amendment or change,

and the identity of the person responsible for such amendment or change.

RESPONSE: With respect to brake linings and clutch facings sold as components of new vehicles, Ford is unaware of any feasible and useful method of labeling the component part. With respect to after-market products sold by Ford, labels were placed on cartons in 1980. Those labels read along lines such as:

"CAUTION: Contains asbestos fibers. Avoid creating dust. Breathing asbestos dust may cause serious bodily harm. When servicing this brake lining or any component related to it or located near it, prevent asbestos dust from becoming airborne by vacuuming the assembly with an industrial type vacuum cleaner equipped with a high efficiency filter system and by washing the assembly with an appropriate brake parts washer if necessary. Never remove dust or dirt from this assembly by blowing with compressed air."

The decision to place the labels on cartons containing after-market parts was a corporate decision. It was not the decision of any individual.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION 0: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions an authenticated copy of each warning label or notice used on any asbestos-containing product sold, manufactured or incorporated in any product manufactured or distributed by you.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

3.09 Did you provide respirators to plaintiff, plaintiff's employers or persons at plaintiff's job sites during the time period plaintiff was employed at Stuart-Western, Inc. or Western Brake Industries, Seattle, Washington?

RESPONSE: No.

3.10 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state the following:

- (a) The date(s) respirators were provided;
- (b) To whom the respirators were provided;
- (c) The type of respirators provided;
- (d) The instructions and/or warnings provided with respirators, if any.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

3.11 Did you receive any comments or complaints concerning asbestos dust and/or asbestos health hazards from any persons who were co-employees or employed at plaintiff's place of employment during the time period plaintiff was employed at Stuart-Western, Inc. or Western Brake Industries, Seattle, Washington?

RESPONSE: Ford has no record of any such comments or complaints.

3.12 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state the following:

- (a) The name and address of the person commenting or complaining;
- (b) The precise wording of the comment and/or complaint;
- (c) The date the comment and/or complaint was received by you;
- (d) What action, if any, was taken in response to the comment and/or complaint.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

3.13 Did you receive notice of any workmen's compensation claims alleging injury as a result of asbestos exposure?

RESPONSE: Yes.

3.14 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state the following for each year from the date of your incorporation:

- (a) The name and address of each claimant;
- (b) The date you received notice;
- (c) The state in which the claim was filed;
- (d) The injury alleged in the claim;
- (e) The outcome of the claim (i.e., settled, dismissed, etc.).

RESPONSE: Ford's records do not permit retrieval of this information as injuries alleged are described in general terms such as: lungs, chest, back, silicosis,

bronchitis, emphysema, pneumoconiosis, cough, pulmonary system, etc. resulting from exposure to "deleterious substances" and/or "atmospheric pollutants". It is impossible to ascertain from these records whether or not the alleged injury was associated with asbestos exposure. Furthermore, because of the differences in occupational exposure, the information sought would not be relevant to the claims asserted herein, and Ford objects to this Interrogatory.

3.15 State the total number of product liability, third party cases which have been filed naming you as a party defendant, in which it was alleged in any way that your asbestos-bearing product caused harm.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION A: Over 10,000 cases described in Interrogatory No. 3.17 are pending or have been filed naming you as a defendant.

RESPONSE: Denied.

3.16 When were you first served with a summons and complaint in which it was alleged that asbestos-related damages were sustained by a third party as a result of alleged exposure to an asbestos product manufactured, distributed or incorporated into a product manufactured or distributed by you.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.17 State the court, cause number, attorney identification, and ultimate resolution of such lawsuit identified above.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.18 For each and every year from 1930 to present, state the number of such suits which were served upon you.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.19 Identify by name and address the person or persons who act as corporate custodian of documents pertaining to the third party litigation in which asbestos-related damage is alleged.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.20 When was defendant first served with a third party summons and complaint in which it was alleged then or later that a plaintiff or a plaintiff's decedent sustained mesothelioma as a result of exposure to asbestos products manufactured, distributed or incorporated into a product manufactured or distributed by you?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.21 State the court, cause number, attorney identification, and ultimate resolution of such lawsuit identified above.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.22 For each and every year from 1930 until the present, state the number of such suits which were served upon you.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.23 When was defendant first served with a summons and complaint in which it was then or later alleged

that a plaintiff or plaintiff's decedent sustained lung cancer as a result of exposure to asbestos products manufactured, distributed or incorporated into a product manufactured or distributed by you?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.24 State the court, cause number, attorney identification and ultimate resolution of such lawsuit identified above.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.25 For each and every year from 1930 to the present, state the number of such suits which were served upon you.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.26 When was defendant first served with a summons and complaint in which it was then or later alleged that a plaintiff or plaintiff's decedent sustained asbestosis as a result of exposure to asbestos products manufactured,

distributed or incorporated into products manufactured or distributed by you?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.27 State in detail the court, cause number, attorney identification and ultimate resolution of such lawsuit identified above.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.28 For each and every year since 1930 to the present, state the number of such suits which were served upon you.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3.29 Do you retain records of the worker's compensation or third party claims described in the foregoing interrogatories?

RESPONSE: Yes. See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

3.30 Identify with name and address the corporate custodian of records concerning claims of workers.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. No one person is the custodian of such records and there is no single depository for them.

3.31 Identify all documents relating to the information kept on worker's compensation claims.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION P: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of all documents identified in the preceding interrogatory.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION B: You were aware as early as 1900 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION C: You were aware as early as 1910 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result

of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION D: You were aware as early as 1920 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION E: You were aware as early as 1930 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION F: You were aware as early as 1940 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION G: You were aware as early as 1950 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION H: You were aware as early as 1960 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION I: You were aware as early as 1965 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION J: You were aware as early as 1970 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Resonse to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION K: You were aware as early as 1975 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION L: You were aware as early as 1979 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION M: You were aware as early as 1980 that one or more individuals had filed workmen's compensation claims alleging injury or disease as a result of exposure to asbestos while employed at one or more of your facilities.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 3.14.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION Q: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions annual summaries of compensation claims analyzed by nature of claims, lost time, disposition and the like.

RESPONSE: Not Applicable.

SECTION 4.0

4.01 Does or did defendant provide pulmonary function tests on its asbestos-exposed workers?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

4.02 If the answer to the foregoing interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The nature of such program(s);
- (b) Whether such program was optional or mandatory; if mandatory, when it became so;
- (c) The location(s) of such program(s);
- (d) The date of service of such program(s);
- (e) If any of the program(s) have undergone modification, the nature and dates of such modification;
- (f) The custodian (by name, address and position) of records of such pulmonary function test program(s);
- (g) The highest level of management (by name, address and position) who participated in the decision to institute such program(s).

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION R: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of the records pertaining in any way to the implementation of the previously identified pulmonary function test programs.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.03 With reference to the pulmonary function testing program described in your answer to Interrogatory No. 4.02, state the frequency (e.g., tests per year or per month) such tests were administered to individual employees (and if frequency varies by categories of employee or if testing policy was modified, indicate when and where the modifications occurred and by what categories).

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.04 Did you ever institute a program of chest x-rays for asbestos-exposed workers?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

4.05 If the answer to the foregoing interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The nature of such program(s);
- (b) Whether such program was optional or mandatory; if mandatory, when it became so;
- (c) The location(s) of such program(s);
- (d) The date of service of such program(s);
- (e) If any of the program(s) have undergone modification, the nature and dates of such modification;

(f) The custodian (by name, address and position) of records of such x-ray test program(s);

(g) The highest level of management (by name, address and position) who participated in the decision to institute such program(s).

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.06 For each and every such program identified in your answer to the preceding interrogatory, describe in detail the method by which the results of such testing was made available to the employees.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION S: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of the records of the implementation of the afore-identified chest x-ray programs.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.07 Did defendant ever institute a safety program other than pulmonary function tests and x-ray exams for its asbestos exposed workers?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being vague, overly broad and burdensome, and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

4.08 If the answer to the foregoing interrogatories is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The nature of such program(s);
- (b) Whether such program was optional or mandatory; if mandatory, when it became so;
- (c) The location(s) of such program(s);
- (d) The date of service of such program(s);
- (e) If any of the program(s) have undergone modification, the nature and dates of such modification;
- (f) The custodian (by name, address and position) of records of such x-ray test program(s);
- (g) The highest level of management (by name, address and position) who participated in the decision to institute such program(s).

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION T: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of the records of the implementation of the afore-identified chest safety program.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.09 Did defendant ever institute a no-smoking program for its asbestos-exposed workers?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

4.10 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The nature of such program(s);
- (b) Whether such program was optional or mandatory; if mandatory, when it became so;
- (c) The location(s) of such program(s);
- (d) The date of service of such program(s);
- (e) If any of the program(s) have undergone modification, the nature and dates of such modification;
- (f) The custodian (by name, address and position) of records of such x-ray test program(s);
- (g) The highest level of management (by name, address and position) who participated in the decision to institute such program(s).

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.11 Identify all records which pertain to the implementation of the above-described program(s).

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION U: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of the records of the implementation of the above-identified no-smoking programs.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION N: Prior to 1900, dust counts, air sampling surveys, or other types of studies or tests were conducted at one or more of your facilities where products containing asbestos were manufactured to determine the levels of dust or asbestos fiber concentrations in the air.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being vague, overly broad and burdensome, and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION O: Prior to 1910, dust counts, air sampling surveys, or other types of studies or tests were conducted at one or more of your facilities where products containing asbestos were manufactured to determine the levels of dust or asbestos fiber concentrations in the air.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being vague, overly broad and burdensome, and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION P: Prior to 1920, dust counts, air sampling surveys, or other types of studies or tests were conducted at one or more of your facilities where products containing asbestos were manufactured to determine the levels of dust or asbestos fiber concentrations in the air.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being vague, overly broad and burdensome, and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION Q: Prior to 1930, dust counts, air sampling surveys, or other types of studies or tests were conducted at one or more of your facilities where products containing asbestos were manufactured to determine the levels of dust or asbestos fiber concentrations in the air.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being vague, overly broad and burdensome, and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION R: Prior to 1940, dust counts, air sampling surveys, or other types of studies or tests were conducted at one or more of your facilities where products containing asbestos were manufactured to determine the levels of dust or asbestos fiber concentration in the air.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being vague, overly broad and burdensome, and requesting documents, which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION S: Prior to 1950, dust counts, air sampling surveys, or other types of studies or tests were conducted at one or more of your facilities where products containing asbestos were manufactured to determine the levels of dust or asbestos fiber concentrations in the air.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being vague, overly broad and burdensome, and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION T: Prior to 1960, dust counts, air sampling surveys, or other types of studies or tests were conducted at one or more of your facilities where products containing asbestos were manufactured to determine the levels of dust or asbestos fiber concentrations in the air.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as being vague, overly broad and burdensome, and requesting documents which are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION U: Prior to 1970, dust counts, air sampling surveys, or other types of studies or

RESPONSE: Ford cannot state when a Ford employee or Ford became aware of the articles in question.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION II: You were aware as early as 1930 of research, studies and/or articles indicating a causal connection between asbestos exposure and

- (a) asbestosis;
- (b) lung cancer;
- (c) mesothelioma;
- (d) forms of cancer other than lung cancer.

RESPONSE: Ford cannot state when a Ford employee or Ford became aware of the articles in question.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION JJ: You were aware as early as 1940 of research, studies and/or articles indicating a causal connection between asbestos exposure and

- (a) asbestosis;
- (b) lung cancer;
- (c) mesothelioma;
- (d) forms of cancer other than lung cancer.

RESPONSE: Ford cannot state when a Ford employee or Ford became aware of the articles in question.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION KK: You were aware as early as 1950 of research, studies and/or articles indicating a causal connection between asbestos exposure and

- (a) asbestosis;
- (b) lung cancer;

(c) mesothelioma;

(d) forms of cancer other than lung cancer.

RESPONSE: Ford cannot state when a Ford employee or Ford became aware of the articles in question.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION LL: You were aware as early as 1960 of research, studies and/or articles indicating a causal connection between asbestos exposure and

(a) asbestosis;

(b) lung cancer;

(c) mesothelioma;

(d) forms of cancer other than lung cancer.

RESPONSE: Ford cannot state when a Ford employee or Ford became aware of the articles in question.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION MM: You were aware as early as 1970 of research, studies and/or articles indicating a causal connection between asbestos exposure and

(a) asbestosis;

(b) lung cancer;

(c) mesothelioma;

(d) forms of cancer other than lung cancer.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NN: You were aware as early as 1975 of research, studies and/or articles indicating a causal connection between asbestos exposure and

(a) asbestosis;

(b) lung cancer;

(c) mesothelioma;

(d) forms of cancer other than lung cancer.

RESPONSE: Ford cannot state when a Ford employee or Ford became aware of the articles in question.

4.19 Have you ever lobbied for or participated in the lobbying for, or in the creation of, governmental/legislative remedies for asbestos-related lung diseases?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

4.20 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state in detail:

- (a) The form such lobbying took;
- (b) All person(s) acting on behalf of defendant;
- (c) The amount of monies spent on the above lobbying;
- (d) The intended and actual results of such lobbying.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.21 Were you involved in any stage of the preparation of the bill H.R. 2740 introduced by Millicent Fenwick, Republican-New Jersey, in the House of Representatives?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

4.22 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, identify:

- (a) the manner in which defendant was involved;
- (b) The person(s) so involved;
- (c) The time spent in contribution to the creation of the Fenwick bill;
- (d) All documents generated by your involvement in the preparation of H.R. 2740.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION Y: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of all documents identified in subpart (d) of your answer to the preceding interrogatory.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.23 Was defendant involved in any aspect or stage of preparation of the Senate bill, S. 2847, introduced by Senator Hart, Democrat-Colorado, to the Senate of the United States?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

4.24 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, identify and describe in detail:

- (a) The manner in which defendant was involved;

- (b) The person(s) so involved;
- (c) The time spent in contribution to the creation of the Hart bill.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.25 With respect to liability insurance, identify each and every insurance policy actually, potentially or arguably effective for each year after the founding of defendant.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. However, without waiving such objections, a chart of insurance coverages can be made available.

4.26 For each insurance policy identified in your answer to the above interrogatory, state:

- (a) The name of the insurance company;
- (b) The policy number of each;
- (c) The name and address of the agent who sold the insurance policy;
- (d) The dollar limits of coverage and scope of coverage for liability of each such insurance policy and the deductibles of each such insurance policy;
- (e) Effective date and expiration date of each such insurance policy;

- (f) The name insured;
- (g) The name, address and title of the employee of the insurance company and/or agent who has supervisory responsibility for plaintiff's claims in this litigation;
- (h) Dollar limits of coverage for any medical payment personal injury protecting benefits which are the same as available to the plaintiff and under what condition;
- (i) The name of the attorney defending this litigation who represents each such carrier, identifying each;
- (j) Subsequent to the issuance of each policy or policies identified in the preceding interrogatory, was the original policy amended, changed or otherwise modified
- (k) If so, for each modification, for each such policy, identify:
 - 1. The substance of the modification;
 - 2. The date it became effective.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 4.25.

4.27 Has a claim or suit involving policy limits, reserved rights or disputed coverage been initiated against

any of the insurance companies identified in your answer to the preceding interrogatory?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

4.28 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The insurance company(ies) against whom the claim or lawsuit has been initiated;
- (b) The date upon which it was initiated;
- (c) The contentions therein;
- (d) The claim number, cause number, court, parties to the litigation, attorneys representing the parties in the litigation, and any other identifying information, including but not limited to the disposition of such litigation, claim or contention.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION 2: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions a copy of all documents which pertain in any way to your answers to the preceding insurance interrogatories.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Request as overly broad and burdensome. See attached List of Insurance Coverages.

4.29 Identify any other disputed matters with respect to any other insurance policies, including but not limited to:

- (a) The name of the insurance company;
- (b) The policy number;
- (c) The contentions of the respective parties;
- (d) The identity of the attorneys with relation to each contention;
- (e) The dates of each such contention, when initiated, and if relevant, when resolved;
- (f) The substance of the resolution.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

4.38 Do you have or have you had liability coverage other than that previously identified, such as umbrella or excess liability policies or secondary policies or self-insurance reserve pools?

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 4.25.

4.39 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state for each:

- (a) The name of the insurance company;

- (b) The policy number and other identification;
- (c) The name, address, telephone number, job title, or capacity of the agent who sold the insurance;
- (d) The dollar limits of coverage and scope of coverage for liability;
- (e) Effective date and expiration;
- (f) Dollar limits of coverage and scope of coverage for any medical or person injury protection or benefits, and whether same is available to plaintiffs and under what conditions;
- (g) The name, address, and title of the employee who has supervisory responsibility for the disposition of plaintiff's claims.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 4.25.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION AA: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions, a copy of all documents which pertain in any way to your answers to the foregoing interrogatory.

RESPONSE: See Response to Request for Production 2.

4.40 Identify all trade publications that have been subscribed to by your employers or agents, including

all such publications for which you have paid employee subscription.

RESPONSE: Libraries are maintained in the following sections:

Medical, Industrial Hygiene, Toxicology, Health Surveillance System. The following publications, among others, were subscribed to at some times during the period from 1928 to the present by the Medical Department: Industrial Health, Industrial Medicine & Surgery, Journal of Occupational Medicine, Journal of American Medical Association, Archives of Environmental Health, British Journal of Industrial Medicine, Annals of Occupational Hygiene, Journal of American Industrial Hygiene Association.

The following publications, among others, were subscribed to by Industrial Hygiene: Archives of Environmental Health, American Industrial Hygiene Journal, Industrial Hygiene & Toxicology, British Journal of Industrial Medicine, The Annals of Occupational Hygiene.

4.41 Identify all manufacturers' and/or chemists' association publications your company has subscribed to or received from 1920 to the present.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory No. 4.40.

4.42 Identify all medical journals or other such publications that your company has subscribed to or received from 1920 to the present.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory No. 4.40.

4.43 Identify all organizations connection with the asbestos products industry which your company has belonged to, participated in and/or financially supported from 1920 to the present.

RESPONSE: Ford has had memberships in the American Society for Testing and Materials, the Society of Automotive Engineers, and the American Industrial Hygiene Association. It would not be feasible for Ford to identify all of its employees who have been or are members of these organizations. Ford also had a membership from January, 1947 to December, 1974 in the Industrial Health Foundation.

It has been reported by representatives of the respective organizations that there is no record of Ford's membership in the following organizations: Institute of Occupational & Environmental Health, Quebec Asbestos Mining Association, Brake Lining Manufacturers Association, Friction Materials Standards Institute, Grinding Wheel Institute, Asbestos Textile Institute, Asbestos Information Association, Trudeau Foundation, Asbestos Brake Lining Manufacturers Institute.

4.44 Did your company or any of your employees, agents, personnel, directors, or officers ever belong to, participate in, or financially support the Asbestos Textile Institute?

RESPONSE: Ford cannot state whether any of its personnel were involved in these activities and objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and burdensome. However, without waiving such objections, Ford believes the answer to be "no."

4.45 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The date(s) of such membership, participation, or financial support;
- (b) The nature of your company's relationship with the Asbestos Textile Institute;
- (c) The name(s), address(es), and nature of duties of the person(s) in your company with any responsibilities regarding the Asbestos Textile Institute;
- (d) In what committee(s) of the Asbestos Textile Institute your company or persons in your company participate;
- (e) Whether any documents pertaining to such membership, participation, or financial support exist, and, if so, identify the custodian of such documents.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.46 State whether any safety precautions are or were needed by workers handling any asbestos product.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this interrogatory as being overly broad and burdensome. Without waiving such objections, Ford states that it issued an August 3, 1973 Memorandum to Plant Safety Engineers directing that brake drums be cleaned using industrial vacuum cleaners. The memo directed that air hoses should not be used to clean brake drums. Simultaneously, Maintenance Bulletin 137 was issued by the Plant Engineering Office to the same effect. Copies of these documents can be made available.

4.47 If safety precautions are or were needed, as to each asbestos product, state the following:

- (a) What safety precautions are or were needed;
- (b) Why these precautions are or were needed;
- (c) What safety precautions are or were recommended to workers or others by you;
- (d) State the date(s) such recommendations were made;
- (e) State the manner in which such recommendations were made, whether oral or written;
- (f) Identify the person(s) in your company making such recommendations;
- (g) If in writing, identify the custodian or possessor of such recommendations.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory No. 4.46.

4.48 Identify all persons in your company who are delegated to attend asbestos or asbestos product safety hearings or meetings, or be familiar with asbestos or asbestos product safety.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this Interrogatory as being vague, overly broad and burdensome, and requesting information which is neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

4.49 Has any buyer or user of any asbestos product manufactured or distributed by you ever been given instructions by anyone to discontinue using such asbestos product?

RESPONSE: No.

4.50 If the answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

- (a) Identify the date of such instructions;
- (b) Identify the buyer or user;
- (c) State the reason(s) for such instructions being given;
- (d) Identify the person(s) giving such instructions to the buyer or user;
- (e) If written, identify the custodian of such instructions.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.51 Have you ever engaged in any joint venture or cooperative arrangement with any company, corporation, or other business entity concerning the manufacture or distribution of asbestos or any asbestos product, including, but not limited to, any technical assistance arrangement, any research regarding asbestos or asbestos products or any marketing arrangement?

RESPONSE: No.

4.52 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The date(s) of any such joint venture or cooperative arrangement;
- (b) With what business entity you engaged in any such joint venture or cooperative arrangement;
- (c) Describe in detail the nature of any such joint venture or cooperative arrangement;
- (d) Whether any documents exist regarding any such joint venture or cooperative arrangement, and, if so, state:
 - 1. The date(s) of any such documents;
 - 2. The custodian or possessor of any such documents.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

4.53 When did you first learn in any manner or from any source that asbestos or asbestos products are hazardous or dangerous to the health of persons?

RESPONSE: Ford cannot state when a Ford employee or Ford first became aware of this information.

4.54 From whom did you learn the information referred to in the answer to the preceding interrogatory?

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 4.53.

4.55 State what documents reflect the information given in answer to the two preceding interrogatories, their date, and the present custodian of said records.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory 4.53.

SECTION 5.0

5.01 Do you contend that any other party defendants in this litigation caused or contributed to the damage or damages sustained by plaintiff or plaintiff's decedent?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.02 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

- (a) Identify each such party;
- (b) State the manner and means of such contribution;
- (c) Indicate the quantification thereof in percentage terms;
- (d) Identify each document which supports such a contention, including the custodian thereof;

- (e) Identify each person(s) who has/have knowledge concerning such contribution by name, address, phone number, and relationship to defendant.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION AA: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce according to the above instructions, a copy of all documents identified in your answer to the foregoing interrogatory.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.03 Do you contend that any person, business, or entity not a party to this litigation contributed to the damage or damages to plaintiff?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.06 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

- (a) Specifically indicate the nature of the conduct;
- (b) Identify each document which in any way bears upon this issue;
- (c) Identify any eye-witness or other person who has information of any kind concerning such contention.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.07 Do you contend that plaintiff voluntarily and/or knowingly assumed the risk of an asbestos-related injury?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.08 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

(a) Specifically indicate the nature of the conduct;

(b) Identify each document which in any way bears upon this issue;

(c) Identify any eye-witness or other person who has information of any kind concerning such contention.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.09 Do you contend that the plaintiff's asbestos-related injuries were caused or contributed to, in whole or in part, by improper and/or negligent actions of any of the respective plaintiff's fellow servants?

5.10 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

(a) Specifically indicate the nature of the conduct?

(b) Identify each document which in any way bears upon this issue;

(c) Specifically identify any eye-witness or other

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.11 Do you contend that the plaintiff failed to use reasonable precautions for his own safety or otherwise failed to mitigate or minimize his damages?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.12 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

(a) Specifically indicate the nature of the conduct;

(b) Identify each document which in any way bears upon this issue;

(c) Specifically identify any eye-witness or other person who has information of any kind concerning such contention.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.13 Do you contend that the plaintiff misused your product?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.14 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

- (a) Specifically indicate the nature of the conduct;
- (b) Identify each document which in any way bears upon this issue;
- (c) Specifically identify any eye-witness or other person who has information of any kind concerning such contention.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.15 Do you contend that the plaintiff or any other person materially altered your asbestos-containing products prior to their use by the plaintiff?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.16 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

- (a) Specifically indicate the nature of the conduct;
- (b) Identify each document which in any way bears upon this issue;
- (c) Specifically identify any eye-witness or other person who has information of any kind concerning such contention.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.17 Do you contend that the damages sustained by the plaintiff was caused by third parties not named as parties in this action?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.18 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

- (a) Specifically indicate the nature of the conduct;
- (b) Identify each document which in any way bears upon this issue;
- (c) Specifically identify any eye-witness or other person who has information of any kind concerning such contention.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.19 Do you contend that plaintiff or any named defendant voluntarily and/or knowingly assumed the risk of an asbestos-related injury?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.20 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative:

- (a) Identify who you contend voluntarily and/or knowingly assumed the risk of an asbestos-related injury;
- (b) Indicate the exact reason(s) why you believe he/they assumed such risk.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.21 Do you contend that this court lacks jurisdiction over you on the grounds that there is an insufficiency of process or an insufficiency of service of process?

RESPONSE: No.

5.22 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, indicate the exact reason(s) why you believe that process has been insufficient and/or why the service of process was insufficient.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

5.23 Do you contend that the plaintiff failed to commence the action herein within the time required by the applicable statute of limitations?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.24 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state in detail each and every fact you rely on in raising that defense, and state exactly which statute of limitations you are relying upon for that

defense and the date of commencement of the statute of limitations.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.25 Do you contend that the plaintiff's claim against you is barred by the doctrine of laches and/or waiver and/or estoppel?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.26 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, for each such plaintiff specify the facts, circumstances, documents, or other evidence upon which you rely for that defense.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.27 Do you contend that the claim of plaintiff has been barred by state and/or federal industrial insurance and/or worker's compensation laws?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.28 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, specify the applicable state and/or federal industrial insurance law and/or worker's compensation law upon which you rely, and specify the facts, circumstances, documents, or other evidence upon which you rely for this defense.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.29 Do you contend that your sales and distribution of products containing asbestos was consistent with the state-of-the-art, industry practice or custom, general scientific and/or medical knowledge and standards existing at any particular time pertinent to this lawsuit?

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this interrogatory as vague, overly broad and burdensome.

5.30 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) The facts and circumstances upon which you rely;
- (b) Identify each document which in any way bears upon this issue;
- (c) Specifically identify any eye-witness who has information of any kind concerning such a contention.

RESPONSE: Ford objects to this interrogatory as vague, overly broad and burdensome.

5.31 Do you contend that the claim of the plaintiff is barred by improper venue and/or lack of jurisdiction?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.32 If your answer to the preceding interrogatory is in the affirmative, indicate the reason(s) why you assert there is improper venue and/or lack of jurisdiction.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.33 List any person with knowledge of facts material to this case, including any persons you presently consider may be called as witnesses at trial, including their names, addresses, occupations, and telephone numbers.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.34 List the names, addresses, occupations, professional qualifications, and telephone numbers of all expert witnesses whom you will call at trial of this case, and as to each further state:

- (a) The subject matter upon which each such witness is expected to testify,
- (b) The substance of the facts and opinions to which the expert is expected to testify;
- (c) A summary of the grounds for each such opinion.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.35 Identify each document reviewed and/or generated by each expert identified in your answer to the

preceding interrogatory in connection with this specific litigation; and identify the document which each expert has reviewed with respect to this case.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

. 5.36 Identify each document reviewed and/or generated by each expert identified in your answer to Interrogatory No. 5.34 above in connection with any asbestos claim or lawsuit.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION DD: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce, according to the above instructions, all documents identified in your response to the preceding interrogatory.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Request for Production.

5.37 With respect to each such expert identified above:

- (a) Indicate the total number of claims or lawsuits for which said expert has been retained;
- (b) Identify the person(s) responsible for the decision to retain;
- (c) Identify the trial court, worker's compensation cause number, or other

information which identifies where any sworn testimony (including affidavits, depositions, or other testimony) was given;

(d) State in detail the nature of such testimony.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.38 Have you, your attorneys or agents, any written, otherwise recorded, or oral statements from any witnesses or persons who have or claim to have any knowledge of facts relevant to or arising out of this lawsuit? If so, for each such statement:

- (a) Identify each person, with name and address, making the statement;
- (b) Identify each statement;
- (c) Identify each person, with name and address, at whose request such statement was made;
- (d) Identify each person, with name and address, who prepared such statement;
- (e) Identify each person, with name and address, now in possession of each statement.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.39 Have you conducted or caused to be conducted any surveillance or investigation of any of the facts pertaining to this lawsuit?

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

5.40 If your answer to the foregoing interrogatory is in the affirmative, state:

- (a) Who was investigated or surveilled;
- (b) Who conducted such surveillance;
- (c) The form of the reporting of such investigation or surveillance;
- (d) Identify all tapes, reports, photos, statements, and the like so generated;
- (e) Identify the name and address of the custodian of the tapes, reports, photos, statements, etc., referred to in your answer to subpart (d) hereof.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Interrogatory.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. EE: Pursuant to CR 34, attach or produce, according to the above instructions, all tapes, reports, photos, statements, or other documents and the like identified or related to Interrogatories No.'s 5.01 through the preceding interrogatory herein.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Request.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION FF: You are hereby requested, pursuant to CR 34, to produce for inspection and copying any and all sales records pertaining to the sale,

delivery, or use of your asbestoscontaining products at the facilities identified in answer to Interrogatories No. 1.20 and 1.24 herein.

RESPONSE: Since discovery is not complete, Ford cannot respond to this Request.

5.41 State whether or not you have ever made any asbestos-containing canisters or filters for use in respirators or masks. If you have made such filters, state:

- (a) The brand name and type of filter;
- (b) The years of production;
- (c) The location of any documents or materials pertaining to the production, distribution or advertising information concerning said filters, respirators and/or masks.

RESPONSE: No.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION GO: Pursuant to CR 34, produce such study or report for inspection and copying in the office of the plaintiff's counsel pursuant to the instructions in these interrogatories.

RESPONSE: Not applicable.