

February 3, 2017

**NOTICE REGARDING POSTING NARCO TRUST DIRECTIVES RELATED TO EXPOSURE**

In April 2016, the NARCO Trust issued Directives Related to Exposure to its claims processor. Those Directives with their exhibits (redacted as appropriate) are attached. The claims processor is instructed to process claims in accordance with these and other instructions and the TDP. Processing instructions change from time to time and may be amended by the NARCO Trust without further update or notice to claimants. In the event of any inconsistency between an instruction and the TDP, the TDP controls.

The attached are provided for your information only and do not guarantee the payment of any claim.

NARCO Trust Directives Related to Exposure – April 2016

These directives address exposure issues only. In every case, all medical and other requirements under the TDP must also be met before any recommendation for payment is made.

1. Communications between claims processor and a claimant’s law firm on a platform other than eClaims should be linked to the individual claim in its eClaims file as appropriate, or, if of a general nature, maintained separately on eClaims with a NARCO designation.
2. The directives in this paragraph 2 apply to “NARCO Presumptive Claims” only, *i.e.* where claimants submitted claim forms showing that the injured party worked in an industry and occupation designated on the “Presumptive NARCO Chart” (available on the Trust website) at an Approved Worksite during the stipulated time frame:
  - (a) If the exposure evidence submitted shows both presumptive and non-presumptive occupations in the same line-item for the injured party’s work history, and the dates for that entry fall entirely within the stipulated time frame for the identified Approved Worksite, the claim should be recommended for payment. [REDACTED]
  - (b) If the exposure evidence submitted shows both presumptive and non-presumptive occupations in the same line-item for the injured party’s work history, but the dates for that entry extend beyond the stipulated time frame for the identified Approved Worksite, issue deficiency code PRE [REDACTED]. Where the duration of the employment date range falling outside the stipulated time frame is minimal (*e.g.* 2 out of 20 years are beyond the stipulated time frame for the identified Approved Worksite) the Trustees will review the claim before any action is taken.
  - (c) If the exposure evidence submitted separately lists non-presumptive occupations and/or nonqualified worksites for date ranges that overlap with the date range for the presumptive pairing, the claim should be recommended for payment (*e.g.*, a union laborer who worked in a presumptive industry and occupation in multiple locations, as long as at least one of the jobs was at an Approved Worksite during the stipulated time frame). [REDACTED]
  - (d) The industry/occupation pairings designated on the chart attached hereto as Exhibit A satisfy the TDP’s exposure requirement only if the injured party worked on an Approved Worksite during the stipulated time frame (the “NARCO Presumptive Stipulation”).
3. Newport News Shipyard (“NNS”). No inferences will be drawn of the requisite exposure to a NARCO asbestos-containing product based solely on the injured party’s having worked in, with, or near the boiler rooms, engine rooms, machinery spaces, steam pipes, and/or other high-heat areas on commercial ships that were constructed, refurbished or repaired at NNS.

Despite this, however, the requisite inference of exposure to a NARCO ACP can be drawn at NNS provided that a claimant submits competent evidence stating that the injured party (a) worked at NNS between January 1, 1961 and March 31, 1967 and (b) during that time, worked on a regular basis in the engine rooms, boiler rooms, machinery spaces, or other high heat areas of: (i) the following commercial ships: Pioneer Moon, American Challenger, Atlantic Prestige, Esso Houston and Esso New Orleans; and (ii) any other commercial ship where the Trust obtains and/or discovers competent evidence of the presence of a NARCO ACP (which evidence the Trust shall provide to Honeywell thirty (30) days before adding any other commercial ships to the list).

4. Prior to making a recommendation for payment on any individual claim, the reviewer must determine that the claim is supported by competent and credible exposure evidence.
5. Competent evidence of exposure means evidence that is relevant and reliable, and includes, without limitation, the types of evidence identified in section 4.7(b)(3) of the TDP. For an affidavit of a non-injured party to be competent, such affidavit must describe the basis of the affiant's personal knowledge of the facts he alleges, (*e.g.* the injured party told me that he regularly breathed asbestos dust while on the job). Members of the injured party's immediate family or household are presumed to have personal knowledge of certain information, including but not limited to the injured party's worksites, dates of employment, job titles, day-to-day duties, and working conditions.
6. Credible evidence of exposure means evidence that is believable based on a review of the evidence submitted as a whole.
7. The following examples represent evidence that raises competence and/or credibility concerns:
  - (a) The claims reviewer shall not consider exposure allegations that use identical descriptive language as the language highlighted in the exposure affidavit(s) attached hereto as Exhibit B (as may be supplemented from time to time).
  - (b) The claims reviewer shall not consider exposure allegations that use only conditional language (*e.g.* "could," "should," or "may" have been exposed) to describe the injured party's exposure. [*See, e.g.*, the highlighted allegations in the exposure affidavits attached hereto as Exhibit C].
  - (c) The claims reviewer shall not consider exposure allegations that use a "check-the-box" format substantially similar to the language highlighted in the exposure affidavit(s) attached hereto as Exhibit D.
  - (d) The claims reviewer shall not consider exposure allegations that check off every single NARCO product, including ones where the dates of the use of the asbestos containing product clearly fall outside the dates of the claimant's exposure. [REDACTED]
  - (e) The claims reviewer shall not consider exposure allegations made by an injured party in an affidavit executed after a documented diagnosis of dementia.

- (f) The claims reviewer shall not consider exposure allegations that simply copy, word for word, the exposure criteria listed in the claim form or exposure language of the TDP.
8. Where the Trustees have directed that certain exposure evidence not be considered, the claim shall be evaluated on the basis of any remaining competent and credible evidence of exposure, whether in the claim file, in other claim files, elsewhere in eClaims, or in the Trust's files, [REDACTED]. Evidence relied upon in review of each particular claim shall be linked to such claim's file.
9. Subject to the NARCO Presumptive Stipulation, any claims recommended for payment that do not identify a specific NARCO asbestos containing product by name (if not on an Approved Worksite) or a NARCO product generally (if on an Approved Worksite) shall be forwarded to the Trust along with the exposure documentation submitted in support of such claim highlighted to show the relevant portions relied upon by the reviewer.
10. Exposure to "Raw Asbestos"/"Asbestos Fibers". Each claim must be supported by requisite evidence of exposure to a specific asbestos-containing product manufactured, sold, or distributed by NARCO or its predecessors. This standard applies to injured parties who worked on a regular basis in close proximity to workers engaged in the activities set forth in Section 4.7(b)(2)(a)-(c).
11. "Regular basis" as used in the TDP means that the injured party's job duties routinely required them to either work directly with the NARCO asbestos containing product or in close proximity to workers engaged in the activities set forth in Section 4.7(b)(2)(a) through (c). For example, an insulator's job duties would bring him into contact with asbestos containing products, whereas a typical office worker's job duties would not.
12. If the filing date of a lawsuit entered in eClaims by the claimant does not match the date reflected on the supporting file-stamped copy of the complaint or other pleading, the claims processor shall use the date that is reflected in the file-stamped document.
13. When a reviewer marks a claim as "peer reviewed," the reviewer shall note the name of the peer and the section or sections of the file that were peer reviewed.
14. No claim shall be recommended for payment unless or until the claims processor has reviewed the entire claim file. If deposition transcripts or interrogatory responses were provided, the claims processor must (i) make sure that the claimant provided the entire transcript and/or set of interrogatory responses, and (ii) read the entire transcript and/or set of interrogatory responses.
15. If the injured party worked on an Approved Worksite but did not submit competent evidence that he worked there during the stipulated time frame, then the claims processor shall process the claim in the same manner as if the injured party did not work on an Approved Worksite, and to the extent such claim otherwise qualifies for payment (through circumstantial or direct evidence) the Trustees shall review the underlying evidence that supports exposure.

Exhibit A











Exhibit B

Intentionally Deleted

Exhibit C

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1. [REDACTED]

2. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] would have worked in the area of the various trades removing and applying castable and gunnite materials manufactured by NARCO. He would have been required to work on the piping, pumps and valves connected to this refractory-insulated equipment. These various tasks would have exposed him to large amounts of asbestos-containing dust from the installation and removal of castable and gunnite materials manufactured by NARCO which he would have breathed in, on a continuous basis throughout his career.

3. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

4. [REDACTED]

5. [REDACTED]

6. [REDACTED]

7. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1. [REDACTED]

2. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] would have assisted bricklayers by dumping and mixing numerous bags of the castable and gunnite materials manufactured by NARCO on a continuous basis throughout his career. In addition, he would have had to remove the castable and gunnite materials manufactured by NARCO after it had been used and required to be replaced. All of these various tasks would have created large amounts of asbestos-containing dust that he would have been exposed to and breathed in on a continuous basis throughout his career.

3. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

4. [REDACTED]

5. [REDACTED]

6. [REDACTED]

7. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Exhibit D

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5. [REDACTED] He/she: (initial one or more of the following):

- a. Worked on a regular basis with a NARCO asbestos-containing product
- or
- b. Worked on a regular basis in close proximity to workers who:
  - i. Fabricated NARCO asbestos-containing products or
  - ii. Installed, altered, repaired, removed or otherwise worked with a NARCO asbestos containing product.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]