

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON
FOR KING COUNTY

SYLVIN W. PICKNER and EVELYN I.)
PICKNER, a married couple,)
Plaintiffs,)
v.)
OWENS CORNING, et al.,)
Defendant.)

No: 98-2-09390-1 SEA

KAISER GYPSUM COMPANY, INC.'S
RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET
OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUEST
FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

PROPOUNDING PARTY: SYLVIN W. PICKNER and EVELYN I. PICKNER

RESPONDING PARTY: KAISER GYPSUM COMPANY, INC.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

No single person associated with Kaiser Gypsum has the knowledge necessary to supply every answer to these interrogatories and request for production, and a number of individuals who might have had personal knowledge of the matters addressed by these interrogatories are either deceased or no longer employees of Kaiser Gypsum.

1 Further, Kaiser Gypsum objects to these interrogatories on the grounds that they are vague,
2 ambiguous, overbroad as to time, scope, products and location not in issue, and seek information not
3 relevant to the issues in this lawsuit.

4 Without waiving said objections and in the interest of full disclosure, Kaiser Gypsum responds
5 solely with regard to its Seattle facility and with regard to products identified by plaintiff.

6 Kaiser Gypsum continues its ongoing investigation to locate information regarding the subject
7 matter of these interrogatories and reserves its right to supplement these interrogatory responses as may
8 be necessary, if and when, such further information becomes available.

9 INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

10 State your full legal name, date of incorporation, principle place of business and whether you
11 are a private or public corporation.

12 **RESPONSE:**

13 Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc. was incorporated on December 1, 1952 in the State of
14 Washington. Its principal place of business is Pleasanton, California, and it is a privately held
15 corporation.

16 INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

17 For each year between 1950 and 1978, identify your officers and directors.

18 **RESPONSE:**

19 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, burdensome,
20 ambiguous, and overbroad, as it contains years when Kaiser Gypsum was not doing business, and thus
21 it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said
22 objections, Kaiser Gypsum responds: see Exhibit A attached hereto.

23 INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

24 Please relate your corporate history from 1948 to the present, including, but not limited to, any
25 mergers, acquisitions, name changes or re-incorporations or secession of business operations.

RESPONSE:

1 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, and
2 overbroad, as it contains years when Kaiser Gypsum was not doing business, and thus it is not
3 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objections,
4 Kaiser Gypsum responds:

5 Kaiser Gypsum was organized and incorporated in 1952. On June 19, 1952, Permanente Cement
6 Company (later known as Kaiser Cement Corporation) formed a wholly owned subsidiary named Kaiser
7 Gypsum Company. On December 1, 1952, Kaiser Gypsum Company was merged with Pacific Coast
8 Cement Company, a Washington corporation and another subsidiary of Permanente Cement Company.
9 At the time of the merger, Pacific Coast Cement Company had no assets or operations. The name of
10 the combined company was then changed to Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc. In 1978, Kaiser Gypsum
11 Company, Inc. ceased all business operations.

12 INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

13 Have you at any time engaged in the sale of a product which contained asbestos fibers? If so,
14 please identify

- 15 (a) the names of your entities selling each of those products;
16 (b) the trade or brand name of each asbestos containing product sold by you;
17 (c) the dates each product was manufactured or sold;
18 (d) a description of each product including the type and percentage of asbestos contained in said
19 product;
20 (e) how each product was packaged; and
21 (f) your gross sales of each asbestos containing product between 1950 and 1978.

22 **RESPONSE:**

23 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, and
24 overbroad, as it seeks information about types of products and places not at issue in this litigation and
25 years when Kaiser Gypsum was not in business. Thus, this interrogatory is not reasonably calculated
to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. As to subsection (f), Kaiser Gypsum objects to this on
the grounds that it is unduly burdensome, harassing and not reasonably calculated to lead to the

1 discovery of admissible evidence. Further, Kaiser Gypsum responds that it does not possess complete
2 information for its Seattle facility for said years.

3 Without waiving said objections, Kaiser Gypsum responds that the following products which
4 contained asbestos fibers for various periods of time were manufactured at its Seattle facility.

5 1. Joint Compound Powder

6 This product was manufactured at Seattle from 1969 to 1975 and contained 7.5% to 10%
7 chrysotile asbestos. This off-white powder was packaged and sold in sacks of 10 and 25 pounds.

8 2. Finishing Compound Powder

9 This product was manufactured at Seattle from 1969 to 1975 and contained 3.5% to 11%
10 chrysotile asbestos. It was white to off-white powder and packaged in sacks of 25 pounds.

11 3. One-Day Joint Compound Powder

12 This product was manufactured at Seattle from 1970 to 1975 and contained 3.5%
13 chrysotile asbestos. It was a white to off-white powder and packaged in sacks of 25 pounds.

14 4. Three Purpose Compound Powder

15 This product was manufactured at Seattle from 1969 to 1975 and contained 5% to 11%
16 chrysotile asbestos. This was a white to off-white powder and packaged in sacks of 25 pounds.

17 5. Dual-Purpose Pre-Mix Compound

18 This product was manufactured at Seattle from 1969 to 1975 and contained 2.5% to 4%
19 chrysotile asbestos. This was a white to off-white or light buff colored paste and packaged in buckets
20 or cartons of 4 to 5 gallons.

21 6. Pre-Mix Topping Compound

22 This product was manufactured at Seattle from 1971 to 1975 and contained 1% chrysotile
23 asbestos. This was a white to off-white colored paste, packaged and sold in buckets of 4 or 5 gallons
24 and cartons of 4 gallons.

25 INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

1 Identify the date, if any, on which you ceased the sale of asbestos-containing products.

2 **RESPONSE:**

3 By 1975, Kaiser Gypsum's Seattle plant ceased to manufacture products containing asbestos.

4 INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

5 For each product identified in response to Interrogatory No. 4, identify all warnings you
6 employed to protect the purchasers said products from asbestos-related harm including in your answer
7 the text of said warning and the date on which it commenced.

8 **RESPONSE:**

9 Beginning in 1972, Kaiser Gypsum affixed caution labels to the packages and containers of its
10 asbestos-containing products. The warning label, as prescribed by OSHA, read:

11 CAUTION: contains asbestos fibers; avoid creating dust; breathing
12 asbestos dust may cause serious bodily harm.

13
14
15
16 INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

17 State the date on which you learned that asbestos poses a hazard to human health.

18 **RESPONSE:**

19 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous,
20 overbroad, and assumes that any type of asbestos, in any condition or in any amount, poses a hazard
21 to human health.

22 Without waiving said objections, Kaiser Gypsum responds that it became aware generally
23 sometime in the 1970s that users of some asbestos-containing building products could be at risk of
24 inhaling quantities of respirable asbestos fibers sufficient to pose a potential hazard to their health.

25 INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

1 Identify all measures you employed to protect the users of your asbestos-containing products
2 from any asbestos-related harm.

3 **RESPONSE:**

4 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous,
5 overbroad, and not sufficiently limited in time or scope. Without waiving said objections, Kaiser
6 Gypsum responds that it placed warning labels on its asbestos-containing products upon learning that
7 such products posed potential health hazards to end users.

8 INTERROGATORY NO. 9:

9 Identify all measures you employed to protect your employees from any asbestos-related harm.

10 **RESPONSE:**

11 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous,
12 and overbroad. Further, Kaiser Gypsum is informed and believes that plaintiff was neither employed
13 by Kaiser Gypsum, nor present at any of its plants at any time. Thus, events occurring at any Kaiser
14 Gypsum plant have no relevance to the conditions allegedly experienced by plaintiff. Therefore, this
15 interrogatory is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

16 INTERROGATORY NO. 10:

17 Identify all trade publications to which you subscribed between 1950 and 1978.

18 **RESPONSE:**

19 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous,
20 overbroad, and unintelligible as to the word "trade publications". Furthermore, this interrogatory
21 contemplates years when Kaiser Gypsum was not in business. Thus, this interrogatory is not reasonably
22 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving said objections, Kaiser
23 Gypsum responds that it is informed and believes it was a member of the Gypsum Association from
24 approximately 1952 to approximately 1978, and believes it may have received its publications.

25 INTERROGATORY NO. 11:

1 Do you maintain a computerized listing of the sales of your asbestos-containing products? If so,
2 describe the information stored on said computer including whether said sales are broken down by
3 geographic area, the type of computer program and the manner in which specific sales information can
4 be retrieved.

5 **RESPONSE:**

6 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous,
7 overbroad in time, place, and scope. Furthermore, this interrogatory calls for information which seeks
8 to invade the purview of the attorney-client privilege and doctrine of attorney-work product.

9 INTERROGATORY NO. 12:

10 For each asbestos product identified in response to Interrogatory 4, state the gross sales
11 of said product in the State of Oregon between 1965 and 1980.

12 **RESPONSE:**

13 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is burdensome,
14 harassing, vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unintelligible as written. Additionally, this interrogatory
15 seeks information regarding time periods when Kaiser Gypsum was either not in business, was not
16 selling to the State of Oregon, and/or was not manufacturing asbestos-containing products. Thus, this
17 interrogatory is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further,
18 Kaiser Gypsum responds that it does not possess complete information for Oregon sales for said years.

19 INTERROGATORY NO. 13:

20 For each asbestos product identified in response to Interrogatory No. 4, identify the entity from
21 whom you purchased the asbestos for use in said product.

22 **RESPONSE:**

23 Kaiser Gypsum is informed and believes that the following at one time or another were its
24 suppliers of chrysotile asbestos:

- 25 1. John K. Bice
2. Harrison & Crosfield
3. Carmonia Chemical Company

4. Philip Carey Corporation (Carey Canadian Asbestos)
5. Western Chemical Company
6. Johns-Manville
7. Union Carbide
8. E.S. Browning
9. Loomis Chemical Company
10. Benson Chemical
11. Paul W. Wood (Johns-Manville)

INTERROGATORY NO. 14:

Identify the legal relationship between Kaiser Gypsum Corporation and Kaiser Cement Corporation.

RESPONSE:

Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and unintelligible as written, as there was no such entity as "Kaiser-Gypsum Corporation". Furthermore, this interrogatory is vague and ambiguous as to "legal relationship" and calls for "legal" opinion beyond the scope of responding defendant's knowledge. Without waiving said objections, and as Kaiser Gypsum understands this question, Kaiser Gypsum responds, it was a wholly-owned subsidiary of Kaiser Cement Corporation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15:

For each year between 1955 and 1975, identify the plant manager of your Seattle plant and his/her four principal subordinates.

RESPONSE:

1 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, and
2 overbroad. Without waiving said objections, Kaiser Gypsum responds that, as of November 1, 1970,
3 the manager of the Kaiser Gypsum Seattle plant was M. Slavich. At this juncture, Kaiser Gypsum is
4 unable to discern who the plant manager's "four principal subordinates" would have been. Thus,
5 discovery is ongoing into this matter and Kaiser Gypsum reserves its right to supplement this response,
6 should further information be discovered.

7 INTERROGATORY NO. 16:

8 For each year between 1955 and 1975, identify the plant manager of each of your Oregon plants
9 and his/her four primary subordinates

10 **RESPONSE:**

11 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous,
12 overbroad as to time, place and scope. Further, this interrogatory is not reasonably calculated to lead
13 to the discovery of admissible evidence, as Kaiser Gypsum's Oregon plant never made the types of
14 asbestos-containing products at issue in this case. Without waiving said objections, Kaiser Gypsum
15 responds that as of November 1, 1970, the manager of Kaiser Gypsum Oregon plant was J. Cassidy.
16 At this juncture, Kaiser Gypsum is unable to discern who the plant manager's "four principal
17 subordinates" would have been. Thus, discovery is ongoing into this matter and Kaiser Gypsum
18 reserves its right to supplement this response, should further information be discovered.

19 INTERROGATORY NO. 17:

20 Identify all contracts and/or re-branding agreements between you and Owens-Corning Fiberglas
21 including in your answer the date said contract was entered into, the terms of said contract and the dates
22 that said contract was in effect.

23 **RESPONSE:**

24 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous,
25 and overbroad as to time, place and scope. Without waiving said objections, Kaiser Gypsum responds

1 that, it never had a "contract and/or rebranding" agreement with Owens-Corning Fiberglas as to the
2 types of products at issue in this litigation.

3 INTERROGATORY NO. 18:

4 For each of the following individuals (named in Documents PLTF 001 - PLTF 1384) please state
5 (a) the individual's full name;
6 (b) whether they are alive or deceased;
7 (c) their current address and telephone number or, if you do not know these individuals'
current address, their last known address;
(d) what position, they held in your company;
(e) whether they are currently employed by you.

8 R.L. Allgood
L. Beck
9 L.M. Bryan
J.W. Blewett
10 C.E. Caprye
R.C. Crowle
11 G.J. Chavalas
D.R. Canham
12 J.D. Cassidy
J.D. Chambers
13 P.D. Crelman
H.C. Dupuis
14 G.C. David
N.D. Dicks
15 L.R. Flicker
P.J. Franklin
16 P.T. Framlom
J.W. Glweitt
17 R.W. Grigg
C.R. Grimme
18 J.M. Garoutte
D.H. Homan
19 J.P. Hughes
P.A. Hawkins
20 W.D. Hopper
R.J. Hoffman
21 R.L. Jones
G. James
22 J. B. Kirk
R.L. Murh
23 J.F. Modaff
Richard Madden
24 William McKinnon
B.J. Murphy
25 P.D. Orleman

1 J.W. Post
2 G.M. Perry
3 J.K. Parker
4 J.C. Reilly
5 C.F. Radier
6 E.N. Reddick
7 J.P. Rohrer
8 Al Raffaelli
9 Mike Slavich
10 F.H. Schaper
11 T.V. Smith
12 E.M. Schaper
13 E.W. Schaper
14 S. Steffens
15 J. Schlenner
16 J.H. Scheahan
17 A.J. Trommershausan
18 W.L. Traub
19 S.R. Witt
20 R.J. Wiborn
21 H.L. Weightman
22 J.I. Walker
23 J.H. Walton
24 V. Whitecage
25

RESPONSE:

Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, burdensome, oppressive, and violative of said employees' rights to privacy. Given the fact that Kaiser Gypsum has not manufactured a product since 1978, there is no one currently employed who is able to identify the full names of said individuals, their names and addresses, any positions which they may have held or whether they are living or dead. Additionally, Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. See response to Interrogatory No. 19.

INTERROGATORY NO. 19:

For each individual identified in Interrogatory 18, state whether that person has ever been deposed in asbestos-related litigation and identify the case, jurisdiction, cause number and the attorneys who represented the defendant and plaintiff at said deposition.

1 **RESPONSE:**

2 Kaiser Gypsum incorporates its response to Interrogatory No. 18 as though fully set forth herein.
3 Without waiving said objections, Kaiser Gypsum responds that W.L. McKinnon, former research
4 engineer, was deposed on August 2, 1984 in the following case: *Robert Butts v. Kaiser Gypsum*
5 *Company, Inc., et al.*, Contra Costa Superior Court No. 251401; Harlan C. Dupuis, former manager
6 of research and development, was deposed on April 16, 1985 in the following case: *Kathryn Maksim*
7 *v. USG, et al.*, San Francisco County Superior Court Case No. 768674; Thomas V. Smith, former
8 technical advisor for accessory products was deposed on March 11, 1992 in the following case:
9 *Michael Richie, et al. v. Raybestos Manhattan, et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court No. 933324;
10 Richard C. Crowle, former merchandising manager, was deposed on July 26, 1995 in the following
11 case: *Central Weslyn College v. W.R. Grace, et al.*, U.S. District Court, District of South Carolina,
12 Charleston Division, Civil Action No. 2:87-1860-8. The attorneys who represented the various parties
13 at those depositions are identified in the transcripts.

14 **INTERROGATORY NO. 20:**

15 Your attention is directed to documents PLTF 0001 to PLTF 1384 that were served upon your
16 counsel by the undersigned in the Winter of 1998. If you contend that any of the foregoing documents
is not genuine, set forth the factual and legal basis for your contention.

17 **RESPONSE:**

18 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous,
19 overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Without waiving said objections, Kaiser Gypsum responds that,
20 as to those documents authored by or directed to Kaiser Gypsum, Kaiser Gypsum does not contest their
21 genuineness. However, Kaiser Gypsum is unable to attest to the genuineness of any document not
22 authored or directed to Kaiser Gypsum, including, but not limited to, the following documents: PLTF
23 0001 through PLTF 0003; PLTF 0366 to PLTF 0372. Additionally, Kaiser Gypsum cannot attest to
24 the genuineness of any document referring to Permanente Cement, Kaiser Cement and Gypsum
25 Company or Kaiser Cement Corporation.

1 INTERROGATORY NO. 21:

2 Identify every person who supplied information to answer these Interrogatories including in your
3 answer the specific interrogatory for which each person supplied information.

4 **RESPONSE:**

5 As previously stated above, Kaiser Gypsum ceased all marketing activities in 1978, thus no one
6 person associated with Kaiser Gypsum provided information for a specific interrogatory herein. The
7 information provided in response to the interrogatories comes from a collection of information gathered
8 throughout the years from various different sources.

11 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION**

- 12 1. Produce all documents in your possession that were generated before 1978 and refer or relate
13 to any human health hazard associated with asbestos including, but not limited to, memoranda,
14 letters, journal articles or notes.

15 **RESPONSE:**

16 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and
17 not limited in time, scope, or location. Furthermore, this request is burdensome and oppressive and
18 assumes that Kaiser Gypsum possesses such documents. Without waiving objections, Kaiser Gypsum
19 refers plaintiff to documents PLTF 0001 to PLTF 1384, which were served upon responding defendant's
20 counsel in the Winter of 1998.

- 21 2. Produce minutes of all meetings of your Board of Directors held between 1950 and 1980 that
22 refer or relate to your asbestos-containing products.

23 **RESPONSE:**

1 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and
2 not reasonably limited in time, scope, or location. Furthermore, this request is violative of Kaiser
3 Gypsum's right to privacy as a privately held corporation and seeks information which is proprietary
4 in nature. Additionally, this request is vague and ambiguous as to "refer or relate to". Without
5 waiving objections, Kaiser Gypsum responds, as it understands the request, that none of the minutes
6 of its Board of Directors' meetings "refer or relate to" its asbestos-containing products.

- 7
8 3. Produce, for inspection and copying, original copies of all documents used to promote the sale
9 of any product identified in response to Interrogatory 4, including, but not limited to, catalogues,
10 magazine advertisements, product lists, photographs, technical specifications and flyers.

11 **RESPONSE:**

12 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad,
13 unduly burdensome, and harassing. Furthermore, this request is not limited in time or scope and thus
14 seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

15 Without waiving objections, Kaiser Gypsum refers plaintiffs to documents PLTF 0001 to PLTF 1384,
16 which were served upon responding defendant's counsel in the Winter of 1998.

- 17
18 4. Produce all manuals, specifications and instructions that you provided to the customers of any
19 asbestos-containing products sold by you between 1965 and 1978.

20 **RESPONSE:**

21 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad,
22 unduly burdensome, and harassing. Furthermore, this request is not limited in time or scope and thus
23 seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

24 Moreover, plaintiff has testified that he did not pay attention to or read any literature regarding any
25 products used by other trades. Thus, this interrogatory is not reasonably calculated to lead to the

1 discovery of admissible evidence. Without waiving objections, Kaiser Gypsum refers plaintiffs to
2 documents PLTF 0001 to PLTF 1384, which were served upon responding defendant's counsel in the
3 Winter of 1998.

- 4
- 5 5. Produce all documents that refer or relate to your decision to stop manufacturing asbestos-
6 containing products including, but not limited to, board minutes, technical and safety advisories
7 and unprivileged legal opinions.

8 **RESPONSE:**

9 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad,
10 unduly burdensome, and harassing. Furthermore, this request is not limited in time or scope and thus
11 seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
12 Without waiving objections, Kaiser Gypsum refers plaintiffs to documents PLTF 0001 to PLTF 1384,
13 which were served upon responding defendant's counsel in the Winter of 1998.

- 14 6. Produce for inspection and copying, original photographs of all products identified in response
15 to Interrogatory 4 in their packaged form.

16

17

18 **RESPONSE:**

19 Kaiser Gypsum objects to this request on the grounds that it is vague, ambiguous, overbroad,
20 unduly burdensome, and harassing. Furthermore, this request is not limited in time or scope and thus
21 seeks information which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

22 Without waiving objections, Kaiser Gypsum refers plaintiffs to documents PLTF 0001 to PLTF 1384,
23 which were served upon responding defendant's counsel in the Winter of 1998

1 7. Produce deposition or trial transcripts of any individual identified in Interrogatory 18 in any
2 asbestos-related litigation.

3 **RESPONSE:**

4 Kaiser Gypsum would be willing to produce any deposition or trial transcripts of any individuals
5 identified in its response to Interrogatory 18 at a mutually convenient location at the expense of
6 propounding party.

7
8 **INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION SUBMITTED this 14th day of**
9 **May, 1998**

10 **WEINSTEIN & BERGMAN**

11
12 Matthew P. Bergman, WSBA #20894

KAISER GYPSUM COMPANY, INC.'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF
INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO
DEFENDANT KAISER GYPSUM COMPANY, INC.

VERIFICATION

I am an authorized representative of Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc. and am authorized to make
this affidavit on its behalf. I have read the foregoing responses to interrogatories and requests for
production and believe the responses to be correct.

By: *John R. Hoff*

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me on the 24 day of August 1998.

Diane Marie Hayes
Notary Public in and for the State of *California*
residing at *Contra Costa County*
My commission expires: *May 29, 2002*



Sylvin W. Pickner and Evelyn I. Pickner v. Owens Corning, et al.

King County, Washington Case No. 98-2-09390-1 SEA

EXHIBIT A

As of October 1953, the following were officers/directors of Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc.:

Henry J. Kaiser
L. S. Corey
E. H. Heller
D. V. McEachern
E. E. Trefethen, Jr.
G. J. Shea
H. W. Morrison
W. Marks
W. A. Marsh
C. R. Olsen
Paul S. Marrin
C. E. Harper
Paul E. Rogers
Bryce Simpson
Chad F. Calhoun

As of September 1954, the following were officers/directors of Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc.:

Henry J. Kaiser
E. E. Trefethen, Jr.
H. W. Morrison
G. J. Shea
D. V. McEachern
E. H. Heller
A. Christensen
W. Marks
Alan Christensen
W. A. Marsh
Coral R. Olsen
Peter S. Hass
C. E. Harper
Paul E. Rogers
Bryce Simpson
Chad F. Calhoun
Paul Marrin