EXHIBIT 1.

| | Page 1 |
|----------|--|
| | |
| 1 | STATE OF NEW YORK SUPREME COURT COUNTY OF RENSSELAER |
| 2 | |
| | JAY BURDICK, CONNIE PLOUFFE, |
| 3 | EDWARD PLOUFFE, FRANK SEYMOUR, |
| | EMILY MARPE, as parent and natural |
| 4 | guardian of E.B., an infant, and |
| | G.Y., an infant, JACQUELINE MONETTE, |
| 5 | WILLIAM SHARPE, EDWARD PERROTTI-SOUSIS, |
| | MARK DENUE and MEGAN DUNN, |
| 6 | individually, and on behalf of all |
| 7 | similarly situated, |
| 7 | Plaintiffs, |
| 8 | Flaintills, |
| 0 | - Against - INDEX NO: |
| 9 | 00253835 |
| | TONOGA, INC. (d/b/a TACONIC), |
| 10 | |
| | Defendant. |
| 11 | : |
| 12 | TRANSCRIPT IS MARKED CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY |
| 13 | VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION of: LARRY CARROLL |
| 14 | (Defendant Agent) |
| 15 | 77-1 |
| 16 | Wednesday, August 22, 2018 |
| 17 18 | 10:05 a.m 5:03 p.m. |
| 19 | |
| 13 | HELD: Bond, Schoeneck & King, PLLC |
| 20 | 22 Corporate Woods Boulevard |
| | Albany, New York 12866 |
| 21 | 25 |
| 22 | |
| | Reported by: Deborah M. McByrne |
| 23 | |
| | Videotaped by: Corrine Gates |
| 24 | |
| 25 | Job No. 2935123 |
| | |

BY MS. MATARAZZO:

2

Q. How many locations -- strike that.

3

Taconic is a global company; correct?

4

A. Correct.

5

Q. And that means that they've got locations throughout the globe; correct?

6 7

A. In -- yeah. I think four, four regions, four continents.

8

Q. If you can, can you tell me the countries in which, today, Taconic has manufacturing facilities?

10 11

A. Manufacturing facilities?

12

O. Umm-humm.

13

Α.

We would be in the U.S., we would be in Brazil, we would be in Europe and Ireland, Germany. It would

14 15

be light, light manufacturing; UK would be light

16

manufacturing. We would be in Poland, we would be

17

Canada.

18 19

Q. The "About Taconic" page on Taconic's website, which I looked at on the 19th, so a couple -- a few days

in Korea. We have a -- just a sales office in

21

20

ago, also mentions a location in France?

2223

Α.

sales operation in France, as well. Sorry. And if

Yeah. I didn't want to interrupt you. We have a

24

you give me a quick second -- well, I said the U.S.,

25

but that would cover California, as well.

Page 27

- Q. Yes. So you have, in the United States, you have a manufacturing location in Petersburgh, New York, and also in California; correct?
- 4 A. Correct.

9

10

- 5 O. Any other locations within the United States?
- 6 A. In the United States, no. No other states.
- 7 Q. In the other countries that you mentioned, is there one manufacturing location or multiple locations?
 - A. So in Korea we would have -- we're in one location.

 We have three different buildings, like, you know,

 within the same area within -- our manufacturer in
- 12 Korea says 150 meters of each other, but I think
 13 it's a little further than that between two
- 14 buildings.
- Okay. Are they on the same campus, or are there three separate campuses?
- 17 A. There are three separate plots within the same development zone.
- 19 Q. How many employees does Taconic have today?
- 20 A. I believe 703.
- Q. How many of those employees are located in Petersburgh, New York?
- 23 A. Oh, God. It's a test.
- 24 Q. Approximately.
- 25 A. Approximately, two -- today?

Page 28 Q. Yes. And this would be a guess. 240. Α. I guarantee your math is a lot better than mine. Q. Does that mean that approximately 460 employees are located elsewhere throughout the world? Yes. Including California, for example. Α. MS. MATARAZZO: You guys good? MS. DUFFY: Yes. Just a temperature issue.

Priority-One Court Reporting Services Inc. – A Veritext Company 718-983-1234

OO111 IDDI(1111 ID 111 I O111 I D 2 2 2 0 0 1 1 2

Page 100

- 1 | Q. -- or Jean Gerbini sent it back in --
- 2 A. That time frame.
- 3 Q. -- 2005?
- 4 A. Correct.
- And then you're saying you received correspondence back from them, essentially declining to cover any legal actions that ensued?
 - A. No. I think it was more: We received your letter, we acknowledge your letter, and we reserve the right, kind of response.
- 11 Q. Okay.

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. And in the case -- and at that time and still, it's an unregulated chemical. But the Federal Government then, thank you for sending this, but -- we acknowledge, I think in the case we acknowledge that we had covered you during the period of time or not, or clarification, was all handled by outside counsel.
 - Q. What was the purpose of the letters to the insurance carriers that Ms. Gerbini drafted and that were sent, that you referred to in your e-mail on August 3, 2005?
 - A. I didn't draft the letter. It was at advice of outside counsel. It was Jean Gerbini is, I think her practice is in that area, and she would have

been working for Scott Fein. And we put everyone on notice at that point, in addition to the agencies, our insurance carriers, all this -- all these items.

Q. And specific to the insurance carriers, when you say you put them on notice, what did you put the insurance carriers on notice of in or around August 3, 2005?

A. That we had done some testing of -- and found an unregulated -- just a PFOA, and that we're letting them know that we -- something. I don't know. I'd like to read the letter again to understand and answer your question a little bit more.

Q. And that's the letter that you saw in the last few years; correct?

A. No, in the recent past before the last few years, in the last couple months.

Q. Okay. So you've seen this letter. And did you read the letters referred to in Point 2 of your e-mail when you saw them in the last couple months?

A. No.

0.

What was the purpose of putting the insurance carriers on notice that you had found PFOA in the wells on-site at the Petersburgh facility?

A. I don't know what the purpose was.

Q. Okay. So you had --

I think you had said that you actually drafted the letters with the assistance of counsel?

A. No.

3

4

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

- Q. Okay. So Ms. Gerbini drafted the letters?
- 5 A. Umm-hmm. Correct.
- And you coordinated that, I assume, because working
 with the insurers was part of your job
 responsibility at that time; correct?
 - A. Well, working with our broker on the policies would have been my job responsibility. So I would be -- I'd have knowledge of what policy existed.
- 12 Q. Right.
 - A. I'd have knowledge of what policy -- where files would be relative to past policies, or who would have been, you know, part of that. You know, Sharon Goodermote would have been vice president of administration and part of that, as well.
 - Q. Okay. And your responsibilities included insurance; correct?
 - A. Negotiating insurance, yeah.
- 21 Q. Sure. Understanding what those policies covered; 22 correct?
 - A. Understanding what coverages we had, and whether it was Workers' Comp, commercial liability, you know, property insurance, those -- yeah.

Q. Sure. So let's talk about the liability policy. In terms of having a liability policy, you're negotiating those policies, you need to understand the coverages and negotiate the appropriate coverages for Taconic; correct?

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- A. General liability policies relative to the policies,

 I have a general understanding. Steve Healy, our

 broker, would have strong knowledge of that, as

 well.
- Q. So you rely on your broker to educate you about the policies that are being sold to Taconic; correct?
- A. If I have any questions relative to coverages or anything, I would ask that.
 - Q. And certainly it's part of your job, and was part of your job in 2005, to understand that Taconic had the appropriate coverage that it needed; correct?
- A. Sharon Goodermote would have been in charge of that in the past, prior to Jim O'Keefe being the -- in the room to, you know, to be the guy, the lead, and then it would have been me, so.
- Q. So that was definitely part of your responsibility in 2005; correct?
- A. Responsibility of general liability coverage for the organization.
 - Q. To understand your insurance policies and make sure

that Taconic had appropriate coverage?

2

A. And who truly understands insurance and coverages.

I had a good knowledge of what we had, and what --

3

Q. Yeah.

5

A. Yeah.

6 7

8

Q. And you're saying that as of August 3rd of 2005, you did not understand the purpose for putting the carriers on notice with the letters you did of the PFOA contamination at the Petersburgh facility; is

9

that correct? Did I understand that correctly?

10 11

A. No.

Α.

12

Q. Okay.

13

So we had put them on notice that we had found the presence of PFOA --

14 15

Q. Why?

16

A. -- an unregulated chemical.

17

legal reason why we would do that, but then we put

19

our insurance carriers on notice. And they're

20 21 saying somebody has an injury at the factory, we put

them on notice. If we have a situation where, you

I'm not 100 percent certain about the

22

know, we have equipment failure and a business

interruption, potential business interruption,

23

24

25

whether it leads to a claim or not, we put them on notice. Business interruption is a perfect example.

When we have a power outage and it lasts several days and we lose this, then we start compiling and we put them in -- on notice. We're very good to do that.

- Q. And you do that when you think that you may have a potential claim; is that correct?
- A. It's just good practice to let your carrier know what's happening in your business.
- Q. Well, certainly, because they could disclaim, if you have a claim, and you have not put them on notice; correct?
- A. I can't answer that question.
- Q. So you don't have an understanding, as a person who oversees insurance and has had that as part of their job responsibilities, per your testimony earlier today, you don't have an understanding of why you would put an insurance company on notice of a claim?
- A. I have -- it's certainly a good practice to put your carrier on notice to make sure if a claim arises in the future, right, that you would have them put on notice. It doesn't mean that they would -- It doesn't mean that you have coverage in every case, it doesn't mean that they wouldn't in this case push back or, say, deny, or to reserve the right.
- Q. Right. So to reserve the right to make a claim, is

that why you put your carriers on notice --

2

Or defend a claim. Α.

3

-- of the PFOA --0.

our carriers.

correct?

as well.

4

Or defend a claim.

5

-- of the PFOA contamination that was found on-site in 2004 and 2005; is that why you put 6

7

the carriers on notice in or around August of 2005?

8

You use the word "contamination", and you use that Α.

9

often, and I disagree with that word. In that case

10

it's an unregulated chemical, okay. So EPA had no

11

standard. Has no standard for that. So you use the

12

word "contamination", and that's -- I don't agree

13

with that. I just want it to be on record for that.

14

0.

Α.

I don't have a problem with that. We can -- let's

15

come up with a term we can agree on then.

16 17

Yeah. Presence of PFOA in our water was found. There is no guidance. There is no standard.

18

mean, there was no standard for that, but we felt it

19

important to communicate it to the agencies and to

20

21

Okav. And the carriers that you alerted, these were 0.

22

carriers that held your general liability policies;

23

Our general liability policies, our umbrella policy, Α.

25

- And you put your general liability carrier and your 1 Q . umbrella carrier on notice because you thought there might be the potential for a future claim; correct? 3
 - I don't know -- Certainly we put them on notice for A. a good -- for good business practices, correct, we would put them on notice. If there was ever a concern, and that would have been 2005, yeah. renewed our general liability policy year after year after year with no concern relative to PFOA or the notice.

MS. MATARAZZO: Okay. I am going to move to strike that as unresponsive.

So you put the general liability and umbrella 0. carriers on notice, I assume because you had some concern that you may bear liability for the presence of PFOA in the water below the facility that was discovered in 2004 and 2005; correct?

> MS. DUFFY: Objection. Asked and answered.

Again, I don't -- at the time, it was unregulated. Α. At request -- or at --

It would have been a direction that our attorney at the time said you should take. Otherwise, I wouldn't have given notice, because --

Understood. Q.

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

be there.

24

25

highlighting on the first page. That shouldn't

