EXHIBIT A

LAW OFFICES SOMMERS SCHWARTZ, P.C. 2000 TOWN CENTER • SUITE 900 • SOUTHFIELD, MICHIGAN 48075 • (248) 355-0300

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

WENDY KUBIK, et al., Michigan residents,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

Civil Action No. 03-73350 Hon. Paul D. Borman Magistrate Judge Mona Majzoub

WILLIE GARY, et al. Florida residents,

Defendants.

AND

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF MACOMB

SARA AGUINAGA, et al,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

Case No: 04-3238-CK

RUNDELL, et al

Defendants.

SCHWARTZ LAW FIRM, P.C. By: Jay A. Schwartz (P45268)

Attorney for Plaintiffs

WIGOD, FALZON, ET AL.

By: Lawrence C. Falzon (P30655)

Attorney for Plaintiffs

ZAUSMER, KAUFMAN, ET AL.

By: Timothy D. Wittlinger (P22490)

Reginald M. Turner, Jr. (P40543)

By: Mark J. Zausmer (P31721)

Co-Counsel for Defendants

Attorney for Defendants

CLARK HILL, PLC

GARY, WILLIAMS, ET AL.

By: Willie E. Gary Tricia P. Hoffler Attorney for Defendants

VOLUNTARY BINDING ARBITRATION OF DISTRIBUTION OF SETTLEMENT PROCEEDS

ARBITRATOR'S FINDINGS AND RULINGS

I. Introduction

This binding arbitration proceeding has been voluntarily established by the 42 party Plaintiffs in the two captioned cases. In their writing, each of them has agreed to allow the undersigned arbitrator to conduct an arbitration hearing and to make binding findings of fact and rulings regarding the final disposition of all funds, on a percentage basis, which the Plaintiffs in the two captioned cases are entitled to receive in a final disposition of the settlement proceeds of both cases.

By notice to all 42 Plaintiffs dated September 12, 2005, the date of the arbitration hearing was set for Monday, November 7, 2005, beginning at 8:00 a.m. Each of the 42 Plaintiffs was invited to participate in person, or to be represented by an attorney, at the option of each Plaintiff. In addition, each Plaintiff was invited to file directly with the undersigned, if she chose to do so, anything in writing to support her position regarding the amount of her entitlement to payment of funds as a percentage of the total recovery that is available for distribution to all of the 42 Plaintiffs.

Of the 42 Plaintiffs, 30 did file directly with the office of the undersigned arbitrator, something in writing. The arbitration hearing was conducted on November 7, 2005 at the offices of the undersigned, beginning at 8:00 a.m. Twenty-six of the 42 Plaintiffs appeared and made a presentation at the arbitration hearing. Sixteen of the Plaintiffs did not attend the arbitration hearing. The arbitration hearing was closed at 5:00 p.m. on November 7, 2005. The following findings and ruling are made.

II. Findings And Rulings

All of the Plaintiffs reported having been subjected to gender discrimination in the workplace. Almost without exception, each of the Plaintiffs reported having been subjected to some form of sexual harassment, including vulgar body motions directed at them from males, sexual comments to them and in their presence about their bodies, cat calls, whistling, and pornographic pictures and reading materials

in the workplace. A disturbing majority of the Plaintiffs reported detailed *quid pro quo* requests for sexual favors from their male supervisors. Many of the Plaintiffs reported inappropriate sexual touching of their bodies by male employees in the workplace. A few of the Plaintiffs reported attempted criminal sexual assault on them by male employees, and one Plaintiff even reported a criminal sexual assault on her by a female employee.

As to damages, the most common result of the unlawful conduct in the workplace to the 42 Plaintiffs was disparate workplace treatment compared to the male employees. The resulting damage most commonly was in the form of job assignment discrimination, usually in retaliation for refusal of *quid pro quo* sex demands from supervisors. Also commonly experienced by many of the Plaintiffs was emotional and/or psychological disorder, for which there was treatment by a psychiatrist, psychologist, or clinical social worker. Many of the Plaintiffs were regularly denied overtime opportunities and job promotions for which they were well qualified. The damages were not exclusively to females who were hourly employees. More than one female salaried employee suffered damages from disparate treatment and retaliation in the workplace that was related to gender and/or sexual harassment. A number of the Plaintiffs are presently undergoing medical treatment and are on prescription medications as a result of their damages arising from their treatment in the workplace.

Without specifically outlining here the nature and extent of the damages to each of the Plaintiffs, the following percentages of recovery of the total recovery in the two captioned cases is assigned to the individual Plaintiffs:

1.	Aguinaga, Sara	3.6 %
2.	Arnold, Barbara	2.2%
3.	Battaglia, Lisa	3.9%
4	Blaiic Georgina	2.2%

5.	Bolone, Pat	2.2%
6.	Bott, Janet	2.2%
7.	Boulton, Michele	3.6%
8.	Bousson, Bonnie	2.2%
9.	DeTomaso, Michelle	2.2%
10.	Diem, Christina	1.0%
11.	Diem, Kathy	1.0%
12.	Dillon, Rita	2.2%
13.	Ditch, Rebecca	2.2%
14.	Ewald, Christine	1.0%
15.	Flenna, Judith	2.9%
16.	Gould, Theresa	2.9%
17.	Haddix, Lisa	3.6%
18.	Harbin, Stephanie	1.5%
19.	Harder, Marjorie	1.5%
20.	Harsen, Patricia	2.9%
21.	Kolodziej, Elaine	2.9%
22.	Kubik, Wendy	2.2%
23.	Lindstrom, Pamela	2.2%
24.	Maniaci, Sandra	2.2%
25.	Mayo, Osuil	2.9%
26.	Presley, Deborah	2.2%
27.	Pryzbylski, Peggy	1.5%

28.	Rahill, Joan E.	2.2%
29.	Richardson, Mary	2.9%
30.	Ritch, Joan	2.9%
31.	Rogers, Pamela	3.6%
32.	Sandora, Janice	2.2%
33.	Schmaltz, Susan	2.9%
34.	Spradley, Judy	1.5%
35.	Stewart, Barbara	2.2%
36.	Taylor, Eleanor	3.1%
37.	Thomas, Beverly	1.0%
38.	Thornton, Judith	1.5%
39.	Trombley, Kristie	3.9%
40.	Van Tiem, Mary Jo	3.1%
41.	Vaughn, Donna	2.9%
42.	Willits, Renee	1.5%

Respectfully submitted,

SOMMERS SCHWARTZ, P.C.

MARVIN R. STEMPIEN Binding Arbitrator

2000 Town Center, Suite 900

Southfield, MI 48075

(248) 355-0300

Dated: December 22, 2006