1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR.	Original Ge nformed Gepy Of Original Filed Los Angeles Sup erior Cou rt			
•	Attorney General of the State of California	Fos Audeles ankelles anne			
2	J. MATTHEW RODRIQUEZ	Alig 1 2008			
3	Chief Assistant Attorney General KEN ALEX	John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk			
4	Senior Assistant Attorney General LAURA ZUCKERMAN	By: I. Flores, Deputy			
5	DEBORAH SLON				
6	Deputy Attorneys General				
	EDWARD G. WEIL, State Bar No. 88302 Supervising Deputy Attorney General				
7	1515 Clay Street, 20 th Floor	,			
8	P.O. Box 70550				
9	Oakland, CA94612-0550 Telephone: (510)622-2149				
	Fax: (510) 622-2270	•			
10	E-mail: Ed.Weil@doj.ca.gov				
11	Attorneys for the People of the State of California Ex rel. Edmund G. Brown Jr., Attorney General of	ftha			
12					
13					
	SUPERIOR COURT	OF CALIFORNIA			
14	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES				
ĺ		OF LOS ANGELES			
15		OF LOS ANGELES			
15 16	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	Case No. BC 338956			
16 17	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California,	Case No. BC 338956			
16 17 18	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney	Case No. BC 338956 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC. Dept.: 307			
16 17	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California,	Case No. BC 338956 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC. Dept.: 307 Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger			
16 17 18 19	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California, Plaintiff,	Case No. BC 338956 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC. Dept.: 307			
16 17 18 19 20	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California, Plaintiff, v.	Case No. BC 338956 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC. Dept.: 307 Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger			
16 17 18	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California, Plaintiff, v. FRITO-LAY, INC, ET AL.	Case No. BC 338956 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC. Dept.: 307 Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger			
16 17 18 19 20	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California, Plaintiff, v. FRITO-LAY, INC, ET AL. Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION	Case No. BC 338956 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC. Dept.: 307 Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California, Plaintiff, v. FRITO-LAY, INC, ET AL. Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION	Case No. BC 338956 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC. Dept.: 307 Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger Trial Date: July 28, 2008 the State of California ("People"), by and			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California, Plaintiff, v. FRITO-LAY, INC, ET AL. Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION 1.1 On August 26, 2005, the People of	Case No. BC 338956 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC. Dept.: 307 Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger Trial Date: July 28, 2008 the State of California ("People"), by and ornia ("Attorney General"), filed a complaint for			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California, Plaintiff, v. FRITO-LAY, INC, ET AL. Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION 1.1 On August 26, 2005, the People of through the Attorney General of the State of California	Case No. BC 338956 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC. Dept.: 307 Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger Trial Date: July 28, 2008 the State of California ("People"), by and ornia ("Attorney General"), filed a complaint for of Proposition 65 and unlawful business			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California, Plaintiff, v. FRITO-LAY, INC, ET AL. Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION 1.1 On August 26, 2005, the People of through the Attorney General of the State of California, civil penalties and injunctive relief for violations of the State of California, Plaintiff, v.	Case No. BC 338956 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC. Dept.: 307 Judge: Hon. William F. Highberger Trial Date: July 28, 2008 the State of California ("People"), by and ornia ("Attorney General"), filed a complaint for of Proposition 65 and unlawful business as Angeles. The People's Complaint alleges			

chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. The Complaint further alleges that under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, also known as "Proposition 65," businesses must provide persons with a "clear and reasonable warning" before exposing individuals to these chemicals, and that the Defendants failed to do so. The Complaint also alleges that these acts constitute unlawful acts in violation of the Unfair Competition Law, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq.

- 1.2 Kettle Foods, Inc. ("Settling Defendant") is among the Defendants named in the complaint.
- 1.3 Settling Defendant is a corporation that employs more than 10 persons, or employed ten or more persons at some time relevant to the allegations of the complaint, and that manufactures, distributes and/or sells Products in the State of California or has done so in the past.
- 1.4 The products listed on Exhibit A were put in controversy by the Complaint and are referred to in this Consent Judgment as "Covered Products."
- 1.5 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the People and the Settling Defendant stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the People's Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in the People's Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint based on the facts alleged therein.
- 1.6 The People and Settling Defendant enter into this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement of all claims relating to Covered Products arising from the failure to warn regarding the presence of acrylamide in such Products. By execution of this Consent Judgment and agreeing to provide the relief and remedies specified herein, Settling Defendant does not admit any violations of Proposition 65 or Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq., or any other law or legal duty. Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, or defense the Attorney General and Settling Defendant may respectively have in any other or in future legal proceedings unrelated to these proceedings. However, this Paragraph shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations,

9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

25

24

26 27

28

responsibilities, and duties of the parties under this Consent Judgment, or the *res judicata* impacts of this Consent Judgment on other litigation under Proposition 65.

1.7 The effective date of this Consent Judgment shall be the date on which the Consent Judgment is entered as a judgment by the trial Court ("Effective Date").

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: ACRYLAMIDE REDUCTION

- 2.1 Target Level and Compliance Date. Settling Defendant shall reduce the level of acrylamide in the Covered Products shipped for sale in California from the current levels to a sales-weighted arithmetic mean level no higher than 275 parts per billion as determined pursuant to the testing protocol in Paragraph 2.4 ("Target Level"), no later than December 31, 2011 ("Compliance Date"), or be subject to the provisions of Section 3 below. Settling Defendant shall continue its program of research, development, and implementation of technologies and methods intended to reduce the presence of acrylamide in the Covered Products shipped for sale in California. Settling Defendant shall endeavor in good faith, using all commercially and technologically reasonable efforts, to achieve the Target Level of acrylamide in all Covered Products by December 31, 2011. For the purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Settling Defendant shall not be considered to have achieved the Target Level if, as of the Compliance Date, the arithmetic mean of the acrylamide concentration in any product line of Covered Products (e.g., Kettle brand "fried" potato chips and Kettle brand "baked" potato chips each constitute a distinct "product line"), as determined in accordance with the Sampling Protocol, described supra at ¶ 2.4(b) and (c), exceeds the Target Level by more than 25%. Any product line for which pre-Compliance Date warnings have been provided in accordance with Paragraph 3.2 shall not be included in any calculation determining whether the Target Level or the threshold set forth in Paragraph 3.5(a) has been achieved.
- 2.2 "Shipped for sale in California" means Covered Products that Settling Defendant either directly ships into California for sale in California or that it sells to a distributor who Settling Defendant knows will sell the Covered Products in California. Where a retailer or distributor sells products both in California and other states, Settling Defendant shall take all commercially reasonable steps to ensure that after the Target Levels have been reached, only

Covered Products that meet those levels are sold in California.

2.3 Grace Period. Settling Defendant may request a grace period extending the Compliance Date by a period of up to six months by notifying the Attorney General at least ninety days before the Compliance Date. The Attorney General will consider the extension for good cause shown based on Settling Defendant's diligence in reducing acrylamide levels in Covered Products as well as reported progress at the time of the requested extension. If the Attorney General denies the extension, Settling Defendant may apply to the Court to extend the Compliance Date and the Court may grant the requested extension upon timely application, for good cause shown based on Settling Defendant's diligence and good faith efforts to reduce acrylamide in Covered Products as well as reported progress at the time the request for extension is considered..

2.4 Standard and Verification.

- (a) Testing for acrylamide shall be performed using either GC/MS (Gas Chromatrograph/Mass Spectrometry), LC-MS/MS (Liquid Chromatograph-Mass Spectrometry) or any other testing method agreed upon by the parties.
- (b) Test results demonstrating compliance with the Target Level shall be conducted in accordance with a sampling protocol that establishes that the sales-weighted arithmetic mean of acrylamide levels in all Covered Products is at or below the Target Level with a 95% confidence level, i.e., p<0.05 ("Sampling Protocol"). The arithmetic mean is to be determined from a sales-weighted average calculated according to the following formula: Multiply the arithmetic mean of the acrylamide concentration of each product line of Covered Products in each sampled month by that product line's fraction of monthly sales volume for all product lines, and thereafter sum all such weighted means across all product lines that are included in the weighted mean and across all sampled months. Sales volume for each product line and total sales volume shall be based on 52-week Nielsen data for Los Angeles, San Francisco, Sacramento and San Diego metropolitan areas available to Settling Defendant by the Compliance Date and each anniversary of that Date.
 - (c) A Sampling Protocol for Covered Products that meets the requirements of

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Paragraph 2.4(b) above shall require a minimum of the following: Settling Defendant shall take a minimum of 30 samples from each product line among the Covered Products in the twelve months prior to the Compliance Date. Five samples for each product line shall be taken in each of at least six of the twelve months of the year prior to the Compliance Date. The samples for the year prior to the Compliance Date shall then be aggregated according to the formula in Paragraph 2.4(b) above to determine compliance with the Target Level.

- (d) If the Attorney General enters a consent judgment with another sliced potato chip manufacturer that adopts a sampling protocol that Settling Defendant determines is preferable to the Sampling Protocol described in Paragraph 2.4(c) above for purposes of measuring compliance with Target Level, Settling Defendant shall notify the Attorney General that Settling Defendant intends to adopt the alternative sampling protocol as the Sampling Protocol under this Consent Judgment. If the Attorney General objects to Settling Defendant's adoption of the alternative sampling protocol, the Attorney General shall provide Settling Defendant with the reasons for any objection, and Settling Defendant may apply to the Court to allow the alternative sampling protocol to be used to measure compliance with the Target Level under this Consent Judgment
- (e) All test results, once provided to the Attorney General, shall be public documents.
- (f) If Settling Defendant's test results demonstrate that the Target Level has been achieved for the Covered Products on or before the Compliance Date, Settling Defendant shall be required to test the Covered Products according to the Sampling Protocol for two additional years - in 2012 and in 2013. If those additional tests confirm that the Target Level has been achieved for the Covered Products, Settling Defendant shall have no further duty to test the Covered Products, although the Attorney General may apply to the Court for enforcement of the judgment based on results of the Attorney General's own testing showing that the Target Level has not been achieved. Any test data used by the Attorney General for this purpose must be performed and analyzed by methods consistent with Paragraph 2.4(a) and include as many samples of each product line as are required by Paragraph 2.4(c) or (d). A prima facie showing of

violation based on such test results may be rebutted by a showing made in compliance with all aspects of the testing and sampling protocol under Paragraph 2.4.

- Products by the Compliance Date, it shall provide warnings for the Covered Products as provided in Section 3 below. Settling Defendant may also continue testing of the Covered Products after the Compliance Date until tests demonstrate that the Target Level has been achieved, at which time Settling Defendant shall have no further duty to warn, although the Attorney General may apply to the Court for enforcement of the judgment based on results of his own testing showing that the Target Level has not been achieved. Any test data used by the Attorney General for this purpose must be performed and analyzed by methods consistent with Paragraph 2.4(a) and include as many samples of each product line as are required by Paragraph 2.4(c) or (d). A prima facie showing of violation based on such test results may be rebutted by a showing made in compliance with all aspects of the testing and sampling protocol under Paragraph 2.4.
- 2.5 <u>Technology Licensing</u>. The requirements in this Consent Judgment are not contingent upon the use of any particular method to meet the Target Level, but Settling Defendant shall license any patented technology used to meet the Target Level, whether existing or in the future, to others for use in other food products, at a commercially reasonable price and using other commercially reasonable terms.

3. <u>INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: CLEAR AND REASONABLE WARNINGS</u>

- 3.1 If Settling Defendant does not achieve the Target Level by the Compliance Date, Settling Defendant shall, within 30 days after the Compliance Date, and until it achieves the Target Level provide warnings as follows:
- (a) By placing a warning label as described in Paragraph 3.3 (or Paragraph 3.5, if applicable) on the package of each Covered Product for which the Target Level has not been achieved that is shipped for sale in California; or, at Settling Defendant' option,
- (b) By providing signs as described in Paragraph 3.4 (or Paragraph 3.5, if applicable).
 - 3.2 <u>Pre-Compliance Date Warning</u>. To the extent that Settling Defendant, at its option,

decides to place a label warning on packages of a Covered Product before the Compliance Date, that warning shall conform to the form of label warning set forth in Paragraph 3.3, or Paragraph 3.5, if applicable.

- 3.3 <u>Label Warnings</u>. A label warning placed on the package of a Covered Product pursuant to Paragraph 3.1(a) shall, at Settling Defendant's option, either:
- (a) Conform to the requirements for the "safe harbor" warning methods set out in California Code of Regulations, title 27, section 25601, subdivision (b) [formerly title 22, section 12601, subdivision (b)], while also stating that acrylamide is the chemical in question and/or the approximate level of acrylamide in the product; or

(b) State as follows:

WARNING: This product contains acrylamide, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. Acrylamide is not added to the products, but is created by browning potatoes. The FDA does not recommend that people stop eating browned potatoes. For more information, see the FDA's website at www.fda.gov.

3.4 Sign Warnings.

- (a) Form of Sign. A warning sign shall be rectangular and at least 36 square inches, with the word "WARNING" centered one-half of an inch from the top of the sign in ITC Garamond bold condensed type face all in one-half inch capital letters. The body of the warning message shall be in ITC Garamond bold condensed type face. For the body of the warning message, left and right margins of at least one-half of an inch, and a bottom margin of at least one-half inch shall be observed. Larger signs shall bear substantially the same proportions of type size and spacing to sign dimension as the sign 36 square inches.
 - (b) <u>Text of Sign</u>. The sign shall state as follows:

WARNING: Kettle brand potato chips contain acrylamide, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. Acrylamide is not added to the products, but is created by browning potatoes. The FDA does not recommend that people stop eating browned potatoes. For more information, see the FDA's website at www.fda.gov.

- (c) <u>Placement of Sign</u>. The sign shall be posted on the shelf(ves) or in the aisle(s) where Covered Products are sold; unless the store has less than 7500 square feet of retail space and no more than two cash registers, in which case it may be placed at each cash register. In addition, if the store operates a customer service desk or similar central facility, the sign shall also be posted at that location.
- in California who are collectively responsible for at least 80 percent of such Settling Defendant's sales of Covered Products in the State of California for which the Target Level has not been achieved by the Compliance Date. Signs shall be provided with a letter substantially as provided in Exhibit B, in which posting instructions are provided. The letter shall request that the receiving retailer provide Settling Defendant a written acknowledgement that the sign will be posted. Settling Defendant shall send a follow up letter substantially as provided in Exhibit C to any retailer in California who does not send any acknowledgement. Settling Defendant (or its agent) shall maintain files demonstrating compliance with this provision, including the letters sent and receipts of any acknowledgements from retailers, which shall be provided to the Attorney General on written request.
- Settling Defendant is required to provide a warning under this Consent Judgment and chooses to provides signs but warning signs are already in place as a result of obligations of parties other than Settling Defendant, Settling Defendant may rely on such signage to satisfy its warning obligations under this Consent Decree if the signs in place materially satisfy the requirements of this Section 3 for Covered Products. If the signs do not materially satisfy the requirements of this Section 3 for Covered Products, the Parties shall negotiate in good faith to modify the required type, size, placement and language set forth in Paragraph 3.4(a)-(d), in consideration of the signs already in place.

3.5 Alternative Warning Language.

(a) Settling Defendant has the option to use the following alternative warning language for labels or the text of signs if, as of the date the warning is first given or the

Compliance Date, whichever is earlier, the Covered Product(s) for which the warning is given has acrylamide levels, calculated in accordance with the Sampling Protocol, that are above 275 parts per billion but below 600 parts per billion:

WARNING

Cooked potatoes that have been browned, such as potato chips, contain acrylamide, a chemical identified under California Proposition 65 as causing cancer. Other cooked foods that have been roasted or browned, such as coffee, cereals, french fries, potato crisps, breads, crackers, cookies, and nuts, also contain acrylamide, but usually at lower levels than in certain cooked potatoes that have been browned.

Acrylamide is not added to these foods but is created when these and certain other foods are browned.

The FDA has not advised people to stop eating potato chips or any foods containing acrylamide as a result of cooking. For more information, see FDA's website at www.fda.gov.

- (b) Other Alternative Warning Language. If, after the Compliance Date, defendants Frito-Lay, Inc. or Lance, Inc. are providing warnings using language set forth in a Consent Judgment entered in this case, Settling Defendant, at its option, may use the same warning language as that used by Frito-Lay or Lance.
- 3.6 Nothing in this Consent Judgment requires that warnings be given for Covered Products sold outside the State of California.
- 3.7 If Settling Defendant has demonstrated that it has achieved the Target Level after providing warnings under this Section 3, the Settling Defendant may cease providing warnings.
- 3.8 If, before the Compliance Date, Proposition 65 warnings are being given in California retail locations that include the Covered Products, Settling Defendant shall be relieved of the obligation to provide warnings under this Consent Judgment, but the Settling Defendant shall still be obligated to use all commercially and technologically reasonable efforts to meet the Target Level by the Compliance Date.

4. <u>PAYMENTS</u>

4.1 <u>Civil Penalties</u>. Settling Defendant shall pay a civil penalty pursuant to California

6

9

8

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

26 27 28 Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.7(b) and 25249.12 of \$250,000 no later than 30 days after the Effective Date.

- 4.2 Other Payments. Within 30 days after the Effective Date, Settling Defendant shall also pay \$100,000 to be used by the Attorney General for the enforcement of Proposition 65. Funds paid pursuant to this paragraph shall be placed in an interest-bearing Special Deposit Fund established by the Attorney General. These funds, including any interest, shall be used by the Attorney General, until all funds are exhausted, for the costs and expenses associated with the enforcement and implementation of Proposition 65, including investigations, enforcement actions, other litigation or activities as determined by the Attorney General to be reasonably necessary to carry out his duties and authority under Proposition 65. Such funding may be used for the costs of the Attorney General's investigation, filing fees and other court costs, payment to expert witnesses and technical consultants, purchase of equipment, travel, purchase of written materials, laboratory testing, sample collection, or any other cost associated with the Attorney General's duties or authority under Proposition 65. Funding placed in the Special Deposit Fund pursuant to this Paragraph, and any interest derived therefrom, shall solely and exclusively augment the budget of the Attorney General's Office and in no manner shall supplant or cause any reduction of any portion of the Attorney General's budget.
- 4.3 Each payment required by this Consent Judgment shall be made through the delivery of separate checks payable to "California Department of Justice," to the attention of Edward G. Weil, Supervising Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice, 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor, Oakland, CA 94612.

5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified by written agreement of the Attorney General and Settling Defendant, after noticed motion, and upon entry of a modified consent judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of the Attorney General or Settling Defendant as provided by law and upon entry of a modified consent judgment by the Court. Before filing an application with the Court for a modification to this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall meet and confer with the Attorney General to determine whether the Attorney General will

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

2728

consent to the proposed modification. If a proposed modification is agreed upon, then Settling Defendant and the Attorney General will present the modification to the Court by means of a stipulated modification to the Consent Judgment.

5.2 Subsequent Settlement or Judgment.

- (a) If the Attorney General agrees in a settlement or judicially entered consent judgment that some or all of the products put in controversy by the Complaint (as sold by other companies) do not require a warning under Proposition 65 (based on the presence of acrylamide), or if a court of competent jurisdiction renders a final judgment, and the judgment becomes final, that some or all of the products put in controversy by the Complaint (as sold by other companies) do not require a warning for acrylamide under Proposition 65, then Settling Defendant may seek a modification of this Consent Judgment to eliminate the duty to warn under section 3 of this Consent Judgment and/or other duties related to the reduction of acrylamide levels, which modification may be granted as provided by law.
- (b) If the Attorney General agrees to a target level exceeding 275 parts per billion of acrylamide with another sliced potato chip manufacturer, or agrees to warning language that varies from the label or sign warning language set forth in Paragraphs 3.3(b) or 3.4(b), respectively, then effective upon written notice by Settling Defendant to the Attorney General, which notice shall be provided at the Settling Defendant's option, the target level and/or warning language agreed to by the Attorney General with another sliced potato chip manufacture shall become the Target Level, or required warning language, as the case may be, under this Consent Judgment. Without limiting the foregoing, the Parties acknowledge that the Attorney General has entered a settlement with Frito-Lay, Inc. ("Frito Settlement") in which the target level for acrylamide in sliced potato chips is based on certain contingencies that limit the range of the target level to be achieved, but do not allow the target levels to be precisely calculated as of the Effective Date of this Consent Judgment. When the precise target level in the Frito Settlement is calculated, it will be the target level against which the Target Level under this Consent Judgment, for the purposes of this Paragraph 5(b), shall be compared. If the target level in the Frito Settlement is greater than 275 ppb, then it shall apply as the Target Level in this Consent

 Judgment.

- 5.3 If Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations are changed from their terms as they exist on the Effective Date to establish explicitly, or by their application, that warnings for acrylamide in the Covered Products are not required, Settling Defendant may seek a modification of this Consent Judgment to relieve it of the duty to warn under Section 3 of this Consent Judgment.
- 5.4 If an agency of the federal government, including, but not limited to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, states through any communication, regulation, or legally binding act, that federal law precludes Settling Defendant from providing any of the warnings set forth in this Consent Judgment or the manner in which the warnings are given, Settling Defendant may seek to modify this Consent Judgment to bring the warnings under this Consent Judgment into compliance with federal law, but the modification shall not be granted unless this Court concludes, in a final judgment or order, that federal law precludes Settling Defendant from providing the warnings set forth in this Consent Judgment. A determination that the provision of some, but not all, forms of warning described in Section 3 above is not permitted shall not relieve Settling Defendant of the duty to provide one of the other warnings described under this judgment for which such determination has not been made.
- 5.5 If Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations are changed from their terms as they exist on the Effective Date, and without limiting or otherwise affecting any other provision in this Section 5, the Parties may seek modifications in the Consent Judgment as follows:
- (a) If the change establishes that warnings for acrylamide in the Covered Products are not required, Settling Defendant may seek a modification of this Consent Judgment to relieve it of the duty to warn.
- (b) If the change establishes that the warnings provided by this Consent

 Judgment would not comply with the law, either party may seek a modification of the Consent

 Judgment to conform the judgment to the change in law.
- (c) If the change would provide a new form or manner of an optional or safeharbor warning, Settling Defendant may seek a modification to provide a warning in the newly

 permitted form, but the modification shall not be granted unless the Court finds that the new warning would not be materially less informative or likely to be seen, read and understood than the warning provisions under this Consent Judgment.

States Government in connection with the application of Proposition 65 to acrylamide in fried or baked potato products, then, so long as such correspondence is not confidential and would be retrievable by the Attorney General under the Freedom of Information Act, the Settling Defendant originating such communication shall provide the Attorney General with a copy of such communication as soon as practicable, but not more than 10 days after sending or receiving the correspondence; provided, however, that this Paragraph shall not apply to correspondence to or from trade associations or other groups of which a Settling Defendant is a member, nor shall this Paragraph apply to the extent Settling Defendant is no longer required to test for acrylamide under this Consent Judgment.

6. <u>ENFORCEMENT</u>

before this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In any such proceeding, the Attorney General may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment and where said violations of this Consent Judgment constitute subsequent violations of Proposition 65 or other laws independent of the Consent Judgment and/or those alleged in the Complaint, the Attorney General is not limited to enforcement of the Consent Judgment, but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies are provided for by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws. In any action brought by the Attorney General or another enforcer alleging subsequent violations of Proposition 65 or other laws, Settling Defendant may assert any and all defenses that are available, including the *res judicata* or collateral estoppel effect of this Consent Judgment.

7. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT

7.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into and

8. <u>CLAIMS COVERED</u>

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

8.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between the People and Settling Defendant, of any violation of Proposition 65, Business & Professions Code sections 17200 et seq., or any other statutory or common law claims that have been or could have been asserted in the Complaint against Settling Defendant for failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings of exposure to acrylamide from the consumption of the Covered Products, or any other claim based on the facts or conduct alleged in the Complaint, whether based on actions committed by Settling Defendant or by any entity to whom Settling Defendant distributes or sells Covered Products, or any entity that sells the Covered Products to consumers except for sales of Covered Products by retailers during any period in which such retailers have not posted signs sent to them pursuant to section 3.4(d). With this one exception, as to Covered Products, compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any issue now, in the past, and in the future concerning compliance by Settling Defendant, its parents, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, sister companies, affiliates, franchisees, cooperative members, and licensees; its distributors, wholesalers, and retailers who sell Covered Products (including without limitation those retailers listed in Exhibit D); and the predecessors, successors, and assigns of any of them, with the requirements of Proposition 65 or Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq. for Covered Products.

9. <u>RETENTION OF JURISDICTION</u>

9.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement the Consent Judgment.

10. PROVISION OF NOTICE

10.1 When any party is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the notice shall be sent by overnight courier service to the person and address set forth in this Paragraph. Any party may modify the person and address to whom the notice is to be sent by sending each other party notice by certified mail, return receipt requested. Said change shall take effect for any notice mailed at least five days after the date the return receipt is signed by the party

receiving the change.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

10.2 Notices shall be sent by First Class Mail and/or overnight delivery to the following when required:

For the Attorney General:

Edward G. Weil, Supervising Deputy Attorney General 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor Oakland, CA 94612

Telephone: (510) 622-2149 Facsimile: (510) 622-2270

10.3 Notices for the Settling Defendant shall be sent to:

For Kettle Foods, Inc.:

Richard C. Coffin, Esq. Barg Coffin Lewis & Trapp, LLP 350 California, 22nd Floor San Francisco, California 94104-1435 Telephone: (415) 228-5400 Facsimile: (415) 228-5450

Michèle B. Corash Morrison & Foerster, LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, California 94105-2482

Telephone: (415) 268-7000 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

11. COURT APPROVAL

11.1 This Consent Judgment shall be submitted to the Court for entry by noticed motion or as otherwise may be required or permitted by the Court. If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect and may not be used by the Attorney General or Settling Defendant for any purpose.

12. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

12.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties.

1	13. <u>EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS</u>	
2	13.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by	
3	means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.	
4	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
5	DATED: July 30, 2008 EDMUND G. BROWN, JR. Attorney General	
6	J. MATTHEW RODRIQUEZ Chief Assistant Attorney General	
7	KEN ALEX Senior Assistant Attorney General	1
8	EDWARD G. WEIL Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
9	LAURA ZUCKERMAN Deputy Attorney General	
10	511(11)	
11	By: Edward G. Weil	
12	Deputy Attorney General For Plaintiffs People of the State of California	
13	Tof Flanking Feople of the State of Camorina	
14	DATED: July 2008 BARG COFFIN LEWIS & TRAPP, LLP RICHARD C. COFFIN	
15	JOSHUA A. BLOOM BRETT S. HENRIKSON	
16	1.) o. 1 6/2	
17	By: Yoshua A. Bloom	
18	Attorneys For Defendant KETTLE FOODS, INC.	
19	DATED: July 2008 MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP	Ì
20	MICHÈLE B. CORASH JAMES M. SCHURZ	
21	BROOKS M. BEARD ROBIN S. STAFFORD	
22 23	10 A A 1	
24	By: Michèle B. Corash	
25	Attorneys For Defendant KET LE FOODS, INC.	
26	DATED: July 2008 KETTLE FOODS, INC.	
27	By: Comothy M Hally	
28	Timothy G. Fallon President	
	16	,
l l	The state of the s	. 1

CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC.

CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC.

Exhibit A

Covered Products

For the purposes of this Consent Judgment, Covered Products shall include all sliced potato chip products manufactured by Settling Defendant at any time while this Consent Judgment remains in effect, including but not limited to the following:

Fried Potato Chip Product Line

Kettle Brand

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Kettle Chips	Backyard Barbeque
Kettle Chips	Sour Cream, Onion and Chive
Kettle Chips	Death Valley Chipotle
Kettle Chips	Lightly Salted
Kettle Chips	Unsalted
Kettle Chips	New York Cheddar w/ Herbs
Kettle Chips	Sea Salt & Vinegar
Kettle Chips	Yogurt & Green Onion
Kettle Chips	Honey Dijon
Kettle Chips	Spicy Thai
Kettle Chips	Tuscan Three Cheese
Kettle Chips	Cheddar Beer
Kettle Chips	Sweet Onion
Kettle Krinkle	Salt & Fresh Ground Pepper
Kettle Krinkle	Buffalo Bleu
Kettle Krinkle	Lightly Salted
Kettle Krinkle	Dill & Sour Cream
Kettle Krinkle	Classic BBQ
Kettle Krinkle	Island Jerk
Kettle Organic	Lightly Salted
Kettle Organic	Chipotle Chili Barbeque
Kettle Organic	Sea Salt & Black Pepper

Trader Joe's Brand

Ridge Cut Potato Chips 16 oz Lightly Salted Ridge Cut Potato Chips 16 oz Salt & Pepper Hawaiian Style Potato Chips 7 oz Salted Hawaiian Style Potato Chips 7 oz Salt & Vinegar Hawaiian Style Potato Chips 7 oz Hickory Barbeque

Costco Brand

Kirkland Signature Krinkle Cut Potato Chips 32 oz Lightly Salted

Whole Foods Brand

365 Brand Homestyle Potato Chips 15 oz Lightly Salted 365 Brand Homestyle Potato Chips 15 oz Barbeque 365 Brand Homestyle Potato Chips 15 oz Salt & Vinegar 365 Brand Homestyle Potato Chips 15 oz Garlic Ranch

////

Kroger Brand 1 2 Naturally Preferred Original Potato Chips 9 oz Original Naturally Preferred Original Potato Chips 9 oz Classic BBQ Naturally Preferred Original Potato Chips 9 oz Balsamic Vinegar and Sea Salt 3 Naturally Preferred Original Potato Chips 9 oz Sea Salt & Cracked Pepper 4 Naturally Preferred Original Potato Chips 9 oz Aged Cheddar 5 **Baked Potato Chip Product Line** 6 Kettle Brand 7 Kettle Bakes Lightly Salted Kettle Bakes Aged White Cheddar 8 Kettle Bakes Hickory Honey Barbeque Kettle Bakes Sea Salt & Vinegar 9 Trader Joe's Brand 10 Trader Joe's Light Salt Baked Potato Chips 11 //// 12 //// 13 1111 14 //// 15 //// 16 //// 17 //// 18 //// 19 //// 20 //// 21 //// 22 //// 23 //// 24 //// 25 //// 26 //// 27 //// 28 19

CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT KETTLE FOODS, INC.

Exhibit B 1 (For use if Settling Defendant provides sign warnings pursuant to Paragraph 3.4) 2 THIS COMMUNICATION APPLIES ONLY TO 3 RETAILERS LOCATED IN CALIFORNIA 4 Kettle Foods, Inc. ("Kettle") has entered into a consent judgment with the Attorney General for the State of California regarding the presence of acrylamide in sliced potato chip products sold by 5 retailers in California. Under the terms of this consent judgment, Kettle is providing the enclosed sign warnings to retailers to be posted in retail stores selling any of the products identified below in California. In the consent judgment, Kettle obtained a conditional release on your behalf. For the release to continue to be effective after the date of this letter, you need to comply with the directions in this 8 communication. 9 We request that you post these signs on your shelf(ves) or in your aisle(s) where sliced potato products are sold. For stores with less than 7500 square feet of retail space and no more than two 10 cash registers, the sign may be placed at each cash register. Additionally, stores that operate a customer service desk or similar central facility should also post a sign at that location. 11 Please sign and return the written acknowledgment below to acknowledge that you have received 12 the signs and that they will be posted in accordance with these specifications until you receive written instruction from Kettle to the contrary. 13 Thank you for your cooperation. If you need more signs or have any questions, such as the 14 appropriate sign locations for your specific retail store(s), please contact 15 Acknowledged by: 16 (Signature) 17 (Print Name) 18 (Company/Store Location) (Date) 20

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Exhibit C

5

(For use if Settling Defendant provides sign warnings pursuant to Paragraph 3.4)

THIS COMMUNICATION APPLIES ONLY TO RETAILERS LOCATED IN CALIFORNIA

On ____, Kettle Foods, Inc. ("Kettle") sent you a letter enclosing sign warnings for posting in your store(s) in California pursuant to a consent judgment entered into between Kettle and the Attorney General for the State of California regarding the presence of acrylamide in sliced potato chip products.

These signs are to be posted on your shelf(ves) or in your aisle(s) where sliced potato chip products are sold in your stores in California. For stores with less than 7500 square feet of retail space and no more than two cash registers, the sign may be placed at each cash register. Additionally, stores that operate a customer service desk or similar central facility should also post a sign at that location.

As stated in our prior letter, Kettle obtained a conditional release in the consent judgment on your behalf. For the release to be effective after the date of the prior letter, you need to comply with the directions in this communication.

We have not received your written acknowledgment that you have received the signs and that your store(s) will post these signs. Please sign and return the written acknowledgment below to acknowledge that you have received the signs and that they will be posted in accordance with these specifications until you receive written instruction from Kettle to the contrary.

Thank you for your cooperate the appropriate sign locations for you	ion. If you need more signs or have any questions, such a ur specific retail store(s), please contact	as —
	(Signature) (Print Name) (Company/Store Location) (Date)	

	Exhibit D
1	Non-Exclusive List of Retailers Within The Scope of
2	Settlement and Release For Sale of Kettle Products
3	Trader Joe's Company Whole Foods Market, Inc.
5	Costco Wholesale Corporation The Kroger Company Safeway, Inc.
6	New Albertson's, Inc. Albertsons, LLC
7	Ralph's Grocery Company Raley's, Inc.
8	Smart & Final, Inc. Stater Bros. Market
9	The Vons Companies, Inc. Food 4 Less of California, Inc.
10	Food 4 Less of Southern California, Inc. Fred Meyer Stores, Inc.
11	Foods Co.
12	
13	
14	
15 16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	