REUBEN YEROUSHALMI (SBN 193981) ORIGINAL FILED

JUN 1 8 2007

LOS ANGELES
SUPERIOR COURT DANIEL D. CHO (SBN 105409) BEN YEROUSHALMI (SBN 232540) YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES 3700 WILSHIRE BLVD., SUITE 480 LOS ANGELES, CA 90010 Telephone: 213-382-3183 Attorneys for Plaintiff, 6 Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. 7 8 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES** 11 CASE NO. BC363759 CONSUMER ADVOCACY 12 GROUP, INC., in the interest [PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING 13 of the Public, SETTLEMENT AND JUDGMENT 14 BETWEEN PLAINTIFF CONSUMER Plaintiff, ADVOCACY GROUP, INC. AND 15 DEFENDANT THOMPSON ROOF CO. ٧. 16 **INCORPORATED** THOMPSON ROOF CO., 17 INCORPORATED, et al., Judge: Richard L. Fruin 18 Place: Dept. 15 Defendants. Date: June 18, 2007 19 Time: 8:30 AM 20 Action Filed: December 20, 2006 21 22 23 On June 18, 2007, at 8:30 AM, the Honorable Richard L. Fruin, in Department 15 of this 24 Court, heard the motion for judicial approval of settlement of action between plaintiff, 25 Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. ("CAG"), on one hand, and, defendant, Thompson Roof Co. 26 Incorporated ("Thompson"), on the other. Appearances are in the record. The Court, having 27 28

[PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING OF SETTLEMENT AND JUDGMENT BETWEEN PLAINTIFF CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC. AND DEFENDANT THOMPSON ROOF CO. INCORPORATED

considered the documents filed in connection with this matter and the arguments of counsel, has arrived at the following conclusions and SO ORDERS:

- A. On December 20, 2006, CAG commenced this action in Los Angeles Superior Court on behalf of itself, and suing in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (d).
- B. CAG and Thompson have executed a [Proposed] Consent Judgment ("Proposed Settlement"), fully executed as of March 16, 2007, attached to this order as Exhibit A, which CAG submitted to this Court for approval pursuant to Proposition 65 (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 25249.5 et seq.).
- C. This Court has considered the Proposed Settlement and determined that it represents a fair, reasonable, and adequate settlement between CAG and Thompson.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDER APPROVING PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

- 1. The Proposed Settlement attached as Exhibit A provides that Thompson will:
- Change its business practices in order to reduce exposures of Proposition 65-listed chemicals to its employees and the public;
- Provide warnings to its employees that satisfy the "clear and reasonable" warning requirement under Proposition 65;
- Pay CAG \$4,500 for its attorney fees and costs; and
- Pay civil penalties of \$500.
- 2. The court grants the Motion for Judicial Approval of Settlement between CAG and Thompson in its entirety pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (f)(4) after making the following findings.

24

25

26

27

28

 a. CAG followed all procedural rules in seeking approval of the Proposed Settlement;

- The Proposed Settlement properly requires Proposition 65 compliant warnings for extant exposures to Proposition 65-listed chemicals;
- c. The award of \$4,500 in attorney fees and costs as set forth in the Proposed Settlement is appropriate and reasonable under California law given the total fees and costs incurred by CAG and its counsel of record in prosecuting this action;
- d. The Proposed Settlement provides that Thompson will pay a civil penalty of \$500 that is proper in light of the criteria set forth in Health and Safety Code, section 25249.7, subdivision (b)(2);
- e. The terms of the Proposed Settlement are in the public interest consistent with Health and Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (d); and
- f. CAG adequately represented the public interest in entering into the Proposed Settlement.

<u>JUDGMENT</u>

- The Court approves the [Proposed] Consent Judgment, an executed copy of which is
 attached as Exhibit A, as the Judgment of this Court resolving this action between
 plaintiff, Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc., on one hand, and defendant, Thompson Roof
 Co. Incorporated, on the other.
- The Court Clerk is to enter this Judgment as the Judgment of the Court as to defendant,
 Thompson Roof Co. Incorporated.
- 3. Thompson Roof Co. Incorporated is dismissed with prejudice from this action.

4. Except as otherwise set forth in the Proposed Settlement, all parties shall bear their own attorney fees and costs.

Dated: <u>June 18</u>, 2007

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

1	REUBEN YEROUSHALMI (SBN 193981) DANIEL D. CHO (SBN 105409)				
2	DANIEL D. CHO (SBN 105409) DANIEL J. HARTMAN (SBN 223005) YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES				
3	3700 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 480				
4					
5	Facsimile: (213) 382-3430				
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff				
7	CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.				
8	STIPEDIOD COLUT OF THE STATE OF GALEBORY.				
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES				
10	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES				
11	CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.	Case No. BC 363759			
12	Plaintiff,		ENT JUDGMENT AS		
13	v.	TO PLAINTIFF COL ADVOCACY GROU	NSUMER		
14	THOMPSON ROOF CO. INC.; et al.,	DEFENDANT THON INC.	MPSON ROOF CO.,		
15	Defendants.				
16					
17		Date action filed: Trial date:	December 20, 2006 Not set		
18		i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	Not set		
19	Plaintiff, CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC., (referred to herein as "CAG"),				
20	and defendant THOMPSON ROOF CO., INC. (referred to herein as "Settling Defendant"),				
21	enter into this Consent Judgment as follows:				
22 23	1. Introduction.				
24	1.1 CAG is an entity based in Los Angeles, California that seeks to promote				
25	awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals and i	awareness of exposures to toxic chemicals and improve human health by reducing or			
26	eliminating hazardous substances contained in consumer and industrial products.				
27					
28					
~~					

- 1.2 Settling Defendant is a California corporation that employs ten or more persons, or has employed ten or more persons during the relevant limitations period, and acts primarily as a roofing contractor.
- tar, the use of which is alleged to expose persons to acetaldehyde; arsenic (inorganic arsenic compounds, including oxides); benz[a]anthracene; benzene; benzo[a]pyrene; benzo[b]flouranthene; benzo[k]flouranthene; beryllium and beryllium compounds; 1,3-butadiene; cadmium and cadmium compounds; carbazole; chromium (hexavalent compounds); chrysene; dibenz[a,j]acridine; dibenz[a,h]anthracene; dibenzo[a,e]pyrene; dibenzo[a,h]pyrene; dibenzo[a,i]pyrene; dibenzo[a,i]pyrene; dibenzo[a,i]pyrene; dibenzo[a,i]pyrene; dichloromethane (methylene chloride); formaldehyde (gas); indeno[1,2,3-cd]-pyrene; lead and lead compounds; 5-methylchrysene; nickel and nickel compounds; silica, crystalline; tetrachloroethylene (perchloroethylene); toluene diioscyanate; trichloroethylene; carbon disulfide; mercury and mercury compounds; and toluene (hereinafter the "Covered Chemicals").
- 1.4 The Covered Chemicals are identified as substances listed in the regulations promulgated under the California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act, California Health & Safety Code sections 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65") as chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive harm. A list of the roofing products that consist of, contain or result in exposure to either asphalt or coal tar and are covered by this Consent Judgment (the "Materials") is provided in Exhibit A. Some of the Materials are heated and/or delivered to the place of application using a kettle, tank truck or other equipment. Tank trucks and kettles are collectively referred to herein as "Heating and Delivery Equipment."
- 1.5 In February 2006, Plaintiff served public enforcement agencies and Settling Defendant with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" (the "Notice"), which provided public enforcers and the Settling Defendant with notice that Settling Defendant was alleged to have violated Proposition 65 by failing to warn its employees and other persons in

California that the Materials used by Settling Defendant expose those persons to the Covered Chemicals.

- as Consumer Advocacy Group v. Thompson Roof Co. Inc., et al., in the Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC 363759 (hereinafter the "Action"), naming THOMPSON ROOF CO., INC., et al., as defendants, and alleging that Settling Defendant and John Doe defendants violated Health & Safety Code section 25249.6 by exposing employees and other persons to chemicals listed pursuant to Proposition 65 contained in the Materials without providing "clear and reasonable" warnings. Such alleged exposures constitute "consumer product," "occupational" and "environmental" exposures within the meaning of the Proposition 65 implementing regulations set forth at California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 12601, subdivisions (b), (c) and (d), respectively.
- 1.7 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in CAG's Complaint and Notice, that the Court has personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in CAG's Complaint and Notice, that venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in CAG's Complaint and Notice, and of all claims which were or could have been raised by any person or entity based on whole or in part, directly or indirectly, on the facts alleged in the Notice, in CAG's Complaint, or arising therefrom or related thereto.
- 1.8 The parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a settlement of disputed claims between the parties as alleged in CAG's Complaint and Notice for the purpose of avoiding prolonged and costly litigation between the parties hereto. By execution of this Consent Judgment, the parties do not admit any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law, including, but not limited to, any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law suggesting or demonstrating any violations of Proposition 65 or any other statutory, common law or equitable requirements relating to the Materials. Nothing in this Consent

Judgment shall be construed as an admission by the parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law. Nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by the parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, argument or defense the parties may have in this or any other or future legal proceedings. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CAG from opposing any argument. Nevertheless, Settling Defendant's obligations, responsibilities and duties shall remain as set forth in this Consent Judgment unless a modification has been entered by a court of law as set forth in Paragraph 12, below.

2. Injunctive Relief.

- 2.1 Settling Defendant agrees to provide Proposition 65 warnings and to take actions intended to prevent, reduce and mitigate exposure to the Covered Chemicals arising from using the Materials, in the manner prescribed below.
- 2.2 Within ninety (90) days after entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall provide Proposition 65 warnings to its own California employees who use the Materials by fully incorporating Proposition 65 warnings into the chemical hazard warnings and training provided in its hazard communication training plans, as part of compliance with the California Hazard Communication Standard under California Code of Regulations, title 8, section 5194. Such warnings shall include the Proposition 65 warning set forth in Exhibit B, attached hereto.
- 2.3 Within ninety (90) days after entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall post a Proposition 65 warning sign conspicuously at each of its California places of business where employees who are likely to handle, use, or store the Materials or prepare the Materials for application, are likely to see and read the warning sign, such as a locker room where such employees store their gear or in the proximity of a time clock where such employees check in and out on a regular basis. For the purposes of this Consent Judgment, such places of business shall not include job sites at which services may be performed, but which are not

owned and operated by Settling Defendant. The Proposition 65 warning sign shall set forth the following warning statement:

WARNING: CHEMICALS KNOWN TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA TO CAUSE CANCER AND BIRTH DEFECTS OR OTHER REPRODUCTIVE HARM

Asphalt, coal tar, and other roofing or waterproofing materials contain chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive hazards. Exposure to these chemicals occurs during the installation, repair or removal of roofing and waterproofing materials containing asphalt, coal tar, or other bituminous binders and other types of roofing or waterproofing materials. Exposures may occur not only from the roofing or waterproofing materials you are working with but also from the solvents, mastics, cements, sealants, caulking compounds and other products and equipment that may be used in the operation. Always familiarize yourself with the hazards of the materials and equipment you are using and follow the precautions indicated on product labels, Material Safety Data Sheets and your health and safety training program.

The parties agree that this warning shall be deemed "clear and reasonable" for purposes of Proposition 65 and the Proposition 65 implementing regulations set forth at California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 12601(a) for any chemical contained in the Materials or to which exposure occurs from use of the Materials, to the extent that such chemical presently is or in the future may become listed under Proposition 65, whether as a carcinogen or reproductive toxin or both.

- 2.4 CAG maintains that environmental and consumer product and service exposures occur as a result of the presence of Covered Chemicals in the Materials, and that warnings for such exposures are required. Settling Defendant disputes this. In recognition of the measures adopted in Subparagraph 2.5 below and the effect those measures will have, and in consideration for the adoption of these measures, the parties have agreed that warnings for consumer product and service exposures and environmental exposures are not required.
- 2.5 The parties agree that Settling Defendant shall institute certain measures in order to reduce or mitigate alleged occupational, environmental or consumer exposure to the Covered Chemicals arising from the use of the Materials. The parties agree to these measures with the mutual understanding and expectation that such measures will be effective to reduce and mitigate exposure to the Covered Chemicals arising from the use of the Materials to or within

the levels such that warnings for "consumer product/service" or "environmental" exposures, within the meaning of the Proposition 65 implementing regulations set forth at California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 12601, subdivisions (b) and (d), respectively, would not be required. Within ninety (90) days after entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant that uses Heating and Delivery Equipment shall do the following:

- 2.5.1 ensure that Heating and Delivery Equipment with a capacity greater than200 gallons will have operational thermostatic heating controls.
- 2.5.2 incorporate the following instructions in its chemical hazard training plan for employees, as part of its compliance with the California Hazard Communication Standard, set forth at California Code of Regulations, title 8, section 5194.
 - 2.5.2.1 Employees shall restrict access to Heating and Delivery Equipment in which Materials are being heated for application to those employees whose job responsibilities require them to be present.
 - 2.5.2.2 Employees shall not heat any Material to a temperature that is higher than the manufacturer's specifications for that material.
 - 2.5.2.3 Employees shall verify the temperature of heated Materials with a thermometer on a regular basis, to ensure that the Materials are not being heated higher than the applicable manufacturer's specifications.
 - 2.5.2.4 Employees will work upwind from Heating and Delivery Equipment whenever it is practical to do so.
 - 2.5.2.5 Employees will keep kettle lids closed except when necessary to: (i) add or remove Materials from the kettles, (ii) check the temperature of the Materials in the kettles; (iii) the check the

volume or quality of the Material in the kettles; or (iv) perform similar activities.

2.5.2.6 Employees shall position Heating and Delivery Equipment as close to the point of application as practical in order to minimize heat loss.

Settling Defendant shall train its employees in the physical and health hazards of the Materials and other substances in their work area(s), and the measures that they can take to protect themselves from these hazards, including specific procedures that the employer has implemented to protect employees from exposure to hazardous substances, such as appropriate work practices, emergency procedures and personal protective equipment to be used. Settling Defendant shall periodically monitor its employees' conduct to promote full compliance with all the requirements of this Subparagraph 2.5.

2.6 Within ninety (90) days after entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall provide the Attorney General with a sworn statement indicating that it has adopted a model training program, that (a) complies with the terms of this Consent Judgment, and (b) includes model warnings, educational program materials and monitoring timetables and procedures that have already been submitted to the Attorney General.

3. Monetary Relief.

- 3.1 Payment Pursuant to Health & Safety Code Section 25249.7(b). Within thirty (30) days after entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall pay CAG civil penalties in the amount of \$500.
- 3.2 Other Payments. The parties recognize and agree that monetary relief other than payments under Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b), or in addition to such payments, might be imposed or required if the Settling Defendant was found liable in this matter. Such monetary relief might include payments denominated as restitution, disgorgement of profits, attorneys' fees and costs, investigative costs, or other payments, as such payments might be imposed under the Civil Procedure Code, or any other law. Nevertheless, as

consideration for Settling Defendant's agreement to adopt the measures set forth in Paragraph 2 above, CAG agrees to accept a single payment from Settling Defendant in the amount set forth in Paragraph 3.1, above, in complete satisfaction of any claim for such monetary relief, and Settling Defendant agrees to pay this amount.

- 3.3 Manner of Payment. The above-required civil penalty payment shall be made payable to Yeroushalmi & Associates, 3700 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 480, Los Angeles, California, 90010 (Attn: Reuben Yeroushalmi, Esq.). Penalty monies shall be apportioned by Yeroushalmi & Associates in accordance with Health & Safety Code section 25249.12, with 75% of these funds remitted to the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Fund, and the remaining 25% apportioned to CAG pursuant to Section 25249.12(d).
- 3.4 Satisfaction of Claims/No Admissions. The payment that Settling Defendant makes pursuant to this Paragraph 3 shall be in consideration for the full, final and complete satisfaction of all claims for civil penalties or restitution for the alleged violations regarding the Materials, up to and including the date of entry of this Judgment. Making this payment shall not be construed as an admission by Settling Defendant of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law. Nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by Settling Defendant of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of fact, law or violation of law.
- 4. Payment of CAG's Attorneys' Fees and Costs.
- 4.1 Attorneys' Fees Payment. Within thirty (30) days after entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall pay CAG attorneys' fees and costs as follows in the amount of \$4,500.
- 4.2 **Manner of Payment.** The above-required attorneys' fees and costs payment shall be made payable to Yeroushalmi & Associates, 3700 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 480, Los Angeles, California, 90010 (Attn: Reuben Yeroushalmi, Esq.).
- 4.3 **Satisfaction of Claims/No Admissions.** The payment that Settling Defendant makes pursuant to this Paragraph 4 shall be in consideration for the full, final and complete

4

9

7

10

12

13

14

11

15 16

17 18

19 20

2122

23

2425

26

27

satisfaction of all claims for attorneys' fees or costs related to the alleged violations regarding the Materials. Making these payments shall not be construed as an admission by Settling Defendant of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law. Nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by Settling Defendant of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of fact, law or violation of law.

5. Additional Enforcement Actions; Continuing Obligations.

By entering into this Consent Judgment, CAG does not waive any right to take further enforcement actions regarding any violations not covered by the Action or this Consent Judgment. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as diminishing Settling Defendant's continuing obligation to comply with Proposition 65 in their future activities.

Enforcement of Consent Judgment.

CAG may, by motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Los Angeles, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In any action brought by CAG to enforce this Consent Judgment, CAG may seek whatever fines, costs, attorneys' fees, penalties or remedies are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment. Where said failure to comply constitutes future violations of Proposition 65 or other laws, independent of the Consent Judgment and/or those alleged in the Complaints, CAG is not limited to enforcement of this Consent Judgment, but may seek in another action, subject to satisfaction of any procedural requirements, including notice requirements, whatever fines, costs, attorneys' fees, penalties or remedies are provided by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws. However, the rights of Settling Defendant to defend itself and its actions in law or equity shall not be abrogated or reduced in any fashion by the terms of this Paragraph and Settling Defendant shall be entitled to raise any and all applicable defenses and/or counterclaims arising in law or equity against CAG, and seek such costs, damages, and attorneys' fees as may apply. In any action to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment, the prevailing party shall be entitled to and shall collect from the other party its costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

Application of Consent Judgment.

This Consent Judgment shall apply to, be binding upon and inure to the benefit of, the parties, including CAG and Settling Defendant, its divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, and affiliates and the successors or assigns of each of them.

8. Claims Covered.

Except as provided below, this Consent Judgment is a final and binding resolution between CAG and Settling Defendant, satisfying and releasing Settling Defendant from any and all claims, causes of action, damages, costs, penalties or attorneys' fees based upon alleged violations of:

Proposition 65, or

any other statutory or common law,

that arise from Settling Defendant's failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings, pursuant to Proposition 65, that roofing operations cause exposure to the following:

the Materials,

any other material containing asphalt or coal tar or any of their

constituents, or

any Covered Chemicals present in or released from the Materials,

asphalt or coal tar.

This Consent Judgment shall not resolve any claim for chemicals, if any, that are contained in the Materials and are added to the Proposition 65 list of chemicals known to the State to cause cancer, or the list of chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, after the entry of judgment. The list of Materials to be governed by this Consent Judgment (i.e., for which Settling Defendant must comply with the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment) is set forth as Exhibit A attached to this Consent Judgment.

9. Mutual Releases of Claims.

9.1 CAG's Release of Settling Defendant. This Consent Judgment shall constitute a release from CAG on behalf of itself, its agents, representatives, attorneys and assigns, by which they waive all rights to institute or participate in, directly or indirectly, any form of legal action, and release all claims, liabilities, obligations, losses, costs, expenses, penalties, fines and damages, against Settling Defendant, and its directors, officers, employees, parent companies, sister companies, subsidiaries, or any other affiliated person who may use, maintain or sell the Materials, and the successors and assigns of any of them, whether under Proposition 65 or other law, based upon Settling Defendant's failure to warn about exposure to chemicals listed under Proposition 65, before and after the entry of this Consent Judgment, resulting from the sale, distribution, marketing or use of any of the Materials.

CAG acknowledges that it has read and waives the provisions of California Civil Code §

"A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO
CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR
SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE
TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF
KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY
AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE
DEBTOR."

CAG understands and acknowledges the significance of this waiver of Section 1542 of the Civil Code is that even if it discovers additional claims or causes of action, CAG will not be able to enforce or prosecute those claims or causes of action. Furthermore, CAG acknowledges that it intends these consequences even as to claims or causes of action that may exist as of the date of this release but which CAG does not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect CAG's decision to execute this release, regardless of whether CAG's lack of knowledge is a result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause.

Settling Defendant's Release of CAG. Settling Defendant by this Consent 9.2 Judgment, releases and waives all rights to institute any form of legal action against CAG and its attorneys or representatives, for all actions or statements made by CAG, and its attorneys or representatives, in the course of seeking enforcement of Proposition 65 through CAG's Complaint against Settling Defendant as to the Materials that are the subject of the Notice and CAG's Complaint.

Settling Defendant acknowledges that it has read and waives the provisions of California Civil Code § 1542:

> "A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR."

Settling Defendant understands and acknowledges the significance of this waiver of Section 1542 of the Civil Code is that even if it discovers additional claims or causes of action, Settling Defendant will not be able to enforce or prosecute those claims or causes of action. Furthermore, Settling Defendant acknowledges that it intends these consequences even as to claims or causes of action that may exist as of the date of this release but which Settling Defendant does not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect Settling Defendant's decision to execute this release, regardless of whether Settling Defendant's lack of knowledge is a result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause.

10. Entire Agreement.

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

27103906

27

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.

11. Authorization.

Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment on behalf of the party represented and legally to bind that party.

12. Modification.

- 12.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified from time to time by express written agreement of the parties, with the approval of the Court, or by an order of this Court in accordance with law.
- 12.2 If (1) the Attorney General or CAG subsequently agree in a settlement or judicially entered injunction or consent judgment (i) that certain Materials do not require a warning under Proposition 65, or (ii) that a modified warning for the Materials is appropriate, or (iii) to injunctive relief concerning the use, manufacture and/or sale of the Materials that differs from that imposed in this Consent Judgment, or (2) a court of competent jurisdiction renders a final judgment in a case brought by the Attorney General or CAG (i) that eliminates such a warning requirement for Materials, or (ii) that modifies such a warning requirement for the Materials, or (iii) that imposes injunctive relief concerning the use, manufacture and/or sale of the Materials that differs from that imposed in this Consent Judgment, then Settling Defendant shall be entitled to submit evidence to CAG demonstrating that the Materials come within the scope of the agreement or ruling and (i) do not require a warning under Proposition 65, or (ii) require a modified warning under Proposition 65, or (iii) require different injunctive relief under Proposition 65.
- 12.3 CAG and Settling Defendant shall have ninety (90) days from the date on which a Settling Defendant submits such evidence to CAG in which to confer and decide concerning whether (1) to eliminate the warning requirement set forth in Paragraph 2 above or (2) otherwise

to eliminate or modify the injunctive relief provisions of this Consent Judgment. If the parties agree that the Materials used by Settling Defendant come within the scope of the agreement or ruling, then they shall jointly move the Court for such modification.

- 12.4 If the parties are unable to agree on the elimination or modification of the warning requirement of this Consent Judgment, or are unable to agree on the elimination or modification of any of the injunctive relief provisions of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant may file a motion with the Court, seeking the elimination or modification of the warning requirement, or the dissolution or modification of the injunctive relief provisions of this Consent Judgment, based on the agreement or the ruling. In any motion by Settling Defendant under this Paragraph 12, the burden of proving, based on the agreement or ruling, (1) that the Materials do not require a warning, or (2) that the warning should be modified, or (3) that the injunctive relief provisions of this Consent Judgment should be eliminated or modified shall remain on Settling Defendant.
- 12.5 This Paragraph 12 shall not apply to the monetary relief provisions of this Consent Judgment.

13. Entry of Consent Judgment Required.

This Consent Judgment shall be null and void, and be without any force or effect, unless entered by the Court in this matter. If the Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, the execution of this Consent Judgment by Settling Defendant or CAG shall not be construed as an admission by Settling Defendant or CAG of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law.

14. Retention of Jurisdiction.

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

15. Severability.

In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions shall not be adversely affected.

16. Attorneys' Fees.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

In the event that a dispute arises with respect to any provision(s) of the Consent Judgment, and such disputes are resolved by the Court or through mediation, arbitration or other alternative dispute resolution proceeding, the prevailing party in such action or proceeding shall be entitled to recover costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

17. Governing Law.

The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

18. Notices.

18.1 All correspondence to CAG shall be mailed to:

Reuben Yeroushalmi Yeroushalmi & Associates 3700 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 480 Los Angeles, CA 90010

18.2 All correspondence to Settling Defendant shall be mailed to:

Settling Defendant's registered agent with copy to

Stanley W. Landfair McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP 101 California Street 41st Floor San Francisco, CA 94111

Tel.: 415-267-4000 Fax: 415-267-4198

22

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 15 -

01-24-2007 02:07pm

From-McKenna Long & Aldridge

14162874188

F-088

T-286 P.018/021

19. Counterparts and Facsimile. 1 2 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and facsimile, each of which 3 shall be deemed an original, and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the 4 same document. 5 AGREED TO: AGREED TO: 6 7 DATE:_ 8 9 Lyn Marcus Herb Thompson 10 President THOMPSON ROOF CO., INC. 11 CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC. Defendant 12 13 14 AGREED AS TO FORM: AGREED AS TO FORM: 15 16 YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 17 18 19 Reuben Yeroushalmi Stanley W. Landfair 20 Attorneys for Plaintiff
CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC. Attorneys for Defendants
ARCHADEL, INC.; GORDON MOTT 21 ROOFING COMPANY, INC.; PREMIUM ROOF SERVICES; THOMPSON ROOF CO., INC.; URBACH ROOFING, INC. 22 23 24 DATE: DATE: 25 26 27 28 - 16 -27103908 CONSENT JUDGMENT SF:27213596.1

1	19. Counterparts and Facsimile.			
2	This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and facsimile, each of which			
3				
4	same document.			
5	f .			
6	AGREED TO:	AGREED TO:		
7	DATE: 2/1//27	DATE:		
8	3/1/			
9	In Warcas			
10	Lyn Marcus	Herb Thompson		
11	President CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.	THOMPSON ROOF CO., INC. Defendant		
12		2 oronam.		
13	·			
14				
15	AGREED AS TO FORM:	AGREED AS TO FORM:		
16	YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES	MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP		
17				
18		Jan n n		
19	Reuben Yeroushalmi	Stanley W. Landfair		
20	Attorneys for Plaintiff	Attorneys for Defendants		
21	CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC.	ARCHADEL, INC.; GORDON MOTT ROOFING COMPANY, INC.; PREMIUM		
22		ROOF SERVICES; THOMPSON ROOF CO., INC.; URBACH ROOFING, INC.		
23				
24	DATE: April 12/07	DATE: 1/25/07		
25	J			
26				
27				
28				

- 17 -

EXHIBIT A

The Materials, as defined at Paragraph 1.4, include all roofing products that consist of, contain or result in exposure to asphalt or coal tar, and any equipment used in the storage, installation, repair, removal, and transportation of such products whose use may cause persons to be exposed to asphalt or coal tar, including specifically, but not exclusively, the products and equipment listed below:

6	equipment listed below:			
7	Binders	Insulation materials		
8	Felts	Substrates		
9	Base sheets	Roofing kettles		
	Cap sheets	Tank trucks		
10	Surfacing materials	Vehicles used to tow roofing kettles to, from, and within job sites		
11	Membrane systems			
12	Shingles	Torches		
13	Roll roofing	Hot-air welders		
	Felt underlayments	Other heating equipment		
14	Flashings	Spreaders		
15	Coatings	Felt-laying machines		
16	Mastics	Roof removal equipment, including but not limited to roof cutters		
17	Cements			
ı	Adhesives	Hand tools		
18	Caulking compounds			
19	- 			

EXHIBIT B

WARNING: CHEMICALS KNOWN TO THE STATE OF

CALIFORNIA TO CAUSE CANCER AND BIRTH DEFECTS OR OTHER REPRODUCTIVE HARM

Asphalt, coal tar, and other roofing or waterproofing materials contain chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or

reproductive hazards. Exposure to these chemicals occurs during the installation, repair or removal of roofing and waterproofing materials

products and equipment that may be used in the operation. Always familiarize yourself with the hazards of the materials and equipment you

Safety Data Sheets and your health and safety training program.

I have read and understand the above warning.

Employee Signature

Employee Name (printed)

containing asphalt, coal tar, or other bituminous binders and other types of roofing or waterproofing materials. Exposures may occur not only from

the roofing or waterproofing materials you are working with but also from the solvents, mastics, cements, sealants, caulking compounds and other

are using and follow the precautions indicated on product labels, Material

Dated:

- 19 -

CONSENT JUDGMENT