i		
1	WILLIAM VERICK, SBN 140972 FREDRIC EVENSON, SBN 198059 KLAMATH ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER	ENDORSED
2	424 First Street Eureka, CA 95501	FILED San Francisco County Superior Court
3	Telephone: (707) 268-8900 Facsimile: (707) 268-8901 E-mail: wverick@igc.org	DEC 1 6 2010
4		CLEBY OF THE COURT
5	DAVID WILLIAMS, SBN 144479 BRIAN ACREE, SBN 202505 370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5	BY:Deputy Clerk
6	Oakland, CA 94610 Telephone: (510) 271-0826	
7	Facsimile: (510) 271=0829 E-mail: davidhwilliams@earthlink.net	•
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION	
9		
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
11	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	
12	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE) Case No: 498558
13	FOUNDATION,) CONSENT JUDGMENT
14	PLAINTIFF,)) (AKERUE INDUSTRIES LLC AND
15	V.) BRUNTON COMPANY)
16	AKERUE INDUSTRIES, LLC; ET AL.,	
17	DEFENDANTS.	
18		-' ·
19	1. INTRODUCTION	
20	1.1 On April 12, 2010, the MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	
21	FOUNDATION ("Mateel") acting on behalf of itself and the general public, filed a	
22	Complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in San Francisco	
23	Superior Court, Case No. 498558, against, among others, Defendants Akerue Industries,	
24	LLC, ("Akerue"), and Brunton Company, a Wyoming corporation ("Brunton").	
25	Collectively Akerue and Brunton may be referred to as Settling Defendants. The	
26	Complaint alleges, among other things, that Settling Defendants violated provisions of	
27	the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code	
28		

CONSENT JUDGMENT CASE NO. CGC-10-498558

Sections 25249.5, et seq. ("Proposition 65"). In particular, Mateel alleges that Settling Defendants have knowingly and intentionally exposed persons to products, including fuel burning equipment and other products that are made of or include a component made of brass that contains lead and/or lead compounds, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals. Lead and lead compounds are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm.

- 1.2 On December 23, 2009, Mateel sent a 60-Day Notice letter ("Notice Letter") to Settling Defendants, the California Attorney General, all California District Attorneys, and all City Attorneys of every California city with populations exceeding 750.000.
- 1.3 Settling Defendants are each a business that employs ten or more persons and manufactures, distributes, and/or markets leaded brass products, within the State of California. Some of these products are alleged to contain components made of brass that contain lead and/or lead compounds. Lead and lead compounds are chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, and lead is a chemical known to the State of California to cause reproductive toxicity pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.9. Under specified circumstances, products containing lead and/or lead compounds that are sold or distributed in the State of California are subject to the Proposition 65 warning requirement set forth in Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6. Plaintiff Mateel alleges that products that are made from leaded brass, or that have leaded brass components, are manufactured, distributed, sold and/or marketed by Settling Defendants for use in California and require a warning under Proposition 65.
- 1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Covered Products" shall be defined as products that are made from leaded brass or that have leaded brass components and are manufactured, distributed, marketed and/or sold by Settling Defendants, regardless of whether they bear Settling Defendants' label. _The "Effective Date" shall be defined as 120 days after entry of this Consent Judgment.
 - 1.5 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the parties stipulate that this Court

has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendants as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaint and of all claims that were or could have been raised by any person or entity based in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, on the facts alleged therein or arising therefrom or related thereto.

1.6 This Consent Judgment resolves claims that are denied and disputed. The parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full and final settlement of any and all claims between the parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. This Consent Judgment shall not constitute an admission with respect to any material allegation of the Complaint, each and every allegation of which Settling Defendants deny, nor may this Consent Judgment or compliance with it be used as evidence of any wrongdoing, misconduct, culpability or liability on the part of Settling Defendants or any other person or entity related to the Settling Defendants.

2. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

2.1 In settlement of all of the claims referred to in this Consent Judgment
Settling Defendants, shall pay \$30,000 (thirty_thousand dollars), in total monetary relief.
Each Settling Defendant shall be responsible for fifty percent (50%) of the total monetary relief, or \$15,000 (fifteen thousand dollars), and each Settling Defendant shall not be held jointly or severally liable for any failure of the other Settling Defendant to pay its equitable share of the total monetary relief. Of this amount, a total of \$10,000 (ten thousand dollars) shall be paid in lieu of and as an offset for any civil penalty and shall be divided such that \$5,000 (five thousand dollars) shall be made payable to Ecological Rights Foundation, and \$5,000(five_thousand dollars) shall be made payable to Californians for Alternatives to Toxics. Also, \$20,000 (twenty thousand dollars) shall be made payable to the Klamath Environmental Law Center ("KELC") for attorneys fees and costs incurred by KELC on behalf of Plaintiff in investigating and prosecuting this

matter and in negotiating this Consent Judgment on behalf of itself and in the public interest. The payments described above shall be delivered at least 5 days prior to any hearing on a motion to approve this settlement, to William Verick, 424 First Street, Eureka, CA 95501. If payment has not been received as provided in this paragraph, Plaintiff may withdraw any motion to approve and enter the agreement and the agreement shall become null and void. If this Consent Judgment has not been approved and entered by the Court within 120 days of the execution of the agreement by the parties, the payments described above shall be promptly returned to the Settling Defendants, and the terms of this agreement shall be null and void.

- 2.2 MEJF and KELC represent and warrant that Ecological Rights Foundation and Californians for Alternatives to Toxics are each a tax exempt, section 501(c)(3) non-profit organization and that funds distributed to this organization pursuant to this Consent Judgment may only be spent to reduce harm from toxic chemicals, or to increase consumer, worker and community awareness of health hazards posed by lead and other toxic chemicals.
- 2.3 Except as specifically provided in this Consent Judgment, each side shall bear its own costs and attorney's fees.
 - 3. ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT
- 3.1 The parties hereby request that the Court promptly enter this Consent Judgment. Upon entry of the Consent Judgment, Settling Defendants waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations of the Complaint.
 - 4. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT
- 4.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between Settling Defendants and Mateel, acting on behalf of itself and, as to those matters raised in the 60 Day Notice Letter, acting in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d), of all matters that are or that could have been alleged in the Complaint, including any violation of Proposition 65, or the regulations promulgated thereunder, to the fullest extent that any violation could have been asserted by Mateel

28

against the Settling Defendants based upon, arising out of, or relating to Settling Defendants' compliance with Proposition 65, or regulations promulgated thereunder, with respect to exposures to lead or lead compounds from the Covered Products (and components thereof), whether based on actions committed by Settling Defendants, or by any other entity which at any time was or is within the chain of manufacture, distribution and sale of the Covered Products, including but not limited to manufacturers, distributors, wholesale or retail sellers and any other person in the course of doing business. As to alleged lead and lead compound exposures from Covered Products, as expressed in the 60 Day Notice Letters, compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any issue, now and in the future, concerning compliance by Settling Defendants and their parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, divisions, predecessors, successors, assigns, officers, directors, shareholders, attorneys, representatives, agents, employees, and all manufacturers, customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers or any other person or entity in the course of doing business involving the Covered Products or components found in the Covered Products, and the successors and assigns of any of these who may manufacture, use, maintain, distribute, market or sell Covered Products, with the current requirements and standards of Proposition 65. This Consent Judgment also is a full, final and binding resolution between Plaintiff and Settling Defendants as to any other claims that could have been asserted against Settling Defendants or their affiliates, parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, divisions, predecessors, successors, assigns, officers, directors, shareholders, attorneys, representatives, agents, employees, and all manufacturers, customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, or any other person or entity in the course of doing business involving the Covered Products, and the successors and assigns of any of them who may manufacture, use, maintain, distribute, market or sell Covered Products or components found in the Covered Products, for any claims regarding exposure to, and/or failure to warn about or disclose the presence of lead (or lead compounds) in or associated with use of the Covered Products.

4.2 As to alleged lead exposures associated with Covered Products, Mateel,

21

24

23

25

26 27

28

acting on behalf of itself, and its agents, attorneys, representatives, successors and assigns, waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly, or indirectly, any form of legal action, and releases all claims as between Mateel and Settling Defendants, including, without limitation, all actions, and causes of action, in law or in equity, suits, liabilities, demands, obligations, agreements, promises, royalties, accountings, damages, costs, fines, penalties, losses, or expenses (including, but not limited to, investigation fees, expert fees, and attorney's fees) of any nature whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent (collectively "claims"), against Settling Defendants and their parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, divisions, predecessors, successors, assigns, officers, directors, shareholders, attorneys, representatives, agents, employees, and all manufacturers, customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, or any other person or entity in the course of doing business involving the Covered Products, and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may manufacture, use, maintain, distribute, market or sell the Covered Products or components found in the Covered Products, including, but not limited to, any claims regarding exposure to, and/or failure to warn about or disclose the presence of lead (or lead compounds) in or associated with the use of, the Covered Products. In furtherance of the foregoing, as to alleged violations of Proposition 65 and lead exposures to Covered Products, Mateel hereby waives any and all rights and benefits which it now has, or in the future may have respecting the Covered Products, conferred upon it with respect to claims involving Covered Products by virtue of the provisions of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

"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."

5.

21 22

20

18

19

23 24

25

26 27

28

6. MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT

6.1 Except as provided for in Paragraph 7.3(c), this Consent Judgment may be

Mateel understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542 is that even if Mateel suffers future damages arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Covered Products, including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with respect to exposure to lead or lead compounds from Covered Products, Mateel will not be able to make any claim for those damages against the Settling Defendants. their parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, divisions, predecessors, successors, assigns, officers, directors, shareholders, attorneys, representatives, agents, employees, and all manufacturers, customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers or any other person or entity in the course of doing business involving the Covered Products, and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may manufacture, use, maintain, distribute, market or sell the Covered Products or components found in the Covered Products. Furthermore, Mateel acknowledges that it intends these consequences for any such claims and any other claims for violations of Proposition 65 which may exist as of the date of this release but which Mateel does not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect its decision to enter into this Consent Judgment, regardless of whether its lack of knowledge

5. ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT

is the result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause.

5.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the parties hereto. The parties may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of San Francisco County, giving the notice required by law, enforce the terms and conditions contained herein. The parties hereto agree that prior to any such enforcement action, they will notify each other of any perceived violation of this Consent Judgment. The parties further agree to take no enforcement action for 30 days after such notice is given, in order to allow the parties to meet and confer in good faith in an effort to resolve the alleged violation.

modified only upon written agreement of the parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of any party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.

- INJUNCTIVE RELIEF CLEAR AND REASONABLE WARNING
- 7.1 Covered Products brass components shall be deemed to comply with current requirements of Proposition 65 for lead and be exempt from any Proposition 65 warning requirements for lead if the brass that is part of the Covered Products meets the following criteria: (a) the brass alloy from which the brass fittings are made shall have no intentionally added lead and a lead content by weight of no more than 0.03% (300 parts per million, or "300 ppm"). Settling Defendants may comply with the above requirements by relying on information obtained from its suppliers regarding the content of the brass alloy from which the brass products or components are made, provided such reliance is in good faith. Obtaining test results showing that the lead content is no more than 0.03%, using a method of sufficient sensitivity to establish a limit of quantification (as distinguished from detection) of less than 300 ppm shall be deemed to establish good faith reliance.
- 7.2 Covered Products that do not meet the warning exemption standard set forth in Section 7.1 of the Consent Judgment shall be accompanied by a warning as described in paragraph 7.3 below. The warning requirements set forth in paragraph 7.3 shall apply only to products Settling Defendants manufacture, distribute, market, sell or ship after the Effective Date for sale or use inside the State of California.
 - 7.3 Each Settling Defendant shall provide Proposition 65 warnings as follows:
 - (a) Each Settling Defendant shall provide one of the following warning statements:
 - (i) WARNING: This product contains lead; a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm. Do not place your hands in your mouth after handling the product. Wash your hands after touching this product.

The word "WARNING" shall be in bold. The words "Wash your hands after touching the product" shall be in bold and italicized.

or

(ii) WARNING: This product contains one or more chemicals, including lead, known to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm. Wash hands after handling.

The word "WARNING" shall be in bold. The words "Wash hands after handling" shall be in bold and italicized.

If the warning was printed prior to December 8, 2010, or pursuant to an order for printing entered into prior to December 8, 2010, the instruction to "Wash Hands after handling" and the identification of the chemical as lead may be omitted.

Settling Defendant shall provide such warning with the unit package of the Covered Products. Such warning shall be prominently affixed to or printed on each Covered Product's label or package. The warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other safety warnings, if any, on the product container. If printed on the label itself, the warning shall be contained in the same section that states other safety warnings, if any, concerning the use of the product.

- The requirements for product labeling, set forth in subparagraph (a) (b) above are imposed pursuant to the terms of this Consent Judgment. The parties recognize that product labeling is not the exclusive method of providing a warning under Proposition 65 and its implementing regulations.
- (c) If Proposition 65 warnings for lead or lead compounds should no longer be required, Settling Defendants shall have no further warning obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment. In the event that either Settling Defendant ceases to implement or modifies the warnings required under this Consent Judgment (because of a change in the law or otherwise),

that Settling Defendant shall provide written notice to Mateel (through KELC) of its intent to do so, and of the basis for its intent, no less than thirty (30) days in advance. Mateel shall notify the Settling Defendant in writing of any objection within thirty (30) days of its receipt of such notice, or such objection by Mateel shall be waived.

- (d) If after the Effective Date, either Settling Defendant ships Covered Products to a retailer or distributor outside of California that neither provide the warnings specified in this paragraph nor meet the Reformulation Standard specified in paragraphs 7.1 through 7.3 of this Consent Judgment ("Non-Conforming Covered Products"), and if the retailer or distributor then offers those Non-Conforming Covered Products for sale in California, then as to those Non-Conforming Covered Products, that retailer or distributor, and their customers, are not released pursuant to Sections 4.1 and 4.2 above.
- (e) Except as provided in paragraph 4.2 hereof for Covered Products manufactured or distributed prior to the Effective Date, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall create a limitation on a Proposition 65 enforcement action based on future conduct if such future conduct is not in compliance with the injunctive terms of this Consent Judgment.

8. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE

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 and to execute it on behalf of the party represented and legally to bind that party.

9. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

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

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 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. GOVERNING LAW

The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of law provisions of California law.

12. NOTICES

Unless specified herein, all correspondence and notices required to be provided pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be in writing and personally delivered or sent by: (i) first-class, (registered or certified mail) return receipt requested; or (ii) overnight currier on any party by the other party at the following addresses:

To Defendant Akerue:	To Mateel:
Agent for Service of Process	William Verick, Esq.
	Klamath Env. Law Center
	424 First Street

Eureka, CA 95501

To Defendant Brunton:

Agent for Service of Process

13. COURT APPROVAL

If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.

IT IS SO STIPULATED:

DATED:

MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

FOUNDATION

William Verick
CEO Mateel Environmental Justice

Foundation.

Klamath Environmental Law Center

DATED: JEZABER 15,2010

AKERUMONDUSTRIES, LLC

By: JOIN J HUARAY

Its: CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

DATED: Describer to Acid

BRUNTON COMPANY

By: Christian G. Steinmetz Its: Apply from 16 2 or performen

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

DATED:

CHARLOTTE WALTER WOOLARD
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

DEC 1 6 2010