Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389 1 Joseph Mann, State Bar No. 207968 ENDORSED 503 Divisadero Street 2 FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY San Francisco, CA 94117 3 Telephone: (415) 913-7800 Facsimile: (415) 759-4112 AUG 1 5 2014 4 mtodzo@lexlawgroup.com imann@lexlawgroup.com CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT 5 Rick Franco, State Bar No. 170970 ^BYOLANDA ESTRAD Center for Environmental Health 6 2201 Broadway, Suite 302 Oakland, California 94612 7 Telephone: (510) 655-3900 Facsimile: (510) 655-9100 8 rick@ceh.org 9 Attorneys for Plaintiff 10 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH 11 12 SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 13 FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 14 15 Case No. RG-13707315 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL 16 HEALTH, a non-profit corporation, 17 [PROPOSED] CONSENT Plaintiff, JUDGMENT RE: RADIAL 18 ENGINEERING LTD. v. 19 ACOUSTICAL SOLUTIONS, INC., et al., 20 Defendants. 21 22 23 1. Introduction This Consent Judgment is entered into by Plaintiff Center for Environmental 24 1.1. Health, a non-profit corporation ("CEH"), and Defendant Radial Engineering Ltd. ("Defendant") 25 26 to settle claims asserted by CEH against Defendant as set forth in the operative Complaint in the 27 matter Center for Environmental Health v. Acoustical Solutions, Inc., et al., Alameda County 28 DOCUMENT PREPARED -1-ON RECYCLED PAPER

CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO RADIAL ENGINEERING LTD. - CASE NO. RG-13707315

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Superior Court Case No. RG-13707315 (the "Action"). CEH and Defendant are referred to collectively as the "Parties."

- 1.2. On November 15, 2013, CEH served a "Notice of Violation" (the "Notice") relating to the California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65") on Defendant, the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every County in the State of California, and the City Attorneys for every City in State of California with a population greater than 750,000. The Notice alleges violations of Proposition 65 with respect to the presence of tris (1,3-dichloro-2-propyl) phosphate ("TDCPP") in acoustic and soundproofing foam manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Defendant.
- 1.3. Defendant is a corporation that employs ten (10) or more persons and that manufactures, distributes, and/or sells Covered Products (as defined herein) in the State of California.
- 1.4. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that: (i) this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Notice and Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint; (ii) venue is proper in the County of Alameda; and (iii) 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 in the Notice and Complaint with respect to Covered Products manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Defendant.
- 1.5. The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement of all claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint arising out of the facts or conduct related to Defendant alleged therein. By execution of this Consent Judgment and agreeing to comply with its terms, the Parties do not admit any fact, conclusion 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, or violation of law. Defendant denies the material, factual, and legal allegations in the Notice and Complaint, expressly denies any wrongdoing whatsoever, and contends that all products it sells comply with all laws and are safe for their intended use. Except as specifically provided herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense either Party may have in this or any other pending or future legal proceedings. This Consent Judgment is the product of negotiation and compromise and is accepted by the Parties solely for purposes of settling, compromising, and resolving issues disputed in this Action.

2. DEFINITIONS

- 2.1. "Chemical Flame Retardant" means any halogenated or phosphorous-based chemical compound used for the purpose of resisting or retarding the spread of fire. "Chemical Flame Retardant" does not include (a) any chemical that has been rated as a Benchmark 4 chemical pursuant to Clean Production Action's GreenScreen (http://www.cleanproduction.org/Green.Greenscreen.php); or (b) ammonium polyphosphate.
- 2.2. "Covered Products" means acoustic and/or soundproofing foam manufactured, distributed, and/or sold by Defendant in California.
 - 2.3. "Effective Date" means the date on which the Court enters this Consent Judgment.
- 2.4. "Listed Chemical Flame Retardants" means Tris(1,3-dichloro-2-propyl) phosphate ("TDCPP"), Tris(2-chloroethyl) phosphate ("TCEP"), and Tris(2,3-dibromopropyl)phosphate ("TDBPP").
- 2.5. "Manufacture Date" means the date the Covered Product was manufactured and/or as may be indicated on a tag attached to the Covered Product.
- 2.6. "Treated" means the addition or application of any Chemical Flame Retardant to any polyurethane foam used in any Covered Product.
- 2.7. "Untreated Foam" means polyurethane foam that has not been Treated with any Chemical Flame Retardant.

3. Injunctive Relief

- 3.1. **Reformulation of Covered Products.** Defendant shall comply with the following requirements to reformulate the Covered Products to eliminate exposures to TDCPP and other Chemical Flame Retardants arising from the use of the Covered Products:
- 3.1.1. **Reformulation of Covered Products.** As of the Effective Date,

 Defendant shall not distribute, sell, or offer for sale in California any Covered Product that has

been Treated with any Chemical Flame Retardant and which has a Manufacture Date that is on or later than the Effective Date.

3.1.1.1. Prior to the Effective Date, to ensure compliance with the reformulation provisions of this Section following the Effective Date, Defendant shall directly or through its supply chain issue specifications to its suppliers of Covered Products and/or polyurethane foam used in any Covered Product requiring that such products and/or foam not be Treated with any Chemical Flame Retardants in accordance with the requirements of Section 3.1.1. Defendant shall obtain and maintain written certification(s) from its suppliers confirming that all such Covered Products and/or foam received by Defendant for distribution in California have not been Treated with any Chemical Flame Retardants. Defendant shall not be deemed in violation of the requirements of Section 3.1.1 for any Covered Product to the extent: (a) it has relied on a written certification from its vendor that supplied a Covered Product that such Covered Product is made with only Untreated Foam, and/or, if such certification is not relied on or has previously been demonstrated to be invalid, (b) it has obtained a test result from an independent third party certified laboratory reporting that the Covered Product has been made with no Chemical Flame Retardants.

3.1.2. **Interim Compliance – All Covered Products.** Any Covered Products in which the polyurethane foam has been Treated with any Listed Chemical Flame Retardant and which is distributed, sold, or offered for sale by Defendant in California after the Effective Date shall be accompanied by a Clear and Reasonable Warning that complies with Section 3.1.4.

3.1.3. Warnings for Products in the Stream of Commerce. For Covered Products Settling Defendant sold to a retailer after October 31, 2011 that have not been reformulated pursuant to Section 3.1.1 or labeled in accordance with Section 3.1.2, and for which the Settling Defendant does not have actual knowledge that (i) the retailer is no longer holding such Covered Product in inventory for sale in California, or (ii) a Proposition 65 warning is already affixed to the Covered Product or is otherwise being provided by the retailer, the Settling Defendant shall within 30 days following the Effective Date either send to the retailer warning

materials that comply with Section 3.1.4 for such Covered Products or direct the retailer to discontinue sale of the Covered Product in California.

3.1.4. **Proposition 65 Warnings.** A Clear and Reasonable Warning under this Consent Judgment shall state:

WARNING: This product contains TDCPP [and/or TCEP and/or TDBPP], a chemical[s] known to the State of California to cause cancer.¹

A Clear and Reasonable Warning shall not be preceded by, surrounded by, or include any additional words or phrases that contradict, obfuscate, or otherwise undermine the warning. The warning statement shall be prominently displayed on the Covered Product or the packaging of the Covered Product with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, or designs as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual prior to sale. For internet, catalog, or any other sale where the consumer is not physically present and cannot see a warning displayed on the Covered Product or the packaging of the Covered Product prior to purchase or payment, the warning statement shall be displayed in such a manner that it is likely to be read and understood prior to the authorization of or actual payment.

4. PENALTIES AND PAYMENT

4.1. Defendant shall initially pay to CEH the total sum of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000), which shall be allocated as follows:

4.1.1. \$2,200 shall constitute a penalty pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), such money to be apportioned by CEH in accordance with Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.12.

¹ The regulatory safe harbor warning language specified in 27 CCR § 25603.2 may also be used if Defendant had begun to use it, prior to the Effective Date. Should Defendant seek to use alternative warning language, other than the language specified above or the safe harbor warning specified in 27 CCR § 25603.2, or seek to use an alternate method of transmission of the warning, it must obtain the Court's approval of its proposed alternative and provide all Parties and the Office of the Attorney General with timely notice and the opportunity to comment or object before the Court acts on the request. In the event that Defendant's application for Court approval of an alternative warning is contested by CEH, the prevailing party shall be entitled to its reasonable attorneys' fees associated with opposing or responding to the opposition to the application. No fees shall be recoverable for the initial application seeking an alternative warning.

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER 4.1.2. \$3,000 shall constitute a payment in lieu of civil penalty pursuant to Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b) and 11 C.C.R. § 3202(b). CEH will use such funds to continue its work of educating and protecting the public from exposures to toxic chemicals, including chemical flame retardants. CEH may also use a portion of such funds to monitor compliance with this Consent Judgment and to purchase and test Defendant's products to confirm compliance. In addition, as part of its Community Environmental Action and Justice Fund, CEH will use four percent (4%) of such funds to award grants to grassroots environmental justice groups working to educate and protect the public from exposures to toxic chemicals. The method of selection of such groups can be found at the CEH website at www.ceh.org/justicefund.

- 4.1.3. \$14,800 shall constitute reimbursement of CEH's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
- 4.1.4. The payments required under Sections 4.1.1-4.1.3 shall be made in three separate checks, all to be delivered within 10 days following the Effective Date. The payments required pursuant to Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 shall each be made payable CEH. The payment required pursuant to Section 4.1.3 shall be made payable to Lexington Law Group. All checks shall be delivered to Mark Todzo at Lexington Law Group at the address set forth in Section 8.

5. Enforcement of Consent Judgment

5.1. Any party may, by motion or application for an order to show cause before the Superior Court of Alameda County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. Prior to bringing any motion or application to enforce the requirements of Section 3 above, CEH shall provide Defendant with a Notice of Violation and a copy of any test results which purportedly support CEH's Notice of Violation. The Parties shall then meet and confer regarding the basis for CEH's anticipated motion or application in an attempt to resolve it informally, including providing Defendant a reasonable opportunity of at least thirty (30) days to cure any alleged violation. Should such attempts at informal resolution fail, CEH may file its enforcement motion or application. The prevailing party on any motion to enforce this Consent Judgment shall be entitled to its reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred as a result of such motion or application. This Consent Judgment may only be enforced by the Parties.

DOCUMENT PREPARED

ON RECYCLED PAPER

6. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

6.1. This Consent Judgment may only be modified by written agreement of CEH and Defendant, or upon motion of CEH or Defendant as provided by law.

7. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE

- 7.1. This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between CEH acting in the public interest and Defendant and Defendant's parents, officers, directors, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, and their respective successors and assigns ("Defendant Releasees"), and all entities to whom they distribute or sell or have distributed or sold Covered Products including, but not limited to, distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisees, cooperative members, and licensees ("Downstream Defendant Releasees"), of all claims alleged in the Complaint in this Action arising from any violation of Proposition 65 that have been or could have been asserted in the public interest against Defendant and Downstream Defendant Releasees, regarding the failure to warn about exposure to TDCPP in the Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Defendant prior to the Effective Date.
- 7.2. CEH, for itself releases, waives, and forever discharges any and all claims alleged in the Complaint against Defendant and Downstream Defendant Releasees arising from any violation of Proposition 65 that have been or could have been asserted regarding the failure to warn about exposure to TDCPP, TCEP and/or TDBPP in connection with Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Defendant prior to the Effective Date.
- 7.3. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by Defendant and the Downstream Defendant Releasees shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by Defendant and Downstream Defendant Releasees with respect to any alleged failure to warn about any Listed Chemical Flame Retardants in Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Defendant after the Effective Date.

8. Provision of Notice

8.1. When any Party is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail as follows:

-7-

-8-

11 12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

26

27

28

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

11. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

- 11.1. This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of CEH and Defendant with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, or understandings related thereto, if any, are hereby merged herein and therein.
- 11.2. There are no warranties, representations, or other agreements between CEH and Defendant except as expressly set forth herein. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those specifically referred to in this Consent Judgment have been made by any Party hereto.
- 11.3. No other agreements not specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto. Any agreements specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto only to the extent that they are expressly incorporated herein.
- 11.4. No supplementation, modification, waiver, or termination of this Consent Judgment shall be binding unless executed in writing by the Party to be bound thereby.
- 11.5. No waiver of any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of any of the other provisions hereof whether or not similar, nor shall such waiver constitute a continuing waiver.

12. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

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

13. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT

13.1. 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 execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and to legally bind that Party.

14. NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS

14.1. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim against another entity on terms that are different from those contained in this Consent Judgment.

_9.

15. **EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS** 15.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document. IT IS SO STIPULATED: Dated: 25 July, 2014 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH Dated: <u>July 10</u>, 2014 IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED: AUG 1 5 GEORGE C. HERNANDEZ, JR. Dated: Judge of the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Alameda DOCUMENT PREPARED -10-ON RECYCLED PAPER CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO RADIAL ENGINEERING LTD. - CASE NO. RG-13707315