2	RICHARD M. FRANCO (CBN 170970) LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO 6500 Estates Drive		
3	Oakland, CA 94611	ENDORSED	
4	Ph: 510-684-1022 Email: rick@rfrancolaw.com	ALAMEDA COUNTY	
5	Attorney for Plaintiff	FEB 1 5 2017	
6	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, IN	C. CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	
7	DAWN SESTITO (CBN 214011)	By YOLANDA ESTRADA Deputy	
8	DANIEL FARIA (CBN 285158) O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP		
	400 South Hope Street		
9	Los Angeles, CA 90071 Email: dsestito@omm.com		
10	dfaria@omm.com		
11	Attorney for Defendants TRADER JOE'S COMPANY and		
12	TRADER JOE'S EAST, INC.		
13	,	OT LOT OF GALLYDODAY	
14	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE		
15	COUNTY OF	ALAMEDA	
16	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER,	Case No. RG16833585	
17	INC., a non-profit California corporation,		
17 18	INC., a non-profit California corporation,  Plaintiff,	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT	
	INC., a non-profit California corporation,	STIPULATED CONSENT	
18	INC., a non-profit California corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  TRADER JOE'S COMPANY, a California	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT  Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.  Action Filed: October 3, 2016	
18 19	INC., a non-profit California corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT  Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.	
18 19 20	INC., a non-profit California corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  TRADER JOE'S COMPANY, a California corporation, and TRADER JOE'S EAST, INC. a Massachusetts corporation,	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT  Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.  Action Filed: October 3, 2016	
18 19 20 21	INC., a non-profit California corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  TRADER JOE'S COMPANY, a California corporation, and TRADER JOE'S EAST, INC.	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT  Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.  Action Filed: October 3, 2016	
18 19 20 21 22	INC., a non-profit California corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  TRADER JOE'S COMPANY, a California corporation, and TRADER JOE'S EAST, INC. a Massachusetts corporation,	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT  Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.  Action Filed: October 3, 2016	
18   19   20   21   22   23	INC., a non-profit California corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  TRADER JOE'S COMPANY, a California corporation, and TRADER JOE'S EAST, INC. a Massachusetts corporation,	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT  Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.  Action Filed: October 3, 2016	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	INC., a non-profit California corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  TRADER JOE'S COMPANY, a California corporation, and TRADER JOE'S EAST, INC. a Massachusetts corporation,	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT  Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.  Action Filed: October 3, 2016	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	INC., a non-profit California corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  TRADER JOE'S COMPANY, a California corporation, and TRADER JOE'S EAST, INC. a Massachusetts corporation,	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT  Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.  Action Filed: October 3, 2016	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	INC., a non-profit California corporation,  Plaintiff,  vs.  TRADER JOE'S COMPANY, a California corporation, and TRADER JOE'S EAST, INC. a Massachusetts corporation,	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT  Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.  Action Filed: October 3, 2016	

1.1

. 1

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25° 26

27

28

against Trader Joe's Company and Trader Joe's East, Inc. (collectively "Trader Joe's"). ERC alleges that the following products (referred to hereinafter individually as a "Covered Product" or collectively as "Covered Products") sold by Trader Joe's contain lead, a chemical listed under Proposition 65 as a carcinogen and reproductive toxin, and expose consumers to this chemical at a level requiring a Proposition 65 warning:

• Trader Joe's Trader Darwin's Soy Protein Powder Quick Dissolve Vanilla Flavored (SKU No. 35336)

• Trader Joe's Organic Hemp Protein Powder Vanilla Flavored (SKU No. 93156)

On October 3, 2016, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), a

non-profit corporation, as a private enforcer and in the public interest, initiated this action by

filing a Complaint for Injunctive Relief and Civil Penalties (the "Complaint") pursuant to the

provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65"),

1.2 ERC and Trader Joe's are hereinafter referred to individually as a "Party" or collectively as the "Parties."

Trader Joe's Super Green Drink Powder Berry Flavor (SKU No. 99157)

- 1.3 ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.
- 1.4 ERC alleges that each entity has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant of this action, and qualifies as a "person in the course of business within the meaning of Proposition 65. Trader Joe's Company manufactures, distributes, and sells the Covered Products.
- 1.5 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC's Notice of Violation dated January 13, 2016 that was served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Trader Joe's ("Notice"). A true and correct copy of the Notice is attached as **Exhibit A** and is hereby incorporated by reference. More than 60 days have passed since the Notice was served on the Attorney General, public enforcers, and Trader Joe's, and no

designated governmental entity has filed a complaint against Trader Joe's with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.

- 1.6 ERC's Notice and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Product exposes persons in California to lead without first providing clear and reasonable warnings in violation of California Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6. Trader Joe's generally denies all material and factual allegations contained in or arising from ERC's Notice, asserts that it has various affirmative defenses to such potential claims, and specifically denies that the Plaintiff or California consumers have been harmed or damaged by its conduct or products, including the Covered Products.
- 1.7 The Parties have entered into this Consent Judgment in order to settle, compromise, and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged and costly litigation.

  Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission by any of the Parties (or by any of their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers) of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, violation of law, fault, wrongdoing, or liability. Nothing in this Consent Judgment or any document referred to shall be construed as giving rise to any presumption or inference of admission or concession by the Parties as to any fault, wrongdoing, or liability. This Section shall not diminish or otherwise affect the obligations, responsibilities, and duties of the Parties under this Agreement.
- 1.8 Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any other or future legal proceeding. Provided however, nothing in this Section shall affect the enforceability of this Consent Judgment.
- 1.9 The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which it is entered as a Judgment by this Court.

#### 2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2.1 For purposes of this Consent Judgment and any further court action that may become necessary to enforce this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has

subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint, personal jurisdiction over Trader Joe's as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in Alameda County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims up through and including the Compliance Date which were or could have been asserted in this action based on the facts alleged in the Notice and Complaint.

#### 3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, REFORMULATION, TESTING, AND WARNINGS

- 3.1 Beginning three months from the Effective Date ("Compliance Date"), Trader Joe's shall not "Distribute into the State of California" any Covered Product which exposes a person to a "Daily Lead Exposure Level" of more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day when the maximum suggested dose is taken as directed on the Covered Product's label, unless each such unit of the Covered Products meets the warning requirements under Section 3.2.
- 3.1.1 As used in this Consent Judgment, the term "Distribute(d) into the State of California" shall mean to sell, at a Trader Joe's store in California, a Covered Product.
- 3.1.2 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula: micrograms of lead per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings of the product per day (using the largest number of servings in a recommended dosage appearing on the product label), which equals micrograms of lead exposure per day.
- 3.1.3 Trader Joe's is not required to undertake any efforts or conduct to remove from the stream of commerce Covered Products that have entered into the stream of commerce prior to the Compliance Date. All Covered Products that have been or will have been distributed, shipped, sold, or otherwise placed in the stream of commerce by Trader Joe's through and including the Compliance Date of this Consent Judgment are exempt from the provisions of Section 3 and are included within the release in Section 8.

### 3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings

3.2.1 If Trader Joe's is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, the following warning must be utilized ("Warning"):

WARNING: This product can expose you to chemicals including [lead] which is known to the State of California to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.

Trader Joe's shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the Warning only if the maximum recommended daily dose causes an exposure to more than 15 micrograms of lead when taken as directed on the Covered Product's label.

- 3.2.2 Beginning on the Compliance Date, Trader's Joe's shall cease and desist from using labels on the Covered Products (a) containing recommendation that more than one serving size of a Covered Product be consumed per day; and (b) declaring a recommended serving size greater than the following amounts:
  - Trader Joes's Trader Darwin's Soy Protein Powder Quick Dissolve Vanilla: 15 g
  - Trader Joe's Organic Hemp Protein Powder Vanilla Flavor: 30g

To the extent that ERC believes Trader Joe's has overlooked a label subject to this obligation, it shall notify Trader Joe's and provide Trader Joe's with an opportunity to cure pursuant to Section 6.2 below.

3.2.3 For sales at brick and mortar retail establishments in California, the warning statement set forth in Section 3.2 shall be prominent at the point of display of the Covered Products wherever they are offered for sale in California. Signs shall not be covered or obscured, and the warning statement shall be displayed with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices at the point of display in California, as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual prior to purchase or use. The Warning shall be presented on a sign or shelf label in a font no smaller than the largest type size used for other information on the sign or on a shelf label for similar products. The word "WARNING" shall be in capital letters and in bold print. No statements contradicting or conflicting with the Warning shall accompany the warning.

#### 4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

4.1 In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, additional settlement payments, attorneys' fees, and costs, Trader Joe's shall make a total payment of \$105,000.00 ("Total Settlement Amount") to ERC within 14 days of the Effective Date ("Due Date"). Trader Joe's

Page 4 of 14
STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

Case No. RG16833585

FAC 12/12/16 D.J.F. 12/12/16 Obs/12/13/16 ff 12/13/16

shall make this payment by wire transfer to ERC's escrow account, for which ERC will give Trader Joe's the necessary account information. The Total Settlement Amount shall be apportioned as follows:

- 4.2 \$29,553.62 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$22,165.22) of the civil penalty to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") for deposit in the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Fund in accordance with California Health and Safety Code section 25249.12(c). ERC will retain the remaining 25% (\$7,388.40) of the civil penalty.
- 4.3 \$8,960.94 shall be distributed to ERC as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable costs incurred in bringing this action.
- 4.4 \$22,165.18 shall be distributed to ERC as an Additional Settlement Payment ("ASP"), pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 27, sections 3203, subdivision (d) and 3204. ERC will utilize the ASP for activities that address the same public harm as allegedly caused by Defendant in this matter. These activities are detailed below and support ERC's overarching goal of reducing and/or eliminating hazardous and toxic chemicals in dietary supplement products in California. ERC's activities have had, and will continue to have, a direct and primary effect within the State of California because California consumers will be benefitted by the reduction and/or elimination of exposure to lead in dietary supplements and/or by providing clear and reasonable warnings to California consumers prior to ingestion of the products.
- 4.5 Based on a review of past years' actual budgets, ERC is providing the following list of activities ERC engages in to protect California consumers through Proposition 65 citizen enforcement, along with a breakdown of how ASP funds will be utilized to facilitate those activities: (I) ENFORCEMENT (55-70%): obtaining, shipping, analyzing, and testing dietary supplement products that may contain lead and are sold to California consumers; continued monitoring and enforcement of past consent judgments and settlements to ensure companies are in compliance with their obligations thereunder, with a specific focus on those judgments and settlements concerning lead (which necessarily includes additional work purchasing, processing,

analyzing, and testing consumer products; litigating matters that result in defaults, bankruptcies, or dismissals; (2) VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE PROGRAM (10-20%): maintaining ERC's Voluntary Compliance Program by acquiring products from companies, developing and maintaining a case file, testing products from these companies, providing the test results and supporting documentation to the companies, and offering guidance in implementing a self-testing program for lead in dietary supplement products; (3) "GOT LEAD" PROGRAM (up to 5%): maintaining ERC's "Got Lead?" Program which reduces the numbers of contaminated products that reach California consumers by providing access to free testing for lead in dietary supplement products (products submitted to the program are screened for ingredients which are suspected to be contaminated, and then may be purchased by ERC, catalogued, sent to a qualified laboratory for testing, and the results shared with the consumer that submitted the product); (4) DONATION: from this settlement, a donation of \$1,100.00 to Center For Environmental Health will be provided to address reducing toxic chemical exposures in California and following up with the recipient to ensure the funds are utilized in a manner that is consistent with ERC's mission and stated purpose of the Donation; (5) PUBLIC OUTREACH (up to 5%): public outreach programs including maintaining ERC's blog, website, and social media accounts; (6) SPECIAL PROJECTS (10-20%): projects including obtaining expert and legal opinions not specific to any one case that are necessary to the continued private enforcement of Proposition 65; (7) SCHOLARSHIPS (up to 5%): scholarships for college students in California who have been or are currently diagnosed with cancer or who are pursuing an environmental health science major; and (8) PRODUCT DATABASE (up to 5%): maintaining a database with all products sold to California consumers that ERC has tested for lead, cadmium, or arsenic.

- 4.6 ERC will maintain adequate records to document that the funds paid as an ASP are spent on the activities described herein. ERC shall provide the Attorney General, within thirty days of any request, copies of documentation demonstrating how such funds have been spent.
- 4.7 \$18,200.00 shall be distributed to the Law Office of Richard M. Franco as reimbursement of ERC's attorneys' fees, while \$26,120.26 shall be distributed to ERC for its

7 8 9

in-house legal fees. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.

4.8 In the event that Trader Joe's fails to remit the Total Settlement Payment owed under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment on or before the Due Date, Trader Joe's shall be deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this Consent Judgment. ERC shall provide written notice of the delinquency to Trader Joe's via electronic mail. If Trader Joe's fails to deliver the Total Settlement Payment within fifteen (15) days from the written notice, the Total Settlement Payment shall accrue interest at the statutory judgment interest rate provided in the California Code of Civil Procedure section 685.010.

#### 5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified by written agreement and stipulation of the Parties and upon having such stipulation reported to the Office of the California Attorney General at least twenty-one days in advance of its submission to the Court for approval. ERC shall not unreasonably withhold agreement to any modification requested by Trader Joe's based on an amendment to Proposition 65 or its supporting regulations, or a change in the case law interpreting Proposition 65. If either party seeks to modify this Consent Judgment, then it must provide written notice to the other party of its intent. If despite their meet-and-confer efforts, the Parties are unable to reach agreement on a stipulated modification, either Party may file a noticed motion for modification with the Court for good cause shown, provided a copy of the motion is also served on the other Party and the Office of the California Attorney General.

#### 6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION AND ENFORCEMENT

- 6.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify, or terminate this Consent Judgment.
- 6.2 If ERC alleges that any Covered Product is being "Distributed into California" which exposes a person to a "Daily Lead Exposure Level" of more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day when the maximum suggested dose is taken as directed on the Covered Product's label (for which ERC alleges that no Warning has been provided), then ERC shall inform Trader Joe's in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information sufficient to permit

Trader Joe's to identify the Covered Product at issue. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior to ERC taking any further legal action. As long as Trader Joe's cures any such alleged violations within the 30 (thirty) days of receipt of the written notice by ceasing the sale of the Covered Products in California until such time as warnings are provided for it pursuant to Section 3.2 above, then there shall be deemed no material violation.

#### 7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

7.1 This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Consent Judgment shall have no application to Covered Products which is distributed or sold exclusively outside the State of California and which is not used by California consumers.

#### 8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

- 8.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Trader Joe's and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of Trader Joe's), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and all other upstream and downstream entities in the distribution chain of any Covered Product, and the predecessors, successors, and assigns of any of them (collectively, "Released Parties"). ERC hereby fully releases and discharges the Released Parties from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties, fees, costs, and expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted from the handling, use, or consumption of the Covered Products, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered Products regarding lead up to and including the Compliance Date.
- 8.2 ERC on its own behalf only, and Trader Joe's on its own behalf only, further waive and release any and all claims they may have against each other for all actions or statements made or undertaken in the course of seeking or opposing enforcement of Proposition

65 in connection with the Notice and Complaint up through and including the Compliance Date, provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment. In addition, going forward, the Parties shall not cause any aspect of this matter, the Notice, or the terms of this Consent Judgment not otherwise available in the public record to be reported to the public or any media or news-reporting outlet. Regardless of the form or formality of a communication or statement to the media or other person or entity, neither any Party nor their counsel shall disparage the other. Notwithstanding these obligations, the Parties may make such disclosures regarding this matter and terms of this Consent Judgment as necessary to auditors or as otherwise required by state or federal law.

8.3 It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties, arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice and Complaint, and relating to the Covered Products, will develop or be discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, and Trader Joe's on behalf of itself only, acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims up through and including the Compliance Date, including all rights of action therefore. ERC and Trader Joe's acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 8.1 and 8.2 above may include unknown claims, and nevertheless waive California Civil Code section 1542 as to any such unknown claims. California Civil Code section 1542 reads 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.

ERC on behalf of itself only, and Trader Joe's on behalf of itself only, acknowledge and understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code section 1542.

- 8.4 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by any releasee regarding alleged exposures to lead in the Covered Products as set forth in the Notice and Complaint.
- 8.5 Nothing in this Consent Judgment is intended to apply to any occupational or environmental exposures arising under Proposition 65, nor shall it apply to any of Trader Joe's

1	products other than the Covered Products.				
2	9.	SEVI	ERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS		
3		9.1	In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgm	nent are held by a	
4	court to be unenforceable, the validity of the remaining enforceable provisions shall not be				
5	adversely affected.				
6	10.	GOV	ERNING LAW		
7		10.1	The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be	governed by and	
8	construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.				
9	11. PROVISION OF NOTICE			u.	
10		11.1	All notices required to be given to either Party to this Conse	nt Judgment by the	
11	other shall be in writing and sent to the following agents listed below via first-class mail.				
12	Courtesy copies via email may also be sent.				
13		FOR	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.:		
14 15		3111 San E	Heptinstall, Executive Director, Environmental Research Cen Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400 Diego, CA 92108	iter	
16			619) 500-3090 l: chris_erc501c3@yahoo.com		
17 18 19		RICH LAW 6500 Oakla	a copy to: IARD M. FRANCO OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO Estates Drive and, CA 94611		
20			10-684-1022 l: rick@rfrancolaw.com		
21		FOR	TRADER JOE'S COMPANY and TRADER JOE'S EAST	Γ, INC.	
22		Kathr	yn Cahan	·	
23			r Vice President, General Counsel er Joe's Company		
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>		800 S	South Shamrock Avenue rovia, CA 91016		
26		With	a copy to:		
27			IEL J. FARIA ELVENY & MYERS LLP		
28			South Hope Street	•	
			Page 10 of 14		
			STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT	Case No. RG16833585	

Los Angeles, CA 90071 Email: dfaria@omm.com

#### 12. COURT APPROVAL

- 12.1 Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, ERC shall notice a Motion for Court Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this Consent Judgment.
- 12.2 If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment, the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible, prior to the hearing on the motion.
- 12.3 If this Stipulated Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be void and have no force or effect.

#### 13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS

13.1 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed to be as valid as the original signature.

#### 14. DRAFTING

14.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for each Party prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms and conditions with legal counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and construction of this Consent Judgment, no inference, assumption, or presumption shall be drawn, and no provision of this Consent Judgment shall be construed against any Party, based on the fact that one of the Parties and/or one of the Parties' legal counsel prepared and/or drafted all or any portion of the Consent Judgment. It is conclusively presumed that all of the Parties participated equally in the preparation and drafting of this Consent Judgment.

#### 15. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES

15.1 If a dispute arises with respect to either Party's compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall meet and confer in person, by telephone, and/or in writing, and endeavor to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. No

action or motion may be filed in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute beforehand.

#### 16. ENFORCEMENT

Alameda County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In any action brought by ERC to enforce this Consent Judgment, ERC may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment. To the extent the failure to comply with the Consent Judgment constitutes a violation of Proposition 65 or other laws, ERC shall not be limited to enforcement of this Consent Judgment, but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws.

#### 17. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION

- 17.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, 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. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.
- 17.2 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.

## 18. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT, AND ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 18.1 This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties.

  The Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to:
- (1) Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a fair and equitable settlement of all matters raised by the allegations of the Complaint that the matter has been diligently prosecuted, and that the public interest is served by such settlement; and

1	(2) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section		
2	25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment.		
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
4			
5	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH		
6	Dated: 12/7/, 2016 CENTER, INO.		
7	By:		
8	Chris Hephastal Lecture Director		
9	Dated:, 2016 TRADER JOE'S COMPANY and TRADER JOE'S EAST, INC.		
10			
11	By: Kathryn Cahan, Esq.		
12	Senior Vice President, General Counsel		
13	APPROVED AS TO FORM:		
14	Dated: 12/7, 2016 LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO		
15	By: /Cll		
16	Richard M. Franco Attorney for Plaintiff Environmental		
17	Research Center, Inc.		
18	Dated: 12/7, 2016 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP		
19	Dated. 10-7 , 2010 O MEEVEN TE WITE SELLY		
20	Ву:		
21	Daniel J. Fania.  Attorney for Defendants Trader Joe's		
22	Company and Trader Joe's East Inc.		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
-	Page 13 of 14		
1	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT Case No. RG1683358:		

1	(2) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section		
2	25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment.		
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
4			
5		ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	
6	Dated:, 2016	CENTER, INC.	
7		By:Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director	
8			
9	Dated: December (e, 2016	TRADER JOE'S COMPANY and TRADER JOE'S EAST, INC.	
10			
11		By. Kathryn Cahan, Esq.	
12		Senior Vice President, General Counsel	
13	APPROVED AS TO FORM:		
14	Dated:, 2016	LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO	
15		Ву:	
16		Richard M. Franco	
17		Attorney for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.	
18			
19	Dated:, 2016	O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	
20		By: Daniel J. Faria	
21		Attorney for Defendants Trader Joe's	
22		Company and Trader Joe's East Inc.	
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		Page 13 of 14 STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT Case No. RG16833585	

## ORDER AND JUDGMENT Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing, this Consent Judgment is approved, and Judgment is hereby entered according to its terms. IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED. FEB 1 5 2017 GEORGE C. HERNANDEZ, JR. Dated: Judge of the Superior Court

Page 14 of 14
STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

Case No. RG16833585

#### LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO

#### 6500 ESTATES DRIVE OAKLAND, CA 94611 510.684.1022

RICK@RFRANCOLAW.COM

#### VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Current CEO or President Trader Joe's Company 800 South Shamrock Avenue Monrovia, CA 91016

Current CEO or President Trader Joe's East Inc. 711 Atlantic Avenue, Floor 3 Boston, MA 02111

Current CEO or President Trader Joe's East Inc. 800 South Shamrock Avenue Monrovia, CA 91016

Paracorp Incorporated (Trader Joe's Company's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 2804 Gateway Oaks Drive, #200 Sacramento, CA 95833

Paracorp Incorporated (Trader Joe's East Inc.'s Registered Agent for Service of Process) 2804 Gateway Oaks Drive, #200 Sacramento, CA 95833

Paracorp Incorporated (Trader Joe's East Inc.'s Registered Agent for Service of Process) 44 School Street, Suite 325 Boston, MA 02108

Paracorp Incorporated (Trader Joe's Company's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 44 School Street, Suite 325 Boston, MA 02108

#### VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator Lassen County 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney
Monterey County
1200 Aguajito Road
Monterey, CA 93940
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Gary Lieberstein, District Attorney Napa County 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney Riverside County 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney Sacramento County 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.org

#### VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney San Francisco County 732 Brannan Street San Francisco, CA 94103 gregory.alker@sfgov.org

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney Santa Clara County 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney Tulare County 221 S Mooney Blvd Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

#### VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney Ventura County 800 S Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney Yolo County 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org

#### VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Office of the California Attorney General

#### VIA PRIORITY MAIL

District Attorneys of Select California Counties and Select City Attorneys (See Attached Certificate of Service)

Re: Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq.

#### Dear Addressees:

I represent the Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC") in connection with this Notice of Violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, which is codified at California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq. and also referred to as Proposition 65.

ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

The names of the Companies covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violators") are:

> Trader Joe's Company Trader Joe's East Inc.

The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemical in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- Trader Joe's Trader Darwin's Soy Protein Powder Quick Dissolve Vanilla Flavored Lead
- Trader Joe's Organic Hemp Protein Powder Vanilla Flavored Lead
- Trader Joe's Super Green Drink Powder Berry Flavor Lead

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

This letter is a notice to the Violators and the appropriate governmental authorities of the Proposition 65 violations concerning the listed products. This notice covers all violations of Proposition 65 involving the Violators currently known to ERC from the information now available. ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations. A summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with the copy of this letter to the Violators.

The Violators have manufactured, marketed, distributed, and/or sold the listed products, which have exposed and continue to expose numerous individuals within California to the identified chemical, lead. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and/or recommended use of these products by consumers. The primary route of exposure to lead has been through ingestion, but may have also occurred through inhalation and/or dermal contact. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to lead. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product's label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide an appropriate warning to persons using and/or handling these products that they are being exposed to lead. Each of these ongoing violations has occurred on every day since January 13, 2013, as well as every day since the products were introduced in the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users.

Pursuant to Section 25249.7(d) of the statute, ERC intends to file a citizen enforcement action sixty days after effective service of this notice unless the Violators agree in an enforceable written instrument to: (1) reformulate the listed products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and my client's objectives in pursuing this notice, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive

resolution to this matter. Such resolution will avoid both further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemical and expensive and time consuming litigation.

ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall, and is located at 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. 619-500-3090. ERC has retained me in connection with this matter. We suggest that communications regarding this Notice of Violations should be directed to my attention at the above listed law office address and telephone number.

Sincerely,

Rick Franco

#### Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Trader Joe's Company, Trader Joe's East Inc. and their Registered

Agents for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

#### CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Trader Joe's Company and Trader Joe's East Inc.

#### I, Rick Franco, declare:

- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice in which it is alleged the parties identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
- 2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.
- 3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice.
- 4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violators will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- 5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: January 13, 2016

Rick Franco

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years of age, and am not a party to the within entitled action. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On January 13, 2016, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY" on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current CEO or President Trader Joe's Company 800 South Shamrock Avenue Monrovia, CA 91016

Current CEO or President Trader Joe's East Inc. 711 Atlantic Avenue, Floor 3 Boston, MA 02111

Current CEO or President Trader Joe's East Inc. 800 South Shamrock Avenue Monrovia, CA 91016

Paracorp Incorporated (Trader Joe's Company's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 2804 Gateway Oaks Drive, #200 Sacramento, CA 95833 Paracorp Incorporated (Trader Joe's East Inc.'s Registered Agent for Service of Process) 2804 Gateway Oaks Drive, #200 Sacramento, CA 95833

Paracorp Incorporated (Trader Joe's East Inc.'s Registered Agent for Service of Process) 44 School Street, Suite 325 Boston, MA 02108

Paracorp Incorporated (Trader Joe's Company's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 44 School Street, Suite 325 Boston, MA 02108

On January 13, 2016, I verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1) were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice:

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On January 13, 2016, I verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to the party listed below:

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator Lassen County 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney Monterey County 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Gary Lieberstein, District Attorney Napa County 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney Riverside County 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney Sacramento County 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.org Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney San Francisco County 732 Brannan Street San Francisco, CA 94103 gregory.alker@sfgov.org

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney Santa Clara County 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney Tulare County 221 S Mooney Blvd Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney Ventura County 800 S Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney Yolo County 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org

On January 13, 2016, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it with the U.S. Postal Service with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Priority Mail.

Executed on January 13, 2016, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Phyllis Dunwoody

Page 8

District Attorney, Alameda County 1225 Fallon Street, Suite 900 Oakland, CA 94612

District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive, Suite 245 Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249

District Attorney, Colusa County 346 Fifth Street Suite 101 Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Room 171 Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County 515 Main Street Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000 Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn County Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5th Street 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial County 940 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Inyo County 230 W. Line Street Bishop, CA 93514

District Attorney, Kern County 1215 Truxtum Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings County 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230

#### Service List

District Attorney, Lake County 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles County 210 West Temple Street, Suite 18000 Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera County 209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendocino County Post Office Box 1000 Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced County 550 W. Main Street Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202 Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Nevada County 201 Commercial Street Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange County 401 West Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92701

District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95678

District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971

District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023 District Attorney,San Bernardino County 316 N. Mountain View Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92415-0004

District Attorney, San Diego County 330 West Broadway, Suite 1300 San Diego, CA 92101

District Attorney, San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Ave. Rm. 202 Stockton, CA 95202

District Attorney, San Luis Obispo County 1035 Palm St, Room 450 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Santa Barbara County 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101

District Attorney, Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street, Room 200 Santa Cruz, CA 95060

District Attorney, Shasta County 1355 West Street Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra County PO Box 457 Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12th Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter County 446 Second Street Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093 District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba County 215 Fifth Street, Suite 152 Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's
Office
City Hall East
200 N. Main Street, Suite
800
Los Angeles, CA 90012

San Diego City Attorney's Office 1200 3rd Avenue, Ste 1620 San Diego, CA 92101

San Francisco, City Attorney City Hall, Room 234 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett PL San Francisco, CA 94102

San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor San Jose, CA 95113

#### 27 CCR Appendix A

#### Appendix A

## OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as "Proposition 65"). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. Please refer to the statute and OEHHA's implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001. These implementing regulations are available online at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html.

## WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The "Proposition 65 List." Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at:

http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65\_list/Newlist.html.

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

Clear and reasonable warnings. A business is required to warn a person before "knowingly and intentionally" exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be "clear and

reasonable." This means that the warning must: (1) clearly say that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

Prohibition from discharges into drinking water. A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

### DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

*Grace Periods.* Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

Governmental agencies and public water utilities. All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

Businesses with nine or fewer employees. Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses "no significant risk." This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific "No Significant Risk Levels" (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at:

http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 et seq. of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the "no observable effect level" divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at:

http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 et seq. of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant<sup>2</sup> it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501. Discharges that do not result in a "significant amount" of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a "significant amount" of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A "significant amount" means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the "no significant risk" level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the "no observable effect" level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

### HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off- premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;

- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form. A private party may not file an action against the alleged violator for these exposures, or recover in a settlement any payment in lieu of penalties any reimbursement for costs and attorney's fees, if the notice was served on or after October 5, 2013, and the alleged violator has done *all* of the following within 14 days of being served notice:

- Corrected the alleged violation;
- Agreed to pay a civil penalty of \$5B500 (subject to change as noted below) to the private party within 30 days; and
- Notified the private party serving the notice in writing that the violation has been corrected.

The written notification to the private-party must include a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form completed by the alleged violator as directed in the notice. On April 1, 2019, and every five years thereafter, the dollar amount of the civil penalty will be adjusted by the Judicial Council based on the change in the annual California Consumer Price Index. The Judicial Council will publish the dollar amount of the adjusted civil penalty at each five-year interval, together with the date of the next scheduled adjustment.

An alleged violator may satisfy these conditions only one time for a violation arising from the same exposure in the same facility or on the same premises. The satisfaction of these conditions does not prevent the Attorney General, a district attorney, a city attorney of a city of greater than 750,000 population, or any full-time city prosecutor with the consent of the district attorney, from filing an enforcement action against an alleged violator. The amount of any civil penalty for a violation shall be reduced to reflect any payment made by the alleged violator for the same alleged violation to a private-party.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included with this notice and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at: <a href="http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html">http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html</a>. The notice is reproduced here:

#### Page 1

Date: January 13, 2016

Name of Noticing Party or attorney for Noticing Party: Environmental Research Center, Inc.

Address: 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108

Phone number: 619-500-3090

#### SPECIAL COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE

#### PROOF OF COMPLIANCE

You are receiving this form because the Noticing Party listed above has alleged that you are violating California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 (Prop. 65).

The Noticing Party may not bring any legal proceedings against you for the alleged violation checked below if

1. You have actually taken the corrective steps that you have certified in this form

2. The Noticing Party has received this form at the address shown above, accurately completed by you, postmarked within 14 days of your receiving this notice

3. The Noticing Party receives the required \$500 penalty payment from you at the address shown above

postmarked within 30 days of your receiving this notice.

4. This is the first time you have submitted a Proof of Compliance for a violation arising from the same exposure in the same facility on the same premises.

## PART 1: TO BE COMPLETED BY THE NOTICING PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR THE NOTICING PARTY

The alleged violation is for an exposure to: (chec	ck one)
--	---------

Alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent on-site consumption is permitted by law.

A chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises for immediate consumption on or off premises to the extent: (1) the chemical was not intentionally added; and (2) the chemical was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination.

Environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises.

Chemicals known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking noncommercial vehicles.

#### **IMPORTANT NOTES:**

1. You have no potential liability under California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 if your business has nine (9) or fewer employees.

2. Using this form will NOT prevent the Attorney General, a district attorney, a city attorney, or a prosecutor in whose jurisdiction the violation is alleged to have occurred from filing an action over the same alleged violations, and that in any such action, the amount of civil penalty shall be reduced to reflect any payment made at this time.

Page 2

Date: January 13, 2016

Name of Noticing Party or attorney for Noticing Party: Environmental Research Center, Inc.

Address: 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108

Phone number: 619-500-3090

## PART 2: TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ALLEGED VIOLATOR OR AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

Certification of Computance
Accurate completion of this form will demonstrate that you are now in compliance with California Health and
Safety Code §25249.6 for the alleged violation listed above. You must complete and submit the form below to the
Noticing Party at the address shown above, postmarked within 14 days of you receiving this notice.
I hereby agree to pay, within 30 days of completion of this notice, a civil penalty of \$500 to the Noticing Party
only and certify that I have complied with Health and Safety Code §25249.6 by (check only one of the following):
☐ Posting a warning or warnings about the alleged exposure that complies with the law, and attaching a copy of
that warning and a photograph accurately showing its placement on my premises;
☐ Posting the warning or warnings demanded in writing by the Noticing Party, and attaching a copy of that
warning and a photograph accurately its placement on my premises; OR
☐ Eliminating the alleged exposure, and attaching a statement accurately describing how the alleged exposure has
been eliminated.
Certification
My statements on this form, and on any attachments to it, are true, complete, and correct to the best of my
knowledge and belief and are made in good faith. I have carefully read the instructions to complete this form. I
understand that if I make a false statement on this form, I may be subject to additional penalties under the Safe
Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65).
Signature of alleged violator or authorized representative Date
Name and title of signatory

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS. . .

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov.

Revised: May 2014

<sup>1</sup> All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html.

Note: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

#### **HISTORY**

- 1. New Appendix A filed 4-22-97; operative 4-22-97 pursuant to Government Code section 11343.4(d) (Register 97, No. 17).
- 2. Amendment filed 1-7-2003; operative 2-6-2003 (Register 2003, No. 2).
- 3. Change without regulatory effect renumbering title 22, section 12903 and Appendix A to title 27, section 25903 and Appendix A, including amendment of appendix, filed 6-18-2008 pursuant to section 100, title 1, California Code of Regulations (Register 2008, No. 25).
- 4. Amendment filed 11-19-2012; operative 12-19-2012 (Register 2012, No. 47).
- 5. Amendment of appendix and Note filed 11-19-2014; operative 1-1-2015 (Register 2014, No. 47). This database is current through 9/18/15 Register 2015, No. 38
- 27 CCR Appendix A, 27 CA ADC Appendix A

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Section 25501(a)(4).