ENDORSED FILED 1 ALAMEDA COUNTY 2 JUN 1 8 2018 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT 3 PAM WILLIAMS 4 5 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 10 Case No. RG 16-834958 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH. 11 PROPOSED CONSENT Plaintiff, 12 JUDGMENT AS TO DS SERVICES OF AMERICA, INC. v. 13 DS SERVICES OF AMERICA, INC., et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 17 INTRODUCTION 1. 18 The Parties to this Consent Judgment are the Center For Environmental Health 19 1.1 ("CEH"), a California non-profit corporation, and DS Services of America, Inc., a Delaware 20 corporation ("Settling Defendant"). CEH and Settling Defendant are referred to herein 21 individually as a "Party" and together as the "Parties." 22 CEH and Settling Defendant (the "Parties") enter into this Consent Judgment to 1.2 23 settle certain claims asserted by CEH against Settling Defendant as set forth in the operative 24 complaint ("Complaint") in the above-captioned matter. This Consent Judgment covers refillable 25 water bottles made of polycarbonate plastic ("Covered Products") that are used to deliver bottled 26 water sold, filled by, or offered for sale by Settling Defendant in the State of California. 27

- 1.3 Settling Defendant is a corporation that manufactures, distributes, fills, sells or offers for sale in the State of California drinking water that is packaged in Covered Products.
- 1.4 On June 27, 2016, CEH provided a 60-day Notice of Violation of Proposition 65 to the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater than 750,000 and to Settling Defendant, alleging that Settling Defendant violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons to bisphenol A ("BPA") contained in drinking water that is sold in Covered Products without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.
- 1.5 On October 13, 2016, CEH filed the Complaint against Settling Defendant in the above-referenced Court.
- 1.6 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Alameda and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter and enforce this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint based on the facts alleged therein with respect to Covered Products manufactured, distributed or sold by Settling Defendant.
- 1.7 Nothing in this Consent Judgment is or shall be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, argument or defense the Parties may have in 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. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

2.1 Stamping and Removal of Covered Products . As soon as practicable, using
best efforts, but no later than the first day of the first month that is at least 60 days after the entry
of this Consent Judgment (the "Stamping Program Date"), Settling Defendant shall implement a
polycarbonate bottle stamping and removal program (the "Program"). Under the Program,
Settling Defendant will ensure that each newly manufactured Covered Product used by Settling
Defendant to deliver or sell drinking water in California after the Stamping Program Date is
stamped with the year of the bottle's manufacture in a manner that ensures the stamp will be
visible during the usable life of the bottle. Each such stamp will be in a location that is plainly
visible to Settling Defendant's employees assigned to inspect bottles on the filling line at Settling
Defendant's facilities that distribute the Covered Products for use in California ("Inspectors").
Beginning on January 1, 2023 (the "Removal Program Date"), upon inspection, Settling
Defendant will ensure that its Inspectors remove from the active inventory of bottles, through a
periodic review occurring at least once every three months, each bottle that is stamped with a
manufacture date that is five (5) or more years in the past. (Any bottles not bearing a
manufacture date will be removed from the active inventory of bottles only based on "visible
signs of wear," as set forth below.)

- 2.2 Removing Additional Covered Products from Inventory. CEH believes that polycarbonate bottles leach more BPA as the bottles wear, age and undergo additional wash cycles. Settling Defendant has agreed to undertake the following steps to remove older bottles that have been in use for the longest period of time and undergone the most wash cycles from the active inventory of Covered Products:
- 2.2.1 On or before the Stamping Program Date, Settling Defendant will update the inspection protocols used by its Inspectors to add "visible signs of wear" to the criteria for the removal of polycarbonate bottles (whether or not they bear a date stamp) from the active inventory of bottles.

- 2.2.2 Settling Defendant shall provide instruction and training to each Inspector on what "visible signs of wear" are and how to determine if a bottle exhibits such signs and should be removed from inventory.
- 2.2.3 Settling Defendant's employees shall perform periodic visual inspections that shall include looking for visible wear and cracks, prominent date and or identity stamps or labeling that are easily read on the bottle-filling line, or other indications of bottle age as well as using knowledge of the origin or time certain bottles were acquired in an effort to ensure that the oldest bottles that have undergone the most wash cycles are removed from circulation first.
- 2.2.4 On or before the first day of the month following the Stamping Program Date, Settling Defendant shall determine, from its available records, its average rate of removing bottles from the active inventory of bottles intended for use in California, which will be the sum of all bottles removed in calendar year 2017 (the "Baseline"). Beginning on the Stamping Program Date, Settling Defendant's Inspectors will, in the ordinary course, remove from the active inventory of bottles additional bottles beyond the Baseline, as set forth below, and will continue to do so as set forth below. Settling Defendant must meet the following numerical standards for each calendar year until the Removal Program Date:

2018: Increase the number of removed bottles over Baseline by 1%. 2019: Increase the number of removed bottles over Baseline by 2%.

2020: Increase the number of removed bottles over Baseline by 3%.

2021: Increase the number of removed bottles over Baseline by 4%.

2022: Increase the number of removed bottles over Baseline by 5%.

2.3 **Monitoring and Documentation.** Settling Defendant shall monitor the rate at which bottles are removed and prepare an annual report on the number of removed bottles each calendar year on the following February 1, with the final report due on February 1, 2024. Settling Defendant shall retain such reports until December 31, 2024 and promptly send such reports to CEH within thirty (30) days of completion.

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER 2.4 Acquisition of New Bottled Water Businesses in California. At any point in the future, should Defendant acquire, in whole or in part, other than by mere financial investment, a business selling bottled water in 3-gallon or larger polycarbonate bottles in California, then Defendant will incorporate those bottles into its inventory of bottles, but without including any bottles that are can be determined to be more than five years old based on prominent date and or identity stamps or labeling that are easily read on the bottle filling line, and Defendant will implement the procedures set forth in Paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2, above; provided that the Stamping Program Date with respect to the Covered Products of such acquired business shall be January 1 of the year following the date the acquisition closes, and the Removal Program Date with respect to the Covered Products of such acquired business shall be five years after the Stamping Program Date; and further provided that the requirements of Paragraph 2.3 shall not apply to such Covered Products.

3. ENFORCEMENT

3.1 **Enforcement Procedures**. Prior to bringing any motion or request for order to show cause to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment, a Party seeking to enforce shall provide the violating party thirty (30) days' advance written notice of the alleged violation. The Parties shall meet and confer during such thirty (30) day period, exchanging any relevant information, in an effort to try to reach agreement on an appropriate cure for the alleged violation absent Court intervention. After such thirty (30) day period, the Party seeking to enforce may, by new action, motion, or request before the Superior Court of Alameda County, seek to enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment.

4. PAYMENTS

- 4.1 **Payments by Settling Defendant.** On or before five (5) days after the entry of this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendant shall pay the total sum of \$191,127 as a settlement payment as further set forth in this Section.
- 4.2 **Allocation of Payments.** The total settlement amount for Settling Defendant shall be paid in five (5) separate checks in the amounts specified below and delivered as set forth

1	below. Any failure by Settling Defendant to comply with the payment terms herein shall be
2	subject to a stipulated late fee to be paid by Settling Defendant in the amount of \$100 for each
3	day the full payment is not received after the applicable payment due date set forth in Section 4.1.
4	The late fees required under this Section shall be recoverable, together with reasonable attorneys'
5	fees, in an enforcement proceeding brought pursuant to Section 3 of this Consent Judgment. The
6	funds paid by Settling Defendant shall be allocated as set forth below between the following
7	categories and made payable as follows:
8	4.2.1 Settling Defendant shall pay \$24,800 as a civil penalty pursuant to Health
9	& Safety Code §25249.7(b). The civil penalty payment shall be apportioned in accordance with
10	Health & Safety Code §25249.12 (25% to CEH and 75% to the State of California's Office of
11	Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA")). Accordingly, the OEHHA portion of
12	the civil penalty payment for \$18,600 shall be paid by check made payable to OEHHA and
13	associated with taxpayer identification number 68-0284486. This payment shall be delivered as
14	follows:
15	For United States Postal Service Delivery:
16	Attn: Mike Gyurics Fiscal Operations Branch Chief Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
17	P.O. Box 4010, MS #19B
18	Sacramento, CA 95812-4010
19	For Non-United States Postal Service Delivery: Attn: Mike Gyurics
20	Fiscal Operations Branch Chief Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
21	1001 I Street, MS #19B Sacramento, CA 95814
22	
23	The CEH portion of the civil penalty payment for \$6,200 shall be paid by check made
24	payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification
25	number 94-3251981. This payment shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero
26	Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.
27	

4.2.2 Settling Defendant shall pay an Additional Settlement Payment ("ASP") to CEH pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), and California Code of Regulations, Title 11, § 3204 in the amount of \$18,600. CEH intends to place these funds in CEH's Toxics in Food Fund and use them to support CEH programs and activities that seek to educate the public about BPA and other toxic chemicals in food, to work with the food industry and agriculture interests to reduce exposure to BPA and other toxic chemicals in food, and to thereby reduce the public health impacts and risks of exposure to BPA and other toxic chemicals in food sold in California. CEH shall obtain and maintain adequate records to document that ASPs are spent on these activities and CEH agrees to provide such documentation to the Attorney General within thirty days of any request from the Attorney General. The payments pursuant to this Section shall be paid by check made payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981. These payments shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.

4.2.3 Settling Defendant shall pay \$147,727 as a reimbursement of a portion of CEH's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. This amount shall be divided into two checks: (1) a check in the amount of \$126,000 shall be made payable to the Lexington Law Group and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3317175; and (2) a check in the amount of \$21,727 shall be made payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981. These payments shall be delivered to the Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.

4.2.4 To summarize the allocations set forth in Paragraphs 4.2.1 through 4.2.3, inclusive, Settling Defendant shall deliver checks made out to the payees and in the amounts set forth below:

Payee	Type	Amount	Deliver To
ОЕННА	Penalty	\$18,600	OEHHA per Section 4.2.1
Center For Environmental Health	Penalty	\$6,200	LLG

Center For Environmental Health	ASP	\$18,600	LLG
Lexington Law Group	Fee	\$126,000	LLG
Center For Environmental Health	Fee	\$21,727	LLG

5. MODIFICATION AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION

- 5.1 **Modification.** This Consent Judgment may be modified from time to time by express written agreement of the Parties, with the approval of the Court, or by an order of this Court upon motion and in accordance with law.
- 5.2 **Notice; Meet and Confer.** Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with all affected Parties prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment. The Parties agree that possible future developments that may, but do not necessarily, warrant modification of this Consent Judgment include the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's adoption of a "safe harbor" Maximum Allowable Daily Level for BPA exposure via ingestion.

6. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE

- 6.1 Provided that Settling Defendant complies in full with its obligations under Section 4 hereof, this Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH on behalf of itself and the public interest and Settling Defendant and its parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities that are under common ownership, directors, officers, employees, agents, shareholders, successors, assigns, and attorneys ("Defendant Releasees"), and all entities to which Settling Defendant distributes or sells Covered Products, such as distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisees, licensors and licensees ("Downstream Defendant Releasees") of any violation of Proposition 65 based on failure to warn about alleged exposure to BPA contained in the Covered Products that were sold, distributed, used, or offered for sale by Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date (the "Released Products").
- 6.2 Provided that Settling Defendant complies in full with its obligations under Section 4 hereof, CEH, for itself, its agents, successors and assigns, releases, waives and forever

1	discharges any and all claims against Sattling Defendant. Defendant Paleasses and Downstream		
	discharges any and all claims against Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees and Downstream		
2	Defendant Releasees arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or		
3	common law claims that have been or could have been asserted by CEH individually or in the		
4	public interest regarding the failure to warn about exposure to BPA arising in connection with the		
5	Released Products.		
6	6.3 Provided that Settling Defendant complies in full with its obligations under		
7	Section 4 hereof, compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by Settling Defendant and		
8	Defendant Releasees shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by Settling Defendant,		
9	Defendant Releasees and Downstream Defendant Releasees with respect to any alleged failure to		
10	warn about BPA in Covered Products manufactured, distributed or sold by Settling Defendant		
11	after the Effective Date.		
12	7. PROVISION OF NOTICE		
13	7.1 When CEH is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the		
14	notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to:		
15	Eric S. Somers		
16	Lexington Law Group 503 Divisadero Street		
17	San Francisco, CA 94117		
18	esomers@lexlawgroup.com		
19	7.2 When Settling Defendant is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent		
20	Judgment, the notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to:		
21	Trenton H. Norris Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP		
22	Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111		
23	Trent.Norris@apks.com		
24	Any Party may modify the person and/or address to whom the notice is to be sent by sending the		
	other Party notice by first class and electronic mail.		
25			
26			
27			
28			

8. COURT APPROVAL

- 8.1 This Consent Judgment shall become effective upon the date signed by CEH and Settling Defendant, whichever is later, provided however, that CEH shall prepare and file a Motion for Approval of this Consent Judgment and Settling Defendant shall support approval of such Motion.
- 8.2 If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect and shall not be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any purpose.

9. GOVERNING LAW AND CONSTRUCTION

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

10. ATTORNEYS' FEES

- 10.1 A Party who unsuccessfully brings or contests an action or motion arising out of this Consent Judgment shall be required to pay the prevailing Party's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs unless the unsuccessful Party has acted with substantial justification. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term substantial justification shall carry the same meaning as used in the Civil Discovery Act of 1986, Code of Civil Procedure §§2016.010, *et seq.*
- 10.2 Notwithstanding Section 10.1, a Party who prevails in a contested enforcement action brought pursuant to Section 3 may seek an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5 against a Party that acted with substantial justification. The Party seeking such an award shall bear the burden of meeting all of the elements of §1021.5, and this provision shall not be construed as altering any procedural or substantive requirements for obtaining such an award.
- 10.3 Nothing in this Section 10 shall preclude a party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law.

11. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

11.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments or understandings related thereto, if any, are hereby merged herein and therein. There are no warranties, representations or other agreements between the Parties 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. 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. No supplementation, modification, waiver or termination of this Consent Judgment shall be binding unless executed in writing by the Party to be bound thereby. 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 legally to bind that Party.

14. NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS

14.1 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim against an entity that is not Settling Defendant on terms that are different than those contained in this Consent Judgment.

1	15. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS		
2	15.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by		
3	means of facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be deemed to		
4	constitute one document.		
5	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED		
6			
7	AND DECREED		
8	10ANA PETROU		
9	Dated:		
10	Judge of the Superior Court		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	- 12 -		
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	- 12 - CONSENT JUDGMENT – DS SERVICES – CASE NO. RG 16-834958		

1.	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
2		ENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL
3		EALTH
.4		
5	Sig	gnature
. 6		CHINELE VIZMOND
7	Pr	inted Name
8		1
9	Tid	(+SSOCIATE) PACTOR
10		
11	Dated:, 2018 DS	S SERVICES OF AMERICA, INC.
12	Dated, 2016 DS	SERVICES OF AMERICA, INC.
13		
14	Sig	gnature
15		
16	Pri	inted Name
17		
18	Tit	tle ·
19		·
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28 DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	R	3

CONSENT JUDGMENT - DS SERVICES - CASE NO. RG 16-834958

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
2	Dated:, 2018 CENTER FOR E	NVIRONMENTAL	
3	HEALTH		
4			
5	Signature	······································	
6			
7	Printed Name	And the second s	
8	1		
9	N		
10	Title		
11			
12	Dated: February 9, 2018 DS SERVICES O	OF AMERICA, INC.	
- 13			
14	Digitation	784.00 May 100	
15	Thomas	THO	
16	Printed Name	J. Harrington	
17 18			
19	Title		
20			
21			
22	2		
23	3		
24	4		
25	5		
26	5		
27	7		
28 DOCUMENT PREPARED	- 13 -		
on Recycled Paper	CONSENT JUDGMENT – DS SERVICES – CASE NO. RG 16-834958		