1 ENDORSED FILED 2 **ALAMEDA COUNTY** JUL 2 3 2018 3 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT 4 Malisy astanfola 5 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 10 11 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH. Case No. RG-16-834949 12 Plaintiff, [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEL TACO 13 v. RESTAURANTS, INC., DEL TACO LLC, AMERCAREROYAL, LLC, 14 DEL TACO RESTAURANTS, INC., et al., MCLANE COMPANY, INC., AND MCLANE FOODSERVICE, INC. 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 DOCUMENT PREPARED -1-ON RECYCLED PAPER

CONSENT JUDGMENT - MCLANE-ACR-DEL TACO - CASE NO. RG-16-834949

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. The Parties to this Consent Judgment are the Center for Environmental Health, a California non-profit corporation ("CEH"), and Del Taco Restaurants, Inc. and Del Taco, LLC (collectively, "Del Taco"), AmerCareRoyal, LLC, formerly known as JRMI, Ltd. ("ACR"), McLane Company, Inc. and McLane Foodservice, Inc. (collectively "McLane"). Del Taco, ACR and McLane are collectively referred to herein as the "Settling Defendants." The Settling Defendants and CEH are collectively referred to herein as the "Parties." The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment to settle and resolve all claims asserted by CEH against the Settling Defendants, both individually and collectively, as set forth in the operative Complaint (the "Complaint") in the above-captioned matter. This Consent Judgment pertains to thermal paper sold by ACR and McLane as well as thermal paper purchased by Del Taco for use in California as transactional documentation ("Thermal Paper"). CEH contends that the Thermal Paper was coated with bisphenol A ("BPA"). BPA is a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm ("BPA").
- 1.2. On June 14, 2016, CEH provided a 60-day Notice of Violation under Proposition 65 to Del Taco, the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California and the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater than 750,000, alleging that Del Taco violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons to BPA from Thermal Paper without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.
- 1.3. On June 2, 2017, CEH provided a 60-day Notice of Violation under Proposition 65 to ACR and McLane, the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California and the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater than 750,000, alleging that ACR and McLane violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons to BPA from Thermal Paper without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.
- 1.4. Settling Defendants are each corporations or other business entities. CEH contends that Settling Defendants have sold or otherwise provided Thermal Paper containing BPA used to document point of sale transactions to California consumers.

- 1.5. On October 13, 2016, CEH filed the Complaint in the above-captioned matter, which names Del Taco as defendants. On August 29, 2017, CEH amended the Complaint in the above-captioned matter to name ACR and McLane as defendants.
- 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 Defendants 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 Thermal Paper sold or otherwise provided to consumers by Settling Defendants.
- 1.7. Nothing in this Consent Judgment is or shall be construed as an admission by the Parties, either individually or collectively, of any fact, claim, allegation, 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, either individually or collectively, of any fact, claim, allegation, 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 referenced and disputed in the Complaint and this litigation.

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

2.1. **Specification Compliance Date.** The date of entry of this Consent Judgment shall be herein referred to as the "Effective Date." To the extent it has not already done so, no more than thirty (30) days after the Effective Date, before a Settling Defendant purchases any Thermal Paper from any entity that is not another Settling Defendant, it shall instruct in writing each supplier of Thermal Paper (a "Thermal Paper Supplier") that the Thermal Paper supplied to that Settling Defendant must be BPA-free. If in the future a Settling Defendant purchases Thermal Paper that will be sold or used in the United States from a Thermal Paper Supplier that it

has not previously provided with instructions to provide BPA-free Thermal Paper, that Settling Defendant shall provide written instructions to such Thermal Paper Supplier prior to placing an initial order for Thermal Paper that will be sold or used in the United States that instruct the Thermal Paper Supplier to provide it with Thermal Paper that is BPA-free. Each Settling Defendant shall retain and make available to CEH upon reasonable written request records of communications sent to and received from Thermal Paper Suppliers that are related to the requirement of this Section 2.1 for a period of five (5) years from the Effective Date.

- 2.2. **Reformulation of Thermal Paper**. After the Effective Date, neither ACR nor McLane shall distribute, sell or offer for sale in the United States any Thermal Paper that contains BPA that was intentionally added to the Thermal Paper in the manufacturing process. After the Effective Date, Del Taco shall not purchase or provide to any employee or customer in the United States any Thermal Paper that contains BPA that was intentionally added to the Thermal Paper in the manufacturing process. Thermal Paper that contains less than 10 parts per million ("ppm") BPA by weight (the "Reformulation Level") is deemed to contain no intentionally added BPA, such concentration to be determined by use of a test performed by an accredited laboratory using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) equipment.
- 2.3. Additional Efforts to Reduce Use of Thermal Paper. CEH alleges that many of the alternatives to BPA used in Thermal Paper, such as bisphenol-S ("BPS"), are other phenols that also have potentially adverse health effects. Accordingly, Del Taco agrees to use commercially reasonable efforts to reduce the use of Thermal Paper. CEH and Del Taco have discussed, and Del Taco agrees to explore in good faith, potential options to reduce the use of Thermal Paper such as: (i) the expansion of the use of smartphone-based ordering applications that do not involve the use of Thermal Paper such as Del Taco iOS and Android applications (and potentially including expanding markets where the applications work); (ii) implementation of reusable numbers to be handed to customers and returned when the customer picks up the food; and (iii) working with register software to create the option to print receipts only when requested by the customer. Del Taco shall prepare a written report detailing the efforts made regarding the

reduction in use of Thermal Paper which shall be presented to CEH within thirty days of the one-year anniversary of the Effective Date. Upon request by CEH, Del Taco shall meet and confer with CEH once CEH has reviewed the report to discuss possible additional efforts to reduce the use of Thermal Paper in Del Taco's California restaurants. ACR and McLane agree to use commercially reasonable efforts to research using BPS-free non-phenol based thermal paper. ACR and McLane shall each prepare a written report detailing the efforts made and results from this work that shall be submitted to CEH within thirty days of the one year anniversary of the Effective Date.

3. ENFORCEMENT

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

4. PAYMENTS

4.1. **Payments by Payment Defendants.** ACR and McLane are referred to herein as the "Payment Defendants". The Payment Defendants shall be jointly and severally liable for payment of the total sum of \$230,000 as a settlement payment as further set forth in this Section according to the following schedule: (a) \$115,000 on or before April 10, 2018; and (b) \$115,000 on or before five days after the Effective Date. Each of the settlement payments shall be made payable to the Lexington Law Group and shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117. Any failure by Payment Defendants to comply with the payment terms herein shall be subject to a stipulated late fee to be paid by Payment Defendants in the amount of \$100 for each day the full payment is not received after the

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

-5-

1	applicable payment due date set forth in Section 4.1. The late fees required under this Section
2	shall be recoverable, together with reasonable attorneys' fees, in an enforcement proceeding
3	brought against Payment Defendants pursuant to Section 3 of this Consent Judgment. CEH
4	agrees to hold any payments received prior to the Effective Date in trust, such funds to be
5	released and allocated after the Effective Date as set forth below.
6	4.2. Allocation of Payments. The funds paid by Payment Defendants shall be
7	allocated by CEH as set forth below between the following categories and paid as follows:
8	4.2.1. A civil penalty of \$30,180 pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b).
9	The civil penalty payment shall be apportioned in accordance with Health & Safety Code
10	§25249.12 (25% or \$7,545 to CEH and 75% or \$22,635 to the State of California's Office of
11	Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA")). The OEHHA payment shall be
12	delivered by CEH as follows:
13	For United States Postal Service Delivery:
14	Attn: Mike Gyurics Fiscal Operations Branch Chief
15	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment P.O. Box 4010, MS #19B
16	Sacramento, CA 95812-4010
17	For Non-United States Postal Service Delivery: Attn: Mike Gyurics
18	Fiscal Operations Branch Chief Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
19	1001 I Street, MS #19B Sacramento, CA 95814
20	Sacramento, C11 9301 1
21	4.2.2. An Additional Settlement Payment ("ASP") in the amount of \$22,620 shall
22	be paid by Payment Defendants to CEH pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), and
23	California Code of Regulations, Title 11, § 3204. CEH intends to place these funds in CEH's
24	Toxics in Food Fund and use them to support CEH programs and activities that seek to educate
25	the public about BPA and other toxic chemicals in food, to work with the food industry and
26	agriculture interests to reduce exposure to BPA and other toxic chemicals in food, and to thereby
27	reduce the public health impacts and risks of exposure to BPA and other toxic chemicals in food
28	

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.

4.2.3. A reimbursement of a portion of CEH's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs shall be paid by Payment Defendants in the total amount of \$177,200, to be allocated \$26,400 to CEH to reimburse CEH for investigation costs associated with the litigation and \$150,800 to LLG to reimburse LLG for attorneys' fees and costs associated with the litigation.

4.2.4. To summarize, CEH shall allocate the payments made by Payment Defendants to the payees and in the amounts and on the dates set forth below:

First Set of Payments Due April 10, 2018				
Payee	Type	Amount	Deliver To	
ОЕННА	Penalty	\$11,317.50	OEHHA per Section 4.2.1	
Center For Environmental Health	Penalty	\$3,772.50	СЕН	
Center For Environmental Health	ASP	\$11,310.00	СЕН	
Lexington Law Group	Fee	\$75,400.00	LLG	
Center For Environmental Health	Fee	\$13,200.00	СЕН	
Second Set of Payments Due 5 Days After Entry of Consent Judgment				
Payee	Type	Amount	Deliver To	
ОЕННА	Penalty	\$11,317.50	OEHHA per Section 4.2.1	
Center For Environmental Health	Penalty	\$3,772.50	СЕН	
Center For Environmental Health	ASP	\$11,310.00	СЕН	
Lexington Law Group	Fee	\$75,400.00	LLG	
Center For Environmental Health	Fee	\$13,200.00	СЕН	

9

10

7

14 15

13

1617

1819

2021

22

23

2425

26

27

5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 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 Parties prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.

6. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE

- 6.1. Provided that the Payment Defendants comply in all material respects with all of their 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 each Settling Defendant and their respective parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities that are (or were at any relevant times) under common ownership, directors, officers, employees, agents, shareholders, successors, assigns, and attorneys ("Defendant Releasees"), and all individuals and entities to which any Settling Defendant distributed or sold Thermal Paper, including but not limited to distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisees, licensors and licensees, including but not limited to Grewal Superfoods, Inc. ("Downstream Defendant Releasees"), of any violations of Proposition 65 based on failure to warn about exposure to BPA contained in Thermal Paper that was sold, distributed, or otherwise provided to employees or customers by ACR, McLane, or Del Taco prior to the Effective Date. Nothing in this Consent Judgment covers or releases any claim regarding Thermal Paper sold by any entity other than a Settling Defendant or a Defendant Releasee that is upstream of a Settling Defendant, including but not limited to Papeles y Conversiones de Mexico, S.A. de C.V. ("PCM") or any entity affiliated with PCM. The Thermal Paper released in this Section 6.1 is referred to as the "Released Thermal Paper."
- 6.2. Provided that the Payment Defendants comply in all material respects with all of their obligations under Section 4 hereof, CEH, for itself, its agents, successors and assigns, releases, waives, and forever discharges any and all claims against each Settling Defendant, each

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

7.4. Any Party may modify the person and address to whom the notice is to be sent by sending the other Parties notice by first class and electronic mail.

8. COURT APPROVAL

- 8.1. This Consent Judgment shall become effective as a contract upon the date signed by CEH and all Settling Defendants, provided however, that CEH shall also prepare and file a Motion for Approval of this Consent Judgment and Settling Defendants 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 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

2 3

1

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19

20

12.

13.

continuing waiver.

modify the Consent Judgment.

21

22

23

- 24
- 25 26

27

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

-11-

13.1. Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized

This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding

of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter of CEH's claims both individually and in

the public interest against or relating in any way to Settling Defendants (both individually and

collectively), and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, or understandings

representations, or other agreements relating to the Complaint, this dispute, or the resolution of

this dispute by and between the Parties except as expressly set forth herein. No representations,

Judgment have been made by any Party hereto with respect to the Complaint, this dispute, or the

resolution of this dispute by and between the Parties. No other oral or written agreements which

are not specifically contained or referenced herein shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the

written, 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 Parties. No waiver of

any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of

12.1. This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement, enforce, and

any of the other provisions hereof whether or not similar, nor shall such waiver constitute a

AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT

by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into and

Parties hereto. Any agreements specifically contained or referenced herein, whether oral or

oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those specifically referred to in this Consent

related thereto, if any, are hereby merged herein and therein. There are no warranties,

CONSENT JUDGMENT - MCLANE-ACR-DEL TACO - CASE NO. RG-16-834949

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

RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS 14.

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

EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS 15.

15.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.

IT IS SO STIPULATED:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

DOCUMENT PREPARED

CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Charlie Pizarro Associate Director DEL TACO RESTAURANTS, INC. Signature Printed Name Title

1 NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS 14. 2 14.1. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim 3 against an entity that is not a Settling Defendant on terms that are different than those contained 4 in this Consent Judgment. 5 15. **EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS** 6 15.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by 7 means of facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be deemed to 8 constitute one document. 9 IT IS SO STIPULATED: 10 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH 11 12 13 Charlie Pizarro Associate Director 14 15 DEL TACO RESTAURANTS, INC. 16 17 18 Signature 19 Printed Name General Cornsel 20 21 22 23 Title 24 25 26 27

28

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

-12-

1	DEL TACO, LLC
2	
3	
4	Signature
5	Jack Tong
6	Printed Name
7	General Courise
8	Title Court Court
9	
10	AMERCAREROYAL, LLC
11	
12	Signature
13	
14	Printed Name
15	
16	
17	Title
18	MCI ANE COMBANY INC
19	MCLANE COMPANY, INC.
20 21	
22	Signature
23	
24	Printed Name
25	
26	
27	Title
28	
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	-13-
	CONSENT JUDGMENT MCLANE-ACR-DEL TACO CASE NO. RG-16-834949

1	DEL TACO LLC		
2	DEL TACO, LLC		
3	·		
4	Signature		
5			
6	Printed Name		
7			
8	Title		
9	AMERCAREROYAL, LLC		
10	AMERCARERO TAL, ELC		
11	1 () 5 h		
12	Signature		
13			
14	Jay Erley		
15	Printed Name		
16	President		
17	Title		
18			
19	MCLANE COMPANY, INC.		
20		÷	
21	G		
22	Signature	•	
23			
24	Printed Name		
25			
26	T:41_		
27	Title		
28			
PARED		-13-	

CONSENT JUDGMENT – MCLANE-ACR-DEL TACO – CASE NO. RG-16-834949

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

1	DEL TACO, LLC
2	
3	
4	Signature
5	
6	Printed Name
7	
8	Title
9	AMERCAREROYAL, LLC
10	
12	
13	Signature
14	
15	Printed Name
16	
17	Title
18	
19	MCLANE COMPANY, INC.
20	7211/1
21 22	Signature
23	
24	Bart McKay Printed Name
25	
26	Division General Counsel Title
27	Title
28 DOCUMENT PREPARED	-13-
ON RECYCLED PAPER	-13-

CONSENT JUDGMENT – MCLANE-ACR-DEL TACO – CASE NO. RG-16-834949

1	MCLANE FOODSERVICE, INC.
2	
3	ZWL
4	Signature
5	
6	Bart McKay Printed Name
7	
8	Division General Counsel
9	Title
10	
11	IT IS SO ORDERED:
12	
13	1/1
14	Dated:
15	Judge of the Superior Court of California
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28 DOCUMENT PREPARED	-14-
ON RECYCLED PAPER	CONSENT JUDGMENT – MCLANE-ACR-DEL TACO – CASE NO. RG-16-834949