# FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY

AUG 2 4 2021

# CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

MATTHEW C. MACLEAR (SBN 209228)
ANTHONY M. BARNES (SBN 199048)
AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP
4030 Martin Luther King Jr. Way
Oakland, CA 94609
Telephone: (415) 568-5200
Email: mcm@atalawgroup.com

ALAMENA COUNTY

JUL 02 2021

6 Attorney for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.

PEG CAREW TOLEDO (SBN 181227)
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 471-3110

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

| Email: peg.toledo@arnoldporter.com

Attorney for Defendant Standard Process Inc.

# SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, lNC., a non-profit California corporation,

Plaintiff,

٧.

STANDARD PROCESS INC., a Wisconsin corporation; and DOES 1 – 25,

Defendants.

**CASE NO. RG21086370** 

## STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.

Action Filed: January 19, 2021 Trial Date: None set

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On January 19, 2021, 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 Permanent Injunction, Civil Penalties and Other Relief (the "Complaint") pursuant to the provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq.

Page I of 19

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

Case No. RG21086370

- 1			
1	("Proposition 65"), against STANDARD PROCESS INC. ("STANDARD PROCESS") and		
2 -	Does 1-25. In this action, ERC alleges that certain products manufactured, distributed, or sold		
3	by STANDARD PROCESS contain lead and/or cadmium, chemicals listed under Proposition		
4	65 as carcinogens and reproductive toxins, and expose consumers to these chemicals at a level		
5	requiring a Proposition 65 warning. These products (referred to hereinafter individually as a		
6	"Covered Product" or collectively as "Covered Products") are:		
7	Standard Process Standard Bar High-Protein Cocoa Crisp - Lead		
8	Standard Process SP Cleanse - Lead		
9	Standard Process SP Complete Vanilla – Lead, Cadmium		
10	Standard Process Whole Food Fiber - Lead		
11	Standard Process SP Complete Chocolate – Lead, Cadmium		
12	Standard Process SP Complete - Lead		
13	Standard Process SP Complete Dairy Free – Lead, Cadmium		
14	Standard Process Veg-E Complete Pro Chocolate - Lead, Cadmium		
15	Standard Process Veg-E Complete Pro Vanilla - Lead		
16	Standard Process Standard Bar High-Protein Peanut Butter – Lead		
17	Standard Process E-Z Mg Plant-Based Magnesium Supplement		
18	Mixed Berry Flavored - Lead		
19	Standard Process Gastro-Fiber - Lead		
20	Standard Process Prost-X - Lead		
21	Standard Process Calsol - Lead		
22	Standard Process Collinsonia Root - Lead		
23	Standard Process Bio-Dent - Lead		
24	Standard Process Cholacol - Lead		
25	Standard Process Nutrimere - Lead		
26	Standard Process SP Detox Balance Chai Flavored – Lead,		
27	Cadmium		
28	Standard Process Calcifood – Lead		

- 1.2 ERC and STANDARD PROCESS are hereinafter referred to individually as a "Party" or collectively as the "Parties."
- 1.3 ERC is a 501(c)(3) 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 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties agree that STANDARD PROCESS is a business entity that has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant to this action, and qualifies as a "person in the course of doing business" within the meaning of Proposition 65. STANDARD PROCESS manufactures, distributes, and/or sells the Covered Products.
- 1.5 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC's Notices of Violation dated August 13, 2020, September 17, 2020, and October 8, 2020 that were served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and STANDARD PROCESS ("Notices"). True and correct copies of the 60-Day Notices dated August 13, 2020, September 17, 2020, and October 8, 2020 are attached hereto as **Exhibits A, B,** and **C** and each is incorporated herein by reference. More than 60 days have passed since the Notices were served on the Attorney General, public enforcers, and STANDARD PROCESS and no designated governmental entity has filed a Complaint against STANDARD PROCESS with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.
- 1.6 ERC's Notices and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Products by California consumers exposes them to lead and/or cadmium without first receiving clear and reasonable warnings from STANDARD PROCESS in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. STANDARD PROCESS denies all material allegations contained in the Notices and Complaint.
- 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 nor compliance with 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, issue of law, or violation of law.

- 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 current or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.
- 1.9 The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which ERC serves the Notice of Entry of the Consent Judgment.

#### 2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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 and personal jurisdiction over STANDARD PROCESS as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in Alameda County Superior Court, 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 Effective Date that were or could have been asserted in this action based on the facts alleged in the Notices and Complaint.

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

- 3.1 Beginning on the 45<sup>th</sup> dafter after the Effective Date (the "Compliance Date"), STANDARD PROCESS shall be permanently enjoined from manufacturing for sale in the State of California, "Distributing into the State of California" or directly selling in the State of California any Covered Product that exposes a person to a "Daily Lead Exposure Level" of more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day and/or "Daily Cadmium Exposure Level" of more than 4.1 micrograms of cadmium per day unless it meets the warning requirements under Section 3.2.
- 3.1.1 As used in this Consent Judgment, the term "Distributing into the State of California" shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in

Page 4 of 19

California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that STANDARD PROCESS knows will sell the Covered Product in California.

- 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 recommended daily servings appearing on the label), which equals micrograms of lead exposure per day. If the label contains no recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one.
- 3.1.3 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Daily Cadmium Exposure Level" shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula: micrograms of cadmium 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 recommended daily servings appearing on the label), which equals micrograms of cadmium exposure per day. If the label contains no recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one.

#### 3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings

If STANDARD PROCESS is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, one of the following warnings must be utilized ("Warning"):

#### **OPTION 1**

**WARNING:** Consuming this product can expose you to chemicals including lead which are known to the State of California to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to <a href="www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food">www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food</a>.

STANDARD PROCESS shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the Warning if
STANDARD PROCESS has reason to believe that the the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is
greater than 15 micrograms of lead as determined pursuant to the testing methodology set forth in
Section 3.4 or if another Proposition 65 chemical is present which may require a cancer warning.

.0a <u>.</u>

STANDARD PROCESS may replace the term "lead" in the Warning with "cadmium" for those products that are in violation of Proposition 65 for cadmium.

#### **OPTION 2**

STANDARD PROCESS may elect to use the following short-form Warning if the product label has, or is stickered with, a warning:

WARNING: [Cancer and] Reproductive Harm – www.P65Warnings.ca.gov
For Option 2, STANDARD PROCESS shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the Warning
if the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is greater than 15 micrograms of lead as determined pursuant
to the testing methodology set forth in Section 3.4 or if another Proposition 65 chemical is present
at a level requiring a cancer warning.

For Option 2, the entire Warning must be in a type size no smaller than the largest type size used for other consumer information on the product. "Consumer information" includes warnings, directions for use, ingredient lists, and nutritional information. "Consumer information" does not include the brand name, product name, company name, location of manufacture, or product advertising. See Title 27, Cal. Code Regs., § 25600.1(c) (2021). In no case shall the Warning appear in a type size smaller than six (6) point type. In addition for Option 2, a symbol consisting of a black exclamation point in a yellow equilateral triangle with a bold black outline shall be placed to the left of the text of the Warning, in a size no smaller than the height of the word "WARNING." Where the label for the product is not printed using the color yellow, the symbol may be in black and white.

3.2.1 Internet Sales. For any Covered Product sold over the internet, the Warning shall be displayed as follows: (a) on the primary display page for the Covered Product; (b) as a clearly marked hyperlink using the word "WARNING" in all capital and bold letters on the Covered Product's primary display page, so long as the hyperlink goes directly to a page prominently displaying the Warning without content that detracts from the Warning; (c) on the checkout page when a California delivery address is indicated for any purchase of any Covered Product and with an asterisk or other identifying method utilized to identify which products on the checkout page are subject to the Warning; or (d) by otherwise prominently displaying the

Warning to the purchaser prior to completing the purchase. The Warning is not prominently displayed if the purchaser must search for it in the general content of the website.

3.2.2 Warning Prominence. The Warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings also appearing on the website or on the label and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print. STANDARD PROCESS must display the above Warning with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements or designs on the label, or on its website, if applicable, to render the Warning likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use of the product. The Warning may contain supplemental information only to the extent that it identifies the source of the exposure or provides information on how to avoid or reduce exposure to the identified chemical or chemicals. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "label" means a display of written, printed or graphic material that is printed on or affixed to a Covered Product or its immediate container or wrapper.

3.2.3 Alternative Warning Content and Methods. The Parties acknowledge that the Option 1 Warning is the Safe Harbor Warning Language for foods and dietary supplements currently set forth in Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25607.2. In the event that the warning language in section 25607.2 is amended or modified in the future, STANDARD PROCESS may use the Safe Harbor Warning Language in section 25607.2 as amended or modified so long as it remains applicable to the Covered Products.

3.2.3 Stream of Commerce. The requirements of Sections 3.1 and 3.2 do not apply to Covered Products that "enter the stream of commerce" prior to the Compliance Date. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "enter the stream of commerce" means that manufactured Covered Products are put into final packaging for consumer sale and (1) have been Distributed into the State of California or sold in the State of California by STANDARD PROCESS or (2) are no longer in the possession of or under the control of STANDARD PROCESS.

#### 3.3 Conforming Covered Products

A Conforming Covered Product is a Covered Product for which the "Daily Lead Exposure

77,7

Level" is no greater than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day and/or "Daily Cadmium Exposure Level" is no more than 4.1 micrograms of cadmium per day as determined by the exposure methodology set forth in Section 3.1.2 or Section 3.1.3, as applicable, and the testing methodology described in Section 3.4.

#### 3.4 Testing Methodology

PROCESS shall arrange for lead and cadmium testing of the Covered Products at least once a year for a minimum of three (3) consecutive years by arranging for testing of one (1) randomly selected sample of each of the Covered Products, in the form intended for sale to the end-user, which STANDARD PROCESS intends to sell, is manufacturing for sale in California, is directly selling to a consumer in California, or is "Distributing into the State of California." If tests conducted pursuant to this Section 3.4 demonstrate that no Warning is required for a Covered Product during each of three (3) consecutive years, then the testing requirements of this Section will no longer be required as to that Covered Product. However, if during or after the three-year testing period, STANDARD PROCESS changes ingredient suppliers for any of the Covered Products and/or reformulates any of the Covered Products, STANDARD PROCESS shall test that Covered Product annually for at least two (2) consecutive years after such change is made.

- 3.4.2 For purposes of measuring the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" and/or "Daily Cadmium Exposure Level," the lead and/or cadmium testing results of the one (1) randomly selected sample of each of the Covered Products will be controlling.
- 3.4.3 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed using a laboratory method that complies with the performance and quality control factors appropriate for the method used, including limit of detection and limit of quantification, sensitivity, accuracy and precision that meets the following criteria: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry ("ICP-MS") achieving a limit of quantification of less than or equal to 0.010 mg/kg or any other testing method subsequently agreed to in writing by the Parties.
  - 3.4.4 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed by an

independent third party laboratory certified by the California Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program or an independent third-party laboratory that is registered with the United States Food & Drug Administration.

- 3.4.5 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall limit STANDARD PROCESS' ability to conduct, or require that others conduct, additional testing of the Covered Products, including the raw materials used in their manufacture.
- 3.4.6 Within thirty (30) days of ERC's written request, STANDARD PROCESS shall deliver lab reports obtained pursuant to Section 3.4 to ERC. STANDARD PROCESS shall retain all test results and documentation for a period of five years from the date of each test.
- 3.4.7 The testing requirements of this Section 3.4 do not apply to any Covered Product for which STANDARD PROCESS has provided a Warning in compliance with Section 3.2 continuously and uninterrupted after the Compliance Date; however, in the event STANDARD PROCESS ceases to provide the Warning in compliance with Section 3.2, STANDARD PROCESS shall be required to comply with the testing requirements of this Section beginning immediately after the date the Warning ceases to be provided or one year after the Effective Date, whichever date is later, unless STANDARD PROCESS can show to the satisfaction of ERC that the cessation in providing the Warning was a temporary error that was resolved when discovered.

#### 4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1 In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, additional settlement payments, attorney's fees, and costs, STANDARD PROCESS shall make a total payment of \$300,000.00 ("Total Settlement Amount") to ERC within five (5) business days of the Effective Date ("Due Date"). STANDARD PROCESS shall make this payment by wire transfer to ERC's account, for which ERC will give STANDARD PROCESS the necessary account information. The Total Settlement Amount shall be apportioned as follows:
- 4.2 \$128,750.00 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$96,562.50) 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% (\$32,187.50) of the civil penalty.

- 4.3 \$20,669.59 shall be distributed to ERC as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable costs incurred in bringing this action.
- 4.4 \$96,373.33 shall be distributed to ERC as an Additional Settlement Payment ("ASP"), pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 11, 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 and/or cadmium in dietary supplements and/or by providing clear and reasonable warnings to California consumers prior to ingestion of the products.

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: (1) ENFORCEMENT (65-80%): obtaining, shipping, analyzing, and testing dietary supplement products that may contain lead and/or cadmium and are sold to California consumers. This work includes 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 and/or cadmium. This work also includes investigation of new companies that ERC does not obtain any recovery through settlement or judgment; (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 warning or implementing a self-testing program for lead and/or cadmium in dietary supplement products; and (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).

ERC shall be fully accountable in that it will maintain adequate records to document and will be able to demonstrate how the ASP funds will be spent and can assure that the funds are being spent only for the proper, designated purposes described in this Consent Judgment. ERC shall provide the Attorney General, within thirty (30) days of any request, copies of documentation demonstrating how such funds have been spent.

- 4.5 \$24,795.00 shall be distributed to Aqua Terra Aeris Law Group, while\$29,412.08 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.
- Amount owed under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment on or before the Due Date,
  STANDARD PROCESS shall be deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this
  Consent Judgment. ERC shall provide written notice of the delinquency to STANDARD
  PROCESS via electronic mail. If STANDARD PROCESS fails to deliver the Total Settlement
  Amount within five (5) days from the written notice, the Total Settlement Amount shall accrue
  interest at the statutory judgment interest rate provided in the California Code of Civil
  Procedure section 685.010. Additionally, STANDARD PROCESS agrees to pay ERC's
  reasonable attorney's fees and costs for any efforts to collect the payment due under this
  Consent Judgment.

#### 5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only as to injunctive terms (i) by

written stipulation of the Parties and upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment or (ii) by motion of either Party pursuant to Section 5.3 and upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment.

- 5.2 If STANDARD PROCESS seeks to modify this Consent Judgment under Section 5.1, then STANDARD PROCESS must provide written notice to ERC of its intent ("Notice of Intent"). If ERC seeks to meet and confer regarding the proposed modification in the Notice of Intent, then ERC must provide written notice to STANDARD PROCESS within thirty (30) days of receiving the Notice of Intent. If ERC notifies STANDARD PROCESS in a timely manner of ERC's intent to meet and confer, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith as required in this Section. The Parties shall meet in person or via telephone within thirty (30) days of ERC's notification of its intent to meet and confer. Within thirty (30) days of such meeting, if ERC disputes the proposed modification, ERC shall provide to STANDARD PROCESS a written basis for its position. The Parties shall continue to meet and confer for an additional thirty (30) days in an effort to resolve any remaining disputes. Should it become necessary, the Parties may agree in writing to different deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.
- 5.3 In the event that STANDARD PROCESS initiates or otherwise requests a modification under Section 5.1, and the meet and confer process leads to a joint motion or application for a modification of the Consent Judgment, STANDARD PROCESS shall reimburse ERC its costs and reasonable attorney's fees for the time spent in the meet-and-confer process and filing and arguing the motion or application.

### 6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 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 fails to qualify as a Conforming

  Covered Product (for which ERC alleges that no Warning has been provided), then ERC shall inform STANDARD PROCESS in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including

information sufficient to permit STANDARD PROCESS to identify the Covered Products at issue. STANDARD PROCESS shall, within thirty (30) days following such notice, provide ERC with testing information, from an independent third-party laboratory meeting the requirements of Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4, demonstrating STANDARD PROCESS' compliance with the Consent Judgment. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior to ERC taking any further legal action.

### 7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

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 any Covered Product that is distributed or sold exclusively outside the State of California and that is not used by California consumers.

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

- This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and STANDARD PROCESS and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of STANDARD PROCESS), 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, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, 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 and/or cadmium up to and including the Compliance Date.
  - 8.2 ERC on its own behalf only, and STANDARD PROCESS 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 Notices and Complaint up through and including the Effective 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.

8.3 It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties and that one Party may have against the other, arising out of the facts alleged in the Notices and Complaint or relating to the Covered Products, not including claims or actions relating to enforcement of this Consent Judgment, will develop or be discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, and STANDARD PROCESS 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 STANDARD PROCESS 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 THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

ERC on behalf of itself only, and STANDARD PROCESS 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 of the Released Parties regarding alleged exposures to lead and/or cadmium in the Covered Products as set forth in the Notices 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

1 STANDARD PROCESS' products other than the Covered Products. 2 9. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS 3 In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be 4 unenforceable, the validity of the remaining enforceable provisions shall not be adversely 5 affected. 10. GOVERNING LAW 6 7 The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by and construed in 8 accordance with the laws of the State of California. In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed or 9 is otherwise rendered completely inapplicable by the California Office of Environmental Health 10 Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the California Supreme Court, or the United States Supreme 11 Court as to the Covered Products and lead and/or cadmium exposures, then STANDARD 12 PROCESS may provide written notice to ERC of any such change in the law and shall have no further injunctive obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to the unjunctive 13 14 terms, but only to the extent that the Covered Products are so affected by such change in the law. 15 11. PROVISION OF NOTICE 16 All notices required to be given to either Party to this Consent Judgment by the other shall be in writing and sent to the following agents listed below via first class mail or via electronic 17 18 mail where required. FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.: 19 20 Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director, Environmental Research Center 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400 21 San Diego, CA 92108 Ph: (619) 500-3090 22 Email: chris.heptinstall@erc501c3.org 23 September 1 24 With a copy to: MATTHEW C. MACLEAR

27

25

28

Oakland, CA 94609 Telephone: (415) 568-5200

ANTHONY M. BARNES

Email: mcm@atalawgroup.com

AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP 4030 Martin Luther King Jr. Way

Page 15 of 19

#### 1 FOR STANDARD PROCESS INC.: Charlie DuBois, President & CEO 2 Standard Process, Inc. 1200 W. Royal Lee Dr. 3 Palmyra, WI 53156 Email: cdubois@standardprocess.com 5 With a copy to: **PEG CAREW TOLEDO** ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 471-3110 Email: peg.toledo@arnoldporter.com 9 10 **COURT APPROVAL** 12. 11 12 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 13 14 Consent Judgment. 12.2 If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment, 15 16 the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible 17 prior to the hearing on the motion. If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be void and have 18 12.3 19 no force or effect. 13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS 20 21 This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be 22 deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed to be as valid 23 as the original signature. 24 14. DRAFTING 25 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 26 and conditions with legal counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and 27 construction of this Consent Judgment, no inference, assumption, or presumption shall be drawn,

Page 16 of 19
STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

Case No. RG21086370

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

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

ERC may, by motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of 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 and Proposition 65.

#### 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, including any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, and understandings related thereto. 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

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

1	regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to make the findings pursuant to			
2				
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED:			
4		· .		
5 6	Dated:, 2021	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.		
7		By:		
8		Christian Executive Director		
9	Dated:, 2021	STANDARD PROCESS INC.		
1.0	Million of all the contract of			
11		Charlie DuBois, President & CEO		
12				
13				
. 14	APPROVED AS TO FORM:			
15	June 1 Dated: . 2021	AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP		
16	Dated, 2021	AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP		
17		By:		
18		Anthony M. Barnes		
19		Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.		
20	Dated: , 2021	ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER		
21		LLP		
22		D		
23		By:		
24		Attorney for Defendant Standard Process Inc.		
25	·			
26	·	•		
27				
28				
	Page 18 of 19 STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT Case No. RG21086370			

		•		
1	regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to make the findings pursuant to			
2	California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), and approve this Consent Judgment.			
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED:			
4				
5	Dated:			
6	CENTER, INC			
7	By:			
8	Christian Faccutive Director			
_9_	Dated: 6/3 2021 STANDARD PROCESS INC.			
10	last Start			
11	Charlie DuBois, President & CEO	·		
12				
13		; ,		
14				
15	APPROVED AS TO FORM:			
16	Dated:, 2021 AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP			
17	By: Matthew C. Maclear			
18	Anthony M. Barnes			
19	Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.			
20				
21	Dated: 10/3, 2021 ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP			
22	PIT,	1		
23	By: Reg Carew Tolledo	1		
24	Attorney for Defendant Standard Process			
25	inc.			
26				
27				
28				
	Page 18 of 19			
	STIPLE A TED CONSENT LUDGMENT Case No. RG21096370			

### 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.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_\_, 202

Judge of the Superior Court

23.

Page 19 of 19

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

Case No. RG21086370

### Superior Court of California, County of Alameda Department 15, Administration Building

Case Number: RG21086370

Case Name: Environment Research Center vs. Standar Process, Inc.

RE: STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

#### **DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY MAIL**

I certify that I am not a party to this cause and that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was mailed first class, postage prepaid, in a sealed envelope, addressed as shown at the bottom of this document, and that the mailing of the foregoing and execution of this certificate occurred at 1221 Oak Street, Oakland, California.

Executed on August 25, 2021

Executive Officer/Clerk of the Superior Court

By <u>Belinda Mercado</u> Deputy Clerk

Aqua Terra Aeris Law Group Matthew C. Maclear Anthony M. Barnes 4030 Martin Luther King Jr. Way Oakland, CA. 94609	·
	Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP Peg Carew Toledo Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor San Francisco, CA. 94111