Consent Judgment in this case between AESI and the Procter & Gamble defendants ("the prior

27

Consent Judgment"). The Attorney General appealed the prior Consent Judgment. On November 16, 2006, the Court of Appeal affirmed entry of the prior Consent Judgment.

- 1.2 Corporate Acquisition. On October 1, 2005, Procter & Gamble acquired The Gillette Company and its assets, including the Oral B® Brand of toothpaste products and Rembrandt, and Zooth.
- 1.3 Modification of the Prior Consent Judgment Permitted. Pursuant to section 9.1 of the prior Revised Consent Judgment, the prior Revised Consent Judgment may be modified. This Amended Revised Consent Judgment makes such modifications, and thereby supersedes and renders void the prior Revised Consent Judgment.
- **2.** <u>Definitions.</u> As used in this Amended Revised Consent Judgment, the following definitions shall apply:
- 2.1. "Toothpaste Products" includes any toothpaste products previously (i.e., at any time up to or prior to the entry of this consent judgment) sold in California by a Settling Defendant, whether or not such products continue to be sold, as well as all toothpaste products sold by a Settling Defendant in or into California in the future (i.e., at any time after entry of this consent judgment) and includes, without limitation, Rembrandt brand toothpaste.
- 2.2. "<u>Lead</u>" means the chemical element lead (Pb) and lead compounds as defined in section 12000 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.
- **2.3.** "<u>Hydrated Silica</u>" is the naturally-occurring mined material used as a gentle abrasive in the Toothpaste Products.
  - 2.4. "ppm" means parts per million.
- 2.5. "Party" shall mean individually AESI, The Procter & Gamble Distributing Company, The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Company, The Gillette Company, and Zooth, Inc., and when used in the plural shall mean all of them.
- 3. Background.
- 3.1. AESI is a non-profit California corporation dedicated to investigating environmental and public health hazards affecting children and adults in their regular daily lives.

 AESI is based in Palo Alto, California, and was incorporated under the laws of the State of California in 1998. AESI is a "person" within the meaning of Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(a), and brought this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

- 3.2. AESI served a 60-day "Notice of Violation" (the "Notice") on Settling Defendants. AESI served the Notice on June 2, 2005, pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d) and section 12903 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.
- 3.3. The Notice alleged, among other things, that Settling Defendants were in violation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code sections 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65") for failing to warn purchasers of Toothpaste Products sold in California that the products allegedly expose users to Lead.
- 3.4. For purposes of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of the violations contained in the Notice, that venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Amended Revised Consent Judgment. No public prosecutor has commenced an action regarding the matters raised in the Notice.
- 3.5. Settling Defendants deny that any Toothpaste Products have been or are in violation of Proposition 65 or any other law, and further contend that all of their Toothpaste Products have been and are safe for use as directed. Settling Defendants, however, wish to resolve this matter without further litigation or cost.
- 3.6. The Parties enter into this Amended Revised Consent Judgment to settle claims alleged in the Notice and AESI's complaint (the "Complaint") in this action against the Settling Defendants, to avoid prolonged and costly litigation, and to promote the public interest. By executing and complying with this Amended Revised Consent Judgment, no party admits any facts or conclusions of law including, but not limited to, any facts or conclusions of law regarding any violations of Proposition 65, or any other statutory, common law or equitable claim or requirement relating to or arising from the Toothpaste Products. This Amended Revised Consent

Judgment shall not be construed as an admission by Settling Defendants as to any of the allegations in the Notice and/or the Complaint.

### 4. <u>Injunctive Relief.</u>

#### 4.1. Actions as to Hydrated Silica.

- (a) Within 60 days of the of the entry of this Amended Revised Consent

  Judgment by the Court, Settling Defendants shall establish and thereafter maintain a Lead (Pb)

  specification of 4.5 parts per million ("ppm") for any Hydrated Silica to be used in Settling

  Defendants' Toothpaste Products that is obtained by a Settling Defendant 60 days after its Lead
  specification is established.
- (b) The 4.5 ppm Lead standard shall be demonstrated by the Defendant's hydrated silica supplier using the following testing protocol:
  - (1) once every six months, the hydrated silica supplier shall select five (5) randomly chosen grab samples from a lot of hydrated silica that is ready for shipment to the Defendant, and the supplier shall test a composite of the 5 grab samples;
  - (2) using a sample preparation method that permits recovery of at least that amount of Lead in the sample that is bioavailable to humans, test the prepared sample using Inductively Coupled Plasma/Mass Spectrometry ("ICP/MS") or Inductively Coupled Plasma/Optical Emission Spectrometry ("ICP/OES") laboratory equipment and protocols for Lead detection to demonstrate compliance with the 4.5 ppm specification for Lead in hydrated silica for use in toothpaste;
  - (3) failure of this testing protocol shall require rejection by the supplier of the test lot, with written notice of that rejection provided to the Defendant customer, and a re-review by the supplier of its methods then in use to meet the 4.5 ppm Lead specification; and
  - (4) the test protocol set forth above must then be conducted on the next three lots of hydrated silica in succession; if any of these three additional lots fails

this test protocol, then the next five lots must be tested, until all lots in a test group of five demonstrate compliance with the 4.5 ppm Lead specification.

- (c) Because Hydrated Silica is a mined substance, Settling Defendants cannot ensure that Hydrated Silica with a Lead specification of 4.5 ppm will be commercially feasible at all times. If Hydrated Silica with a Lead specification of 4.5 ppm becomes commercially unfeasible, Settling Defendants will make every reasonable effort to use Hydrated Silica with the lowest level of Lead feasible from the Hydrated Silica suppliers able to meet Settling Defendants' quality and volume requirements. Any Party choosing to use Hydrated Silica that does not meet the Lead specification of 4.5 ppm shall provide prompt notice to AESI of that election.
- 4.2. <u>Feasibility</u>. The term "feasible" as used in this Amended Revised Consent Judgment means "reasonable" considering: (1) the availability and reliability of a supply to Settling Defendants of Hydrated Silica meeting a Lead specification not to exceed 4.5 ppm; (2) the cost to Settling Defendants of using such Hydrated Silica; (3) the performance characteristics, including, but not limited to, formulation compatibility, performance, safety, taste, efficacy and stability, of an ingredient in any Toothpaste Product or the Toothpaste Products as a whole; (4) the lawfulness of the alternative (for example, no such alternative can be allowed to render any Settling Defendants' Toothpaste Products unlawful under state or federal law); and (5) other reasonable considerations. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Amended Revised Consent Judgment, Settling Defendants shall be required to fulfill only those obligations respecting Lead in their Toothpaste Products that are feasible as described in this paragraph.
- 4.3. Naturally Occurring Lead. Any Lead remaining in Settling Defendants'

  Toothpaste Products after Settling Defendants have undertaken those actions required by

  Paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2, above, is deemed "naturally occurring" within the meaning of section

  12501 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.
- **4.4.** Confirmation of Compliance. AESI, at its sole expense, shall have the right for three (3) years after the date of the entry of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment to request

samples of the Hydrated Silica manufactured to the specification level of 4.5 ppm and perform independent testing of the material.

- **4.5.** <u>Injunctive Relief Applies Only in California</u>. All of the foregoing injunctive relief shall apply only to Toothpaste Products sold for use within California.
- 4.6. <u>Full and Complete Compliance</u>. Compliance by a Settling Defendant with the terms of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment shall be deemed to constitute its full and complete compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to the provision of warnings for chemicals contained in or otherwise associated with its Toothpaste Products.

#### 5. Settlement Payments.

- 5.1. In keeping with the concept of, but in lieu of, statutory penalties and/or restitution, under the statutes set forth in the Complaint, Settling Defendants shall collectively pay to the Trust Account of the Carrick Law Group, P.C., in immediately available funds \$95,000.00 (the "Settlement Proceeds") within five (5) days from the entry of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment. Carrick Law Group P.C. shall disburse these funds to AESI (a) to pay its attorneys' fees of \$45,600.00 pursuant to those parties' written contingent fee agreement; and (b) to further the remedial purposes established under Proposition 65 by providing funds for AESI's ongoing costs of monitoring compliance with this Amended Revised Consent Judgment, as well as for its future investigational and enforcement activities regarding toxic chemicals and Proposition 65, in a manner that is consistent with the private enforcement mechanism and funds allocation scheme established by Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.7(d) and 25249.12(d) and AESI's non-profit mission.
- 5.2. Attorney's Fees and Costs. Apart from the payments to be made pursuant to paragraph 5.1 above, each party shall bear its own attorneys' fees and costs.

## 6. Termination of All Claims; Claims Covered and Released.

6.1. This Amended Revised Consent Judgment includes the resolution of all claims asserted in the Notice and the Complaint, as well as all potential claims that were considered or could have been brought by AESI on behalf of the public interest and the general public

regarding Lead in any Settling Defendants' Toothpaste Products. This Amended Revised Consent Judgment is a final and binding resolution between AESI, on behalf of the public interest and the general public, and Settling Defendants, of any and all alleged violations of Proposition 65 and any other statutory or common law claims that were or could have been asserted by AESI against Settling Defendants or purchasers or sellers of Settling Defendants' Toothpaste Products arising from or related to Lead in Settling Defendants' Toothpaste Products up through the date of entry of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment, including, but not limited to, any claims for attorneys' fees and costs. AESI hereby releases Settling Defendants, their affiliated companies, officers, directors and employees and their suppliers, distributors, wholesales, and retailers from and against the claims described in this paragraph relating to Settling Defendants' Toothpaste Products; however, AESI expressly does not release any claims which AESI does not have the authority to release, including specifically and without limitation any personal injury claims (or claims directly related to personal injuries).

- 7. <u>Covenant Not To Sue.</u> AESI and Settling Defendants agree that with regard to those matters that AESI has herein released and that are described above, neither AESI nor Settling Defendants will ever institute a lawsuit or administrative proceedings against any other Party, nor shall any Party assert any claim of any nature against any person or entity hereby released, with regard to any such matters which have been released.
- 8. Application of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment. Paragraphs 6 and 7 of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment shall apply to, be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the Parties, their divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, affiliates, merged entities, acquired entities, successors, predecessors and assigns, and the directors, officers, employees, counsel, and agents of each of them, as applicable, and will inure to the benefit of the Parties' parent companies, and all of their suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers and contract manufacturers, and all of their respective directors, officers, employees, counsel, and agents.

### 9. Modification of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment.

- 9.1. This Amended Revised Consent Judgment may be modified or terminated upon written agreement of Settling Defendants and AESI, with approval of the Court, or upon noticed motion for good cause shown. The grounds for modification of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment include, but are not limited to, the infeasibility of obtaining or using Hydrated Silica with a lead specification of 4.5 ppm in Settling Defendants' Toothpaste Products as outlined in Paragraphs 4.1(b) and 4.2; provided that, in such case of infeasibility, Settling Defendants are permitted, but not required, to seek modification of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment. Any party seeking to modify this Amended Revised Consent Judgment must first give notice to each other Party in writing of any proposed modification of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment with the basis for the proposed modification. The Parties shall meet and confer in good faith and attempt to reach agreement on proposed modification of the Amended Revised Consent Judgment. If a resolution is not reached within forty-five (45) days of the notice, the Party seeking modification may move the Court to modify this Amended Revised Consent Judgment.
- 9.2. The Parties agree that if AESI enters into a settlement agreement with another toothpaste manufacturer or distributor in the future that imposes injunctive relief that is less burdensome from the provisions contained in this Amended Revised Consent Judgment and the settlement agreement is entered as a Amended Revised Consent Judgment, Settling Defendants have the right to seek modification of the Amended Revised Consent Judgment pursuant to Paragraph 8.1 to allow Settling Defendants to modify this Amended Revised Consent Judgment to provide for the same injunctive relief imposed on the other toothpaste manufacturer or distributor.
- 10. <u>Publicity</u>. If any Party wants to make any public announcements to the press or otherwise about this Amended Revised Consent Judgment, that Party shall notify the other Parties reasonably in advance of any such announcement. Each Party shall have a right to review any proposed written public announcement by any other Party a reasonable amount of time in

advance of such announcement being made public, but thereafter no Party may veto or stop any such announcement by any other.

- 11. <u>Governing Law</u>. This Amended Revised Consent Judgment shall be governed by, and construed in accordance with, the laws of the State of California, without regard to conflict of laws principles.
- 12. Entire Agreement. The Parties declare and represent that no promise, inducement or other agreement has been made conferring any benefit upon any party except those contained herein and that this Amended Revised Consent Judgment contains the entire agreement pertaining to the subject matter hereof. This Amended Revised Consent Judgment supersedes any prior or contemporaneous negotiations, representations, agreements and understandings of the Parties with respect to such matters, whether written or oral. Parol evidence shall be inadmissible to show agreement by, between, or among the Parties to any term or condition contrary to or in addition to the terms and conditions contained in this Amended Revised Consent Judgment. The Parties acknowledge that each has not relied on any promise, representation or warranty, expressed or implied, not contained in this Amended Revised Consent Judgment.
- Challenges. Subject to their rights to apply for a modification of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment for good cause shown under Paragraph 8 hereof, the Parties agree that they, individually or collectively, will not seek to challenge or to have determined invalid, void or unenforceable any provision of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment or this Amended Revised Consent Judgment itself. The Parties understand that this Amended Revised Consent Judgment contains the relinquishment of legal rights and each Party has, as each has deemed appropriate, sought the advice of legal counsel, which each of the Parties has encouraged the other to seek. Further, no Party has reposed trust or confidence in any other Party so as to create a fiduciary, agency, or confidential relationship.
- 14. <u>Construction</u>. This Amended Revised Consent Judgment has been jointly negotiated and drafted. The language of this Amended Revised Consent Judgment shall be construed as a whole according to its fair meaning and not strictly for or against any Party.

E-mail: nhile@orrick.com

27

24

25

26

27

28

DATED:

npliance with Reporting Requirements. AESI sha	ll comply with the reporting form
ts referred to in Health and Safety Code section 2524	19.7(f) and established in Title 11
Fornia Code of Regulations sections 3000-3008. Cop	ies of all such reports shall be
Settling Defendants as provided in Paragraph 18.2.	
-Interference in Settlement Approval Process. Th	ne Parties will cooperate, as well
respective best efforts, to secure the Attorney Gener	al's approval of this Amended
nsent Judgment, and not to seek his disapproval of a	ny portion of this Amended
nsent Judgment.	
,	CONMENTAL SAFETY  Orofit California corporation  MACONICATION

[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO PROCTER & GAMBLE, THE GILLETTE COMPANY & ZOOTH, INC.

1. In light of the findings below, and based upon the Court's review of the proposed Amended Revised Consent Judgment executed by the Plaintiff and The Procter & Gamble Distributing Company, The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Company, the Gillette Company, and Zooth, Inc. (together and collectively "Settling Defendants"), and the papers filed in support of this Motion to Enter the proposed Amended Revised Consent Judgment, and in a manner consistent with Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6, the Court finds that this settlement agreement is just, and serves and will serve the public interest, as follows:

THE COURT HEREBY FINDS AND ORDERS:

- 2. Because no warnings are required by the foregoing stipulated Amended Revised Consent Judgment, this Court does not have to make any finding regarding compliance with warnings under the provisions of Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.5-25249.13.
- 3. The Parties' agreement that no civil penalties are warranted is in accord with the criteria set forth in Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.7(b)(2) and 25249.7(f)(4)(C), in that payments as set forth in section 5 of the Amended Revised Consent Judgment totaling \$95,000.00, in lieu of such penalties, to Plaintiff (a) to pay its attorneys' fees of \$45,600.00, and (b) to further the remedial purposes established under Proposition 65 by providing funds for Plaintiff's ongoing costs of monitoring compliance with this Amended Revised Consent Judgment, as well as for its future investigational and enforcement activities regarding toxic chemicals and Proposition 65, are consistent with the private enforcement mechanism and funds allocation scheme established by Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.7(d) and 25249.12(d) and AESI's non-profit mission.
- 4. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(f)(4)(B) and Code of Civil Procedure §1033.5, the Court finds that the Amended Revised Consent Judgment's contractual provision at section 5 for the Plaintiff to pay, pursuant to its written contingent fee agreement, to Carrick Law Group, P.C., attorneys' fees of \$45,600.00 from the financial relief set forth in section 4 of the Amended Revised Consent Judgment, as well as the amount of these fees and costs, are reasonable under California law.

- 1	
1	5. In light of the findings made above, and based upon the Court's review of the
2	proposed stipulated Amended Revised Consent Judgment executed among the Parties, the Court
3	finds that this Amended Revised Consent Judgment is just, and serves and will serve the public
4	interest.
5	
6	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED.
7	
8	DATED:
9	
10	
11	HON. MARY THORNTON HOUSE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	14