1	WILLIAM VERICK (SBN 140972)				
2	KLAMATH ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CEI FREDERIC EVENSON (SBN 198059)	NTER			
3	Law Office of Fredric Evenson				
4	424 First Street Eureka, CA 95501				
5	Telephone: (707) 268-8900 Facsimile: (707) 268-8901				
6	wverick@igc.org				
7	ecorights@earthlink.net				
8	DAVID H. WILLIAMS (SBN 144479) BRIAN ACREE (SBN 202505)				
	370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5 Oakland, CA 94610				
9	Telephone: (510) 271-0826 Facsimile: (510) 271-0829				
10	davidwilliams@earthlink.net brianacree@earthlink.net				
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff Mateel Environmental				
12	Justice Foundation				
13	STIDEBTOR COLIDA OF	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
14	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
15	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO				
16	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	Case No. No. CGC-07-461732			
17	FOUNDATION,				
18	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO DEFENDANT STAUB S.A.			
19	VS.				
20	STAUB, S.A.; WILLIAMS-SONOMA, INC.; TARGET CORPORATION,				
21	Defendants.				
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
		-1			
	CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED]	CGC-07-461732			

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 On March 27, 2007, the MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE
FOUNDATION ("Plaintiff" or "MEJF") acting on behalf of itself and the general public, filed a
Complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief ("Complaint") in San Francisco Superior Court,
Case No. CGC-07-461732, against defendant STAUB S.A. ("Defendant"). The Complaint
alleges, among other things, that Defendant violated provisions of the Safe Drinking Water and
Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5, et seq. (Proposition
65) by failing to give clear and reasonable warnings to those residents of California who handle
and use cookware with brass handles that contain lead that handling and use of these products
causes those residents to be exposed to lead and/or lead compounds. The Complaint was based
upon a 60-Day Notice letter, dated July 27, 2006, sent by MEJF to Defendant, the California
Attorney General, all District Attorneys, and all City Attorneys with populations exceeding
750,000 ("Notice Letter").

1.2 Defendant is a business that employs more than ten persons, and manufactures, markets or sells cookware with brass handles that allegedly contain lead and/or lead compounds. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.8, lead and lead compounds are known to the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity. Plaintiff MEJF alleges that cookware with lead-containing brass handles that is marketed or sold by Defendant for use in California requires a warning under Proposition 65, pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6. Defendant denies that a warning is required. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of San Francisco, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaint and of all claims which were or could have been raised by any person or entity based in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, on the facts alleged therein or arising there from or related to.

- 1.3 This Consent Judgment resolves claims that are denied and disputed. The parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full and final settlement of any and all claims between the parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. This Consent Judgment shall not constitute an admission with respect to any material allegation of the Complaint, each and every allegation of which Defendant denies, nor may this Consent Judgment or compliance with it be used as evidence of any wrongdoing, misconduct, culpability or liability on the part of Defendant.
- 1.4. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term "Covered Products" means cookware with brass handles manufactured, marketed or offered for sale by Defendant.
 - 1.5 The term "Effective Date" means 90 days after entry of this Consent Judgment.

2. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 2.1 Defendant shall pay \$20,000 to the Klamath Environmental Law Center ("KELC") to cover Plaintiff's attorneys' fees. Additionally, Defendant shall pay \$5,000 to the Ecological Rights Foundation, and \$5,000 to Californians for Alternatives to Toxics, for use toward reducing exposures to toxic chemicals and other pollutants, and toward increasing consumer, worker and community awareness of health hazards posed by lead and other toxic chemicals. The parties agree and acknowledge that the charitable contributions made pursuant to this section shall not be construed as a credit against the personal claims of absent third parties for restitution against Defendant. The above described payments shall be forwarded by Defendant so that they are received at least 5 days prior to the hearing date scheduled for approval of this Consent Judgment. If the Consent Judgment is not approved with 120 days of the date scheduled for approval, the above described payments shall be returned and the provisions of this Consent judgment shall become null and void.
- 2.2 Defendant shall not be required to pay a civil penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(b).

3. ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

3.1 The parties hereby request that the Court promptly enter this Consent Judgment.

Upon entry of the Consent Judgment, Defendant and MEJF waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations of the Complaint.

28

1

4.1 This Consent Judgment is a final and binding resolution, as to Covered Products, between MEJF, acting on behalf of itself and (as to those matters raised in the Notice Letter) the general public, and Defendant of: (i) any violation of Proposition 65 (including but not limited to the claims made in the Complaint); and (ii) any other statutory or common law claim to the fullest extent that any of the foregoing described in (i) or (ii) were or could have been asserted by any person or entity against Defendant or its parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, and all of their suppliers, customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, or any other person in the course of doing business, and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, distribute or sell Covered Products ("Released Entities"), based on its or their exposure of persons to lead or lead compounds from Covered Products or their failure to provide a clear and reasonable warning of exposure to such individuals; and (iii) as to alleged exposures to lead or lead compounds from Covered Products, any other claim based in whole or in part on the facts alleged in the Complaint, whether based on actions committed by the Released Entities or others. As to alleged exposures to lead or lead compounds from Covered Products, compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any issue, now and in the future, concerning compliance by Defendant and the Released Entities, with the requirements of Proposition 65 with respect to Covered Products, and any alleged resulting exposure. Notwithstanding any other provision in Section 4, no releases on behalf of the general public shall be construed to extend to claims concerning chemicals listed under Proposition 65 other than lead and/or lead compounds or to claims not arising out of allegations in the Notice Letter.

4.2 As to alleged exposures to lead or lead compounds from Covered Products,
MEJF, by and on behalf of itself and its respective agents, successors and assigns, waives any and
all rights to institute any form of legal action, and releases all claims against Defendant and the
Released Entities, and all of their respective parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, and all of their
suppliers, customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, or any other person in the course of doing
business, and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, distribute or sell the
Covered Products, whether, under Proposition 65 or otherwise, arising out of or resulting from, or

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM, MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS SETTLEMENT WITH THE

DEBTOR.

4.3 MEJF understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver of California Civil Code section 1542 is that even if MEJF suffers future damages arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Covered Products, including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with respect to exposure to, lead or lead compounds from Covered Products, MEJF will not be able to make any claim for those damages against Defendant or the Released Entities; provided however, Plaintiff cannot and expressly does not release any claims for personal injury that could be brought by any other individual or organization. Furthermore, MEJF acknowledges that it intends these consequences for any such Claims as may exist as of the date of this release but which MEJF does not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect their decision to enter into this Consent Judgment, regardless of whether their lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause. Notwithstanding the above, Williams-Sonoma shall not be deemed a Released Entity, nor shall it benefit from the releases of liability granted in Sections 4.1 through 4.3.

27 | ///

28 | ///

5. ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT

5.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the parties hereto. The parties may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of San Francisco County, giving the notice required by law, enforce the terms and conditions contained herein.

6. MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT

- 6.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only upon written agreement of the parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of any party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.
- 6.2 If, with respect to brass containing lead, the Attorney General of the State of California or Plaintiff permit any other reformulation standard by way of settlement or compromise with any other person in the course of doing business, or any other entity, or if another reformulation standard for brass is incorporated by way of final judgment as to any other person in the course of doing business, or any other entity, then Defendant is entitled to seek a modification to this Consent Judgment on the same terms as provided in those settlements, compromises or judgments.

7. REFORMULATION STANDARD

- 7.1 On and after the Effective Date, the brass alloys used in manufacturing all Covered Products sold by Defendant for resale or use in California shall meet the following criteria:
- 7.2 (a) The brass used to manufacture the Covered Products shall have no lead as an intentionally added constituent and; (b) A representative sample of the brass alloys used to manufacture the Covered Products shall have been tested for lead, and must have shown lead content by weight of less than 0.03% (300 parts per million "300 ppm"), using a test method of sufficient sensitivity to establish a limit of quantification (as distinguished from detection) of less than 300 ppm.
- 7.3 In the event that MEJF settles another actual or potential claim concerning the alleged failure of a business to provide adequate Proposition 65 warnings concerning its manufacture, distribution or sale of Covered Products in California, and agrees to a standard for

reformulation that allows for lead content by weight of greater than 300 ppm in the brass alloys, Defendant's compliance with the less stringent standard will be deemed to meet the requirements of this Section 7.

8. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

8.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce the terms this Consent Judgment.

9. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE

9.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment and to execute it on behalf of the party represented and legally to bind that party.

10. DUTIES LIMITED TO CALIFORNIA

10.1 This Consent Judgment shall have no effect on Covered Products sold by Defendant outside the State of California.

11. SERVICE ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

11.1 KELC shall serve a copy of this Consent Judgment, signed by all parties, on the California Attorney General on behalf of the parties so that the Attorney General may review this Consent Judgment prior to its submittal to the Court for approval. No sooner than forty five (45) days after the Attorney General has received the aforementioned copy of this Consent Judgment, and in the absence of any written objection by the Attorney General to the terms of this Consent Judgment, the parties may then submit it to the Court for approval.

12. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

12.1 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 and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any party hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the parties.

1	13.	GOV	ERNING LAW			
2		13.1	The validity, construction	and performance of this Consent Judgme	ent shall be	
3	gover	ned by	ne laws of the State of California, without reference to any conflicts of law			
4	provis	provisions of California law.				
5	14.	EXE	CUTION AND COUNTER	CUTION AND COUNTERPARTS		
6		14.1	This Consent Judgment m	aybe executed in counterparts and by mea	ans of	
7	facsin	nile, wh	ich taken together shall be	leemed to constitute one document.		
8	15.	15. COURT APPROVAL				
9		15.1	If this Consent Judgment,	in its entirety, is not approved by the Cou	ert, it shall be	
0	of no force or effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.					
1	16.	NOT	ICES			
2		16.1	Any notices under this Co	onsent Judgment shall be by personal deliv	ery of First	
.3	Class	Mail.				
4			If to MEJF:	William Verick, Esq. Klamath Environmental Law Center		
5				424 First Street		
6				Eureka, CA 95501		
7			If to Staub S.A.:	Catherine Bourdais Administration & Accounting Manag	<i>s</i> er	
8				Staub USA	,01	
9				115 Pine Street, Suite 350 Long Beach, CA 90802		
0			With copy to:	James R. Arnold		
1			••	THE ARNOLD LAW PRACTICE 225 Bush Street, 16th Floor		
2				San Francisco, CA 94101		
3						
4						
5						
6						
7	///					
8	///					
	-			- 8 -	CGC-07-461732	

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED:
2	
3	Dated: MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE
4	FOUNDATION
5	By: Dry Claim Viciel
6	WILLIAM VERICK
7	Dated: 1008 STAUB S.A.
8	
9	By: Huguette GERARI
10	Its: Huguette GERHIEIS General Nammer
11	STAUS TROUP
12	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:
13	
14	DATED:
15	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
16	·
17	
18	·
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	-
26	
27 28	·
46	
	CONSENT JUDGMENT [PROPOSED] CGC-07-461732

ı .