1	WILLIAM VERICK, SBN 140972			
2	WILLIAM VERICK, SBN 140972 KLAMATH ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER FREDRIC EVENSON, SBN 198059 LAW OFFICE OF FREDRIC EVENSON 424 First Street Eureka, California 95501 Telephone: (707) 268-8900 Fax: (707) 268-8901 E-mail: wverick@igc.org			
3				
4				
5				
6				
7	DAVID WILLIAMS, SBN 144479 BRIAN ACREE, SBN 202505			
8	370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5 Oakland, CA 94610			
9	Telephone: (510) 271-0826 Fax: (510) 271-0829 E-mail: dhwill7@gmail.com			
10	E-man. unwin/@gman.com			
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff, MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE FOUNDATION			
12				
13	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
14	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO			
15	(Unlimited Jurisdiction)			
16				
17	MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE Case No. 470688 FOUNDATION,			
18	PLAINTIFF,			
19	V. [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT			
20	ASCASO FACTORY, SL			
21	DEFENDANT.			
22 23	/			
23	1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>			
25	1.1 On or about June 27, 2007, plaintiff MATEEL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE			
26	FOUNDATION ("Mateel"), provided a 60-day notice of violation ("Notice") to the California			
27	Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of			
28	CONSENT JUDGMENT			
	Mateel v. Ascaso Case No 470688			

every California city with a population greater than 750,000, and Ascaso Factory, SL ("Ascaso"
 or "Defendant"), alleging that Defendant, through sales in California of espresso machines
 ("Covered Products"), was violating Health & Safety Code section 25249.6.

1.2 On or about January 3, 2008, Plaintiff Mateel, acting in the public interest
pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d), filed a Complaint for Civil Penalties and
Injunctive Relief in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No. 470688 ("Complaint") against
Defendant based on the allegations contained in the Notice.

8 1.3 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the parties stipulate that this Court has
9 jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal
10 jurisdiction over Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the
11 County of San Francisco, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a
12 full and final settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaint and of all
13 claims which were or could have been raised based on the facts alleged therein or arising
14 therefrom.

1.4 Mateel and Defendant enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full and
final settlement of disputed claims between the parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged
litigation. This Consent Judgment shall not constitute an admission with respect to any
allegation made in the Notice or 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.

21

2.

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF-REFORMULATION

22

28

2.0 <u>Injunctive Relief</u>

2.1 Within ninety (90) days of the days of the date of entry of this Consent Judgment
("Effective Date"), Defendant may not ship for sale in California any Covered Products unless
Defendant either 1.) provides warnings in the manner specified in paragraph 2.2 below; or 2.) the
Covered Products shipped for sale in California meet the Reformulation Standard set forth in
paragraphs 2.3 through 2.6 below.

2.2 Warnings Defendant may provide a warning affixed to the packaging or labeling 1 2 of each unit of the Covered Product. The warning shall state: WARNING: Consuming beverages that have been prepared in this . 3 espresso machine will expose you to lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects and other reproductive 4 harm. 5 The text of this warning must be in 12 point type or larger. The word "WARNING" must be 6 capitalized and be in **bold**. The warning must either be on the front or top of the packaging of the 7 Covered Product. If after the Effective Date, Defendant ships Covered Products to a retailer or 8 distributor outside of California that neither provide the warnings specified in this paragraph nor 9 meet the Reformulation Standard specified in paragraphs 2.3 through 2.6 below ("Non-10 Conforming Covered Products"), and if the retailer or distributor then offers those Non-11 Conforming Covered Products for sale in California, then as to those Non-Conforming Covered 12 Products, that retailer or distributor, and none of their customers, are released pursuant to 13 Sections 6 and 7 below. 14 2.3. Reformulation Standard After the Effective Date, Defendant may ship models 15 of Covered Products for sale in California that do not bear the warning specified in paragraph 2.2 16 above, provided the model of Covered Product has been tested pursuant to the protocol described 17 in paragraph 2.4 and has been determined not to leach more than five (5) micrograms of lead per 18 liter ("5 μ g/L") into the water used to test the machines. 19 2.4 Defendant shall engage in the following program of testing espresso machines 20 ("Testing Program"), to determine whether warnings are required: 21 a) For all tests of all espresso machines, the Exposure Water to be used shall 22 be de-ionized water. 23 b) For those machines that are intended to be plumbed to an external water 24 source: pressurize the Exposure Water storage vessel to 50 ± 5.0 pounds 25 per square inch ("psi") $(350 \pm 35 \text{ kPa})$ using nitrogen gas. Collect a 125 26 mL control sample from the distribution system. Then connect the 27 28 CONSENT JUDGMENT Mateel v. Ascaso Case No 470688 3

1		beverage unit to the Exposure Water storage vessel using only stainless
2.		steel valves and fittings and polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) tubing.
3	c)	While operating the beverage unit in accordance with manufacturer's
4		instructions, purge the unit with a volume of Exposure Water equal to
5		between 1.0 and 1.5 times the total volumetric capacity of the unit, or the
6		volume of purge water recommended in the operator's instructions for the
7		machine, whichever amount is less. If there are multiple beverage outlets
8		(e.g. dispensing spouts) ensure that approximately equal volumes of
9		Exposure Water are purged from each outlet. Discard the purged water.
10	d)	With the Exposure Water in contact with all surfaces having contact with
11		beverages under normal idle operating conditions, maintain static
12		conditions for 24 ± 1 hour. Operate the equipment (including any heating
13		operations) as intended without dispensing any water. No ingredients or
14		product are to be added during the exposure period.
15	e)	After step "d", and while operating the espresso machine in accordance
16		with the manufacturer's instructions, draw a 250 mL sample of Exposure
17		Water from the dispensing spout or spouts of the machine. If there are
18		multiple beverage outlets (e.g. dispensing spouts) ensure that
19		approximately equal volumes of water are drawn from each outlet.
20		Sample should be dispensed into a clean PTFE or polyethylene container
21		with an air-tight lid containing HNO3 as a preservative.
22	f)	Repeat steps "d" and "e" two additional times such that there is a
23		composite volume comprised of 3 samples taken at 24 hour intervals.
24	g)	Analyze each Exposure Water sample and the control sample for the
25		concentration of lead using equipment and a method of analysis which
26		establish a detection limit of five (5) micrograms of lead per liter ("5
27		μ g/L") or lower for each espresso machine tested.
28	CONSENT JUDGMENT Mateel v. Ascaso Case No 470688	
		•

1	h)	Calculate the average lead concentrations of the three samples that were
2		analyzed pursuant to step "g" to determine the test results for the beverage
3		unit in question.
4	i)	All espresso machines tested shall be randomly selected using any
5		generally accepted random sampling method such as International
6		Standards Organization 2589-1 (1989), any random method generally
7		accepted by the National Institute for Standards and Technology, or any
8		authoritative text on statistical sampling.
9	j)	The lot, batch, or other group from which any model of espresso machines
10		tested are drawn must be representative of the entire population of articles
11		of the model of espresso machine in question manufactured in the calendar
12		year or since the date of the last test. In order to accomplish this,
13		Defendant must show that its manufacturing process for the particular
14		model of espresso machine in the Testing Program did not change during
15		the calendar year or since the last test. A manufacturing process will be
16		deemed to have occurred if there is a material change in: the type of
17		components that make up any alloys used in the plumbing of the model of
18		espresso machine, the suppliers of the components that make up the
19		components of the alloys, or any other factor that substantially affects lead
20		leaching test results on a model of espresso machine.
21	k)	The number of espresso machines tested shall be at least six beverage units
22		for each model of espresso machine, and the mean of at least six tested
23		beverage units shall be calculated.
24	1)	After the Effective Date, unless Defendant provides the warning specified
25		in paragraph 2.2 above, Defendant may not ship for sale in California any
26		model of espresso machine unless the mean of at least six tested beverage
27		units calculated according to subparagraph k), above, is \leq 5 µg/L.
28	CONSENT JUDGMENT	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Mateel v. Ascaso Case No 470688	5
ł	Case INU 470000	

.

2.5 As part of the Testing Program, Defendant shall maintain the following records,
 or require by contract that any laboratory conducting testing shall maintain the following records
 and will provide them to Plaintiff upon request:

A. Records kept in the normal course of business showing the maintenance and
calibration of equipment used to conduct the Testing Program;

B. Individual test results of all tests conducted as part of the Testing Program,
provided that Defendant shall not be required to maintain the above records for any test for more
than two years after that test was conducted.

9 2.6. Any records required to be maintained in by Paragraph 2.5 shall be made
available to the Plaintiff or the Attorney General for inspection within the State of California
upon 60 days written notice. Such records shall not be made available to the public unless
required by the California Public Records Act or other laws, except as part of presenting such
records to a court as part of any proceeding.

14

3. <u>MONETARY RELIEF</u>

15 3.1 Within ten (10) days after entry of this Consent Judgment by the Court, Ascaso . 16 shall pay ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) each to the Ecological Rights Foundation and to 17 Californians for Alternatives to Toxics. Both groups are California non-profit organizations that 18 advocate for workers' and consumers' safety and for awareness and reduction of toxic exposures. 19 In addition, Defendant shall pay a civil penalty of \$15,000. This civil penalty shall be paid as 20follows: Defendant shall make one check in the amount of \$11,250 payable to the "Office of the California Attorney General." Defendant shall make another check in the amount of \$3,750 21 22 payable to the Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation ("Mateel"), which shall represent 23 Mateel's share of civil penalties as provided in Cal Health & Safety Code § 25192(a)(2). The 24 foregoing settlement payments shall be mailed to the attention of William Verick, Klamath 25 Environmental Law Center, 424 First Street, Eureka, California 95501, who shall provide them to the respective organizations within fifteen (15) days of receipt. 26

27 28

1

4.

<u>ATTORNEYS' FEES</u>

4.1 Within ten (10) days after entry of this Consent Judgment, Ascaso shall pay forty
thousand dollars (\$40,000) to the Klamath Environmental Law Center to cover Plaintiff's
attorneys' fees and costs. This payment shall be mailed to the attention of William Verick,
Klamath Environmental Law Center, 424 First Street, Eureka, California 95501.

6 4.2 Except as specifically provided in this Consent Judgment, Plaintiff and Defendant
7 shall bear their own costs and attorneys' fees.

8

5.

6.

ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT/STIPULATED_REMEDIES

9 5.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment are enforceable by and among the parties
10 hereto, by Defendant Ascaso with respect to the releases offered in this Consent Judgment, or,
11 with respect to the injunctive relief provided for herein, by the California Attorney General.

12

MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

6.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between the Plaintiff 13 14 acting on behalf of itself and, (as to those matters referenced in the Notice Letters) in the public 15 interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d), and Defendant Ascaso concerning any violation of Proposition 65 regarding any claims made or which could have been 16 17made in the Notice and/or the Complaint, or any other statutory or common law claim that could 18 have been asserted against Defendant, and/or its affiliates, parent or subsidiary corporations, 19 divisions, successors, officers, directors, assigns, distributors, retailers, and/or customers for 20 failure to provide clear, reasonable, and lawful warnings of exposure to lead contained in or 21 otherwise associated with Covered Products manufactured, sold or distributed by, for, or on 22 behalf of, Ascaso. Compliance by Ascaso with the terms of this Consent Judgment resolves any 23 issue, now and in the future, concerning compliance by Defendant Ascaso and/or its affiliates, 24 parent or subsidiary corporations, divisions, successors, officers, directors, assigns, distributors, retailers, and/or customers with the requirements of Proposition 65 with respect to lead contained 25 in or otherwise associated with Covered Products. 26

6.2 As to any claims, violations (except violations of this Consent Judgment), actions,
 damages, costs, penalties or causes of action which may arise or have arisen after the original
 date of entry of this consent judgment, compliance by Ascaso with the terms of this consent
 judgment shall be deemed to be full and complete compliance with Proposition 65 as to claims
 regarding exposure to lead in Covered Products.

6 6.3 In furtherance of the foregoing, Plaintiff hereby waives any and all rights and
7 benefits which it now has, or in the future may have, conferred upon it with respect to the
8 Covered Products by virtue of the provisions of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which
9 provides as follows:

"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."

15 Plaintiff understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver of California Civil Code Section 1542 is that even if Plaintiff suffers future damages arising out of 16 17 or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Covered Products, 18 Plaintiff will not be able to make any claim for those damages against Defendant Ascaso, or its 19 parents, subsidiaries or affiliates, or any of its customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers or 20 any other person in the course of doing business who may manufacture, use, maintain, distribute, 21 market or sell the Covered Products. Furthermore, Plaintiff acknowledges that it intends these consequences for any such claims which may exist as of the date of this release but which 22 23 Plaintiff does not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect its decision to enter 24 into this Consent Judgment, regardless of whether its lack of knowledge is the result of 25 ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause.

26

10

11

12

13

14

1

7.

APPLICATION OF JUDGMENT

7.1 The obligations of this Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon any
and all Plaintiffs, acting in the public interest pursuant to Health and Safety Code section
25249.7(d) and the successors or assigns of any of them.

5

15

16

8.

MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT

8.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only upon written agreement of the
parties and Ascaso 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.

10 9. <u>NOTICE</u>

9.1 When any Party is entitled to receive any notice or report under this Consent
Judgment, the notice or report shall be sent by U.S. mail or overnight courier service to:

- 13 (a) For Mateel: William Verick, Esq., Klamath Environmental Law Center,
 14 424 First Street, Eureka, California 95501; and
 - (b) For: Ascaso: Jose Luis Ascaso, Energia 39-41, 08940 Cornella –
 Barcelona, Spain

9.2 Any Party may modify the person and address to whom notice is to be sent by
sending each other Party notice in accordance with this Paragraph.

19 10. <u>AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE</u>

20 10.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized
21 by the party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment and to execute it on behalf
22 of the party represented and legally to bind that party.

23 11. <u>RE</u>

26

27

28

RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

24 11.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction over the matters covered herein and the
25 enforcement and/or application of this Consent Judgment.

CONSENT JUDGMENT Mateel v. Ascaso Case No 470688

1 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.

8 13. <u>GOVERNING LAW</u>

9 13.1 The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be 10 governed by the laws of the State of California.

11 14. <u>COURT APPROVAL</u>

12 14.1 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or 13 effect, and cannot be used in any proceeding for any purpose.

14 IT IS SO STIPULATED:

15 DATED:

19

21

23

24

25

26

27

· 28

22 Dated:

16 DATED: 12-27-0-17 18

CONSENT JUDGMENT Mateel y: Ascaso

Case No

José Luis Ascaso By adant Ascaso Factory SL Defi

William Verick Mateel Environmental Justice Foundation

20 IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT