$1 \mid$	LEXINGTON LAW GROUP, LLP Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389				
2	Eric S. Somers, State Bar No. 139050				
3.	Howard Hirsch, State Bar No. 213209 1627 Irving Street				
4	San Francisco, CA 94122 Telephone: (415) 759-4111				
5	Facsimile: (415) 759-4112				
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH				
7					
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
9	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA			
10					
11	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, C. N. D. COCCERCO				
12	11 TOTAL TOTA				
13	Plaintiff, v.				
14	PERFECT EQUIPMENT, INC.; HENNESSY [PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGM	IENT			
15	INDUSTRIES, INC.; PLOMBCO; CHRYSLER RE: CHRYSLER LLC				
16	inclusive,				
	Defendants.				
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27		•			
28					
40	<sup>1</sup>				

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 On May 22, 2008 plaintiff the Center for Environmental Health ("CEH"), a non-profit corporation acting in the public interest, filed a complaint naming Chrysler LLC ("Defendant") as a defendant in the San Francisco County Superior Court case entitled *Center for Environmental Health v. Perfect Equipment, Inc., et al.*, San Francisco County Superior Court Case Number RG08388923 (the "CEH Action"), for civil penalties and injunctive relief pursuant to the provisions of Cal. Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.* ("Proposition 65").
- 1.2 Defendant is a corporation that employs 10 or more persons and manufactures automobiles for sale in the State of California.
- appropriate public enforcement agencies with the requisite 60-day notice alleging that

  Defendant was in violation of Proposition 65. CEH's notice and the Complaint in this Action
  allege that Defendant discharges and releases substantial quantities of lead and lead
  compounds (collectively, "Lead") into sources of drinking water and into land where the Lead
  passes or probably will pass into sources of drinking water throughout the State of California.

  CEH also alleges that such discharges have occurred, and continue to occur, through the
  manufacture, distribution, sale and use of Defendants' automobiles equipped with Lead Wheel
  Weights. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, Lead Wheel Weights are any wheel
  weight with 0.1% or more lead by weight. Lead is a chemical known to the State of California
  to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm. The notice and Complaint allege
  that Defendant's conduct violates Health & Safety Code §25249.5, the discharge prohibition of
  Proposition 65. Defendant disputes such allegations and asserts its production of wheels with
  lead wheel weights is safe and complies with all applicable laws.
- 1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the parties stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the violations alleged in CEH's Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Defendant as to the acts alleged in CEH's 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 and final resolution of all claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint based on the facts alleged therein.

certain disputed claims between the parties as alleged in the Complaint. By executing this Consent Judgment, the parties do not admit any facts or conclusions of law. It is the parties' intent that nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by the parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by the parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, argument or defense the parties may have in this or any other or future legal proceedings.

## 2. COMPLIANCE - PHASE OUT OF LEAD WHEEL WEIGHTS

- 2.1 Deadlines for phase out. Defendant shall phase out the use of Lead Wheel Weights in California, in accordance with the following schedule.
- 2.1.1 Initial phase out. As of July 31, 2008 (the "Initial Phase Out Date"), at least 55% of the automobiles manufactured for sale or distribution in California by Defendant shall be manufactured without Lead Wheel Weights.
- 2.1.2 Final phase out. As of July 31, 2009 (the "Final Phase Out Date"), 100% of the automobiles manufactured for sale or distribution in California by Defendant shall be manufactured without Lead Wheel Weights.
- 2.1.3 Reporting regarding compliance with phase outs. Defendant shall provide CEH with a written affidavit, signed under penalty of perjury, documenting its compliance with each of the phase out deadlines (the "Affidavits"). The Affidavits must include sufficient information and detail to enable CEH to determine whether Defendant has complied with the phase out deadlines. At a minimum, each Affidavit shall include a breakdown by automobile plant and automobile model, indicating which plants and models

- 2.2 Failure to meet phase out deadlines. Should Defendant fail to meet either of the deadlines set forth in Section 2.1, Defendant shall be liable for a stipulated payment in lieu of penalty equal to \$10,000 for each percentage point below the required phase out percentage. The payment in lieu of penalty shall be made in accordance with Section 3.1 below and shall be used for the purposes set forth in that section.
- 2.3 Phase out in advance of deadlines. Should defendant exceed the requirements of Section 2.1 for either the initial or final phase out, it shall be entitled to a credit of \$10,000 for each percentage point above the initial phase out requirement. Any credit pursuant to this section shall be credited against future payments. Under no circumstance will CEH be required to provide Defendant with a refund of payments previously made under this Consent Judgment.

# 3. SETTLEMENT PAYMENTS

\$5,150 in lieu of any penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code §25249.7(b). CEH shall use such funds to continue its work protecting people from exposures to toxic chemicals. The parties acknowledge that the payment in lieu of penalty provided for in this section has been greatly reduced due to Defendant's prompt agreement to eliminate the use of Lead Wheel Weights. The payment required under this section shall be made payable to CEH.

- 3.2 Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Defendant shall pay \$27,500 to reimburse CEH and its attorneys for their reasonable investigation fees and costs, attorneys' fees, and any other costs incurred as a result of investigating, bringing this matter to Defendant' attention, negotiating a settlement in the public interest and obtaining Court approval of the settlement. The payment required under this section shall be made payable to Lexington Law Group, LLP.
- 3.2 shall be made payable within ten (10) days of entry of judgment. All of the payments made pursuant to this Section 3 shall be delivered to the Lexington Law Group, LLP at the address set forth in section 12.1.

## 4. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

4.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified by written agreement of CEH and Defendant, or upon motion of CEH or Defendant as provided by law.

## 5. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

5.1 Either party may, by motion or application for an order to show cause, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment.

## 6. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

6.1 This Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon the parties hereto, their divisions, subdivisions and subsidiaries, and the successors or assigns of any of them.

### 7. CLAIMS COVERED

7.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH and Defendant of any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted in the Notice of Complaint against Defendant or its parents, subsidiaries, directors, officers, employees, agents, attorneys, distributors, or dealerships based on alleged discharge of Lead from Lead Wheel Weights mounted on Defendant's automobiles into sources of drinking water and onto land where it probably will pass into a source of drinking water on or prior to the date of entry of this Consent Judgment. Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment

constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 for purposes of Lead discharges from Lead Wheel Weights mounted on Defendant's automobiles. This release does not in any way release or otherwise affect the liability of any manufacturer or supplier of Lead Wheel Weights used on Defendant's automobiles.

#### 8. SEVERABILITY

**8.1** In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the enforceable provisions shall not be adversely affected.

#### 9. SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE

9.1 The parties expressly recognize that Defendant's obligations under this Consent Judgment are unique. In the event that any Defendant is found to be in breach of this Consent Judgment for failure to comply with the provisions of Section 2 hereof, the parties agree that it would be extremely impracticable to measure the resulting damages. Accordingly, CEH, in addition to any other available rights or remedies, may sue in equity for specific performance, and Defendant expressly waives the defense that a remedy in damages will be adequate.

## 10. GOVERNING LAW

10.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

### 11. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

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

# 12. PROVISION OF NOTICE

12.1 All notices required pursuant to this Consent Judgment and correspondence shall be sent to the following:

1	For CEH:			
2	Mark N. Todzo			
3		Lexington Law Group, LLP		
1627 Irving Street		1627 Irving Street		
4	San Francisco, CA 94122			
5.				
6	For Defendant:			
7	Joshua W. Gubkin, Esq.			
8		Chrysler, LLC		
9	9   1000 Chrysler Drive			
10		CIMS 485-13-62		
11	:	Auburn Hills, MI 48326		
12	13. COURT APPROVAL			
13		13.1 CEH will comply with the settlement notice provisions of Health and		
14		13.1 CEA will comply with the settlement hotice provisions of fleatur and		
15	Safety Code § 25249.7(f) and Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations § 3003.			
16		13.2 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no		
17	further force and effect.			
18	14.	EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS		
19		14.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in		
20				
21	counterparts and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one			
22	document.			
23	15.	AUTHORIZATION		
24		15.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is		
25	6.11			
26	fully authorized by the party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to			
27	enter into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the party represented and legally			
28				
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	counterparts document.  15.  fully authorize	<ul> <li>14.1 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in and by means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute on AUTHORIZATION</li> <li>15.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is zeed by the party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to</li> </ul>		

1	bind that party. The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and			
2	conditions of this Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each party is to			
3	bear its own fees and costs.			
4				
5				
6	AGREED TO:			
7	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH			
8	4/			
9	Michael C Dated: 5/28/08			
10	Michael Green, Executive Director			
11	Center for Environmental Health			
12				
13				
14				
15	CHRYSLER LLC			
16				
17	Dated:			
18	Deborah L. Morrisette			
19	Vice President, Regulatory Affairs			
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

•	bind that party. The undersigned have read, understand and agree to all of the terms and
2	conditions of this Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each party is to
3 -	bear its own fees and costs.
4	
5 .	
6	AGREED TO:
7	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
8	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
9	Dated:
10	Michael Green, Executive Director Center for Environmental Health
11	Center for Environmental Beauti
12	
13 14	
15	CHRYSLER LLC
16	
17	Debas O Mouris H
18	Dated: May 23, 2008
19	Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27 28	
1.	

and Chrysler LLC,

1	ORDER AND JUDGMEN 1		
2	Based upon the stipulated Consent Judgment between CEH and Chrysler L		
3	the settlement is approved and the clerk is hereby directed to enter judgment in accordance		
4	with the terms herein.		
5			
- 6	Dated:		
7		<del></del>	
8			
9			
10		Judge, Superior Court of the State of California	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>			
27			
28	· ·		
20	II .		