1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF T	HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	COUNTY (OF ALAMEDA
11		
12	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL	Case No. RG-13-677800
13	HEALTH, a non-profit corporation,	
14	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO UNITED STATES BAKERY, INC. AND THREE J'S DISTRIBUTING, INC.
15	v.	
16	MONDELEZ INTERNATIONAL, INC., et al.,	
17	Defendants.	
18		
19		
20		
21		
2223		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
J		

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Parties to this Consent Judgment are the Center for Environmental Health, a California non-profit corporation ("CEH"), and Defendants United States Bakery, Inc. ("U.S. Bakery") and Three J's Distributing, Inc. ("Three J's"). U.S. Bakery and Three J's are referred to herein as Settling Defendants. The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment to settle certain claims asserted by CEH against Settling Defendants as set forth in the operative complaint ("Complaint") in the above-captioned matter. This Consent Judgment covers cookies containing molasses, ginger, or both molasses and ginger sold by Settling Defendants that have been or will be sold or offered for sale to California consumers ("Covered Products").
- 1.2 On February 3, 2014, CEH provided a 60-day Notice of Violation under Proposition 65 to the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater than 750,000, Three J's and Three J's' customer Winco Foods LLC ("WinCo"), alleging that Three J's and WinCo violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons in California to lead and lead compounds ("Lead") contained in Covered Products without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.
- 1.3 On August 8, 2014, CEH provided a 60-day Notice of Violation under Proposition 65 to the California Attorney General, the District Attorneys of every county in California, the City Attorneys of every California city with a population greater than 750,000 and U.S. Bakery, alleging that U.S. Bakery violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons to Lead contained in Covered Products without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.
- 1.4 U.S. Bakery is a corporation or other business entity that manufactures, distributes, sells or offers for sale Covered Products that are sold or offered for sale in California or has done so in the past. Three J's is a corporation or other business entity that distributes, sells or offers for sale Covered Products that are sold or offered for sale in California or has done so in the past.
- 1.5 On May 1, 2013, CEH filed the original Complaint in the above-captioned matter, and on September 20, 2013, CEH filed the First Amended Complaint. The First Amended Complaint was amended on May 9, 2014 to add Three J's and WinCo as named defendants and, again on December 18, 2014, to add U.S. Bakery as a named defendant.

- 1.6 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, CEH and Settling Defendants (the "Parties") stipulate that this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendants as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Alameda, 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 with respect to Covered Products manufactured, distributed, offered for sale or sold by Settling Defendants.
- 1.7 Nothing in this Consent Judgment is or 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 any other pending or future legal proceedings. This Consent Judgment is the product of negotiation and compromise and is accepted by the Parties solely for purposes of settling, compromising, and resolving issues disputed in this Action.

2. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

2.1 Specification Compliance Date. To the extent it has not already done so, no more than thirty (30) days after the date of entry of this Consent Judgment, if a Settling Defendant purchases any Covered Products from a third party that is not under common ownership (a "Covered Product Supplier"), it shall provide the Reformulation Level set forth in Section 2.2 to each Covered Product Supplier and shall instruct each such Covered Product Supplier to provide it with Covered Products that comply with the Reformulation Level set forth in Section 2.2. If in the future a Settling Defendant purchases Covered Products from a Covered Product Supplier that it has not previously provided with instructions regarding the Reformulation Level set forth in Section 2.2, that Settling Defendant shall provide the Reformulation Level set forth in Section 2.2 to such Covered Product Supplier prior to placing an initial order for Covered Products and instruct the Covered Product Supplier to provide it with Covered Products that comply with the Reformulation

Level set forth in Section 2.2. Settling Defendants shall retain and make available to CEH upon reasonable written request records of communications sent to and received from Covered Product Suppliers that are related to the requirement of this Section 2.1 for a period of five (5) years from the date of entry of this Consent Judgment (the "Effective Date").

- 2.2 **Reformulation of Covered Products**. Settling Defendants shall not sell or offer for sale a Covered Product that will be sold or offered for sale either by that Settling Defendant or by third parties to California consumers that was manufactured on or after the Effective Date (the "Reformulation Deadline") if that Covered Product contains more than thirty (30) parts per billion ("ppb") Lead by weight (the "Reformulation Level"), such concentration to be determined by use of a test performed by an accredited laboratory using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) equipment with a level of detection of at least ten (10) ppb. Upon inquiry by CEH concerning a Covered Product's best-by or sell-by (or equivalent) date or other code, the Settling Defendants shall promptly provide CEH with such Covered Product's date of manufacture.
- 2.2.1 Alternative Covered Product Compliance Requirements. The Parties acknowledge that U.S. Bakery is a company based in Oregon that in some instances manufactures Private Label Covered Products. Private Label Covered Products means Covered Products that are sold at retail where: (i) the products (or their containers) are labeled with the brand or trademark of a person other than U.S. Bakery (or any affiliate of U.S. Bakery), (ii) the entity whose brand or trademark the products (or containers) are labeled has authorized or caused the product to be so labeled, (iii) the identity, brand or trademark of U.S. Bakery does not appear on such label; and (iv) the products are sold by U.S. Bakery only to distributors and other non-retail wholesale entities over which U.S. Bakery has no control regarding the packaging, labeling, marketing or distribution of the products. As an alternative to the requirements of Sections 2.2, U.S. Bakery may sell Private Label Covered Products that do not meet the Reformulation Level provided that all of the following restrictions have been met.

2.2.1.1 U.S. Bakery shall not sell any Private Label Covered Products that do not meet the Reformulation Level to a person or entity that it knows or should know will directly or indirectly introduce such Private Label Covered Products to the California marketplace;

- 2.2.1.2 U.S. Bakery may sell Private Label Covered Products that do not comply with the reformulation Level only if:
- (a) it has provided the purchaser with written notice with each shipment that such Private Label Covered Products contain lead, are not labelled in compliance with California's Proposition 65 and are not to be sold or offered for sale to California consumers; and
- (b) U.S. Bakery has received and retained written confirmation from any such customer acknowledging receipt and understanding of each such notice.
- 2.3 **Testing.** To ensure compliance with Section 2.2 and except as provided in Section 2.5, each Settling Defendant that manufactures or bakes Covered Products shall conduct random testing of such Covered Products and take the follow-up actions described in this section ("Validation Testing"). A Settling Defendant that does not manufacture or bake Covered Products and that only purchases finished Covered Products from other entities shall not be required to conduct Validation Testing.
- 2.3.1 <u>Covered Products To Be Tested.</u> Validation Testing shall be performed on a quarterly basis for each "type" of Covered Product that a Settling Defendant manufactures or arranges to be manufactured on or after the Reformulation Deadline; such Validation Testing shall be performed on samples drawn randomly from single production lots of each "type" of Covered Product manufactured during that quarter. For purposes of this Consent Judgment a "type" of a Covered Product is either each individual SKU of Covered Products or a group of Covered Products which CEH and a Settling Defendant have agreed in writing has materially the same characteristics based on the type, supplier and amount of ginger or molasses used in its recipe or formula.
- 2.3.2 <u>Methods of Testing</u>. Settling Defendants shall conduct Validation

 Testing pursuant to one of the following methods: (1) the FDA sample preparation protocol

 discussed in the method entitled "Elemental Analysis Manual: Section 4.4 Inductively Coupled

7

8 9

10 11 12

13 14

16

15

17

18

19

20

21

23

22

24

25

26

27

28

Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectrometric Determination of Elements in Food Using Microwave Assisted Digestion" or (2) a microwave- or heat-assisted acid digestion method employing highpurity reagents. In either event, the laboratory shall digest at least 0.5 grams of each sample taken from a properly homogenized random selection of a complete package of a Covered Product from a particular production lot, and shall analyze each such sample without further dilution using ICP-MS.

2.3.3 Laboratories Conducting Validation Testing. Any Validation Testing shall be performed by a laboratory meeting at least one of the following standards: Environmental Laboratory Certification from the State of California, Department of Health Services, Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program; NSF International; American Association for Laboratory Accreditation for Chemical Testing; International Standards Organization/IEC via ANSI-ASQ; or an in-house laboratory or other facility experienced in testing for lead levels in foods that complies with the Production and Process Control System; Requirements for Laboratory Operations set forth in 21 C.F.R. Part 111, Subpart J, including but not limited to the requirements for written procedures, requirements for laboratory control processes, requirements for laboratory methods and examination, record retention policies, and other laboratory requirements. Laboratories deemed to meet these requirements are listed on Exhibit B.

2.3.4 <u>Duration of Testing</u>. In the event that the Validation Testing demonstrates compliance with the Reformulation Level by a Settling Defendant for six (6) continuous quarters in which production of a type of Covered Product has occurred, such Settling Defendant may send written notice to CEH and thereafter may cease Validation Testing for that type of Covered Product; provided however, if there is a material change in the type or level of ginger or molasses used in a Covered Product that is reasonably likely to affect the Lead levels in the product, then the Settling Defendant shall arrange for testing for a minimum of three consecutive production quarters after that change.

¹ The referenced FDA test protocol may be found at which can be found at http://www.fda.gov/Food/Food/ScienceResearch/LaboratoryMethods/ucm204245.htm.

2.3.5 <u>Covered Products That Exceed Reformulation Level</u> . If a Validation
Testing result indicates that a type of a Covered Product exceeds the Reformulation Level, the
Settling Defendant that manufactured or baked the Covered Product shall ensure that all Covered
Products from the same production lot as those from which the sample of the Covered Product(s)
that exceeded the Reformulation Level were drawn, as well as other lots of the same type of
Covered Product produced in the same calendar quarter that were not directly subject to Validation
Testing (the "Non-Compliant Products"), will not be sold or offered for sale to California
consumers.
2.3.5.1 Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the results of Validation Testing o
a sample of a type of Covered Product exceeds the Reformulation Level, the Settling Defendant

2.3.5.1 Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the results of Validation Testing of a sample of a type of Covered Product exceeds the Reformulation Level, the Settling Defendant may collect up to three (3) more samples of the Covered Product from the same production lot and have those samples tested in accordance with Section 2.3. If the results of Validation Testing of all of the additional samples of a type of Covered Product collectively yield an arithmetic mean of no more than thirty (30) ppb Lead by weight, the Settling Defendant may treat that type of Covered Product as meeting the Reformulation Level for that Validation Testing cycle as long as no result for a sample exceeds fifty (50) ppb Lead. If a sample result exceeds fifty (50) ppb Lead, the Settling Defendant may collect three (3) more samples of the Covered Product from the same production lot and have those samples tested in accordance with Section 2.3. Provided that none of those additional test results exceed forty (40) ppb, those additional test results shall then be used in place of the sample that exceeded fifty (50) ppb in determining whether the arithmetic mean of Validation Test results for the Covered Product exceeded the Reformulation Level.

- 2.3.6 <u>Records</u>. The testing reports and results of the Validation Testing performed pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be retained by the Settling Defendant that manufactured or baked the Covered Products subjected to testing for four (4) years and make such test results available to CEH upon reasonable request.
- 2.4 **Good Faith Commitment to Pursue Further Lead Reduction.** Except as provided in Section 2.5, Settling Defendants who manufacture or bake Covered Products shall

continue to take, or cause to be taken, good faith and commercially reasonable efforts to further reduce the Lead content of its Covered Products with a goal of Covered Products having a consistent Lead content of seventeen (17) ppb or less. These efforts shall include, at a minimum, efforts to further adjust recipes and formulas that will reduce Lead content in Covered Products and attempts to secure Covered Product ingredients such as molasses and ginger with lower Lead content. Within fifteen days of the Reformulation Deadline, and annually thereafter for two more years, a Settling Defendant that manufactures or bakes Covered Products shall submit to CEH a written report of the activities it has undertaken to effectuate its good faith commitment under this paragraph. If such Settling Defendant has test results demonstrating that all of its Covered Products have a consistent Lead content of seventeen (17) ppb or less and it provides such documentation to CEH, or if CEH and such a Settling Defendant otherwise agree in writing, then such Settling Defendant need not submit any subsequent annual report to CEH pursuant to this paragraph. To the extent that a Settling Defendant who does not manufacture or bake Covered Products continues to source Covered Products that may be sold in California from others, that Settling Defendant shall, for a period of at least two years following the Effective Date, undertake reasonable good faith efforts to try and obtain Covered Products with Lead levels below the Reformulation Level, with a goal of ultimately obtaining Covered Products having a consistent Lead content of seventeen (17) ppb or less.

2.5 **Products Not Subject to Testing.** The requirements of Sections 2.3 and 2.4 shall not apply to any type of Covered Product for which CEH and a Settling Defendant agree in writing that such sections shall not apply, nor shall they apply to Private Label Covered Products that are sold in compliance with Section 2.2.1.

3. ENFORCEMENT

3.1 **General Enforcement Provisions**. CEH may, by motion or application for an order to show cause before this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. Any action to enforce alleged violations of Section 2.2 by a Settling Defendant shall be

27

26

brought exclusively pursuant to this Section 3, and, as applicable, be subject to the meet and confer requirement of Section 3.2.4.

3.2 Enforcement of Reformulation Commitment.

3.2.1 Notice of Violation. In the event that CEH identifies a Covered Product that was sold or offered for sale to California consumers with a best-by or sell-by (or equivalent) date or other code that reflects that the Covered Product was manufactured on or after the Effective Date (based on either the information provided to CEH by a Settling Defendant or after first giving the Settling Defendant an opportunity to identify the manufacture date as provided in Section 2.2), and for which CEH has laboratory test results showing that the Covered Product has a Lead level exceeding the Reformulation Level, CEH may issue a Notice of Violation pursuant to this Section. Such Notice of Violation shall be based upon a test result sufficient to establish an exceedance of the Reformulation Level as it is to be evaluated under Section 2.3; the results employed shall also meet the sampling, preparation, testing, and laboratory criteria specified under Section 2.3.

3.2.2 <u>Service of Notice of Violation and Supporting Documentation.</u>

3.2.2.1 Subject to Section 3.2.1, the Notice of Violation shall be sent to the person(s) identified in Exhibit A to receive notices for the Settling Defendant, and must be served within 45 days of the date the Covered Products at issue were purchased or otherwise acquired by CEH, provided, however, that CEH may have up to an additional 45 days to send the Notice of Violation if, notwithstanding CEH's good faith efforts, the test data required by Section 3.2.2.2 below cannot be obtained by CEH from its laboratory before expiration of the initial 45 day period. If the Covered Product is a Private Label Covered Product, the time to serve the Notice of Violation shall run from the date CEH learns that the Private Label Covered Product was sold by U.S. Bakery.

3.2.2.2 The Notice of Violation shall, at a minimum, set forth: (a) the date the alleged violation was observed; (b) the location at which the Covered Products were offered for sale; (c) a description of the Covered Products giving rise to the alleged violation, including the name and address of the retail entity from which the sample was obtained and if available information that identifies the product lot; and (d) all test data obtained by CEH regarding the

Covered Products and supporting documentation sufficient for validation of the test results, including any laboratory reports, quality assurance reports and quality control reports associated with testing of the Covered Products.

- 3.2.3 <u>Notice of Election of Response</u>. No more than thirty (30) days after effectuation of service of a Notice of Violation, the Settling Defendant shall provide written notice to CEH whether it elects to contest the allegations contained in a Notice of Violation ("Notice of Election"). Failure to provide a Notice of Election within thirty (30) days of effectuation of service of a Notice of Violation shall be deemed an election to contest the Notice of Violation.
- 3.2.3.1 If a Notice of Violation is contested, the Notice of Election shall include all then-available documentary evidence regarding the alleged violation, including all test data, if any. If the Settling Defendant or CEH later acquires additional test or other data regarding the alleged violation, it shall notify the other party and promptly provide all such data or information to the party. Any test data used to contest a Notice of Violation shall meet the criteria of Section 2.3.
- 3.2.3.2 If U.S. Bakery contends that the Covered Product identified in the Notice of Violation is a Private Label Covered Product, it shall include with its Notice of Election to CEH the identity of the customer to which the Covered Products were sold as well as full documentation supporting the classification of the Covered Products as Private Label Covered Product, and if the Notice of Violation is contested, the notice and return confirmation acknowledgment identified in Section 2.2.1.2.
- 3.2.4 <u>Meet and Confer.</u> If a Notice of Violation is contested, CEH and the Settling Defendant shall meet and confer to attempt to resolve their dispute. Within 30 days of serving a Notice of Election contesting a Notice of Violation, and if no enforcement action or application has been filed by CEH pursuant to Section 3.1, the Settling Defendant may withdraw the original Notice of Election contesting the violation and serve a new Notice of Election to not contest the violation, provided, however, that, in this circumstance, the Settling Defendant shall pay \$2,500 in addition to any payment required under this Consent Judgment. At any time, CEH may

withdraw a Notice of Violation, in which case for purposes of this Section 3.2 the result shall be as if CEH never issued any such Notice of Violation. If no informal resolution of a Notice of Violation results within thirty (30) days of a Notice of Election to contest, CEH may file an enforcement motion or application pursuant to Section 3.1. In any such proceeding, CEH may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, attorneys' fees or other remedies are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment.

3.2.5 <u>Non-Contested Matters</u>. If the Settling Defendant elects not to contest the allegations in a Notice of Violation, it shall undertake corrective action and make payments, if any, as set forth below.

3.2.5.1 If the Settling Defendant did not manufacture or bake the Covered Product identified in the Notice of Violation, it shall identify on a confidential basis to CEH (by proper name, address of principal place of business and telephone number) the person or entity that sold the Covered Products to the Settling Defendant and the manufacturer and other entities in the upstream chain of distribution of the Covered Product, provided that such information is reasonably available. In such an instance, if the entity that manufactured or baked the Covered Product is also a settling defendant under this or any other consent judgment entered into by CEH concerning Lead in cookies containing molasses, ginger, or both molasses and ginger, then the Settling Defendant that manufactured or baked the cookies shall be responsible for the further corrective action or payments pursuant to its consent judgment obligations and the Settling Defendant that did not manufacture or bake the Covered Product shall not be responsible for the further corrective action or payments as set forth below.

3.2.5.2 If the test data provided by CEH in support of the Notice of Violation shows that Lead content in a Covered Product is above the Reformulation Level but less than sixty (60) ppb, then, except as provided in Section 3.2.5.1 above, the Settling Defendant that does not contest a Notice of Violation shall take the following corrective action and make the following payments, if any:

(a) The Settling Defendant shall include in its Notice of Election a detailed description with supporting documentation of the corrective action that it has undertaken or proposes to undertake to address the alleged violation. Any such correction shall, at a minimum, provide reasonable assurance that the Settling Defendant has stopped selling or offering for sale in California all Covered Products from the same lot as that of the Covered Products identified in CEH's Notice of Violation. The Settling Defendant shall make available to CEH for inspection and/or copying records and correspondence regarding the corrective action. If there is a dispute over the corrective action, the Settling Defendant and CEH shall meet and confer pursuant to Section 3.2.4 before seeking any remedy in court. In no case shall CEH issue more than one NOV per manufacturing lot of a type of Covered Product.

(b) If the Notice of Violation is the first Notice of Violation received by the Settling Defendant under Section 3.2.5.1 that was not successfully contested or withdrawn, no payment shall be required by that Settling Defendant. If the Notice of Violation is the second, third or fourth Notice of Violation received by the Settling Defendant under Section 3.2.5.1 that was not successfully contested or withdrawn, that Settling Defendant shall pay \$5,000 for each Notice of Violation. If a Settling Defendant has received more than four Notices of Violation under Section 3.2.5.1 that were not successfully contested or withdrawn, that Settling Defendant shall pay \$10,000 for each subsequent Notice of Violation. If a Settling Defendant produces with its Notice of Election test data from the manufacturer or supplier of the Covered Product that: (i) was conducted prior to the date CEH purchased the Covered Product that is the subject of the Notice of Violation; (ii) was conducted on the same Covered Product from the same production lot as the Covered Product that is the subject of the Notice of Violation; and (iii) demonstrates Lead levels below the Reformulation Level as evaluated under Section 2.3, then any payment under this Section shall be reduced by fifty percent.

3.2.5.3 If the test data provided by CEH in support of the Notice of Violation reports a Lead content in a Covered Product of more than sixty (60) ppb, then, except as

15 16

17

13

14

18 19

21

20

23

22

24

25

26

27 28 provided in Section 3.2.5.1 above, the Settling Defendant shall take the following corrective action and make the following payments:

The Settling Defendant shall include in its Notice of Election a (a) detailed description with supporting documentation of the corrective action that it has undertaken or proposes to undertake to address the alleged violation. Any such correction shall, at a minimum, provide reasonable assurance that all Covered Products having the same lot number as that of the Covered Product identified in CEH's Notice of Violation (the "Noticed Covered Products") will not be thereafter sold or offered for sale to California consumers, that the Noticed Covered Products are removed from the California market and that the Setting Defendant has sent instructions to any of its stores and/or customers that offer the Noticed Covered Products for sale to cease offering the Noticed Covered Products for sale to California consumers and to either return all such Noticed Covered Products to the Settling Defendant for destruction, or to directly destroy such Noticed Covered Products. The Settling Defendant shall keep and make available to CEH for inspection and copying records and correspondence regarding the market withdrawal and destruction of the Noticed Covered Products. If there is a dispute over the corrective action, the Settling Defendant and CEH shall meet and confer before seeking any remedy in court. In no case shall CEH issue more than one NOV per manufacturing lot of a type of Covered Product.

(b) If the Notice of Violation is the first, second, third or fourth Notice of Violation received by a Settling Defendant under Section 3.2.5.2 that was not successfully contested or withdrawn, that Settling Defendant shall pay \$16,000 for each Notice of Violation. If a Settling Defendant has received more than four Notices of Violation under Section 3.2.5.2 that were not successfully contested or withdrawn, that Settling Defendant shall pay \$24,000 for each Notice of Violation. If a Settling Defendant produces with its Notice of Election test data on the Covered Product that: (i) was conducted prior to the date CEH purchased the Covered Product that is the subject of the Notice of Violation; (ii) was conducted on the same or same type of Covered Product; and (iii) demonstrates Lead levels below the Reformulation Level as evaluated under Section 2.3.4, then any payment under this Section shall be reduced by fifty percent.

- 3.2.6 <u>Payments</u>. Any payments under Section 3.2 shall be made by check payable to the "Lexington Law Group" and shall be paid within thirty (30) days of service of a Notice of Election triggering a payment and which shall be used as reimbursement for costs for investigating, preparing, sending and prosecuting Notices of Violation, and to reimburse attorneys' fees and costs incurred in connection with these activities.
- 3.3 **Repeat Violations.** If a Settling Defendant has received four or more Notices of Violation concerning the same type of Covered Product that were not successfully contested or withdrawn in any twelve (12) month period then, at CEH's option, CEH may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, attorneys' fees or other remedies that are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment. Prior to seeking such relief, CEH shall meet and confer with the Settling Defendant for at least 30 days to determine if the Settling Defendant and CEH can agree on measures that the Settling Defendant can undertake to prevent future violations.

4. PAYMENTS

- 4.1 **Payments by Settling Defendants.** Within five (5) days of the entry of this Consent Judgment, each Settling Defendant shall pay the amounts specified for it on Exhibit A.
- Allocation of Payments. The total settlement amount for each Settling Defendant shall be paid in four separate checks and delivered as set forth below. Any failure by a Settling Defendant to comply with the payment terms herein shall, at CEH's discretion, be subject to a stipulated late fee in the amount of \$100 for each day after the delivery date the payment is received. The late fees required under this Section shall be recoverable, together with reasonable attorneys' fees, in an enforcement proceeding brought pursuant to Section 3 of this Consent Judgment. The funds paid by each Settling Defendant shall be allocated as set forth on Exhibit A between the following categories and made payable as follows:
- 4.2.1 A civil penalty pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b). The civil penalty payment shall be apportioned in accordance with Health & Safety Code § 25249.12 (25% to CEH and 75% to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA")). Accordingly, the OEHHA portion of the civil penalty payment shall be

- 5.1 **Modification.** This Consent Judgment may be modified from time to time by express written agreement of the Parties, with the approval of the Court, or by an order of this Court upon motion and in accordance with law.
- 5.2 **Notice; Meet and Confer.** Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with all affected Parties prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.

6. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE

- 6.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH on behalf of itself and the public interest and each Settling Defendant and each Settling Defendant's parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities that are under common ownership, directors, officers, employees, agents, shareholders, successors, assigns, and attorneys ("Defendant Releasees"), and all entities to which a Settling Defendant directly or indirectly distributes or sells Covered Products, including but not limited to distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisees, licensors and licensees ("Downstream Defendant Releasees"), of any violation of Proposition 65 based on failure to warn about alleged exposure to Lead contained in Covered Products that were sold, distributed or offered for sale by such Settling Defendant prior to the Effective Date.
- 6.2 CEH, for itself, its agents, successors and assigns, releases, waives, and forever discharges any and all claims against Settling Defendants, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Defendant Releasees arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law claims that have been or could have been asserted by CEH individually or in the public interest regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Lead arising in connection with Covered Products manufactured by or for a Settling Defendant prior to the Reformulation Deadline.²
- 6.3 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by a Settling Defendant shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by such Settling Defendant, its Defendant Releasees and

² With respect to Sections 6.1 and 6.2 above, CEH acknowledges that WinCo is a Downstream Defendant Releasee of the Settling Defendants and shall accordingly dismiss WinCo from this action without prejudice within 30 days following the Court's approval and entry of this Consent Judgment, provided that WinCo agrees to a cost waiver.

1	its Downstream Defendant Releasees with respect to any alleged failure to warn about Lead in		
2	Cover	ed Prod	ucts manufactured, distributed or sold by such Settling Defendant after the Effective
3	Date.		
4	7.	PROV	VISION OF NOTICE
5		7.1	When CEH is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the notice
6	shall t	oe sent b	by first class and electronic mail to:
7			Eric S. Somers
8			Lexington Law Group 503 Divisadero Street
9			San Francisco, CA 94117 esomers@lexlawgroup.com
10		7.2	When a Settling Defendant is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent
11	Judgn	nent, the	e notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to the person(s) identified in
12	Exhib	it A.	
13		7.3	Any Party may modify the person and address to whom the notice is to be sent by
14	sending the other Party notice by first class and electronic mail.		
15	8.	COUI	RT APPROVAL
16		8.1	This Consent Judgment shall become effective as a contract upon the date signed by
17	CEH a	and Sett	ling Defendants, whichever is later, provided however, that CEH shall also prepare
18	and fi	le a Mot	tion for Approval of this Consent Judgment and Settling Defendants shall support
19	appro	val of su	ach Motion.
20		8.2	If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect
21	and shall not be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any purpose.		
22	9.	GOVI	ERNING LAW AND CONSTRUCTION
23		9.1	The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of
24	Califo	rnia.	
25	10.	ATTO	DRNEYS' FEES
26		10.1	A Party who unsuccessfully brings or contests an action arising out of this Consent
27	Judgment shall be required to pay the prevailing Party's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs unless		
28			

the unsuccessful Party has acted with substantial justification. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term substantial justification shall carry the same meaning as used in the Civil Discovery Act of 1986, Code of Civil Procedure §§2016.010, et seq.

- 10.2 Notwithstanding Section 10.1, a Party who prevails in a contested enforcement action brought pursuant to Section 3 may seek an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5 against a Party that acted with substantial justification. The Party seeking such an award shall bear the burden of meeting all of the elements of §1021.5, and this provision shall not be construed as altering any procedural or substantive requirements for obtaining such an award.
- 10.3 Nothing in this Section 10 shall preclude a party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law.

11. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

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, or understandings related thereto, if any, are hereby merged herein and therein. There are no warranties, representations, or other agreements between the Parties except as expressly set forth herein. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those specifically referred to in this Consent Judgment have been made by any Party hereto. No other agreements not specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto. Any agreements specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto only to the extent that they are expressly incorporated herein. The obligations set forth in this Consent Judgment and its Exhibit A's shall be deemed several and apply severally (and not joint and severally) as between U.S. Bakery and Three J's. No supplementation, modification, waiver, or termination of this Consent Judgment shall be binding unless executed in writing by the Party to be bound thereby. No waiver of any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of any of the other provisions hereof whether or not similar, nor shall such waiver constitute a continuing waiver.

26

3

4

5

6

7

9

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

12. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS AND DATA TO CEH

12.1 For any report or information that a Settling Defendant submits to CEH pursuant to this Consent Judgment, the Settling Defendant may make such a submission subject to the terms of the protective order previously entered in this action and the protective order's terms shall apply to the report or information as if it were still in effect.

RETENTION OF JURISDICTION **13.**

13.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement or modify the Consent Judgment.

AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT 14.

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 and to enter into and execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and legally to bind that Party.

15. NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS; EXCEPTION

- 15.1 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim against an entity that is not a Settling Defendant on terms that are different than those contained in this Consent Judgment.
- 15.2 By executing this Consent Judgment, U.S. Bakery and Three J's shall be deemed to have resolved and waived, and hereby release each other from, any potential claims arising as between them relating to this action or the expenses they have incurred in association with it, including but not limited to defense costs or the expense associated with the fulfillment of their respective obligations as set forth herein.

16. **EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS**

The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:	
	•
Dated:, 2015	Judge of the Superior Court of the State of California
• ' 	
TERCOCCURITY ATER.	
IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
Dated: Oct 7, 2015	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
•	and the same of th
	Cianatura
	Signature
	CAMPALIE PIZARO
	Printed Name
	ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
	Title
0015	VINTED OF A THEO DAY/EDV INC
Dated:, 2015	UNITED STATES BAKERY, INC.
•	Signature
	Printed Name
	Title
	•
	BAKERY & THREE J'S DIST. – Case No. RG-13-677800

1	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:	
2		
3	Dated:, 2015	
4	Dated, 2013	Judge of the Superior Court of the State of California
5		
6	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
7		
8	Dated:, 2015	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
9		
11		Signature
12		
13		Printed Name
14		
15	;	Title
16		
۱7	Dated: October 1, 2015	UNITED STATES BAKERY, INC.
18		Man Av
19		Signatura
20		Manc Ausens Printed Name
21		Printed Name
22		Title Printed Name Coo Title
23		Title
24 25		
26		
27		
28		
	CONSENT JUDGMENT – UNITED STATES B	AKERY & THREE J'S DIST. – Case No. RG-13-677800

Signature Jon B. Jones	1	Dated: 10-2-15, 2015	THREE J'S DISTRIBUTING, INC.
Jon R. Jones Printed Name President Title 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	1		Im K. Jone
President Title President Title President Title	3		Signature
President Title President Title President Title	4		Jon B. Jones
President Title President Title President Title	5		Printed Name
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24			President
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24			Title
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		7	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24			
17			
18			
19 20 21 22 23 24			
20 21 22 23 24			
21 22 23 24			
22 23 24 24	- 11		
23 24			
24			
	- 11		
²³ []	- 11		
26			
26 27	- 11		
28	- 11		

CONSENT JUDGMENT – UNITED STATES BAKERY & THREE J'S DIST. – Case No. RG-13-677800

1	EXHIBIT A		
2	United States Bakery, Inc.		
3	Defendant: United States Bakery, Inc.		
4	Defendant's Settlement Payment and Allocation:		
5	Total Settlement Payment \$87,500		
6	Civil Penalty OEHHA Portion \$ 8,550		
7	Civil Penalty CEH Portion \$ 2,850		
8	Payment in Lieu of Civil Penalty \$17,100		
9	Attorneys' Fees and Costs \$59,000		
10	Person(s) to Receive Notices Pursuant to Section 8:		
12	Steven M. Wilker		
13	Tonkon Torp LLP 1600 Pioneer Tower		
14	888 SW Fifth Avenue		
15	Portland, Oregon 97204 steven.wilker@tonkon.com		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23 24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1	Three	J's Distributing, Inc.	
2	Defendant: Three J's Distributing, Inc.		
3	Defendant's Settlement Payment and Allocation:		
5	Total Settlement Payment	\$25,000	
6	Civil Penalty OEHHA Portion	\$ 2,400	
7	Civil Penalty CEH Portion	\$ 800	
8	Payment in Lieu of Civil Penalty	\$ 4,800	
9	Attorneys' Fees and Costs	\$ 17,000	
10	Person(s) to Receive Notices Pursuant to	Section 8:	
11	Robert L. Falk		
12	Morrison Foerster 425 Market Street		
13 14	San Francisco, California 94105 rfalk@mofo.com		
15	1.44.11 © 1.110.201.001.11		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
2526			
27			

EXHIBIT B

1	
2	Laboratories Deemed To Comply with the Requirements of Section 2.3.2
3	Curtis & Tompkins Laboratories
4	Covance Laboratories
5	Eurofins
6	Exova, Inc.
7	K Prime, Inc.
8	National Food Laboratory, Inc.
9	Silliker, Inc.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27 28	
40	

EXHIBITS TO CONSENT JUDGMENT - UNITED STATES BAKERY & THREE J'S DIST. Case No. RG-13-677800