	I i				
1	WILLIAM F. WRAITH, SBN 185927 WRAITH LAW 24422 Avenida de la Carlota, Suite 400 Laguna Hills, CA 92653 Tel: (949) 452-1234 Fax: (949) 452-1102				
2					
3					
4	Attorney for Plaintiff				
5	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.				
6	WHITNEY JONES ROY, SBN 211541 SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER &				
7	HAMPTON LLP 333 South Hope Street, 43 rd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-1422				
8					
9	Tel: (213) 620-1780 Fax: (213) 620-1398				
10	Attorney for Defendant MUSCLEPHARM CORPORATION				
11					
12					
13	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
14	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA				
15	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	CASE NO. RG16839532			
16	CENTER, INC. a non-profit California corporation,	STIPULATED CONSENT			
17	Plaintiff,	JUDGMENT			
18	v.	Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.			
19	MUSCLEPHARM CORPORATION and	Action Filed: November 21, 2016			
20	DOES 1-25, Inclusive,	Trial Date: None set			
21	Defendants.				
22					
23					
24	1. INTRODUCTION				
25	1.1 On November 21, 2016, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), a				
26	non-profit corporation, as a private enforcer and in the public interest, initiated this action by				
27	filing a Complaint for Injunctive Relief and Civil Penalties (the "Complaint") pursuant to the				
8	provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65"),				
	Page 1 of 16				
	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT	Case No. RG16839532			

Page 2 of 16

Case No. RG16839532

- 1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties agree that MUSCLEPHARM is a business entity that has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant to this action, and qualifies as a "person in the course of business" within the meaning of Proposition 65.
 MUSCLEPHARM manufactures, distributes, and/or sells the Covered Products.
- 1.5 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC's Notice of Violation dated February 19, 2016, that was served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and MUSCLEPHARM ("Notice"). A true and correct copy of the 60-Day Notice dated February 19, 2016 is attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference. More than 60 days have passed since the Notice was served on the Attorney General, public enforcers, and MUSCLEPHARM and no designated governmental entity has filed a complaint against MUSCLEPHARM with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.
- 1.6 ERC's Notice and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Products exposes persons in California to lead without first providing clear and reasonable warnings in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. MUSCLEPHARM denies all material allegations contained in the Notice and Complaint.
- 1.7 The Parties have entered into this Consent Judgment in order to settle, compromise, and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged and costly litigation.

 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission by any of the Parties, or by any of their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers. Except for the representations made above, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law, at any time, for any purpose.

- 1.8 Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any current or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.
- 1.9 The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which it is entered as a Judgment by this Court.

2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

For purposes of this Consent Judgment and any further court action that may become necessary to enforce this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint, personal jurisdiction over MUSCLEPHARM as to the acts alleged in the Complaint that venue is proper in Alameda County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims up through and including the Effective Date which were or could have been asserted in this action based on the facts alleged in the Notice and Complaint.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, REFORMULATION, TESTING AND WARNINGS

- 3.1 Beginning on the Effective Date, MUSCLEPHARM shall be permanently enjoined from manufacturing for sale in the State of California, "Distributing into the State of California", or directly selling in the State of California, any Covered Products which exposes a person to a "Daily Lead Exposure Level" of more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day unless it meets the warning requirements under Section 3.2.
- 3.1.1 As used in this Consent Judgment, the term "Distributing into the State of California" shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that MUSCLEPHARM knows or has reason to know will sell the Covered Product in California.
- 3.1.2 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" and "Daily Cadmium Exposure Level" shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula: micrograms of lead per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings of the product per day (using the largest number of

servings in a recommended dosage appearing on the product label), which equals micrograms of lead exposure per day.

3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings

If MUSCLEPHARM is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, the following warning must be utilized ("Warning"):

WARNING: This product can expose you to chemicals including [lead] which is known to the State of California to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to www.P65Warnings.ca.gov.

MUSCLEPHARM shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the Warning only if the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is greater than 15 micrograms of lead as determined pursuant to the quality control methodology set forth in Section 3.4.

The Warning shall be securely affixed to or printed upon the container or label of each Covered Product. In addition, for any Covered Product sold over the internet, the Warning shall appear on the checkout page when a California delivery address is indicated for any purchase of any Covered Product. An asterisk or other identifying method must be utilized to identify which products on the checkout page are subject to the Warning.

The Warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings also appearing on its website or on the label or container of MUSCLEPHARM's product packaging and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print. No statements contradicting or conflicting with the Warning shall accompany the Warning.

MUSCLEPHARM must display the above Warning with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, design of the label, container, or on its website, as applicable, to render the Warning likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use of the product.

3.3 Reformulated Covered Products

A Reformulated Covered Product is one for which the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is no greater than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day as determined by the quality control methodology described in Section 3.4.

3.4 Testing and Quality Control Methodology

- 3.4.1 Beginning within one year of the Effective Date, MUSCLEPHARM shall arrange for lead testing of the Covered Products at least once a year for a minimum of five consecutive years by arranging for testing of five randomly selected samples of each of the Covered Products, in the form intended for sale to the end-user, which MUSCLEPHARM intends to sell or is manufacturing for sale in California, directly selling to a consumer in California or "Distributing into the State of California." If tests conducted pursuant to this Section demonstrate that no Warning is required for a Covered Product during each of five consecutive years, then the testing requirements of this Section will no longer be required as to that Covered Product. However, if during or after the five-year testing period,
 MUSCLEPHARM changes ingredient suppliers for any of the Covered Products and/or reformulates any of the Covered Products, MUSCLEPHARM shall test that Covered Product annually for at least four (4) consecutive years after such change is made.
- **3.4.2** For purposes of measuring the "Daily Lead Exposure Level," the highest lead detection result of the five (5) randomly selected samples of the Covered Products will be controlling.
- 3.4.3 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed using a laboratory method that complies with the performance and quality control factors appropriate for the method used, including limit of detection, qualification, accuracy, and precision that meets the following criteria: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry ("ICP-MS") achieving a limit of quantification of less than or equal to 0.010 mg/kg or any other testing method subsequently agreed to in writing by the Parties and approved by the Court through entry of a modified consent judgment.
- 3.4.4 All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed by an independent third party laboratory certified by the California Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program or an independent third-party laboratory that is registered with the United States Food & Drug Administration.
 - 3.4.5 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall limit MUSCLEPHARM's ability

caused by Defendant in this matter. These activities are detailed below and support ERC's

28

1	overarching goal of reducing and/or eliminating hazardous and toxic chemicals in dietary		
2	supplement products in California. ERC's activities have had, and will continue to have, a direct		
3	and primary effect within the State of California because California consumers will be benefitted		
4	by the reduction and/or elimination of exposure to lead and/or cadmiumin dietary supplements		
5	and/or by providing clear and reasonable warnings to California consumers prior to ingestion of		
6	the products.		
7	Based on a review of past years' actual budgets, ERC is providing the following list of activities		
8	ERC engages in to protect California consumers through Proposition 65 citizen enforcement,		
9	along with a breakdown of how ASP funds will be utilized to facilitate those activities: (1)		
10	ENFORCEMENT (65-80%): obtaining, shipping, analyzing, and testing dietary supplement		
11	products that may contain lead and/or cadmium and are sold to California consumers. This work		
12	includes continued monitoring and enforcement of past consent judgments and settlements to		
13	ensure companies are in compliance with their obligations thereunder, with a specific focus on		
14	those judgments and settlements concerning lead and/or cadmium. This work also includes		
15	investigation of new companies that ERC does not obtain any recovery through settlement or		
16	judgment; (2) VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE PROGRAM (10-25%): maintaining ERC's		
17	Voluntary Compliance Program by acquiring products from companies, developing and		
18	maintaining a case file, testing products from these companies, providing the test results and		
19	supporting documentation to the companies, and offering guidance in warning or implementing a		
20	self-testing program for lead and/or cadmiumin dietary supplement products; and (3) "GOT		
21	LEAD" PROGRAM (up to 5%): maintaining ERC's "Got Lead?" Program which reduces the		
22	numbers of contaminated products that reach California consumers by providing access to free		
23	testing for lead in dietary supplement products (Products submitted to the program are screened		
24	for ingredients which are suspected to be contaminated, and then may be purchased by ERC,		
25	catalogued, sent to a qualified laboratory for testing, and the results shared with the consumer		
26	that submitted the product).		
27	ERC shall be fully accountable in that it will maintain adequate records to document and will be		
28	able to demonstrate how the ASP funds will be spent and can assure that the funds are being		

spent only for the proper, designated purposes described in this Consent Judgment. ERC shall provide the Attorney General, within thirty days of any request, copies of documentation demonstrating how such funds have been spent.

- 4.6 \$13,230.00 shall be distributed to William F. Wraith as reimbursement of ERC's attorney's fees, while \$18,458.31 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.
- 4.7 In the event that MUSCLEPHARM fails to remit the settlement payments owed under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment on or before the dates defined in the above payment schedule, MUSCLEPHARM shall be deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this Consent Judgment. ERC shall provide written notice of the delinquency to MUSCLEPHARM via electronic mail. If MUSCLEPHARM fails to deliver the scheduled payment within five (5) days from the written notice, the remaining unpaid amounts owed shall accrue interest at the statutory judgment interest rate provided in the Code of Civil Procedure section 685.010. Additionally, MUSCLEPHARM agrees to pay ERC's reasonable attorney's fees and costs for any efforts to collect the payment due under this Consent Judgment.

5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only as to injunctive terms (i) by written stipulation of the Parties or pursuant to Section 5.4 and (ii) upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment.
- 5.2 If MUSCLEPHARM seeks to modify this Consent Judgment under Section 5.1, then MUSCLEPHARM must provide written notice to ERC of its intent ("Notice of Intent"). If ERC seeks to meet and confer regarding the proposed modification in the Notice of Intent, then ERC must provide written notice to MUSCLEPHARM within thirty (30) days of receiving the Notice of Intent. If ERC notifies MUSCLEPHARM in a timely manner of ERC's intent to meet and confer, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith as required in this Section. The Parties shall meet in person or via telephone within thirty (30) days of ERC's notification of its intent to meet and confer. Within thirty (30) days of such meeting, if ERC disputes the proposed modification, ERC shall provide to MUSCLEPHARM a written basis for its position.

The Parties shall continue to meet and confer for an additional thirty (30) days in an effort to resolve any remaining disputes. Should it become necessary, the Parties may agree in writing to different deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.

- 5.3 In the event that MUSCLEPHARM initiates or otherwise requests a modification under Section 5.1, and the meet and confer process leads to a joint motion or application of the Consent Judgment, MUSCLEPHARM shall reimburse ERC its costs and reasonable attorney's fees for the time spent in the meet-and-confer process and filing and arguing the motion or application.
- 5.4 Where the meet-and-confer process does not lead to a joint motion or application in support of a modification of the Consent Judgment, then either Party may seek judicial relief on its own.

6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 6.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify, or terminate this Consent Judgment.
- 6.2 If ERC alleges that any Covered Product fails to qualify as a Reformulated Covered Product (for which ERC alleges that no Warning has been provided), then ERC shall inform MUSCLEPHARM in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information sufficient to permit MUSCLEPHARM to identify the Covered Products at issue. MUSCLEPHARM shall, within thirty (30) days following such notice, provide ERC with testing information, from an independent third-party laboratory meeting the requirements of Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4, demonstrating MUSCLEPHARM's compliance with the Consent Judgment, if warranted. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior to ERC taking any further legal action.

7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), distributors, wholesalers,

retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Consent Judgment shall have no application to Covered Products which is distributed or sold exclusively outside the State of California and which is not used by California consumers.

8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

- 8.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and MUSCLEPHARM and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of MUSCLEPHARM), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and all other upstream and downstream entities in the distribution chain of any Covered Product, and the predecessors, successors, and assigns of any of them (collectively, "Released Parties"). ERC hereby fully releases and discharges the Released Parties from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties, fees, costs, and expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted from the handling, use, or consumption of the Covered Products, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered Products regarding lead up to and including the Effective Date.
- 8.2 ERC on its own behalf only, and MUSCLEPHARM on its own behalf only, further waive and release any and all claims they may have against each other for all actions or statements made or undertaken in the course of seeking or opposing enforcement of Proposition 65 in connection with the Notice and Complaint up through and including the Effective Date, provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.
- 8.3 It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties, arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice and Complaint, and relating to the Covered Products, will develop or be discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, and MUSCLEPHARM on behalf of itself only, acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims up through and including the Effective Date, including all rights of action therefore. ERC and MUSCLEPHARM acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 8.1 and 8.2

Page 12 of 16

Case No. RG16839532

1	Email: chris_erc501c3@yahoo.com		
2			
3	With a copy to:		
4	WWY T Y A A C D WID A VIDY		
5	24422 Avenida de la Carlota, Suite 400 Laguna Hills, CA 92653		
6	$ T_{\alpha} \cdot (0.40) \cdot 452 \cdot 1.224$		
7			
8	MUSCLEPHARM CORPORATION		
9			
10	1721 Hollow St. Blag. 11		
11	Denver, CO 80239 Tel: 303-396-6108		
12	Email: maria.gorecki@musclepharm.com		
13	\$1.50 AND \$100 \$1.00 ALC \$		
14	WHITNEY JONES ROY SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP 333 South Hope Street, 43 rd Floor		
15	Los Angeles, CA 9	00071-1422	
16	Fax: (213) 620-178		
17	12. COURT A	PPROVAL	
18	12.1 Upo	on execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, ERC shall notice a	
19	Motion for Court A	Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this	
20	Consent Judgment		
21	12.2 If th	ne California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment,	
22	the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible		
23	prior to the hearing on the motion.		
24	12.3 If th	is Stipulated Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be	
25	void and have no force or effect.		
26	13. EXECUTI	ON AND COUNTERPARTS	
27	This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be		
28	deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed to be as valid		
	Page 13 of 16		

Case No. RG16839532

as the original signature.

14. DRAFTING

The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for each Party prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms and conditions with legal counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and construction of this Consent Judgment, no inference, assumption, or presumption shall be drawn, and no provision of this Consent Judgment shall be construed against any Party, based on the fact that one of the Parties and/or one of the Parties' legal counsel prepared and/or drafted all or any portion of the Consent Judgment. It is conclusively presumed that all of the Parties participated equally in the preparation and drafting of this Consent Judgment.

15. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES

If a dispute arises with respect to either Party's compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall meet and confer in person, by telephone, and/or in writing and endeavor to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. No action or motion may be filed in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute beforehand.

16. ENFORCEMENT

ERC may, by motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Alameda County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In any action brought by ERC to enforce this Consent Judgment, ERC may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment. To the extent the failure to comply with the Consent Judgment constitutes a violation of Proposition 65 or other laws, ERC shall not be limited to enforcement of this Consent Judgment, but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws.

17. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION

17.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, and understandings related hereto. No

Page 15 of 16

Case No. RG16839532

1	APPROVED AS TO FORM:			
2	Dated: December 22, 2016	WRAITH LAW		
3		By: Misi Flysics		
4		William F. Wraith Attorney for Plaintiff Environmental		
5		Research Center, Inc.		
6				
7		SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP		
8		By: The		
9		Whitney Jones Roy Attorney for Defendant MusclePharm		
10		Corporation		
11				
12				
13	ORDER AND JUDGMENT			
14	Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing, this Consent Judgment is			
15	approved and Judgment is hereby entered according to its terms.			
16	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED.			
17	Dated:, 2016			
18	Judg	e of the Superior Court		
20				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	Page 16 of 16			
	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT	Case No. RG16839532		

WRAITH LAW

24422 AVENIDA DE LA CARLOTA SUITE 400 LAGUNA HILLS, CA 92653 Tel (949) 452-1234 Fax (949) 452-1102

February 19, 2016

NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ. (PROPOSITION 65)

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

ERC has identified violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65"), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq., with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violator identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violator and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Section 25249.7(d) of the statute, ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

<u>General Information about Proposition 65</u>. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is attached with the copy of this letter served to the alleged Violator identified below.

<u>Alleged Violator</u>. The name of the company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violator") is:

MusclePharm Corporation

<u>Consumer Products and Listed Chemical</u>. The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemical in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1) MusclePharm Corp. Arnold Schwarzenegger Series Iron Mass Vanilla Malt Lead
- 2) MusclePharm Corp. Arnold Schwarzenegger Series Iron Mass Chocolate Malt Lead

- 3) MusclePharm Corp. Arnold Schwarzenegger Series Iron Pump Watermelon Lead
- 4) MusclePharm Corp. Arnold Schwarzenegger Series Arnold Iron Cuts Lead
- 5) MusclePharm Corp. Arnold Schwarzenegger Muscle Bar Chocolate Brownie Lead
- 6) MusclePharm Corp. Arnold Schwarzenegger Series Iron Whey Peanut Butter Cup Lead
- 7) MusclePharm Corp. Arnold Schwarzenegger Series Iron Whey Cookies 'N' Cream Lead
- 8) MusclePharm Corp. Arnold Schwarzenegger Series Iron Whey Strawberry Banana Lead
- 9) MusclePharm Corp. Arnold Schwarzenegger Series Iron Whey Chocolate Lead
- 10) MusclePharm Corp. Arnold Schwarzenegger Series Iron Whey Vanilla Lead
- 11) MusclePharm Corp. Arnold Schwarzenegger Series Iron Pack Lead
- 12) MusclePharm Corp. FitMiss Ignite Orange Lead
- 13) MusclePharm Corp. FitMiss Ignite Grape Lead
- 14) MusclePharm Corp. FitMiss Delight Strawberries N' Cream Lead

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

Route of Exposure. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and recommended use of these products. Consequently, the primary route of exposure to this chemical has been and continues to be through ingestion, but may have also occurred and may continue to occur through inhalation and/or dermal contact.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least February 19, 2013, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until this known toxic chemical is either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide persons handling and/or using these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an

appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemical, as well as an expensive and time consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violations to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead.**

Sincerely,
William Fulwith

William F. Wraith

Attachments

Certificate of Merit Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to MusclePharm Corporation and its Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by MusclePharm Corporation

I, William F. Wraith, declare:

- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
 - 2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.
- 3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice.
- 4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- 5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: February 19, 2016

William E Wraith

William Falaith

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years of age, and am not a party to the within entitled action. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On February 19, 2016, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5** ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE **DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY"** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO MusclePharm Corporation 4721 Ironton Street, Unit A Denver, CO 80239

Current President or CEO MusclePharm Corporation 701 Willow Pass Road, Suite 8 Pittsburg, CA 94565

Current President or CEO MusclePharmCorporation 200 Beasley Drive Franklin, TN 37064 VCorp Services, LLC (MusclePharm Corporation's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 1645 Village Center Circle, Suite 170 Las Vegas, NV 89134

VCorp Services CA, Inc. (MusclePharm Corporation's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1530 Los Angeles, CA 90036

On February 19, 2016, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5** *ET SEQ.*; **CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice:

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On February 19, 2016, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5** *ET SEQ.*; **CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to the party listed below:

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator Lassen County 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney Monterey County 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Gary Lieberstein, District Attorney Napa County 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney Riverside County 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney Sacramento County 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.org

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney San Francisco County 732 Brannan Street San Francisco, CA 94103 gregory.alker@sfgov.org Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney Santa Clara County 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney Tulare County 221 S Mooney Blvd Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney Ventura County 800 S Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reisig, District Attorney Yolo County 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org

On February 19, 2016, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5** *ET SEQ.*; **CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Priority Mail.

Executed on February 19, 2016, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Phyllis Dunwoody

District Attorney, Alameda County 1225 Fallon Street, Suite 900 Oakland, CA 94612

District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive, Suite 245 Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249

District Attorney, Colusa County 346 Fifth Street Suite 101 Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Room 171 Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County 515 Main Street Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000 Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn County Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5th Street 4th Floor Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial County 940 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Inyo County 230 W. Line Street Bishop, CA 93514

District Attorney, Kern County 1215 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings County 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230 District Attorney, Lake County 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles County 210 West Temple Street, Suite 18000 Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera County 209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendocino County Post Office Box 1000 Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced County 550 W. Main Street Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202

Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Nevada County 201 Commercial Street Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange County 401 West Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92701

District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95678

District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971

District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023 District Attorney,San Bernardino County 316 N. Mountain View Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92415-0004

District Attorney, San Diego County 330 West Broadway, Suite 1300 San Diego, CA 92101

District Attorney, San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Ave. Rm. 202 Stockton, CA 95202

District Attorney, San Luis Obispo County 1035 Palm St, Room 450 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Santa Barbara County 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101

District Attorney, Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street, Room 200 Santa Cruz, CA 95060

District Attorney, Shasta County 1355 West Street Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra County PO Box 457 Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12th Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter County 446 Second Street Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093 District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba County 215 Fifth Street, Suite 152 Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's Office City Hall East 200 N. Main Street, Suite 800 Los Angeles, CA 90012

San Diego City Attorney's Office 1200 3rd Avenue, Ste 1620 San Diego, CA 92101

San Francisco, City Attorney City Hall, Room 234 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett PL San Francisco, CA 94102

San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor San Jose, CA 95113