MENT		
LLC,		
ΓS,		
tter.		
, 2020;		
k food		
products, including Sliced Chips and Extruded Products (as defined below), and that are or were		
olly		
1,		

1	products manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold, or offered for sale by Inventure Foods, Inc.		
2	and its predecessor, Poore Brothers, Inc. (collectively, "Inventure") that are covered by the		
3	Consent Judgment between the Environmental Law Foundation and Inventure Foods, Inc. in price		
4	Proposition 65 litigation relating to acrylamide bearing case name and number "Environmental		
5	Law Foundation v. Birds Eye Foods, Inc., Case No. BC356591" and (2) all products		
6	manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold, or offered for sale by Inventure that are covered by the		
7	Consent Judgment between Center for Environmental Health and Inventure Foods, Inc. entered in		
8	this action on December 18, 2018. The prior and current subsidiaries and affiliates that have		
9	manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold and/or offered for sale Covered Products and are covered		
10	by this Consent Judgment, including but not limited to the release contained herein, are identified		
11	in Exhibit A ("Subsidiaries").		
12	1.4 "Sliced Chips" means sliced potato chips made from common chipping potatoes.		
13	1.5 "Extruded Products" means all Covered Products other than Sliced Chips,		
14	including but not limited to Veggie Extruded Products and Non-Veggie Extruded Products. It is		
15	the Parties' intent that the Extruded Products referenced in this Consent Judgment are the kind of		
16	products falling within Type 4 in the "extruded, pellet, and baked products" category in the		
17	Consent Judgment as to Defendant Snak King Corporation, entered August 31, 2011, in <i>People v</i>		
18	Snyder's of Hanover, et al., Alameda County Superior Court Case No. RG 09-455286.1		
19	1.6 "Veggie Extruded Products" means Good Health brand veggie snack foods		
20	manufactured utilizing a potato-based pellet, including veggie chips, sticks, and straws.		
21	1.7 "Non-Veggie Extruded Products" means all Extruded Products that do not fall		
22	under the definition of "Veggie Extruded Products."		
23	1.8 "Effective Date" means the date on which the Court approves and enters this		

24 25 Consent Judgment.

26

27

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These products are referred to as "Group C, Type 4" products in Exhibit A to the Snak King Consent Judgment, which is available on the Attorney General's website at https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/litigation.

1.9 "Similar" means having substantially similar vegetable ingredients and cooking processes.

#### 2. INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 The Parties to this Consent Judgment are the Center for Environmental Health, a California non-profit corporation ("CEH"), on the one hand, and Utz Quality Foods, LLC ("Utz"), Snikiddy, LLC ("Snikiddy"), and Good Health Natural Products, LLC ("Good Health") (collectively, "Settling Defendants"), on the other hand. CEH and Settling Defendants (collectively, the "Parties") enter into this Consent Judgment to settle certain claims asserted by CEH against Settling Defendants as set forth in the Complaint. Except as otherwise provided herein, this Consent Judgment is intended to apply to all Covered Products sold or offered for sale by Defendant Releasees (as the term is defined in paragraph 7.1) or Downstream Defendant Releases (as the term is defined in 7.1) in California.
- 2.2 On or about July 27, 2016, CEH provided a 60-day Notice of Violation of 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, to Utz, and to Good Health, alleging that Utz and Good Health violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons to acrylamide contained in fried or baked potato based snack foods without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning. On or about August 26, 2016, CEH provided a 60-day Amended Notice of Violation of Proposition 65 to Utz, Good Health, and the same set of public enforcers alleging that Utz and Good Health violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons to acrylamide contained in Covered Products without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.
- 2.3 On or about August 26, 2016, CEH provided a 60-day Notice of Violation of 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 to Snikiddy, alleging that Snikiddy violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons in California

to acrylamide contained in Covered Products without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.

- 2.4 Each Settling Defendant is a corporation or other business entity that manufactures, distributes, sells, or offers for sale Covered Products that are sold in the State of California or has done so at times relevant to the Complaint.
- 2.5 On November 10, 2016, CEH filed the initial complaint in the above-captioned matter, naming, among other entities, Settling Defendants as original defendants. On April 11, 2017, CEH filed the Complaint, which added additional defendants but did not amend CEH's allegations or claims against Settling Defendants. On May 22, 2018, CEH filed its Second Amended Complaint which also did not amend the allegations or claims against Settling Defendants.
- 2.6 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, 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 and enforce 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 and in the Notice with respect to Covered Products manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold and/or offered for sale by Settling Defendants and their Subsidiaries.
- 2.7 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. Except as otherwise provided for herein, 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 in an efficient and

economic manner.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

#### 3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

**Reformulation of Covered Products.** Except as otherwise permitted by Section 3.1 3.2 of this Consent Judgment, upon the applicable Compliance Date, Settling Defendants and their Subsidiaries shall not manufacture, ship, sell, or offer for sale Covered Products that will be sold or offered for sale in California that exceed the following acrylamide concentration levels (the "Reformulation Levels"), such concentration to be determined by use of a test performed by an accredited laboratory using either GC/MS (Gas Chromatograph/Mass Spectrometry), LC-MS/MS (Liquid Chromatograph-Mass Spectrometry), or any other testing method agreed upon by the Parties. Any samples of a Covered Product tested under 3.1.1 or 3.1.2 shall be homogenized before testing for acrylamide content.

# 3.1.1 For Sliced Chips:

3.1.1.1 The average acrylamide concentration shall not exceed 281 parts per billion ("ppb") by weight (the "Sliced Chips Average Level"). The Sliced Chips Average Level is determined by randomly selecting and testing at least one (1) sample each from at least three (3) and up to ten (10) different lots of a particular type of Covered Product that is a Sliced Chip (or the maximum number of lots available for testing if less than 3) during a testing period of at least three hundred sixty-five (365) days. The mean and standard deviation shall be calculated using the sampling data. Any data points that are more than three standard deviations outside the mean shall be discarded, and the mean and standard deviation recalculated using the remaining data points. The mean determined in accordance with this procedure shall be deemed the "Sliced Chip Average Level."

3.1.1.2 The acrylamide concentration of any individual unit of Sliced Chips shall not exceed 350 ppb by weight, based on a representative composite sample taken from the individual unit being tested (the "Sliced Chips Unit Level").

#### 3.1.2 For Extruded Products:

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

3.1.2.1 The average acrylamide concentration shall not exceed 350 ppl
by weight (the "Extruded Products Average Level"). The Extruded Products Average Level is
determined by randomly selecting and testing at least one (1) sample each from at least three (3)
and up to ten (10) different lots of a particular type of Covered Product that is an Extruded
Product (or the maximum number of lots available for testing if less than 3) during a testing
period of at least three hundred sixty-five (365) days. The mean and standard deviation shall be
calculated using the sampling data. Any data points that are more than three standard deviations
outside the mean shall be discarded, and the mean and standard deviation recalculated using the
remaining data points. The mean determined in accordance with this procedure shall be deemed
the "Extruded Products Average Level."

3.1.2.2 The acrylamide concentration of any individual unit of Extruded Products shall not exceed 490 ppb by weight, based on a representative composite sample taken from the individual unit being tested (the "Extruded Products Unit Level"). For avoidance of doubt, Covered Products either purchased, manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold and/or offered for sale by Settling Defendants and their Subsidiaries prior to the applicable Compliance Date are not subject to the Reformulation Levels, even if such products are sold or offered for sale in California after the applicable Compliance Date.

3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings. A Covered Product purchased, manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold or offered for sale by Settling Defendants or their Subsidiaries may, as an alternative to meeting the Reformulation Levels, be sold or offered for sale in California with a Clear and Reasonable Warning that complies with the provisions of this Section 3.2. A Clear and Reasonable Warning may only be provided for Covered Products that Settling Defendants or their Subsidiaries reasonably believe do not meet the Reformulation Levels. A Clear and Reasonable Warning under this Consent Judgment shall state:

**WARNING:** Consuming this product can expose you to chemicals including acrylamide, which are known to the State of California to cause cancer. Acrylamide is a chemical that

can form in some foods during high-temperature cooking processes, such as frying, roasting, and baking. For more information go to www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food.

The word "WARNING" shall be displayed in all capital letters and bold print. This warning statement shall be prominently displayed on the Covered Product, on the packaging of the Covered Product, or on a placard or sign provided that the statement is displayed with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements or designs as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual prior to sale. If the warning statement is displayed on the Covered Product's label, it must be set off from other surrounding information and enclosed in a text box. If the warning statement is displayed on a placard or sign where the Covered Product is offered for sale, the warning placard or sign must enable an ordinary individual to easily determine which specific Covered Products the warning applies to, and to differentiate between that Covered Product and other products to which the warning statement does not apply. For internet, catalog or any other sale where the consumer is not physically present, the warning statement shall be displayed in such a manner that it is likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual prior to the authorization of or actual payment. Nothing in this Consent Judgment requires that warnings be provided for Covered Products that are not sold or offered for sale in California. To comply with Section 3.2, Settling Defendants and their Subsidiaries may rely on the procedure for notifying retailers set out in Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25600.2, in effect as of the applicable Compliance Date.

If Settling Defendants intend to avail themselves of the warning option provided for in this Section as to Veggie Extruded Products pursuant to Section 5.2.4, they shall provide CEH with notice of their intention at least 14 days' prior to applying Clear and Reasonable Warnings to Veggie Extruded Products sold or offered for sale in California, and Settling Defendants concurrently shall make the additional payment specified in Section 5.2.4 below.

The warning requirements set forth herein are imposed pursuant to the terms of this Consent Judgment, and are recognized by the Parties as not being the exclusive manner of providing a warning for the Covered Products. Warnings may be provided as specific in Proposition 65

26

regulations for food in effect as of the applicable Compliance Date (Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25601, *et seq.*) or as such regulations may be amended in the future.

### 4. ENFORCEMENT

4.1 **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 by CEH to enforce alleged violations of Section 3.1 by a Settling Defendants or to enforce future alleged violations of Proposition 65 with respect to acrylamide exposures from the Covered Products shall be brought exclusively pursuant to this Section 4, and be subject to the meet and confer requirement of Section 4.2.5 if applicable.

# 4.2 Enforcement of Reformulation Commitment.

4.2.1 Covered Product Identification. Within thirty (30) days after the Effective Date, Settling Defendants shall notify CEH of a means sufficient to allow CEH to identify Covered Products that are sold or offered for sale in California and that are sold or offered for sale by Settling Defendants and their Subsidiaries on or after that date, for example, a unique brand name or characteristic system of product numbering or labeling. Upon written request by CEH, but no more than once in any calendar year, Settling Defendants shall, within thirty (30) days of receiving a request from CEH, update the information provided to CEH pursuant to this Section 4.2.1 by notifying CEH of a means sufficient to allow CEH to identify Covered Products currently sold or offered for sale in California and that are sold or offered for sale by Settling Defendants and their Subsidiaries. All information provided to CEH pursuant to this Section 4.2.1 may be designated by Settling Defendants as competitively sensitive confidential business information, and if so designated shall not be disclosed to any person without the written permission of Settling Defendants. Any motions or pleadings or any other court filings that may reveal information designated as competitively sensitive confidential business information pursuant to this Section shall be submitted in accordance with California Rules of Court 8.46 and 2.550, et seq. The provisions of this Section 4.2.1 shall sunset seven (7) years after the applicable Compliance Date.

27

25

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7

4.2.2 Notice of Violation. In the event that CEH purchases a Covered Product in California with a best-by or sell-by (or equivalent) date indicating that the Covered Product was sold or offered for sale by a Settling Defendant or a Subsidiary after the applicable Compliance Date, and for which CEH has laboratory test results showing that the Covered Product exceeds the applicable Unit Level, and which lacks a Clear and Reasonable Warning that complies with Section 3.2 (to the extent Settling Defendants have an option to warn as to that Covered Product), CEH may issue a Notice of Violation pursuant to this Section. CEH shall withdraw the Notice of Violation if Settling Defendants demonstrate that the Covered Product at issue was manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold or purchased before the applicable Compliance Date. Notwithstanding the foregoing, CEH may not issue a Notice of Violation with respect to a Covered Product if its packaging is marked or labeled with the statement "Not for Sale in California" or equivalent language so long as such statement is prominently placed upon such Covered Product's label or other labeling, as compared with other words or statements on the label or labeling, as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customer conditions of purchase or use. If Settling Defendants or their Subsidiaries mark or label a Covered Product with such a statement, Settling Defendants or their Subsidiaries shall include a letter to each of its retailer or distributor customers receiving that Covered Product notifying the customer that the Covered Product may not be sold in California.

# 4.2.3 Service of Notice of Violation and Supporting Documentation.

4.2.3.1 The Notice of Violation shall be sent to the person(s) identified in Section 8.2 to receive notices for Settling Defendants, and must be served within sixty (60) days of the later of the date the Covered Product at issue was purchased by CEH or the date that CEH can reasonably determine that the Covered Product at issue was manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold, or offered for sale by a Settling Defendant or a Subsidiary, provided, however, that CEH may have up to an additional sixty (60) days to send the Notice of Violation if, notwithstanding CEH's good faith efforts, the test data required by Section 4.2.3.2 below cannot be obtained by CEH from its laboratory before expiration of the initial sixty (60) day period.

- 4.2.3.2 The Notice of Violation shall, at a minimum, set forth: (a) the date the Covered Product was purchased; (b) the location at which the Covered Product was purchased; (c) a description of the Covered Product giving rise to the alleged violation, including the name and address of the retail entity from which the sample was obtained and pictures of the product packaging from all sides, which identifies the product lot, manufacturing date and best-by date and sell-by date (to the extent available); and (d) all test data obtained by CEH regarding the Covered Product 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 Product.
- 4.2.4 <u>Notice of Election of Response</u>. No more than thirty (30) days after effectuation of service of a Notice of Violation, Settling Defendants shall provide written notice to CEH whether they elect 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. Upon notice to CEH, Settling Defendants may have up to an additional sixty (60) days to elect if, notwithstanding Settling Defendants' good faith efforts, Settling Defendants are unable to verify the test data provided by CEH before expiration of the initial thirty (30) day period.
- 4.2.4.1 If a Notice of Violation is contested, the Notice of Election shall include all documents upon which Settling Defendants are relying to contest the alleged violation, including all available test data. If a Settling Defendant or CEH later acquires additional test or other data regarding the alleged violation during the meet and confer period described in Section 4.2.5, it shall notify the other Party and promptly provide all such data or information to the Party unless either the Notice of Violation or Notice of Election has been withdrawn.
- 4.2.5 <u>Meet and Confer.</u> If a Notice of Violation is contested, CEH and Settling Defendants shall meet and confer to attempt to resolve their dispute. Within thirty (30) days of serving a Notice of Election contesting a Notice of Violation, Settling Defendants may withdraw the original Notice of Election contesting the violation and serve a new Notice of Election to not

\$2,500 in addition to any other payment required under this Consent Judgment. At any time, CEH may withdraw a Notice of Violation, in which case for purposes of this Section 4.2 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 4.1. The Parties may extend this thirty (30)-day time period by written stipulation. In any such proceeding, CEH may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, attorneys' fees, or other remedies are provided by law for an alleged failure to comply with the Consent Judgment.

4.2.6 <u>Non-Contested Notices</u>. If Settling Defendants elect to not contest the allegations in a Notice of Violation, they shall undertake corrective action(s) and make payments, if any, as set forth below.

4.2.6.1 Settling Defendants shall include in their Notice of Election a detailed description with supporting documentation of the corrective action(s) that they have undertaken or propose 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 in California by Settling Defendants or their Subsidiaries without a warning under Section 3.2, and that Setting Defendants have sent, or cause to be sent, instructions to any retailers or customers that offer the Noticed Covered Products for sale to cease offering the Noticed Covered Products for sale in California and to return all such Noticed Covered Products to Settling Defendants if Settling Defendants have reason to believe the Noticed Covered Products are still offered for sale in California. Settling Defendants shall keep for a period of one year and make available to CEH upon reasonable notice (which shall not exceed more than one request per year) for inspection and copying records of any non-privileged correspondence regarding the foregoing. If there is a dispute over the corrective action, Settling Defendants and CEH shall meet and confer before seeking any remedy

in court. In no case shall CEH issue more than one Notice of Violation per manufacturing lot of a type of Covered Product, nor shall CEH issue more than two Notices of Violation for all Covered Products in the first year following the applicable Compliance Date. Nothing in this or any other section of this agreement envisions or requires any waiver of attorney-client or other privileges that may attach to written or oral communications.

4.2.6.2 If the Notice of Violation is based on a violation of the applicable Unit Level with respect to a single Covered Product, Settling Defendants will be excused from the corrective action obligation if Settling Defendants produce test results or other evidence showing that the Noticed Covered Products comply with the applicable Average Level. However, to avail themselves of this provision, Settling Defendants must provide CEH with all non-privileged acrylamide test data in its possession, custody, or control pertaining to the type of Covered Product at issue in the Notice of Violation that was performed within the year prior to Settling Defendants producing test results to CEH under this Section 4.2.6.2. If there is a dispute over whether Settling Defendants are excused from the corrective action, Settling Defendants and CEH shall meet and confer before seeking any remedy in court.

4.2.6.3 If the Notice of Violation is the first, second, third, or fourth Notice of Violation received by Settling Defendants under Section 4.2.2 that was not successfully contested or withdrawn, then Settling Defendants shall pay \$15,000 for each Notice of Violation. This shall be the sole and exclusive monetary remedy for such non-contested violations and CEH shall not be entitled to seek additional amounts for attorneys' fees and costs, civil penalties, payments in lieu of civil penalties, or other monetary relief. If Settling Defendants have received more than four (4) Notices of Violation under Section 4.2.2 that were not successfully contested or withdrawn, then Settling Defendants shall pay \$25,000 for each Notice of Violation. If Settling Defendants are not contesting the Notice of Violation and Settling Defendants produce with their Notice of Election test data for the specific SKU, or comparative like items, that reasonably demonstrate predicted acrylamide levels below the applicable Unit Level, then any payment under this Section shall be reduced by 100 percent (100%) for the first Notice of

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Violation, by seventy-five percent (75%) for the second Notice of Violation, and by fifty percent (50%) for any subsequent Notice of Violation. If Settling Defendants are excused from the corrective action obligation pursuant to Section 4.2.6.2, then Settling Defendants shall pay \$2,500 for that Notice of Violation. In no case shall Settling Defendants be obligated to pay more than \$100,000 for all Notices of Violation not successfully contested or withdrawn in any calendar year irrespective of the total number of Notices of Violation issued.

- 4.2.7 Payments. Any payments under Section 4.2 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 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, and shall be the extent of all monetary remedies available to CEH under this Consent Judgment for a non-contested Notice of Violation.
- 4.3 **Repeat Violations.** If Settling Defendants have received four (4) or more Notices of Violation concerning the same type of Covered Product that were not successfully contested or withdrawn in any two (2) year 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 Settling Defendants for at least thirty (30) days to determine if Settling Defendants and CEH can agree on measures that Settling Defendants can undertake to prevent future alleged violations.

# 5. PAYMENTS

- 5.1 **Payments by Settling Defendants.** Within twenty (20) calendar days of the date on which the Court approves and enters this Consent Judgment, Settling Defendants shall pay the total sum of \$585,000 as a settlement payment as further set forth in this Section.
- 5.2 **Allocation of Payments.** The total settlement amount shall be paid in five (5) separate checks in the amounts specified below and delivered as set forth below. Any failure by Settling Defendants to comply with the payment terms herein shall be subject to a stipulated late

1	fee to be paid by Settling Defendants to CEH in the amount of \$100 for each day the full paymen		
2	is not received after the payment due date set forth in Section 5.1. The late fees required under		
3	this Section shall be recoverable, together with reasonable attorneys' fees, in an enforcement		
4	proceeding brought pursuant to Section 4 of this Consent Judgment. The funds paid by Settling		
5	Defendants shall be allocated as set forth below between the following categories and made		
6	payable as follows:		
7	5.2.1 \$84,575 as a civil penalty pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b).		
8	The civil penalty payment shall be apportioned in accordance with Health & Safety Code §		
9	25249.12 (25% to CEH and 75% to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health		
10	Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA")). Accordingly, the OEHHA portion of the civil penalty		
11	payment for \$63,431.25 shall be made payable to OEHHA and associated with taxpayer		
12	identification number 68-0284486. This payment shall be delivered as follows:		
13	For United States Postal Service Delivery:		
14	Attn: Mike Gyurics		
15	Fiscal Operations Branch Chief Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment		
16	P.O. Box 4010, MS #19B Sacramento, CA 95812-4010		
17	For Non-United States Postal Service Delivery:		
18	·		
19	Attn: Mike Gyurics Fiscal Operations Branch Chief		
20	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment 1001 I Street, MS #19B		
21	Sacramento, CA 95814		
22	The CEH portion of the civil penalty payment for \$21,143.75 shall be made payable to the Center		
23	for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981. This		
24	payment shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA		
25	94117.		
26	5.2.2 \$63,425 as an Additional Settlement Payment ("ASP") to CEH pursuant to		
27	Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), and California Code of Regulations, Title 11, § 3204. CEH		
28	1.4		

purposes: the funds will be placed in CEH's Toxics in Food Fund and used to support CEH programs and activities that seek to educate the public about acrylamide and other toxic chemicals in food, to work with the food industry and agriculture interests to reduce exposure to acrylamide and other toxic chemicals in food, and to thereby reduce the public health impacts and risks of exposure to acrylamide and other toxic chemicals in food sold in California. CEH shall obtain and maintain adequate records to document that ASPs are spent on these activities and CEH agrees to provide such documentation to the Attorney General within thirty (30) days of any request from the Attorney General. The payment pursuant to this Section shall be made payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981. This payment shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.

5.2.3 \$437,000 as a reimbursement of a portion of CEH's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The attorneys' fees and cost reimbursement shall be made in two separate checks as follows: (a) \$409,500 payable to the Lexington Law Group and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3317175; and (b) \$27,500 payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981. These payments shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.

5.2.4 Additional Contingent Payment for Warning on Veggie Extruded Products. If Settling Defendants avail themselves of the warning option provided for by Section 3.2 as to Veggie Extruded Products, Settling Defendants shall make an additional payment of \$150,000 as a civil penalty, concurrently with its written notice as provided in Section 3.2. This additional 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 for \$112,500 shall be made payable to OEHHA, associated with taxpayer identification number 68-0284486, and sent to the OEHHA address set forth in section 5.2.1 above or any

updated address for OEHHA. The CEH portion of the additional civil penalty payment for \$37,500 shall be made payable to the Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981. This payment shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, 503 Divisadero Street, San Francisco, CA 94117. No additional payment shall be required for Settling Defendants to avail themselves of the warning option provided for by Section 3.2 as to Sliced Chips and Non-Veggie Extruded Products.

# 6. MODIFICATION AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION

- 6.1 **Modification.** This Consent Judgment may be modified from time to time by express written agreement of the Parties, with the approval of the Court and prior notice to the Attorney General's Office, or by an order of this Court upon motion and prior notice to the Attorney General's Office and in accordance with law.
- 6.2 **Notice; Meet and Confer.** Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with the other Party prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.
- 6.3 Court Decision Regarding Similar Products. If a court of competent jurisdiction renders a final judgment that one or more products that are Similar to any of the Covered Products do not require a warning for acrylamide under Proposition 65, where such products contain levels of acrylamide at or above the Reformulation Levels, then Settling Defendants may move to modify this Consent Judgment to conform to such ruling with respect to such portion of the Covered Products as is appropriate.
- 6.4 **Other CEH Settlements.** Settling Defendants may move to modify this Consent Judgment to substitute a higher Reformulation Level that CEH agrees to in a future consent judgment applicable to products Similar to any of the Covered Products and CEH agrees not to oppose any such motion except for good cause shown. Any such modification shall only apply to Covered Products that are Similar to those products that are subject to a higher Reformulation Level.
  - 6.5 **Other Court Decisions.** If a final decision of a court determines that warnings for

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

-16-

acrylamide exposures or that enforcement of Proposition 65 claims for acrylamide exposures are preempted or otherwise unlawful or unconstitutional with respect to products that are Similar to any of the Covered Products, then Settling Defendants may move to modify this Consent Judgment to conform to such ruling in order to avoid unfair, inconsistent, or anti-competitive results.

- Change in Proposition 65. If Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations (including but not limited to the "safe harbor no significant risk level" for acrylamide set forth at Cal. Code Regs., tit. 27, section 25705, subdivision (c)(2) or any "alternative risk level" adopted by regulation or court decision) are changed from their terms as they exist on the date of entry of this Consent Judgment in a manner that impacts the Reformulation Levels, or if OEHHA takes some other final regulatory action for products Similar to the Covered Products in a manner that impacts the Reformulation Levels or that determines that warnings for acrylamide are not required for such products, then Settling Defendants may seek to modify this Consent Judgment to modify the Reformulation Levels. The Parties recognize that the Reformulation Levels are based on a compromise of a number of issues, and that a change to the "safe harbor no significant risk level" for acrylamide would not necessarily entitle a Party to a modification of the terms of this Consent Judgment corresponding in a linear relationship with such a change.
- 6.7 **Scientific Studies.** If an agency of the federal government, including, but not limited to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, states through any guidance, regulation, or other legally binding act, following a review of scientific studies and following public notice and comment, a cancer potency estimate for acrylamide that equates to a no significant risk level higher than 0.2 micrograms per day, then Settling Defendants shall be entitled to seek a modification of this Consent Judgment to be relieved of their obligations to meet any requirements of this Consent Judgment that are inconsistent with such a change. The Parties recognize that the Reformulation Levels are based on a compromise of a number of issues, and that a change to the "no significant risk level" for acrylamide would not necessarily entitle a Party to a modification of the terms of this Consent Judgment corresponding in a linear relationship

with such a change.

- 6.8 **Federal Agency Action and Preemption.** If a court of competent jurisdiction or an agency of the federal government, including, but not limited to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, states through any guidance, regulation, or other legally binding act that federal law has preemptive effect on any of the requirements of this Consent Judgment, then this Consent Judgment may be modified in accordance with the procedure for noticed motions set forth in Section 6.1 to bring it into compliance with or avoid conflict with federal law. Any such modification shall be limited to those changes that are necessary to bring this Consent Judgment into compliance with or avoid conflict with federal law.
- 6.9 Warnings From Other Settlements. To the extent Settling Defendants or their Subsidiaries elect to warn pursuant to Section 3.2, Settling Defendants may seek to modify this Consent Judgment to substitute different warning language or methods approved by a court in a future consent judgment or judgment for exposures to acrylamide in snack food products (provided Settling Defendants only seek to use such language and methods to a comparable manner of sale of the Covered Products) (e.g., internet warnings will only be used for internet sales). If Settling Defendants seek to exercise this option under Section 6.9, they shall provide notice to CEH, and the Parties shall meet and confer, pursuant to Section 6.2. If the Parties cannot resolve the dispute informally during such meet and confer, Settling Defendants may file a motion to modify the Consent Judgment, and the Court shall approve the requested modification unless it finds that the proposed warning language or method does not comply with Proposition 65.

# 7. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE

7.1 Provided that Settling Defendants comply in full with their obligations under Sections 5.1, 5.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 hereof, this Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH on behalf of itself and the public interest and Settling Defendants and Settling Defendants' direct and indirect parents, subsidiaries (including but not limited to the Subsidiaries), affiliated entities that are under common ownership, directors, officers, managers,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

employees, agents, owners, successors, assigns, licensors, licensees and attorneys ("Defendant Releasees"), and all entities and persons to which Settling Defendants and any Subsidiaries directly or indirectly distribute or sell Covered Products, including but not limited to distributors, wholesalers, customers, franchises, and retailers (including but not limited to Walmart Inc., Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Sam's West, Inc., Jet.com, Walmart.com USA, LLC, Gelson's Markets, Save Mart Supermarkets, Sunflower Farmers Markets, LLC, Sprouts Farmers Market, LLC, SF Markets, LLC, Henry's Holdings LLC, Target Corporation and their respective affiliates, subsidiaries, successors and assigns ) (collectively, "Downstream Defendant Releasees"), of any violation of Proposition 65 based on failure to warn about alleged exposure to acrylamide contained in Covered Products that were manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold or offered for sale by Settling Defendants or their Subsidiaries prior to the applicable Compliance Date.

7.2 Provided that Settling Defendants comply in full with their obligations under Sections 5.1, 5.2, 5.2.1, 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 hereof, CEH, for itself, its agents, successors and assigns, releases, waives, and forever discharges any and all claims against Settling Defendants, the Subsidiaries, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Defendant Releasees arising from any and all violations 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 acrylamide allegedly contained in Covered Products manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold or offered for sale by Settling Defendants or their Subsidiaries prior to the applicable Compliance Date.

7.3 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by Settling Defendants shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by Settling Defendants, Defendant Releasees and Downstream Defendant Releasees with respect to any alleged failure to warn about acrylamide in Covered Products manufactured, distributed, shipped, sold or offered for sale by Settling Defendants and their Subsidiaries on or after the applicable Compliance Date. As of the Effective Date, the terms and standards of this Consent Judgment shall supersede the terms and standards of any prior consent judgment addressing acrylamide exposures under Proposition 65

1	as to Settling Defendants, Defendant Releasees and Downstream Defendant Releasees solely with	
2	respect to acrylamide in the Covered Products.	
3	8. PROVISION OF NOTICE	
4	8.1 When CEH is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the	
5	notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to:	
6	Howard Hirsch	
7	Lexington Law Group 503 Divisadero Street	
8	San Francisco, CA 94117	
9	hhirsch@lexlawgroup.com	
10	8.2 When Settling Defendants are entitled to receive any notice under this Consent	
11	Judgment, the notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail to:	
12	Richard Fama	
	Cozen O'Connor 45 Broadway Atrium, Suite 1600	
13	New York, NY 10006	
14	rfama@cozen.com	
15	Brett N. Taylor Cozen O'Connor	
16	601 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 3700	
17	Los Angeles, CA 90066 btaylor@cozen.com	
	• 0	
18	Any Party may modify the person and/or address to whom the notice is to be sent	
19	by sending the other Party notice by first class and electronic mail.	
20	9. COURT APPROVAL	
21	9.1 This Consent Judgment shall become effective upon the date signed by CEH and	
22	Settling Defendants, whichever is later, provided however, that CEH shall prepare and file a	
23	Motion for Approval of this Consent Judgment and Settling Defendants shall support entry of this	
24	Consent Judgment by the Court.	
25	9.2 If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force or	
26	effect and neither the Consent Judgment nor any communication relating to it shall be introduced	
27		
28		

to determine if there was a material breach of Section 9.1.

GOVERNING LAW AND CONSTRUCTION

APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

subdivisions, and subsidiaries, and the successors or assigns of any of them.

into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any purpose, other than to allow the Court

Gelson's Markets, Save Mart Supermarkets, Sunflower Farmers Markets, LLC, and Wal-Mart

Stores, Inc., and each of these defendants shall waive all costs in this action. Within ten (10)

calendar days of receiving the initial payments required by Section 5.1 and Section 5.2, CEH shall

file dismissals without prejudice of all claims in the related CEH v. Snack Innovations, Inc. action,

Case No. RG17-851470 against Jet.com, Inc. and Target Corporation, and each of these defendants

binding upon CEH and Settling Defendants and their Subsidiaries, and the respective divisions,

arising out of this Consent Judgment shall be required to pay the prevailing Party's reasonable

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

Except as otherwise set forth herein, this Consent Judgment shall apply to and be

A Party who unsuccessfully brings or contests an action, motion, or application

Nothing in this Section 11 shall preclude a party from seeking an award of

This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding

Within ten (10) calendar days of receiving the initial payments required by Section

2

3

#### 10. DISMISSAL OF CLAIMS

shall waive all costs in that action.

**ATTORNEYS' FEES** 

ENTIRE AGREEMENT

4 5

5.1 and Section 5.2, CEH shall file dismissals without prejudice of all claims in this action against

10.1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

11.

12.

13.

14.

11.1

13.1

13.2

14.1

attorneys' fees and costs.

sanctions pursuant to law.

California.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

DOCUMENT PREPARED

of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions,

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

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. 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.

# 15. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

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

# 16. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT

16.1 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.

# 17. OTHER SETTLEMENTS

17.1 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim against any other on terms that are different from those contained in this Consent Judgment.

### 18. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS

18.1 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.

27

7 - 1	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED,	
2	AND DECREED	
3		
4	Dated:	Judge of the Superior Court
5		Judge of the Superior Court
6		
7	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
8		
9	Dated: 6/12, 2019	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
10		11 11 1
11		Signature
12		
13		Michael Green
14	*	Printed Name
15 16		CEO
17		Title
18	Dated:, 2019	LITZ OLIALITY FOODS I I C
19	, 2015	UTZ QUALITY FOODS, LLC
20		
21		Signature
22		
23		Printed Name
24		1 Timed Ivaine
25		
26		Title
27		,
28 DOCUMENT PREPARED	-	23-
ON RECYCLED PAPER		KIDDY/GOOD HEALTH – CASE NO. RG 16-838609

1	IT IS SO OPPEDED. A DITTO		
. 2	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED,		
	AND DECREED		
3	Datad		
4	Dated:  Judge of the Superior Court		
5	a ange of the puperior court		
6			
7	IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
8			
9	Dated:, 2019 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL		
10	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH		
11			
12	Signature		
13			
14	Printed Name		
15			
16			
17	Title		
18	Dated: June 11, 2019 UTZ QUALITY FOODS ILC		
19	UTZ QUALITY FOODS, LLC		
20	1.1.11		
21	Signature Interest		
22	Signature		
23	Dylan Lissette		
24	Frinted Name		
25	CEO		
26	Title		
27			
28			
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER -	-23-		
ı	CONSENT JUDGMENT - UTZ/SNIKIDDY/GOOD HEALTH - CASE NO. RG 16-838609		

1 2	Dated: June 11, 2019	SNIKIDDY, LLC
3		
4		By Indee
5		Signature
6		Dylan Lissette
7		Printed Name
8		CEO
9		Title
10	Dated: June 11, 2019	
11	Dailed: June 17, 2019	GOOD HEALTH NATURAL PRODUCTS,
12		
13 14		De Indle
15		Signature
16		Signature Dylan Lissette Printed Name
17		Printed Name
18		
19		Title
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
26		
27		
28		
DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER	-24	
11	CONSENT JUDGMENT – UTZ/SNIKI	DDY/GOOD HEALTH - CASE NO. RG 16-838609

# **EXHIBIT A**

- Utz Quality Foods, LLC
   GH Pop Holdings, LLC
   Heron Holding Corporation
   Good Health Natural Products, LLC
   Condor Snack Foods, LLC

- 6. Snikiddy, LLC7. Golden Flake Snack Foods, Inc.8. Rice Investments, L.P.