1	LEXINGTON LAW GROUP			
2	Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389 Meredyth Merrow, State Bar. No. 328337			
3	503 Divisadero Street San Francisco, CA 94117			
	Telephone: (415) 913-7800			
4	Facsimile: (415) 759-4112 mtodzo@lexlawgroup.com			
5	mmerrow@lexlawgroup.com			
6 7	Attorneys for Plaintiff CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
9	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES			
10				
11 12	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, a non-profit corporation,	Case No. 23STCV	V24545	
13	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] C TO DEFENDAN	ONSENT JUDGMENT AS	
14	V.		0 1 0 2022	
15	BOWMAN PLATING COMPANY, INC., et al.	Complaint Filed: Trial Date:	None set	
16	Defendants.	Department: Judge:	Spring Street, Dept. 6 Hon. Elihu M. Berle	
17				
18				
19	1 INTRODUCTION			
20	1. INTRODUCTION			
21	1.1. This Consent Judgment is entered	•		
22	Health, a non-profit corporation ("CEH"), and De	fendant Moog Inc.	("Settling Defendant") to	
	settle claims asserted by CEH against Settling De	fendant as set forth	in the operative Complaint	
23	in the matter Center for Environmental Health v. Bowman Plating Company, et al., Los Angeles			
24	Superior Court Case No. 23STCV24545 (the "Action"). CEH and Settling Defendant are referred			
25	to collectively as the "Parties."			
26	1.2. Moog Inc. is a corporation that employed ten (10) or more persons and operated			
27	the Facility.			
28 PARED		-1-		

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

- **1.3.** On October 11, 2019, the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) issued a letter to hundreds of facilities that conducted chrome plating activities, including Settling Defendant, to submit site-specific work plans to determine the presence of perand polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) at California facilities.
- **1.4.** On July 15, 2021, Settling Defendant submitted the Per and Polyfluoroalkyl Substance Investigation Report to the SWRCB in accordance with Order WQ 2019-0045-DWQ.
- **1.5.** The PFAS Report indicated that, in certain areas, the soil, wastewater, stormwater, and groundwater contained levels of PFAS, without attributing such levels to any source.
- 1.6. On November 30, 2023, CEH served a 60-Day Notice of Violation (the "Notice") relating to the California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. ("Proposition 65") on Settling Defendant, the California Attorney General, the District Attorney for the County of Los Angeles and City Attorney for the City of Los Angeles. The Notice alleges that there were or had been releases and discharges of certain Proposition 65-listed PFAS chemicals allegedly emanating from Settling Defendant's facility located 20263 S Western Avenue, Torrance, CA 90501 (the "Facility") into sources of drinking water, and that such alleged releases and discharges constituted violations of Proposition 65. Settling Defendant denies these allegations, including that it has violated Proposition 65.
- 1.7. On October 9, 2023, CEH filed the Action. On January 22, 2024, CEH filed the First Amended Complaint naming Settling Defendant as a defendant in the Action. As in the Notice, CEH's complaint alleges that through its operation of the Facility, Settling Defendant discharges and releases Proposition 65-listed PFAS into the groundwater and other sources of drinking water. These allegations rest, in part, on CEH's contention that the Facility has been significantly contaminated with PFAS by Settling Defendant's use of Proposition 65-listed PFAS-containing chemicals such that the exterior portions of the Facility and soil surrounding it are also contaminated. CEH contends that as a result of this contamination, significant amounts of Proposition 65-listed PFAS are present in the stormwater emanating from the Facility, which in turn contaminates the soil and leaches into the groundwater. CEH contends that this process is

ON RECYCLED PAPER

complaint.

1.8.

1.9.

11

12

9

13 14

15

16

1718

1920

21

22

24

25

26

23 **2. DEFINITIONS**

2.1. "Facility" means the facility located at 20263 S Western Ave, Torrance, CA 90501.

purposes of settling, compromising, and resolving issues disputed in this Action.

evidenced by significant amounts of Proposition 65-listed PFAS measured in the stormwater, soil

For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that: (i) this

The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement of all

and groundwater at the Facility. Settling Defendant denies all material allegations in CEH's

Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Notice and Complaint

and personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint; (ii)

venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles; and (iii) 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 in the Notice and Complaint with respect to

claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint arising out of the facts or conduct

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, or violation of law. Settling Defendant

Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense any

of the Parties may have in this or 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

denies the material, factual, and legal allegations in the Notice and Complaint and expressly

denies any wrongdoing whatsoever. Except as specifically provided herein, nothing in this

related to Settling Defendant alleged therein. By execution of this Consent Judgment and

agreeing to comply with its terms, the Parties do not admit any fact, conclusion of law, or

discharges and/or releases of PFAS from the Facility.

2.2. "Effective Date" means the date on which the Court enters this Consent Judgment.

2.3. "PFAS Report" means the Per and Polyfluoroalkyl Substance Investigation Report prepared by GHD for Moog Aircraft Group, submitted to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board on July 15, 2021.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 3.1. Power Washing or Soft Washing Facility. Settling Defendant will conduct the following power washing or soft washing for three years. The three-year period begins at the earlier of (a) the Effective Date or (b) the date on or after October 10, 2024, on which Settling Defendant conducts such washing. The phrase "per year" means a consecutive twelve-month period. All power washing or soft washing shall be conducted by an outside vendor who specializes in industrial cleaning. The vendor shall contain the fluid from the washing and Settling Defendant shall dispose of such runoff and dispose of it in accordance with all statutory and/or regulatory guidelines. Settling Defendant shall maintain records of the activities required under this Section and make those records available to CEH upon 30-days written request.
- **3.1.1. Washing of Roof of Wet Process Area.** Two times per year, Settling Defendant shall conduct power washing or soft washing of the roof of the wet process area of the Facility. *See* Figure 1.
- 3.1.2. Washing of the Exterior Sides of the Wet Process Area. One time per year, Settling Defendant will power wash or soft wash the exterior sides of the building in the area known as the "wet process area" of the Facility, which encompasses the northwest corner of the Facility. See Figure 1.
- **3.1.3. Washing of Concrete Swale.** One time per year, Settling Defendant will conduct power washing or soft washing of the concrete swale located on the west side of the Facility between the southern end of the wet process area and the southern end of the steam booth, west of the Former Honeywell Site B Groundwater Monitoring Well PGW-03. *See* Figure 1.
- **3.2. Soil Remediation.** Settling Defendant will conduct shallow soil remediation at the soil sampling point marked as SB-01. This location was selected because the PFAS Report

found elevated concentrations of PFAS in the soil at a depth of one foot. Settling Defendant will excavate soil to a depth of 3 feet and properly dispose of any contaminated soil in accordance with any regulatory soil remediation requirements.

- 3.3. Confirmatory Testing. The injunctive measures set forth in sections 3.1 and 3.2 are designed to reduce the levels of Proposition 65-listed PFAS-containing chemicals that may be released or discharged from the Facility. In order to determine the effectiveness of these measures, Settling Defendant shall conduct testing of the wastewater and stormwater as outlined in this section.
- **3.3.1. Wastewater Testing**. Within 12 months following the Effective Date, Settling Defendant shall collect an effluent sample from wastewater location WW-1 (as shown on Figure 1) and have that sample tested for Proposition 65-listed PFAS-containing chemicals. The sampling and testing shall be conducted in conformance with the sampling and testing methodology set forth in the PFAS Report.
- 3.3.2. Stormwater Testing. Within 60-days following the completion of the initial round of power or soft washing of the Facility described above, Settling Defendant shall conduct sampling and testing of the stormwater from sampling locations SW-3, SW-4 and SW-6 as set forth in the PFAS Report. Settling Defendant shall then have those samples tested for Proposition 65-listed PFAS-containing chemicals. The sampling and testing shall be conducted in conformance with the sampling and testing methodology set forth in the PFAS Report.
- 3.3.3. Results of the Testing. Within 15 days of receipt of the results of the testing described in this section, Settling Defendant shall provide copies of such results to CEH. In the event that the results of such testing show that the level of Proposition 65-listed PFAS-containing chemicals has decreased from the levels set forth in the PFAS Report, no further action will be required pursuant to this section. In the event that the results of such testing show that the level of Proposition 65-listed PFAS-containing chemicals has materially increased from the levels set forth in the PFAS Report, the Parties will meet and confer regarding what additional steps should be taken to reduce the levels of Proposition 65-listed PFAS-containing chemicals

emanating from the Facility. If the Parties are unable to reach an agreement regarding the additional steps after 60 days following the initiation of any meet and confer, CEH may file a motion to impose additional requirements by following the procedures set forth in Section 5.1.

- **3.4. PFAS Spills and Leaks at the Facility.** The PFAS Report identified a number of actual and potential spills and leaks of PFAS-containing substance(s) at the Facility. All such known spills and leaks were cleaned up at the time of their occurrence. If any spills or leaks of substance(s) that, according to the Safety Data Sheets, contain PFAS occur at the Facility after the Effective Date, Settling Defendant shall follow the applicable National Response Center requirements to clean up the spill or leak.
- 3.5. Cooperation with Regulators. The Parties acknowledge ongoing regulatory oversight of the Facility by California Water Resources Control Board ("Water Board"). Settling Defendant shall comply with any ongoing regulatory oversight from the Water Board at the Facility, subject to its right to dispute, contest, or challenge any directives or orders.
- **3.6. Prohibition of the Use of PFAS-Containing Fume Suppressants**. Within 90 days following the Effective Date, Settling Defendant shall cease using fume suppressants that contain any PFAS chemicals as reflected in the manufacturer's Safety Data Sheets.

4. PAYMENTS

- **4.1.** Settling Defendant shall pay to CEH the total sum of \$150,000 which shall be paid in five separate checks and allocated as follows:
- **4.1.1.** \$20,160 as 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). Accordingly, the OEHHA portion of the civil penalty payment for \$15,120 shall be made payable to OEHAA and associated with taxpayer identification number 68-0284486. This payment shall be delivered as follows:

For United States Postal Service Delivery:
Attn: Mike Gyurics
Fiscal Operations Branch Chief

1	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment P.O. Box 4010, MS #19B		
2	Sacramento, CA 95812-4010		
3	For Non-United States Postal Service Delivery:		
4	Attn: Mike Gyurics		
5	Fiscal Operations Branch Chief Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment		
6	1001 I Street, MS #19B		
7	Sacramento, CA 95814		
8	The CEH portion of the civil penalty payment for \$5,040 shall be made payable to the		
9	Center for Environmental Health and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981		
10	This payment shall be delivered to Lexington Law Group, LLP, 503 Divisadero Street, San		
11	Francisco, CA 94117.		
12	4.1.2. \$15,120 as an Additional Settlement Payment ("ASP") in lieu of civil		
13	penalty to CEH pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), and California Code of		
14	Regulations, Title 11, § 3204. CEH intends to place these funds in CEH's PFAS Fund and use		
15	them to support CEH programs and activities that seek to educate the public about PFAS and		
16	other toxic chemical contamination, to work with allied organizations to reduce discharges and		
17	releases of PFAS and other toxic chemicals. CEH shall obtain and maintain adequate records to		
18	document that ASPs are spent on these activities and CEH agrees to provide such documentation		
19	to the Attorney General within thirty days of any request from the Attorney General. The		
20	payment pursuant to this Section shall be made payable to the Center for Environmental Health		
21	and associated with taxpayer identification number 94-3251981.		
22	4.1.3. \$114,720 as a reimbursement of a portion of CEH's reasonable attorneys'		
23	fees and costs. This amount shall be divided into two checks: (1) a check for \$97,000 shall be		
24	made payable to Lexington Law Group; and (2) a check for \$17,720 shall be made payable to the		
25	Center for Environmental Health.		
26	4.1.4. All checks shall be delivered to Mark Todzo at Lexington Law Group at		
27	the address set forth in Section 8.1.2.		
28			

- . .

5. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

CEH may, by motion or application for an order to show cause before the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. Prior to bringing any motion or application to enforce the requirements of Section 3 above, CEH shall meet and confer regarding the basis for CEH's anticipated motion or application in an attempt to resolve it informally, including providing Settling Defendant a reasonable opportunity of at least thirty (30) days to cure any alleged violation. Should such attempts at informal resolution fail, CEH may file its enforcement motion or application. Should CEH prevail on any motion, application for an order to show cause, or other proceeding to enforce a violation of this Consent Judgment, CEH shall be entitled to its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred as a result of such motion or application. Should a Settling Defendant prevail on any motion, application for an order to show cause, or other proceeding, that Settling Defendant may be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs against Plaintiff as a result of such motion or application upon a finding by the Court that CEH's prosecution of the motion or application lacked substantial justification.

6. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

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

7. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE

7.1. CEH Release in the Public Interest. Provided Settling Defendant or a Defendant Releasee complies in full with Settling Defendant's obligations under Section 4 hereof, this Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between CEH acting in the public interest and Settling Defendant and Settling Defendant's parents, officers, directors, agents, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, affiliated entities, and their respective successors and assigns ("Defendant Releasees"), of all claims alleged in the Complaint in this Action arising from any violation of Proposition 65 that have been or could have been asserted in the public interest against Settling Defendant and Defendant Releasees, regarding the discharge

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER -8-

and/or release of PFAS from the Facility into sources of drinking water or onto land where such PFAS is likely to pass into sources of drinking water prior to the Effective Date.

7.2. CEH Release on Behalf of Itself. Provided Settling Defendant or a Defendant Releasee complies in full with Settling Defendant's obligations under Section 4 hereof, CEH, for itself, releases, waives, and forever discharges any and all known and unknown claims against Settling Defendant and Defendant Releasees arising from any violations of Proposition 65 that have been or could have been asserted regarding any failure to warn or discharge and/or release of PFAS from the Facility prior to the Effective Date based upon the facts alleged in the Notice. With respect to the foregoing waivers and releases in this paragraph, CEH hereby specifically waives any and all rights and benefits which it now has, or in the future may have, conferred by virtue of the provisions of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

7.3. The obligations of Settling Defendant may be performed by Settling Defendant or a Defendant Releasee. Provided Settling Defendant or a Defendant Releasee complies in full with Settling Defendant's obligations under Section 4 hereof, Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by Settling Defendant and the Defendant Releasees shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by Settling Defendant and Defendant Releasees with respect to any alleged discharge and/or release of PFAS from the Facility into sources of drinking water or onto land where such PFAS is likely to pass into sources of drinking water.

8. PROVISION OF NOTICE

- **8.1.** When any Party is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail as follows:
- **8.1.1. Notices to Settling Defendant.** The persons for Settling Defendant to receive notices pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be:

Dawn Salvatore Site General Manager

1 2	Moog Inc. 20263 S. Western Avenue Torrance, CA 90501		
	dsalvatore@moog.com		
3	With copies to:		
4	Jennifer Schamberger Corporate Attorney		
5	Moog Inc. 400 Jamison Road		
6	Elma, NY 14059 jschamberger@moog.com		
7	Jeffrey Parker		
8	Sheppard Mullin		
9	350 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-3460		
10	JParker@sheppardmullin.com 8.1.2. Notices to Plaintiff. The persons for CEH to receive notices pursuant to		
11	_		
12	this Consent Judgment shall be:		
13	Mark Todzo Lexington Law Group		
14	503 Divisadero Street		
15	San Francisco, CA 94117 mtodzo@lexlawgroup.com		
16	8.2. Any Party may modify the person and address to whom the notice is to be sent by		
17	sending the other Parties notice by first class and electronic mail.		
18	9. COURT APPROVAL		
19	9.1. This Consent Judgment shall become effective on the Effective Date, provided		
20	however, that CEH shall prepare and file a Motion for Approval of this Consent Judgment and		
21	Settling Defendant shall support approval of such Motion.		
22	9.2. If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force or		
23	effect and shall not be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any		
24	purpose.		
25	10. GOVERNING LAW AND CONSTRUCTION		
26	10.1. The terms and obligations arising from this Consent Judgment shall be construed		
27	and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of California.		
28	-10-		

11. **ENTIRE AGREEMENT**

- This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of CEH and Settling Defendant 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.
- **11.2.** There are no warranties, representations, or other agreements between CEH and Settling Defendant 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.
- **11.3.** 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.
- **11.4.** No supplementation, modification, waiver, or termination of this Consent Judgment shall be binding unless executed in writing by the Party to be bound thereby.
- 11.5. 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.

12. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

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

13. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT

13.1. 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 to legally bind that Party.

26

23

24

25

27

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

1	14. NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS				
2	14.1. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim				
3	against another entity on terms that are different from those contained in this Consent Judgment.				
4	15. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS				
5	15.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by				
6	means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.				
7					
8	IT IS SO STIPULATED:				
9	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH				
10		Detail December 20, 2024			
11	Kizzy Charles-Guzman	Date: December 20, 2024			
12	Chief Executive Officer				
13					
14	MOOG INC.				
15		Date:			
16	Signature				
17	D' (IN				
18	Printed Name				
19	Title				
20					
21	IT IS SO ORDERED:				
22					
23					
24	Dated:, 2024	Judge of the Superior Court			
25		raage of the superior court			
26					
27					
28 DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER		-12-			

CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: MOOG INC. – CASE NO. 23STCV24545

1	14. NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS					
2	14.1. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim					
3	against another entity on terms that are different from those contained in this Consent Judgment.					
4	15. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS					
5	15.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by					
6	means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.					
7						
8	IT IS SO STIPULATED:					
9	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH					
10	D .					
11	Date: Kizzy Charles-Guzman					
12	Chief Executive Officer					
13						
14	MOOG INC.					
15	Dawn Salvatore Date: 12/23/24					
16	Nawn Salvatore Date: 12/23/24 Signature					
17	DAWN SALVATORE					
18	Printed Name					
19	SITE BENERAL MANAGER Title					
20						
21	IT IS SO ORDERED:					
22						
23						
24	Dated:, 2024					
25	Judge of the Superior Court					
26						
27						
28 DOCUMENT PREPARED	-12-					
ON RECYCLED PAPER	CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: MOOG INC. – CASE NO. 23STCV24545					

Figure 1

