LEXINGTON LAW GROUP, LLP			
Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389			
Telephone: (415) 913-7800			
Facsimile: (415) 759-4112			
CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH			
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES			
CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH,	Case No. 23STCV	V24545	
a non-profit corporation,			
Plaintiff,		ONSENT JUDGMENT AS	
v.	TO DEFENDAN	T MOOG INC.	
BOWMAN PLATING COMPANY, INC., et al.	Complaint Filed: Trial Date:	None set	
Defendants.	Department: Judge:	Spring Street, Dept. 6 Hon. Elihu M. Berle	
I. INTRODUCTION			
1.1. This Consent Judgment is entered into by Plaintiff Center for Environmental			
Health, a non-profit corporation ("CEH"), and De	fendant Moog Inc.	("Settling Defendant") to	
settle claims asserted by CEH against Settling Defendant as set forth in the operative Complaint			
in the matter Center for Environmental Health v. Bowman Plating Company, et al., Los Angeles			
Superior Court Case No. 23STCV24545 (the "Action"). CEH and Settling Defendant are referred			
to collectively as the "Parties."			
1.2. Moog Inc. is a corporation that employed ten (10) or more persons and operated			
the Facility.		-	
	-1-		
	Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389 Meredyth Merrow, State Bar. No. 328337 503 Divisadero Street San Francisco, CA 94117 Telephone: (415) 913-7800 Facsimile: (415) 759-4112 mtodzo@lexlawgroup.com mmerrow@lexlawgroup.com Attorneys for Plaintiff CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUPERIOR COURT OF THE COUNTY OF L CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, a non-profit corporation, Plaintiff, v. BOWMAN PLATING COMPANY, INC., et al. Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION 1.1. This Consent Judgment is entered i Health, a non-profit corporation ("CEH"), and De settle claims asserted by CEH against Settling Def in the matter <i>Center for Environmental Health v. I</i> Superior Court Case No. 23STCV24545 (the "Act to collectively as the "Parties."	Mark N. Todzo, State Bar No. 168389 Meredyth Merrow, State Bar. No. 328337 503 Divisadero Street San Francisco, CA 94117 Telephone: (415) 759-4112 mtodzo@lexlawgroup.com Attorneys for Plaintiff CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALL COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, a non-profit corporation, Plaintiff, v. BOWMAN PLATING COMPANY, INC., et al. Defendants. 1. INTRODUCTION 1.1. This Consent Judgment is entered into by Plaintiff Ce Health, a non-profit corporation ("CEH"), and Defendant Moog Inc. settle claims asserted by CEH against Settling Defendant as set forth in the matter <i>Center for Environmental Health v. Bowman Plating C</i> Superior Court Case No. 23STCV24545 (the "Action"). CEH and S to collectively as the "Parties." 1.2. Moog Inc. is a corporation that employed ten (10) or the set of the set of the se	

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 per and polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) at California facilities.

5

6

7

8

1.4. On July 15, 2021, Settling Defendant submitted the Per and PolyfluoroalkylSubstance 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.

9 1.6. On November 30, 2023, CEH served a 60-Day Notice of Violation (the "Notice") 10 relating to the California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California 11 Health & Safety Code § 25249.5, et seq. ("Proposition 65") on Settling Defendant, the California 12 Attorney General, the District Attorney for the County of Los Angeles and City Attorney for the 13 City of Los Angeles. The Notice alleges that there were or had been releases and discharges of 14 certain Proposition 65-listed PFAS chemicals allegedly emanating from Settling Defendant's 15 facility located 20263 S Western Avenue, Torrance, CA 90501 (the "Facility") into sources of 16 drinking water, and that such alleged releases and discharges constituted violations of Proposition 17 65. Settling Defendant denies these allegations, including that it has violated Proposition 65.

18 1.7. On October 9, 2023, CEH filed the Action. On January 22, 2024, CEH filed the 19 First Amended Complaint naming Settling Defendant as a defendant in the Action. As in the 20 Notice, CEH's complaint alleges that through its operation of the Facility, Settling Defendant 21 discharges and releases Proposition 65-listed PFAS into the groundwater and other sources of 22 drinking water. These allegations rest, in part, on CEH's contention that the Facility has been 23 significantly contaminated with PFAS by Settling Defendant's use of Proposition 65-listed 24 PFAS-containing chemicals such that the exterior portions of the Facility and soil surrounding it 25 are also contaminated. CEH contends that as a result of this contamination, significant amounts 26 of Proposition 65-listed PFAS are present in the stormwater emanating from the Facility, which in 27 turn contaminates the soil and leaches into the groundwater. CEH contends that this process is

evidenced by significant amounts of Proposition 65-listed PFAS measured in the stormwater, soil
 and groundwater at the Facility. Settling Defendant denies all material allegations in CEH's
 complaint.

1.8. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that: (i) this
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
discharges and/or releases of PFAS from the Facility.

11 1.9. The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement of all 12 claims which were or could have been raised in the Complaint arising out of the facts or conduct 13 related to Settling Defendant alleged therein. By execution of this Consent Judgment and 14 agreeing to comply with its terms, the Parties do not admit any fact, conclusion of law, or 15 violation of law, nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an 16 admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, or violation of law. Settling Defendant 17 denies the material, factual, and legal allegations in the Notice and Complaint and expressly 18 denies any wrongdoing whatsoever. Except as specifically provided herein, nothing in this 19 Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense any 20 of the Parties may have in this or any other pending or future legal proceedings. This Consent 21 Judgment is the product of negotiation and compromise and is accepted by the Parties solely for 22 purposes of settling, compromising, and resolving issues disputed in this Action. Nothing in this 23 Consent Judgment prevents any local, state, or federal regulatory agency from exercising 24 jurisdiction over the facility.

25

2. **DEFINITIONS**

26 2.1. "Facility" means the facility located at 20263 S Western Ave, Torrance, CA
27 90501.

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.

5

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

6 Power Washing or Soft Washing Facility. Settling Defendant will conduct the 3.1. 7 following power washing or soft washing for three years. The three-year period begins at the 8 earlier of (a) the Effective Date or (b) the date on or after October 10, 2024, on which Settling 9 Defendant conducts such washing. The phrase "per year" means a consecutive twelve-month 10 period. All power washing or soft washing shall be conducted by an outside vendor who 11 specializes in industrial cleaning. The vendor shall contain the fluid from the washing and 12 Settling Defendant shall dispose of such runoff and dispose of it in accordance with all statutory 13 and/or regulatory guidelines. Settling Defendant shall maintain records of the activities required 14 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.

27

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 PFAScontaining chemicals has decreased from the levels set forth in the PFAS Report, no further
action will be required pursuant to this section. Unless the results of such testing show that the
level of Proposition 65-listed PFAS-containing chemicals have decreased from the levels set forth

in the PFAS Report, the Parties will meet and confer regarding what additional steps, if any,
 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. Settling
Defendant asserts that 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.

19 **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 OEHHA and associated with taxpayer identification number 680284486. This payment shall be delivered as follows:

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

DOCUMENT PREPARED ON RECYCLED PAPER

4.1.4.All checks as set forth in Sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 shall be delivered toMark Todzo at Lexington Law Group, LLP at the address set forth in Section 8.1.2.

5. ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

3

1

2

4 5.1. CEH may, by motion or application for an order to show cause before the Superior 5 Court of Los Angeles County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent 6 Judgment. Prior to bringing any motion or application to enforce the requirements of Section 3 7 above, CEH shall meet and confer regarding the basis for CEH's anticipated motion or 8 application in an attempt to resolve it informally, including providing Settling Defendant a 9 reasonable opportunity of at least thirty (30) days to cure any alleged violation. Should such 10 attempts at informal resolution fail, CEH may file its enforcement motion or application. Should 11 CEH prevail on any motion, application for an order to show cause, or other proceeding to 12 enforce a violation of this Consent Judgment, CEH shall be entitled to its reasonable attorneys' 13 fees and costs incurred as a result of such motion or application. Should a Settling Defendant 14 prevail on any motion, application for an order to show cause, or other proceeding, that Settling 15 Defendant may be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs against Plaintiff as a result of 16 such motion or application upon a finding by the Court that CEH's prosecution of the motion or 17 application lacked substantial justification. This Consent Judgment may only be enforced by the 18 Parties.

19

6.

7.

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.

22

CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASE

7.1. CEH Release in the Public Interest. Provided Settling Defendant or a Defendant
Release 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
 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.

6

7

8

9

15

16

17

18

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

10 have been or could have been asserted regarding any failure to warn or discharge and/or release

11 of PFAS from the Facility prior to the Effective Date based upon the facts alleged in the Notice.

12 With respect to the foregoing waivers and releases in this paragraph, CEH hereby specifically

13 waives any and all rights and benefits which it now has, or in the future may have, conferred by

14 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

- 19a Defendant Releasee. Provided Settling Defendant or a Defendant Releasee complies in full
- 20 with Settling Defendant's obligations under Section 4 hereof, Compliance with the terms of this
- 21 Consent Judgment by Settling Defendant and the Defendant Releasees shall constitute
- 22 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
- 24 onto land where such PFAS is likely to pass into sources of drinking water.
- 25

8. **PROVISION OF NOTICE**

26

8.1. When any Party is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the

27 notice shall be sent by first class and electronic mail as follows:

1	8.1.1. Notices to Settling Defendant. The persons for Settling Defendant to		
2	receive notices pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be:		
3	Dawn Salvatore		
4	Site General Manager Moog Inc.		
5	20263 S. Western Avenue Torrance, CA 90501		
6	dsalvatore@moog.com		
7	With copies to:		
8	Jennifer Schamberger Corporate Attorney Moog Inc.		
9	Moog Inc. 400 Jamison Road		
10	Elma, NY 14059 jschamberger@moog.com		
11	Jeffrey Parker		
12	Sheppard Mullin 350 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor		
13	Los Angeles, CA 90071-3460 JParker@sheppardmullin.com		
14	8.1.2. Notices to Plaintiff. The persons for CEH to receive notices pursuant to		
15	this Consent Judgment shall be:		
16	Mark Todzo		
17	Lexington Law Group, LLP		
18	503 Divisadero Street San Francisco, CA 94117		
19	mtodzo@lexlawgroup.com		
20	8.2. Any Party may modify the person and address to whom the notice is to be sent by		
21	sending the other Parties notice by first class and electronic mail.		
22	9. COURT APPROVAL		
23	9.1. This Consent Judgment shall become effective on the Effective Date, provided		
24	however, that CEH shall prepare and file a Motion for Approval of this Consent Judgment and		
25	Settling Defendant shall support approval of such Motion.		
26	9.2. If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force or		
27	effect and shall not be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any		
28	purpose.		
20 Document Prepared on Recycled Paper	-10-		
	CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: MOOG INC. – CASE NO. 23STCV24545		

1 2 10.

GOVERNING LAW AND CONSTRUCTION

10.1. The terms and obligations arising from this Consent Judgment shall be construed
and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

4

5

6

7

8

11. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

11.1. 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.

9 11.2. There are no warranties, representations, or other agreements between CEH and
10 Settling Defendant except as expressly set forth herein. No representations, oral or otherwise,
11 express or implied, other than those specifically referred to in this Consent Judgment have been
12 made by any Party hereto.

13 11.3. No other agreements not specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or
14 otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto. Any agreements
15 specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind
16 any of the Parties hereto only to the extent that they are expressly incorporated herein.

17 **11.4.** No supplementation, modification, waiver, or termination of this Consent
18 Judgment shall be binding unless executed in writing by the Party to be bound thereby.

19 11.5. No waiver of any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed or
20 shall constitute a waiver of any of the other provisions hereof whether or not similar, nor shall
21 such waiver constitute a continuing waiver.

22

25

26

27

12. **RETENTION OF JURISDICTION**

23 12.1. This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement or modify the
24 Consent Judgment.

1	13. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT			
2	13.1. Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized			
3	by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment and to enter into and			
4	execute the Consent Judgment on behalf of the Party represented and to legally bind that Party.			
5	14. NO EFFECT ON OTHER SETTLEMENTS			
6	14.1. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim			
7	against another entity on terms that are different from those contained in this Consent Judgment.			
8	15. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS			
9	15.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by			
10	means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.			
11				
12	IT IS SO STIPULATED: CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH			
13	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH			
14	Deter Ephrupry 24, 2025			
15	Kizzy Charles-Guzman Date: February 24, 2025			
16	Chief Executive Officer			
17				
18	MOOG INC.			
19	Dawr Salvatore Date: 2/19/2025			
20	Signature			
21	Dawn Salvatore			
22	Printed Name			
23	Site General Manager Title			
24				
25	IT IS SO ORDERED:			
26				
27	Dated:, 2024 Judge of the Superior Court			
28 Document Prepared	-12-			
ON RECYCLED PAPER	CONSENT JUDGMENT RE: MOOG INC. – CASE NO. 23STCV24545			