KAMALA D. HARRIS 1 Attorney General of California 2 SUSAN S. FIERING Supervising Deputy Attorney General OCT 25 2016 3 DENNIS A. RAGEN Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 106468 4 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800 5 San Diego, CA 92101 P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266 6 Telephone: (619) 645-2016 Fax: (619) 645-2271 7 E-mail: Dennis.Ragen@doj.ca.gov 8 Attorneys for People of the State of California ex rel. Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 **COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO** 12 13 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA EX Case No. CGC-13-531045 REL. KAMALA D. HARRIS, ATTORNEY 14 CONSENT JUDGMENT AS TO FOOD GENERAL, MARKET MANAGEMENT, INC. AND 15 PLAINTIFF, REED'S, INC. 16 17 DAKOTA BROTHERS, ET AL., **DEFENDANTS** 18 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH Case No. CGC-12-526396 19 **PLAINTIFF** 20 v. 21 FAYEON DISTRIBUTORS, INC., ET AL., 22 **DEFENDANTS** 23 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH Case No. CGC-12-526395 24 PLAINTIFE v. 25 FOOD MARKET MANAGEMENT, INC. ET AL., 26 **DEFENDANTS** 27 28

CONSENT JUDGMENT (CGC-13-531045

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. This stipulation and proposed consent judgment ("Consent Judgment") is entered into between Plaintiffs, the People of the State of California ("People"), by and through Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General ("Attorney General") and the Center for Environmental Health ("CEH") (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), and the following Defendants ("Settling Defendants"):

Food Market Management, Inc.

Reed's, Inc.

These settling parties are referred to collectively as the "Parties."

1.2. The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment without a trial. Nothing in this Consent Judgment constitutes an admission by any Party regarding any issue of law or fact. This Consent Judgment sets forth the agreement and obligations of Settling Defendants, CEH and the People and, except as specifically provided below, it constitutes the complete, final and exclusive agreement among the Parties and supersedes any prior agreements among the Parties concerning the subject matter herein.

#### 2. BACKGROUND, JURISDICTION AND PURPOSE

2.1. On April 30, 2013, the People, by and through the Attorney General, filed a complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief for alleged violations of Proposition 65 and unlawful business practices in the Superior Court for the County of San Francisco (the "People's Complaint"). The People's Complaint alleges that the named defendants failed to provide clear and reasonable warnings that certain California ginger products that they manufactured, distributed and/or sold contain lead or lead compounds, and that ingestion of these products results in exposure to lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive harm. The People's Complaint further alleges that, under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, also known as "Proposition 65," businesses must provide persons with a "clear and reasonable warning" before exposing individuals to this chemical, and that the Settling Defendants failed to do so. The Complaint also alleges that these acts constitute unlawful acts in violation of the Unfair Competition Law, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq. and 17500

5

7

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

25

24

26

- CEH issued 60-Day Notices of Violation dated August 6, 2012 and November 7, 2012 under Health and Safety Code section 25249.7 to each of the Settling Defendants (the "CEH Notices"). Pursuant to these notices, on November 27, 2012, CEH filed two complaints (the "CEH Complaints") in this Court against the Settling Defendants and other persons (Center for Environmental Health v. Fayeon Distributors, Inc., et al., Case No. CGC-12-526396; and Center for Environmental Health v. Food Market Management, Inc., et al., Case No. CGC-12-526395).
- 2.3. Settling Defendants are named as defendants in both the People's and at least one of the CEH Complaints. The People's Complaint and the CEH Complaints shall be jointly referred to as the "Complaints."
- 2.4. Each Settling Defendant is a business entity that: (1) has employed ten or more persons at times relevant to the allegations of the Complaints; and (2) sells California Ginger Products (as defined below) in the State of California and/or has done so in the past four years.
- 2.5. For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the People, CEH and the Settling Defendants stipulate that: (a) this Court has jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaints; (b) this Court has personal jurisdiction over Settling Defendants as to the acts alleged in those Complaints; (c) venue is proper in San Francisco County; and (d) 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 Complaints based on the facts alleged therein.
- 2.6. Settling Defendants and CEH agree not to challenge or object to entry of this Consent Judgment by the Court unless the People have notified them in writing that the People no longer support entry of the Judgment or that the People seek to modify the Judgment. The Parties agree not to challenge this Court's jurisdiction to enforce the terms of this Judgment once it has been entered, and this Court maintains jurisdiction over this Judgment for that purpose.
- 2.7. The Parties enter into this Consent Judgment as a full and final settlement of all claims relating to California Ginger Products (as that term is defined below) arising from the alleged failure to warn under Proposition 65 regarding the alleged presence of lead in such products. By execution of this Consent Judgment and agreeing to provide the relief and remedies

9

11 12

14

13

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28 specified herein, Settling Defendants do not admit any violations of Proposition 65 or Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq. or 17500 et seq., or any other law or legal duty. Each Settling Defendant expressly denies any liability whatsoever, and maintains that the products it sells were and are completely safe for their intended use and were and are in compliance with all applicable statutes and regulations.

- 2.8. Prior to reaching this settlement, the Attorney General retained two technical experts (the "Technical Experts") to determine the source of alleged lead in the California Ginger Products and the means for reducing it. The Technical Experts requested detailed information from each of the Settling Defendants regarding: the composition of the California Ginger Products; the major ingredients, minor ingredients, and processing aids (materials or substances used to dry, preserve or otherwise process the Products); the range of lead content in the ingredients and processing aids; the countries of origin of the ingredients; and the manufacturing procedures and processes. After the Court entered the Protective Order re Settlement Negotiations on November 15, 2013, Settling Defendants supplied the requested information, and responded to the Technical Experts' follow-up inquiries and requests for additional information. Based on their analysis of this information, the Technical Experts recommended certain actions in addition to those already taken by Settling Defendants, some of which are incorporated here.
- 2.9. In order to resolve these cases and reduce the alleged levels of lead in their products, Settling Defendants have agreed to implement these additional recommendations, as more particularly described in Section 4 below. The Parties have also agreed on the penalty and other monetary payments set forth in Section 6 below and Exhibit A hereto, which take into account Settling Defendants' cooperation in resolving these cases.

#### 3. DEFINITIONS

3.1. "California Ginger Products" shall mean food products made by or for a Settling Defendant primarily with ginger that are processed with sugar or a sugar substitute and that are sold or offered for sale in California by a Settling Defendant or others. Specific non-exclusive examples of California Ginger Products sold in the past by each Settling Defendant are listed on the Exhibit A attachment for each Settling Defendant.

- 3.2. "Compliance Documentation" shall mean: (i) the certifications from the Independent Food Processing Auditor or Internal Auditor received pursuant to Section 4.2; (ii) a resume or summary of the qualifications of the Independent Food Processing Auditor who has provided the Auditor's Certification(s) required under section 4.2 that establishes that the Auditor has the qualifications specified in Section 3.4 below; and (iii) the results of the laboratory testing required by section 4.5.
- 3.3. The "Effective Date" of this Consent Judgment shall be the date on which the Consent Judgment is entered as a judgment by the trial Court.
- 3.4. "Independent Food Processing Auditor" shall mean an independent auditing company or person, foreign or domestic, that: (i) has extensive knowledge of good manufacturing practices in the food processing industry; (ii) has sufficient experience in inspecting food processing facilities to ensure compliance with good manufacturing practices and with the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points ("HACCP") food safety management system; (iii) who is (1) certified as an International HACCP Alliance lead Instructor; or (2) certified as a SQF (Safe Quality Food) HACCP Lead Auditor or SQF Consultant; or (3) holds an NEHA (National Environmental Health Association) Certified Professional Food Safety (CP-FS) Credential; or (4) is certified as a Food Scientist by Institute of Food Technology; or (5) has equivalent qualifications; and (iv) has submitted a satisfactory resume of qualifications. Upon request, the Attorney General will provide to the Settling Defendants a list of Independent Food Processing Auditors who have previously submitted their qualifications to the Attorney General, whose qualifications are up to date, and who are deemed to meet the criteria set forth in this Paragraph. A Settling Defendant, however, may select any Independent Food Processing Auditor who meets these criteria.
- 3.5. For analysis of the California Ginger Products, "Qualified Laboratory" shall mean a laboratory that has demonstrated proficiency to conduct lead analysis on the California Ginger Products using Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry ("ICP-MS"). For analysis of the Packaging Materials, a "Qualified Laboratory" shall mean a laboratory that has demonstrated proficiency to conduct lead analysis on packaging materials using ICP-MS. A Qualified

Laboratory must meet the specifications set forth in Title 27 California Code of Regulations section 25900(b) or in Attachment 2 to Exhibit B.

- 3.6. "Laboratory Standards" shall mean the standards set forth in Attachment 2 to Exhibit B.
- 3.7. The "Maximum Lead Level" is 40 parts per billion by weight. A California Ginger Product satisfies the Maximum Lead Level if testing conducted by a Qualified Laboratory shows either: (a) none of the Representative Product Samples, as that term is defined in Exhibit B, taken from the Production Lot of the California Ginger Product exceeds forty (40) parts per billion lead concentration by weight; or (b) (1) the arithmetic mean of the results from laboratory analysis of six to ten samples of California Ginger Product randomly drawn from that lot does not exceed forty (40) parts per billion lead concentration by weight and (2) none of the samples has a lead concentration of more than sixty (60) parts per billion by weight.
- 3.8. "Packaging Materials" shall mean the containers or wrappers for Settling Defendants' individual California Ginger Products which come in direct contact with food or which could result in exposure to lead from reasonably foreseeable hand to mouth contact or mouthing by the consumer.
- 3.9. "Representative Number of Lots" means: the square root, rounded to the nearest whole number, of the number of lots of that California Ginger Product sold in the preceding calendar year in California. For newly introduced California Ginger Products, testing shall be based on the reasonably projected number of lots to be sold in California for the first year of production.

#### 4. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: Lead Reduction Measures

- 4.1. Commencing ninety (90) days after the Effective Date, Settling Defendants shall not sell any California Ginger Product unless Settling Defendants have complied with the terms set forth below with respect to that product.
- 4.2. Commencing ninety (90) days after the Effective Date, each Settling Defendant shall do the following prior to manufacturing or processing any California Ginger Product or obtaining any California Ginger Product from any third party manufacturer or supplier:

4.2.2.

- 4.2.1. If obtained from a third party manufacturer or supplier, provide that manufacturer or supplier with a copy of the Summary of Compliance Information for Suppliers/Manufacturers set forth in Exhibit B.
  - Obtain an initial annual certification from an Independent Food Processing Auditor who has been retained by the Settling Defendant or the manufacturer or supplier of the California Ginger Product that certifies that the good manufacturing practices and lead reduction practices set forth in Exhibit B have been fully satisfied and that the product does not exceed the Maximum Lead Level. The certification shall be in the form set forth in Exhibit B, Attachment 1. If different manufacturers or processors are responsible for different stages of the production of a California Ginger Product, Settling Defendant shall obtain certification(s) from Independent Food Processing Auditor(s) showing that the good manufacturing practices and lead reduction practices set forth in. Exhibit B have been satisfied during each stage of production during which, as indicated by the Lead Contribution Exercise described in Exhibit B, lead may be contributed to the finished product. If the Settling Defendant, after making good faith efforts, finds it impossible to obtain such certifications with respect to a California Ginger Product and that Product contains more than 40 parts per billion of lead, as determined by the testing procedure set out in Exhibit B and section 3.7, above, then the Settling Defendant may sell the California Ginger Product only if it provides a warning for that product as required in Section 5 below.
- 4.2.3. After the Independent Food Processing Auditor has provided the initial annual certification required by Paragraph 4.2.2 and in Exhibit B, Attachment 1, then an employee or other agent of Settling Defendant or that manufacturer or supplier who has received training adequate to conduct and document the audits ("Internal Auditor") may assume the Independent Food Processing Auditor's responsibility for subsequent annual audits and certifications. When an Internal

Auditor assumes responsibility for providing certifications pursuant to this section, the first such annual certification must be reviewed and approved by the Independent Food Processing Auditor before being submitted to the People and CEH. In order to obtain such approval, the Internal Auditor who prepared the certification shall provide the Independent Food Processing Auditor with such documents, photographic evidence, information regarding laboratory standards and practices, and other information or data as may be reasonably necessary for the Independent Food Processing Auditor to evaluate and approve the certification. The Internal Auditor may be replaced from time to time by another employee of the manufacturer or supplier, who must receive prior training adequate to conduct and document the audits, but such new Internal Auditors are not required to obtain the approval of the Independent Food Processing Auditor prior to submitting subsequent certifications required by this Consent Judgment.

4.3. <u>Certifications</u>. Each Settling Defendant shall provide annual certifications, from the Independent Food Processing Auditor or the Internal Auditor, as applicable, as required by Paragraph 4.2.2 and in Exhibit B, Attachment 1, pursuant to the following Schedule:

Audit	Due Date	Audit Conducted by	
Initial Audit	Six months after the Effective Date	Independent Food Processing Auditor	
First Annual Audit	Eighteen Months After The Effective Date	Independent Food Processing Auditor or Internal Auditor	
Second Annual Audit	Thirty Months After the Effective Date	Independent Food Processing Auditor or Internal Auditor	
Third Annual Audit	Forty-two Months After the Effective Date.	Independent Food Processing Auditor or Internal Auditor	

After the completion of the Third Annual Audit, Settling Defendant will provide certification with respect to subsequent annual audits (if any are required) on the request of the Attorney General.

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

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

26

27

28

1

Six months after the Effective Date	Compliance Documentation and the Initial certifications from the Independent Food Processing Auditor shall be submitted six months after the Effective Date.
For the first forty-two months after the Effective Date	Compliance Documentation and the Annual certifications from the Independent Food Processing Auditor or the Internal Auditor, as applicable, shall be submitted: (a) eighteen months after the Effective Date; (b) thirty months after the Effective Date; and (c) forty-two months after the Effective Date.
More than forty-two months after the Effective Date	Compliance Documentation and the Annual certifications from the Independent Food Processing Auditor or the Internal Auditor, as applicable, shall be provided on the request of the CEH or the Attorney General (if any are required).
New Manufacturers used within sixty months after the Effective Date	To the extent a Settling Defendant uses a new manufacturer, all compliance documentation required by Section 3.2 shall be submitted at the end of the first year that new manufacturer is used and annually thereafter for a period of three years.
New Manufacturers used more than sixty months after the Effective Date	To the extent a Settling Defendant uses a new manufacturer, all compliance documentation required by Section 3.2 shall be provided on the request of the Attorney General.

#### 5. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF: Warnings

- 5.1. Settling Defendant may sell, or offer for sale a California Ginger Product with lead levels exceeding the Maximum Lead Level only if:
  - 5.1.1. It has made diligent efforts to obtain the certifications required by Section 4 and to reduce the lead concentration in its California Ginger Product to levels that do not exceed the Maximum Lead Level, and these efforts have been unsuccessful; and
  - 5.1.2. It provides warnings in accordance with Sections 5.2 through 5.7, below.
- 5.2. The warning shall state: "WARNING: This product contains lead, a chemical known to the State of California to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm." The warnings set forth in this Consent Judgment are the exclusive warnings to be used on California Ginger Products.

- 5.3. If the California Ginger Product is sold in a package, the warning must appear in at least 12 point font size, with the word "WARNING" in bold, clearly visible on the package. Alternatively, any retailer of a California Ginger Product may elect to provide the warning through shelf labeling or signage. Any warning given pursuant to this Section shall be displayed with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, sufficient to (1) render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual prior to purchase and (2) clearly identify it with the California Ginger Product for which the warning is given, so that a reasonable consumer can readily differentiate those products on the shelf to which the warning applies from those to which it does not.
- 5.4. If the Settling Defendant sells the California Ginger Product in bulk, the warning shall appear on a clearly visible 4" by 6" or larger sign, posted immediately adjacent to the product, in 36 point type, that clearly identify it with the California Ginger Product for which the warning is given.
- 5.5. For internet purchases through the Settling Defendant, the warning message must be provided on the internet by a conspicuous and clearly-marked warning message on the product display page, or otherwise prominently displayed to the purchaser before the purchaser completes his or her purchase of the product. The warning is not prominently displayed if the purchaser must search for it in the general content of the website, or if the consumer must click on a hyperlink to view the warning, unless opening the hyperlink is necessary to complete the purchase. The website need not provide the warning for sales to customers outside the State of California, but the warning must be prominently displayed before any sale to a customer within the State of California is completed. If the Office of Health Hazard Assessment adopts a final regulation governing the manner of providing Proposition 65 warnings for products sold online to individuals in California that differs from the provisions of this Section, then a Settling Defendant may, at its option, comply with either this Section or the final regulation with respect to the manner of providing Proposition 65 warnings for California Ginger Products sold online to individuals in California.

 5.6. For catalog or other non-internet sales by the Settling Defendant where the consumer is not physically present and cannot see a warning displayed on the California Ginger Product or the packaging of the California Ginger Product prior to purchase or payment, the warning statement shall be displayed in such a manner that it is likely to be read and understood prior to the authorization of or actual payment.

- 5.7. If the Setting Defendant sells the California Ginger Product wholesale directly to customers that repackage and resell the product either in specific packages or in bulk, Settling Defendant shall: (i) include a letter instructing the customer that the California Ginger Product may only be offered for sale to California consumers with a warning that is compliant with Sections 5.2 through 5.6 hereof; and (ii) obtain the customer's written agreement to provide such a warning.
- 5.8. A Settling Defendant who provides warnings pursuant to this Section 5, must, prior to offering those products for sale, provide the Attorney General (with a copy to CEH) with (1) a summary of the attempts it made to comply with Section 4, above, and (2) a sample of the packaging, labeling, signs and/or internet or published messages displaying the warnings to be given pursuant to sections 5.2 to 5.7.

#### 6. PAYMENTS

- 6.1. <u>Civil Penalties</u>. Each Settling Defendant shall pay the civil penalty amounts set forth on Exhibit A for such Settling Defendant according to the schedule set forth on such Exhibit A, pursuant to California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.7(b) and 25249.12, in complete settlement of any claim for civil penalties by the People and CEH in the cases referenced above.
- 6.2. As specified on each Exhibit A, and pursuant to California Health & Safety Code section 25249.12, 75% of these funds shall be remitted to the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), and the remaining 25% to be divided evenly between the Attorney General and CEH.
- 6.3. <u>Fees and Costs</u>. Each Settling Defendant shall also make the fee and cost payments set forth on Exhibit A for such Settling Defendant according to the schedule set forth on such Exhibit as follows:

6.3.1. Attorney General. Fees and costs payable to the Attorney General shall be paid
in complete settlement of any claim for fees and costs her office has expended in this matter with
respect to each Settling Defendant. Funds paid pursuant to this paragraph shall be placed in an
interest-bearing Special Deposit Fund established by the Attorney General. The money paid to the
Attorney General's Office pursuant to this paragraph shall be administered by the California
Department of Justice and shall be used by the Environment Section of the Public Rights Division
of the Attorney General's Office, until all funds are exhausted, for any of the following purposes:
(1) implementation of the Attorney General's authority to protect the environment and natural
resources of the State pursuant to Government Code section 12600 et seq. and as Chief Law
Officer of the State of California pursuant to Article V, section 13 of the California Constitution;
(2) enforcement of laws related to environmental protection, including, but not limited to,
Chapters 6.5 and 6.95, Division 20, of the California Health & Safety Code; (3) enforcement of
the Unfair Competition Law, Business & Professions Code section 17200 et seq., as it relates to
protection of the environment and natural resources of the State of California; and (4) other
environmental actions that benefit the State and its citizens as determined by the Attorney
General. Such funding may be used for the costs of the Attorney General's investigation, filing
fees and other court costs, payment to expert witnesses and technical consultants, purchase of
equipment, laboratory analyses, personnel costs, travel costs, and other costs necessary to pursue
environmental actions investigated or initiated by the Attorney General for the benefit of the State
of California and its citizens. The payment, and any interest derived therefrom, shall solely and
exclusively augment the budget of the Attorney General's Office as it pertains to the Environmen
Section of the Public Rights Division and in no manner shall supplant or cause any reduction of
any portion of the Attorney General's budget.

6.3.2. <u>Center for Environmental Health</u>. Fees and costs payable to CEH shall be paid in complete settlement of any claim for fees and costs CEH has expended in this matter with respect to each Settling Defendant. These payments represent full compensation from each Settling Defendant for the fees and costs that CEH has incurred with respect to each Settling

good cause shown; or by the Court in accordance with its inherent authority to modify its own judgments.

7.2. Before filing an application with the Court for a modification to this Consent Judgment, the Party seeking modification shall meet and confer with the other Parties to determine whether the modification may be achieved by consent. If a proposed modification is agreed upon, then Settling Defendants, CEH and the Attorney General will present the modification to the Court by means of a stipulated modification to the Consent Judgment.

#### 8. ENFORCEMENT

- 8.1. The Attorney General, CEH and Settling Defendants may, by motion or application for an order to show cause before this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. CEH may only enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment provided that it has given prior notice to Settling Defendants and the Attorney General, and the Attorney General's Office, after completion of the meet and confer process set forth in Section 8.5 below, either (a) joins in such action, or (b) provides written notice that it does not object to CEH's enforcement of any specific alleged violation. The fact that the Attorney General provides such a written non-objection shall not be construed as endorsement of or concurrence in the enforcement action and shall not be admissible in Court except to show that CEH has complied with this Section.
- 8.2. In any enforcement proceeding filed pursuant to Section 8.1, the Attorney General and/or CEH, as applicable, may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment. Where said violations of this Consent Judgment constitute subsequent violations of Proposition 65 or other laws independent of the Consent Judgment and/or those alleged in the Complaint, the Attorney General is not limited to enforcement of the Consent Judgment, but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies are provided for by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws. In any new action brought by the Attorney General, Plaintiffs or another enforcer alleging subsequent violations of Proposition 65 or other laws, Settling Defendants may assert any and all defenses that are available.

- 8.3. Any further enforcement by CEH concerning California Ginger Products, and any action by Settling Defendants to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment, is limited to enforcement pursuant to the terms of this Consent Judgment. This Consent Judgment provides no right of enforcement to any non-party.
- 8.4. The People and CEH may conduct random testing (Enforcement Testing) of California Ginger Products. (The Party who conducts such testing is the "Enforcing Party.")

  Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3.4, if, based on that testing, the Enforcing Party alleges that a Settling Defendant has violated this Consent Judgment by selling California Ginger Products with lead in excess of 40 parts per billion and without the warning described in Section 5, the Parties shall proceed as follows:
  - 8.4.1. Levels over 40 but no more than 45 parts per billion. If the Enforcing Party alleges that a Settling Defendant has sold a California Ginger Product with lead levels over 40 but no more than 45 parts per billion, the People and CEH will provide notice of the exceedance ("Exceedance") to the Settling Defendant.

    The Settling Defendant must then refer the notice to the appropriate Independent or Internal Auditor for review, and the auditor must take the Exceedance into account in ensuring continuing compliance with the Maximum Lead Level and other provisions of this Judgment. If the Settling Defendant is in compliance with all of the requirements of section 4.2 of the Consent Judgment, an Exceedance in the 40-45 parts per billion range will not be considered a violation of this Consent Judgment and will not require the payment of penalties or the reimbursement of costs.
  - 8.4.2. Levels in excess of 45 parts per billion. If the Enforcing Party alleges that a

    Settling Defendant has violated this Consent Judgment by selling California

    Ginger Products with a lead concentration of in excess of 45 parts per billion,
    and the Settling Defendant elects not to contest the allegation, then the Settling

    Defendant shall (1) cease further distribution to its California customers of the
    product lot that is the subject of the violation; (2) if the lead level alleged by the

People or CEH exceeds 55 parts per billion, remove the product lot that is the subject of the violation from retail sale in California; (3) inform the supplier of the product lot and obtain a report from the supplier of the actions taken to prevent future violations; and (4) pay penalties and costs as set forth in the following table:

Stipulated Payment	s of Penalties and Costs
Number of prior violations alleged by the People or CEH against the Settling Defendant (not including violations that the People or CEH withdrew after consulting with the Settling Defendant):	Penalty and reimbursement of laboratory costs per violation
Zero	Laboratory costs
Two through five	\$ 2,500 penalty plus laboratory costs
Six through nine	\$ 5,000 penalty plus laboratory costs.
Ten or more	\$15,000 penalty plus laboratory costs
Surcharge for violations involving lead levels exceeding 60 parts per billion based on the average of six to ten randomly drawn samples from the same lot or bulk sample purchased from the same location at the same time.	If the test data provided by the People or CEH in support of the alleged violation exceeded sixty (60) parts per billion, then the applicable penalty set forth above for that violation shall be doubled.

6.

8.4.3. Lead Levels less than 50 parts per billion. If the People or CEH allege that a Settling Defendant has violated this Consent Judgment by selling a California Ginger Product that has a lead concentration of more than 45 and no more than 50 parts per billion, and neither the People nor CEH has alleged a violation with respect to that California Ginger Product within the twelve month period preceding that alleged violation, then no penalties or costs shall be payable for that alleged violation, and the violation shall not count as a "prior violation" when computing penalties pursuant to the table above, but the Settling Defendant will refer the matter to its Independent or Internal Auditor for review.

8.4.4. <u>Procedures for Enforcement Testing</u>. Testing by the Enforcing Party pursuant to this Section 8.4 shall proceed as follows: The Enforcing Party shall obtain

The costs of such testing shall be apportioned as set forth in Section 8.4.4.

The Parties shall meet and confer during such thirty (30) day period in a good faith effort to try to reach agreement on an appropriate cure for the alleged violation or dispute. After such thirty (30) day period, the Party seeking to enforce may proceed as to the alleged violation of this Consent Judgment as specified in Sections 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3.

#### 9. AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE TO CONSENT JUDGMENT

9.1. 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.

#### 10. CLAIMS COVERED

#### 10.1. Full and Binding Resolution.

10.1.1. This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between the People, CEH, and Settling Defendants, their parents, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions, subsidiaries, sister companies, and cooperative members (collectively, the "Covered Entities"), and the officers, directors, employees, attorneys, consultants, agents, representatives, predecessors, successors, and assigns of any of the above, of any violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations, and any acts of unfair competition, as defined by Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq., for alleged failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings required by Proposition 65 concerning exposure to lead from use of the California Ginger Products manufactured or sold by a Settling Defendant prior to ninety (90) days after the Effective Date.

10.1,2. This Consent Judgment also resolves the liability of any entity who has purchased or received California Ginger Products sold or distributed by Settling Defendants ("Downstream Entities") for violations of Proposition 65 or Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq. and 17500 et seq. for failure to provide clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warnings concerning alleged exposure to lead from use of the California Ginger Products manufactured by or for a Settling Defendant prior to ninety (90) days after the Effective Date or that was purchased or received by a Downstream Entity prior to 90 days after the Effective Date but sold thereafter, provided, however, that this Section 10.1.2 shall not apply to or resolve any

liability of any entity identified on Exhibit C for the California Ginger Products identified for such entity or entities on Exhibit C.2

10.1.3. Compliance by a Settling Defendant with all of the requirements of this Consent Judgment constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 and Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq. with respect to: (1) any obligation of the Covered Entities to provide a warning under Proposition 65 as to the lead content of any California Ginger Product sold by that Settling Defendant; and (2) any obligation of Downstream Entities to provide a warning under Proposition 65 as to the lead content of any California Ginger Product that they obtain from that Settling Defendant, provided that: (i) Covered Entities and Downstream Entities must provide any reasonably necessary cooperation in the implementation of this Judgment; and (ii) Downstream Entities who offer the California Ginger Product for sale to the public must provide any warnings to the extent required by Section 5.7; and (iii) Downstream Entities and Covered Entities may not frustrate or interfere with the implementation of any provision of this Judgment.

#### 11. PROVISION OF NOTICE

- 11.1. When any Party is entitled to receive any notice under this Consent Judgment, the notice shall be sent to the person and address set forth in this Section
- 11.2. Notices shall be sent by e-mail and by First Class Mail or overnight delivery to the following when required:

#### For the Attorney General:

Dennis A. Ragen, Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice 110 West A. Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101 Dennis.Ragen@doj.ca.gov

and simultaneously to:

The downstream release in this Section is based on an understanding between the Parties that prior to the Effective Date, Settling Defendants did not sell California Ginger Products imported from Thailand.

1 2	Susan S. Fiering, Supervising Deputy Attorney General Department of Justice, 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor,
3	Oakland, CA 94612 Susan.Fiering@doj.ca.gov
4	For the Center for Environmental Health:
5	Eric S. Somers
6	Lexington Law Group 503 Divisadero Street
7	San Francisco, CA 94117-2212 esomers@lexlawgroup.com
8	For Food Market Management, Inc.:
9	Bruce Leeson
10	President The Ginger People <sup>®</sup> 215 Reindollar Avenue
11	Marina, CA 93933 USA
12	With copy to:
13	Lauren M. Michals Nixon Peabody LLP
14	One Embarcadero Center, 18th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111
15	lmichals@nixonpeabody.com
16	For Reed's, Inc.:
17	Chris Reed President
18	Reed's, Inc. 13000 South Spring Street
19	Los Angeles, CA 90061
20	With copy to:
21 22	J. Robert Maxwell Rogers Joseph O'Donnell
23	311 California Street, 10th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104
24	<u>bmaxwell@rjo.com</u>
25	Any Party may change its contact information by sending notice by e-mail and by First
26	Class Mail or overnight delivery to the other Parties. Said change shall take effect for any notice
27	mailed at least five days after the date sent.
28	·

11.3. <u>Written Certification</u>. Within 15 court days of the Attorney General's written request, Settling Defendants will provide the Attorney General and CEH with written certification that any required action under this Consent Judgment has been completed.

#### 12. REVALUATION OF MAXIMUM LEAD LEVEL

- 12.1. California Ginger Products. The Maximum Lead Level set forth in subparagraph 3.7 above shall be subject to reevaluation if the Attorney General determines: (i) that it is feasible, through good manufacturing or good agricultural practices to achieve lower levels of lead; or (ii) that it is otherwise necessary to comply with the requirements of Proposition 65 or Business and Professions Code sections 17200 et seq. If the Attorney General, after consulting with CEH, determines that the Maximum Lead Level should be lowered, she shall notify CEH of that determination and meet and confer with Settling Defendants in order to agree by stipulation on a revised level. If that process is not successful, the Attorney General may seek to revise the Maximum Lead Level by making a noticed motion in this Court to re-open litigation for this limited purpose, pursuant to the procedures set out in section 7.2, above. In any such proceeding, the Settling Defendants shall be entitled to present evidence and argument as to why the Maximum Lead Level should not be lowered.
- 12.2. In connection with any reevaluation of the Maximum Lead Level, Settling
  Defendants will, upon granting of a noticed motion by the Court, and upon a showing by the
  Attorney General that such a reevaluation is warranted and supported by evidence, respond to
  limited discovery served by the People pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure that is
  relevant to such reevaluation of the Maximum Lead Level, except to the extent that such
  information is subject to any proper objection that may be asserted pursuant to the Code of Civil
  Procedure, is a trade secret or confidential and thus addressed below, or obtained through
  informal agreement. If a Settling Defendant is called upon to submit any non-privileged
  information that may reasonably be considered as trade secret or confidential, then, on the request
  of the Settling Defendant, such information will be deemed to be "Confidential Settlement
  Information" or "Confidential Plaintiffs Only Settlement Information" subject to the Protective
  Order re Settlement Negotiations previously entered in Case No. CGC-13-531045 and any other

related Protective Order in these cases and will only be produced pursuant to the terms of these Protective Orders.

12.3. By responding to the Attorney General in any reevaluation of the Maximum Lead Level, Settling Defendants do not waive any defenses or objections which they may have to any attempt by the Attorney General, CEH or any other enforcer to revise the Maximum Lead Level.

#### 13. NO EFFECT ON OTHER PRODUCTS

- 13.1. The requirements for product labeling, signage and internet warnings set forth in this Consent Judgment are imposed pursuant to the terms of this Consent Judgment, and they are not intended to be the exclusive method of providing a warning under Proposition 65 and its implementing regulations for products that are not subject to this Consent Judgment.
- 13.2. The Maximum Lead Level set forth in this Judgment is based on, and would not have been approved without Settling Defendants' commitment to continuously implement good manufacturing practices, ingredient sourcing standards, and lead reduction measures, as set forth in Sections 4 and Exhibit B hereof.
- 13.3. The Maximum Lead Level is not applicable to products that are not subject to this Consent Judgment and it is not intended to establish applicable or unacceptable lead levels for any such products.

#### 14. COURT APPROVAL

14.1. This Consent Judgment shall be submitted to the Court for entry by noticed motion or as otherwise may be required or permitted by the Court. If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect and may not be used by the Plaintiffs or Settling Defendants for any purpose.

#### 15. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

15.1. This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party

1	hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be
2	deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties with respect to the subject matter hereof.
3	16. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION
4	16.1. This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce the
5	Consent Judgment, and to resolve any disputes that may arise as to the implementation of this
6	Judgment.
7	16.2. Should a dispute arise as to the implementation of this Consent Judgment, the
8	Parties shall meet and confer in an attempt to resolve the dispute. If the meet and confer process
9	proves unsuccessful, any Party may, by noticed motion, request that the Court resolve the dispute
10	If the dispute involves a determination made by the Attorney General regarding the terms of this
11	Consent Judgment, the Party objecting to that determination will, if it so chooses, have the
12	responsibility to bring a motion challenging it.
13	17. EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS
14	17.1. The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by
15	means of facsimile, which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.
16	
17	IT IS SO ORDERED and ADJUDGED:
18	8-
19	DATED: UTILET 25, 2016
20	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
21	CURTIS E.A. KARNOW
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
20	

# THE UNDERSIGNED PARTIES AGREE TO THE ENTRY OF THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT;

Dated: 9,2016

KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California SUSAN S. FIERING Supervising Deputy Attorney General

DENNIS A. RAGEN Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for People

I	DATED: 10M, 2016	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL
		HEALTH
		Chi
		CHARLE PIZADAD
		Printed Name
		ASSOCIATE CLOSETON
		Title
I	DATED:, 2016	FOOD MARKET MANAGEMENT, INC.
	· .	
		,
		Printed Name
	•	Title
I	DATED:, 2016	REED'S, INC.
		Printed Name
		Title
		26 CONSENT JUDGMENT (CGC-13-531045)

	,		•	•
	2	DATED:, 2016	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL	!
	3	•	HEALTH	
	4	•		
	5.			
	6			
	7		Printed Name	
•	8			•
	9		Title	
ol.	10			
	11	DATED:, 2016	FOOD MARKET MANAGEMENT, INC.	
	12			
	13	,		
	14		**************************************	
	15	•		
	16		Printed Name	
	17	`		
	18		Title	-
	19	•		
	20	DATED: July 11, 2016	REED'S, INC.	
	21			
	22		(H	
	23	·	<del>7</del> /	
	24		CHRIS REED	
	25		Printed Name	
	26		CEO	
	27		Title	
	28		26	

1	DATED:, 2016	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL
2	The second secon	HEALTH
3		
4		
5		
6		Printed Name
7		
8		Title
9		
10	DATED: 21 June, 2016	FOOD MARKET MANAGEMENT, INC.
11		
12		$\mathcal{A}$
13		
14 15		Donce Leeson
16		Printed Name
17		President
18		Title
19		
20	DATED:, 2016	REED'S, INC.
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		Printed Name
26		
27		Title
28		
	26	
		CONSENT JUDGMENT (CGC-13-531045)

#### EXHIBIT A

#### SETTLING DEFENDANT

### Name of Setting Defendant:

Food Market Management, Inc.

## Non-Exclusive Examples of California Ginger Products Sold by Settling Defendant:

The Ginger People® Crystallized Ginger Baking Chips

The Ginger People® crystallized ginger

The Ginger People® Ginger Spread

The Ginger People® Organic Crystallized Ginger

The Ginger People® candied ginger

The Ginger People® organic candied ginger

#### **Settlement Payments:**

Payments are to be made in the amounts set forth below on the later of the dates set forth below or the date fifteen days after entry of the Consent Judgment, provided, however, that if the Consent Judgment is entered after August 31, 2016, the second through fourth payments are each due one month later, with the last payment due no later than June 15, 2017.

Date	Total	AG Fees and costs	Total Civil Penalty	OEHHA Portion of Penalty	AG Portion of Penalty	CEH Portion of Penalty	CEH Fees and cost
8/15/2016	\$ 62,000.00	\$ 9,906.00	\$ 18,750.00	\$ 14,062.50	\$ 2,343.75	\$ 2,343.75	\$ 33,344.00
11/15/2016	\$ 62,000.00	\$ 9,906.00	\$ 18,750.00	\$ 14,062.50	\$ 2,343.75	\$ 2,343.75	\$ 33,344.00
2/15/2017	\$ 62,000.00	\$ 9,906.00	\$ 18,750.00	\$ 14,062.50	\$ 2,343.75	\$ 2,343.75	\$ 33,344.00
5/15/2017	\$ 62,000.00	\$ 9,906.00	\$ 18,750.00	\$ 14,062.50	\$ 2,343.75	\$ 2,343.75	\$ 33,344.00
Total	\$ 248,000.00	\$ 39,624.00	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 56,250.00	\$ 9,375.00	\$ 9,375.00	\$ 133,376.00

#### EXHIBIT A

#### SETTLING DEFENDANT

## Name of Setting Defendant:

Reeds, Inc.

#### Non-Exclusive Examples of California Ginger Products Sold by Settling Defendant:

Reed's Packaged Crystallized Ginger Reed's Bulk Crystalized Ginger

7

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

#### **Settlement Payments:**

Payments are to be made in the amounts set forth below on the later of the dates set forth below or the date fifteen days after entry of the Consent Judgment:

AG Fees and OEHHA Portion AG Portion of CEH Portion of Date **Civil Penalty CEH Fees** Total Penalty Penalty costs of Penalty 7/15/2016 \$ 33,000.00 \$ 6,138.93 \$ 6,971.83 5,228.87 871.48 871.48 \$ 19,889.24 \$ \$ 396.13 396.13 9,040.56 8/15/2016 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 2,790.42 3,169.01 2,376.76 \$ 9/15/2016 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 2,790.42 \$ 3,169.01 2,376.76 396.13 396.13 9,040.56 396.13 396.13 \$ 9,040.56 10/15/2016 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 2,790.42 \$ 3,169.01 2,376.76 - \$ \$ 11/15/2016 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 2,790.42 \$ 3,169.01 2,376.76 \$ 396.13 396.13 \$ 9,040.56 9,040.56 12/15/2016 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 2,790.42 \$ 3,169.01 2,376.76 \$ 396.13 \$ 396.13 \$ \$ 1/15/2017 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 2,790.42 \$ 3,169.01 2,376.76 \$ 396,13 396.13 9,040.56 2/15/2017 \$ 15,000.00 \$ \$ 2,376.76 \$ 396.13 \$ 396.13 \$ 9,040.56 2,790.42 3,169.01 3/15/2017 \$ 15,000.00 \$ \$ 9,040.56 2,790.42 \$ 3,169.01 2,376.76 \$ 396.13 \$ 396.13 4/15/2017 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 2,790.42 \$ 3,169.01 2,376.76 \$ 396.13 396.13 \$ 9,040.56 5/15/2017 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 2,790.42 2,376.76 396.13 396.13 \$ 9,040.56 6/15/2017 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 2,790.42 \$ 3,169.01 2,376.76 396.13 396.13 \$ 9,040.56 7/15/2017 \$ 15,000.00 \$ 2,790.42 \$ 3,169.01 2,376.76 396.13 396.13 \$ 9,040.56 \$213,000.00 \$ 39,624.00 \$ 45,000.00 \$ 5,625.00 \$ 5,625.00 \$ 128,376.00 \$ 33,750.00 Total

2

# EXHIBIT B

# SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE INFORMATION FOR THE SUPPLIER/MANUFACTURER OF CALIFORNIA GINGER PRODUCTS

Dear [Insert Name of Supplier/Manufacturer]:

We plan to offer the following products for sale in California:

[Insert Names of Specific California Ginger Products]

Prior to doing so, we will need certification from an Independent Food Quality Auditor that important steps have been taken to minimize the lead levels in each of these products during the manufacturing process.

The Independent Food Processing Auditor must:

- 1. Have extensive knowledge of good manufacturing practices in the food processing industry;
- 2. Have sufficient experience in inspecting food processing facilities to ensure compliance with good manufacturing practices and with the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points ("HACCP") food safety management system;
- 3. Be (i) certified as an International HACCP Alliance lead Instructor; or (ii) be certified as a SQF (Safe Quality Food) HACCP Lead Auditor or SQF Consultant; or (iii) hold an NEHA (National Environmental Health Association) Certified Professional Food Safety (CP-FS) Credential; or (iv) be certified as Food Scientist by Institute of Food Technology; or (v) have an equivalent qualification;
- 4. Supply us with a resume demonstrating the qualifications listed above.

The Independent Food Processing Auditor must provide the initial signed Certification attached as Attachment 1 for each California Ginger Product. Thereafter, the Independent Food Processing Auditor or a qualified Internal Auditor may provide the Certification.

For the purposes of that Certification, the following definitions are applicable:

- The "Maximum Lead Level" for the finished California Ginger Product is 40 parts per billion (ppb).
- A "Qualified Laboratory" is a laboratory that meets the requirements set forth in Title 27 California Code of Regulations section 25900(b) or in Attachment 2, and that follows the procedures set forth in Attachment 2.
- A "Lead Contribution Exercise" is a mass balance exercise that evaluates the contribution of lead from each ingredient used in the manufacture of a product. The objective of the lead contribution exercise is: (1) to determine if an ingredient or process is contributing measurable lead in concentrations of 2 ppb or more to the finished product; (2) to calculate the potential total amount of lead that will result

from the formulation of the product; and (3) to then compare this total with the maximum amount of lead allowed. If the formulation of the product results in a lead concentration that exceeds the Maximum Lead Level, then the formulation and/or the lead content of the ingredients must be changed to meet the Maximum Lead Level.

7.

The Auditor will verify that a Lead Contribution Exercise for each California Ginger Product has been conducted. Based on this Exercise, the Auditor will establish maximum lead concentrations for major ingredients and ingredients and processing aids materials or substances used to dry, preserve or otherwise process the ingredients that are used to manufacture each California Ginger Product and that can contribute 5 ppb or more lead to the final product. The lead concentrations that the Auditor establishes as part of this Exercise must be designed to result in a finished California Ginger Product that has a lead concentration of no more than 40 ppb.

- "Periodic Testing" means annual testing of Representative Product Samples of the California Ginger Product at a Qualified Laboratory, unless a product fails to satisfy the Maximum Lead Level in which case the testing frequency will be increased to reflect the severity of the failure.
- "Representative Product Samples" of a California Ginger Product shall mean six to ten samples randomly drawn from the following lots ("Representative Lots") of that Product which are intended for sale or distribution in California.:
  - For purposes of the initial certification of the Maximum Lead Level: (a) the first six consecutive lots of the product that were produced after the implementation of the Lead Contribution Exercise and (b) the square root, rounded to the nearest whole number, of the additional number of lots sold in the preceding calendar year. <sup>1</sup> For new products for which no prior sales information is available, the number of lots used to calculate the number of tests for subpart (b) is to be based upon sales of similar products in the prior calendar year.
  - For subsequent certifications of the Maximum Lead Level: the square root, rounded to the nearest whole number, of the number of lots sold or distributed for sale in California in the preceding calendar year, unless a lot fails to satisfy the Maximum Lead Level. In the event of such a failure, the company that manufactures the California Ginger Product must re-evaluate its controls, and then show that six consecutive lots satisfy the applicable Maximum Lead Levels before reverting to testing the square root of the number of lots sold.
  - If the Independent or Internal Auditor concludes that two or more of a Settling Defendant's California Ginger Products are substantially the same except that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> If there are fewer than six production lots or fewer than the additional lots required produced by the date of the initial certification, samples shall be taken from each lot.

they are sliced, cut or diced differently, and that these Products are produced at the same facility, at or about the same time (or if appropriate, during the same production season), using the same sources for the ingredients, and that combining these Products into a single "product" group will result in appropriate analysis of the lead content of the Products in the combined group, then the Auditor may combine these Products into a single group for purposes of the Certifications required by Attachment 1.

• "Representative Ingredient Samples" of ingredients for California Ginger Products shall mean: the average of six or more samples taken from:

- the square root, rounded to the nearest whole number, of the number of lots of the ingredient used in the California Ginger Product in the preceding calendar year; or

- a statistically representative number of the lots of that ingredient, as determined by the supplier of that ingredient; or
- each lot of the ingredient.

- If a lot fails to the satisfy the applicable maximum lead level for the ingredient, then:
  - o If all lots of that ingredient are routinely tested before use, the lot may be rejected without additional action;
  - Otherwise, the lot must be rejected and the company that supplies the ingredient or the Defendant must re-evaluate its controls, and then show that up to six consecutive lots of the ingredient satisfy the applicable maximum lead levels before the ingredient can be used in a California Ginger Product.

1		ATTACHMENT 1
2	REQU	IRED CERTIFICATION FROM INDEPENDENT FOOD QUALITY AUDITOR RETAINED BY THE MANUFACTURER OR SUPPLIER OF THE CALIFORNIA GINGER PRODUCT
3		[Letterhead of Independent Food Processing Auditor.]
4 5	I, Produc	[Name], certify as follows with respect to the following California Ginger ets:
6		[Insert Names of specific California Ginger Products]
7	1.	[Name of Company] (the "Company") has implemented a Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points ("HACCP") program that identifies lead as a hazard and implements the prevention steps to minimize the presence of lead in the California
9		Ginger Products.
10	2.	Ginger. The Company has received adequate certification pursuant to paragraph 9 below that the raw ginger used as an ingredient in the California Ginger Products
11		does not contain lead in excess of the higher of (a) 35 ppb or (b) the maximum
12		concentration established in the Lead Contribution Exercise conducted pursuant to section 8 below.
13		During the first calendar year following the Effective Date, if the ingredient ginger
14 15		for a California Ginger Product has already been brined, the Company may obtain this certification for this brined ginger rather than separately for the raw ginger and brining salt with the lead concentration in the brined ginger not in excess of 35 ppb.
16	. 3	Sugar. The sugar used as an ingredient in the California Ginger Products is food
17	٠.	grade, and the Company has received adequate certification pursuant to paragraph 9 below that it does not contain lead in excess of the maximum concentration
18		established in the Lead Contribution Exercise conducted pursuant to section 8 below.
19	4.	Salt. If salt is more than 2 % of the finished product, the salt used as an ingredient
20		in the California Ginger Products is food grade, and the Company has received
21		adequate certification pursuant to paragraph 9 below that that it does not contain lead in excess of the concentration established in the Lead Contribution Exercise
22		conducted pursuant to section 8 below.
23	5.	Brining Salt. If the California Ginger Products are subject to a brining process: The salt used in the brining of the ginger ingredients is food grade and the
24		Company has received adequate certification pursuant to paragraph 9 below that it
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>		does not contain lead in excess of either (i) 50 ppb, or (ii) the maximum concentration established in the Lead Contribution Exercise conducted pursuant to section 8 below.
27		Other Ingredients/Aids. All other ingredients and processing aids are food grade
28	0.	and the Company has received adequate certification pursuant to paragraph 9 below

that any ingredients that may contribute lead in excess of 5 ppb to the finished

product do not contain lead in excess of the maximum concentration established in the Lead Contribution Exercise conducted pursuant to section 8 below.

- 7. <u>Annual Audit</u>. The Company undergoes an annual audit by an approved third party auditor to verify that their GMP and HACCP programs adequately prevent or minimize the presence of lead in their finished products.
- 8. <u>Lead Contribution Exercise</u>. I have reviewed the Company's Lead Contribution Exercise for the California Ginger Product. Based on this Exercise, the Company has established maximum lead concentrations for the major ingredients, and has evaluated the potential lead contribution from minor ingredients and processing aids that are used to manufacture each California Ginger Product. The lead concentrations that the Company has established as part of this Exercise are designed to result in a finished California Ginger Product that has a lead concentration of no more than 40 ppb.
- 9. Certification from Suppliers.

- a. The Company has either:
  - (1) Requested from its suppliers and maintained a certificate of analysis specific to lead for each raw ingredient and for each manufacturing aid that may, based on the Lead Contribution Exercise, contribute more than 5 ppb of lead to the finished product. These certificates of analysis indicate that the lead levels in Representative Ingredient Samples of each such major ingredient and manufacturing aid do not exceed the maximum lead concentrations set forth in paragraphs 2 through 6, above. These certificates show that the ingredient or processing aid has been analyzed by a Qualified Laboratory.

or

- (2) Has implemented a system to pre-approve each supplier. Such a pre-approved supplier must show that it has process controls and lead prevention programs in place to ensure that the lead levels in its products do not exceed the maximum lead concentrations that are set in paragraphs 2 through 6, above. The supplier must also show that it has a program in place to test Representative Ingredient Samples and that this testing shows that the maximum lead concentrations have not been exceeded. This testing must be conducted at a Qualified Laboratory.
- b. If the final product has failed to satisfy the Maximum Lead Level, any ingredients responsible for any failure to satisfy the Maximum Lead Level have undergone independent testing.
- 10. <u>Potable Water Supply</u>. The potable water supply is monitored for lead levels. The internal distribution system is not a source of lead contamination as verified by

- point of use testing versus influent lead level. The lead levels in potable water used in processing contains no more than 0.010 ppb.
- 11. <u>Food Contact Surfaces</u>. All food contact equipment, utensils, and containers are constructed from lead-free materials. No brass or bronze components may come in contact with ingredients or the final product.
- 12. <u>Lubricants/Sealants</u>, <u>Etc.</u> Lubricants, sealants and similar materials used in direct food contact areas, as well as in areas that have the potential to contaminate product, are food grade. This includes storage areas in addition to processing and packing areas.
- 13. <u>Packaging materials</u>. Packaging materials, inks, and pigments with any contact to the product meet the requirements of California Health and Safety Code section 25214.13. Other packing materials do not result in lead migration into the final product.
- 14. <u>Process control</u>. Process control is validated through an audit program whereby processes and finished product is subjected to Periodic Testing for total lead content. The Limit of Quantification (LOQ) for the finished products and major ingredients must be equal to or less than 0.01 mg/kg.
- 15. Lot identification/Traceability. Lot identification and traceability is maintained for major and minor ingredients and processing aids. The manufacturer is able to document the major and minor ingredients lots used to produce specific finished product lots and to trace finished product shipments one level forward to the customer.
- 16. <u>Testing Program for Final Product</u> The company has a program in place to test Representative Samples of the product annually, unless a product fails to satisfy the Maximum Lead Level in which case the Company has in place a program whereby sampling frequency will be increased to reflect the lead level found in excess of what is permitted under the Consent Judgment.
- 17. <u>Standard GMPs</u>. The Company has in place Good Manufacturing Practices for the California Ginger Product, that include the following, which are continuously in place:
  - a. Specifications are established for controlled manufacturing steps.
  - b. Master manufacturing records and batch production records are prepared and maintained
  - c. Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) are prepared to cover the quality control operations, including the calibration and control of equipment and instruments used in manufacturing.
- 18. <u>Certification of Maximum Lead Level</u>. I have reviewed testing of Representative Samples of the California Ginger Products listed above. This testing was conducted at a Qualified Laboratory that met the standards set forth in Title 27

California Code of Regulations section 25900(b) or set forth in Attachment 2. This testing showed that none of the Representative Lots of California Ginger Products contained an average (arithmetic mean) lead level that exceeded 40 ppb, and that none of the samples had a lead concentration of more than 60 ppb by weight.

25.

SIGNATURE OF INDEPENDENT FOOD QUALITY AUDITOR.

#### 1 **EXHIBIT B - ATTACHMENT 2** 2 QUALIFIED LABORATORIES 3 Analytical guidance for Laboratories: 4 Analyses must utilize a method that employs ICP-MS. Laboratories must have the capability of controlling lead contamination throughout the analytical process, including 5 sample compositing, sample digestion, and the lead determination steps. In order to meet the analytical objectives, the use of high purity acids will be required as well the use of 6 closed-vessel type sample digestion procedures. The conditions and procedures needed to successfully meet the analyses are described in the FDA Elemental Analysis Manual. 7 http://www.fda.gov/Food/Food/ScienceResearch/LaboratoryMethods/ucm2006954.htm 8 See method EAM 4.7. 9 http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Food/FoodScienceResearch/LaboratoryMethods/UCM377 005.pdf 10 Particular attention must be given to recovery information offered to attribute accuracy to 11 these analyses. The levels of lead used to fortify products and ingredients for analyte recovery must be in the range of 50-200% of the lead level found in the product, if the 12 level of lead in the product is in a quantifiable range. As a measure of accuracy, laboratories are also encouraged to provide recovery information on certified reference 13 materials with lead levels similar to these products or ingredients. 14 Participating laboratories must be accredited, preferably under ISO 17025 to conduct low level lead analyses in foods by ICP-MS. 15 The analytical objective for lead analysis, i.e., the Limit of Quantification (LOQ), for 16 finished products and for the major ingredients is 0.010 mg/kg. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

26

27

## **EXHIBIT C**

# List of Entities and California Ginger Products

# Sold By Such Entities That Are Excluded From Downstream

# Release in Section 10.1.2

Entity	California Ginger Products Excluded From Downstream Release
All Entities	Crystallized Ginger Imported from Thailand
Albertson's, LLC	McCormick Crystallized Ginger
Amazon.com	Sincerely Nuts Brand Crystallized Ginger
B&V Enterprises	Nutty & Fruity Dried Ginger
Cost Plus, Inc.	World Market Ginger Root Crystallized Ginger
Draeger's Super Markets	Draeger's Ginger Crystallized Organic
Gelson's Markets	McCormick Crystallized Ginger, Spice Island Crystallized Ginger and The Spice Hunter Crystallized Ginger
McCormick & Company Incorporated	All California Ginger Products
Spice Hunter, Inc.	All California Ginger Products
Sunflower Farmers Mark	cets, LLC Crystallized Ginger SKU 2-06318-80448-8
Vanns Spices Ltd.	Draeger's Ginger Crystallized Organic
Vons Companies, Inc.	McCormick Crystallized Ginger
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.	McCormick Crystallized Ginger and Spice Island Crystallized Ginger
Buderim Ginger Limited	
Euromarket Designs, Inc	All California Ginger Products
Frontier Distribution LL	C All California Ginger Products
Nature's World LLC	All California Ginger Products
Zion Market Irvine, Inc.	All California Ginger Products