ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY

DEC 0 9 2014

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

By K. MCC Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, a non-profit corporation,

Plaintiff.

٧.

AERODYNAMIC AVIATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: RG-11-600721

[PROPOSED] AMENDED CONSENT JUDGMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The parties to this Consent Judgment ("Parties") are Plaintiff, the Center for Environmental Health ("CEH"), and the undersigned defendants on Exhibit A (the "Settling Defendants").
- 1.2 Commencing in May 2011, CEH served multiple 60-Day Notices of Violation under Proposition 65 (The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.5, et seq.), alleging that the entities named in those notices violated Proposition 65 by exposing persons to lead, as well as lead and lead compounds (collectively, "Lead") contained in leaded aviation gasoline ("Avgas") without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning.

34326137v3

- 1.3 On June 30, 2011, several of the defendants in this case filed an action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California against CEH, the California Attorney General, and the Acting Director of the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (together the "Federal Defendants"). The federal plaintiffs sought declaratory and injunctive relief, alleging that CEH's Proposition 65 claims were preempted by federal law. Federal Defendants' motions to dismiss were granted, and the action was dismissed on October 19, 2011.
- **1.4** On October 20, 2011 CEH filed the action entitled *CEH v. Aerodynamic Aviation, et al.*, Case No. RG 11-600721, in the Superior Court of California for Alameda County. On October 25, 2011, CEH filed its First Amended Complaint. On July 17, 2012, CEH filed the operative Second Amended Complaint (the "Complaint").
- 1.5 Each Settling Defendant distributes or offers Avgas for sale in the State of California or has done so in the past. The Settling Defendants are composed of fixed base operators and other businesses that offer Avgas for retail sale at airports in California (the "FBO Settling Defendants") and distributors of Avgas that distribute Avgas to FBOs and other businesses that offer Avgas for retail sale at airports in California (the "Distributor Settling Defendants"). The FBO Settling Defendants together operate at 24 different airports in California. In some instances, a number of different FBO Settling Defendants operate at the same California airport.
- 1.6 The Parties acknowledge that the form of Avgas currently in use is known as 100LL, indicating it has an octane rating of 100 and is "low lead." The concentration of lead in 100LL Avgas currently in use is specified at a maximum of 0.56 grams of lead per liter of fuel under specification ASTM D910. A newer form of Avgas, known as 100VLL for "very low lead," has recently been approved by the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") and is specified at a maximum of 0.45 grams of lead per liter of fuel under specification ASTM D910, but is not yet commercially available for sale in California. In addition, at least one major refinery of Avgas

World Fuel Services Corporation ("WFSC") is a holding company and does not distribute or offer AvGas for sale in the State of California currently or at any time in the past. WFSC is participating in the settlement on behalf of any and all of its subsidiaries and affiliates.

recently began the process of obtaining FAA approval of a lead free alternative to Avgas that may be used in all aircraft.

- 1.7 The Parties acknowledge that certain aircraft that have obtained Supplemental Type Certificates from the FAA are permitted by law to use high octane automotive gasoline that does not contain lead ("Mogas"). Although some aircraft are capable of using Mogas, some are not. As a result, FBOs cannot offer Mogas in lieu of Avgas but only in addition to Avgas. FBOs at approximately 100 U.S. airports outside of California currently sell Mogas; however, due to state requirements concerning the ethanol content of standard automotive gasoline and other factors, Mogas has not, to date, been available in California.
- 1.8 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations of Proposition 65 violations contained in the Complaint applicable to each Settling Defendant and personal jurisdiction over each Settling Defendant as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the County of Alameda, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment. Each Settling Defendant represents that as of the date it executes this Consent Judgment, no public enforcer is diligently prosecuting a Proposition 65 enforcement action related to lead in its Avgas.
- 1.9 Nothing in this Consent Judgment is or shall be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law or violation of law, nor shall compliance with the Consent Judgment constitute or be construed as an admission by the Parties of any fact, conclusion of law, issue of law, or violation of law. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any other legal proceeding. This Consent Judgment is the product of negotiation and compromise and is accepted by the Parties for purposes of settling, compromising and resolving issues disputed in this action.
- 1.10 CEH and the Settling Defendants now agree in this proposed Consent Judgment to resolve CEH's claims in the Complaint by, *inter alia* and as set forth specifically below: (a) requiring clear and reasonable warnings via the posting of signs at the airport locations identified in the Complaint; and (b) ensuring that Settling Defendants distribute and sell the airplane fuel with the lowest lead content that is Commercially Available (as defined below).

2.1 Warnings At Airport Locations. For each airport identified in the Complaint, within 90 days of the date the court enters this Consent Judgment (the "Effective Date"), those FBO Settling Defendant(s) who operate a facility at the airport shall post a warning sign or signs as described below. No airport shall be required to have more than three (3) warning signs posted, regardless of the number of FBO Settling Defendants who operate a facility at that airport. In addition, within 90 days of the Effective Date, for each of the airports identified in the Complaint, those FBO Settling Defendants who operate at each such airport will be responsible for delivering warnings to each residence located within one kilometer of the airport.

2.1.1 Warning Signs

- (a) The warning signs discussed in Section 2.1 shall be at least 24 inches high by 24 inches wide.
- (b) The sign(s) shall be posted in location(s) previously agreed to by the Parties, or as close thereto as practicable. In general, the signs will be posted in conspicuous locations likely to be seen by the general public, close to major roads or intersections surrounding the airport. Maps showing the locations of the signs at each of the airports where the FBO Defendants operate are attached hereto as Exhibit D.
- airports owned and operated by third parties (in most cases, governmental entities). In order to effectuate this warning provision, the vast majority of FBO Settling Defendants have already consulted with the airport authorities that control their leases to post the warning signs at the agreed-upon locations. With the exception of a few locations, all of the airport authorities contacted have agreed to permit the FBO Settling Defendants to post the warning signs. With regard to those airport authorities that have not yet agreed to the posting of the warnings, the FBO Settling Defendants operating at those airports will, within 30 days following the Effective Date, make a formal request to post the warnings. If, despite an FBO Settling Defendant's requests, an airport authority refuses to permit posting of any sign on airport property, the FBO Settling Defendant shall inform CEH of that fact. In such an event, the FBO Settling Defendant shall post a sign on its own

- (a) As of the Effective Date, Settling Defendants shall not purchase for resale in California, distribute for sale in California, or sell in California Avgas that contains a lead concentration of more than 0.56 grams of lead per liter of fuel. In addition, each Settling Defendant shall purchase for resale, distribute, and sell in California Avgas with the lowest concentration of lead approved for aviation use that is commercially available to that Settling Defendant on a consistent and sustained basis at prices and on terms, in quantities and at times sufficient to meet demands of the customers of that Settling Defendant in California ("Commercially Available"), including 100VLL once it becomes Commercially Available to that Settling Defendant for the California market.
- (b) In order to ensure compliance with the lead concentration limits established in this Section 2.3.1, a Settling Defendant shall, upon 30 days' prior written notice, allow CEH (at its own expense) to obtain a sample of the Avgas currently being sold by such Defendant, provided that CEH has not requested a sample from the same Settling Defendant during the preceding 12 months.
- (c) In the event that CEH concludes that a lower lead alternative to 100LL Avgas that is approved for aviation use will be Commercially Available to one or more Settling Defendants on or after November 1, 2015, CEH shall notify each such Settling Defendant as to the basis for CEH's belief at least ninety (90) days in advance of November 1, 2015. Each such Settling Defendant shall, within ninety (90) days of receiving such notice from CEH, either comply with paragraph 2.3.1(a) hereof, or report to CEH the basis for its conclusion that no lower lead alternative to 100LL Avgas that is approved for aviation use is Commercially Available to such Settling Defendant for the California market. Should CEH disagree with a Settling Defendant's assessment about whether any formulation of aviation fuel is approved for aviation use and Commercially Available to that Settling Defendant for the California market, CEH may seek to enforce the requirements of Section 2.3.1(a) in accordance with the procedure set forth in Section 3.1. In any such motion, the burden shall be on CEH to establish that a lower lead alternative to 100LL Avgas is Commercially Available to that Settling Defendant for the California market. In the absence of any notification from CEH to, and successful enforcement effort by CEH as called

for in this Section 2.3.1(c) against, any Settling Defendant, such Settling Defendant's obligation under Section 2.3.1(a) regarding Avgas that contains a lead concentration of less than 0.56 grams of lead per liter of fuel shall not apply until such time as such Avgas is approved for aviation use and Commercially Available to that Settling Defendant.

(d) At any time after 100VLL or any other lower lead alternative to 100LL Avgas that is approved for aviation use becomes Commercially Available for the California market, any Party may file a motion to modify the terms of Section 2.3.1(a) on the basis that either:

(a) Avgas with a lead concentration below 0.45 grams per liter is no longer Commercially Available such that the concentration level should be adjusted upward; or (b) Avgas with a lead concentration at a level of 0.45 is more than 10 percent over the lead concentration level in fuel that is approved for aviation and that is Commercially Available such that the level should be adjusted downward. The Party seeking a modification pursuant to this Section shall provide written notice to all affected Parties and shall meet and confer with all interested parties for a period of not less than 30 days before filing any such motion. The Party bringing a motion to modify this consent judgment shall bear the burden of demonstrating that the concentration limit in Section 2.3.1(a) should be modified pursuant to this Section 2.3.1(d).

2.3.2 <u>Distribution of Mogas</u>

- (a) As of the Effective Date, each FBO Settling Defendant that is not prohibited from offering Mogas (e.g., by insurance, lease, applicable law or regulations, or other conditions) will consider in good faith, but in its sole discretion, whether or not to offer Mogas.
- (b) Also as of the Effective Date, should any FBO operating in California request that a Distributor Settling Defendant provide the FBO with Mogas, the Distributor Settling Defendant to whom the request is addressed shall make Mogas available to the requesting FBO. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no Distributor Settling Defendant shall be required to provide Mogas if, despite reasonable efforts of the Distributor, the supplier(s) of Mogas available to such Distributor Settling Defendant fail to provide a certificate evidencing aviation product liability coverage for such Mogas or otherwise prohibit the Distributor Settling Defendant from making such Mogas available, the firms storing and transporting such Mogas fail to certify that such Mogas has

been stored and transported in accordance with aviation industry standards, or an insurance underwriter has not extended liability coverage, on commercially reasonable terms, for its sale by the Distributor Settling Defendant.

(c) No more frequently than once in any 12-month period, CEH may request from any Distributor Settling Defendant a report of all requests such Distributor Settling Defendant has received from FBOs in California seeking Mogas. In addition, in the event that CEH has reason to believe that an FBO has requested Mogas, but a Distributor Settling Defendant has declined to provide such Mogas, CEH may request that the Distributor Settling Defendant provide the basis upon which the decision not to provide Mogas was made. In response to either form of request from CEH, the Distributor Settling Defendant shall provide such information within 45 days following such request. CEH may then challenge that determination by motion following notice to the Distributor Settling Defendant and 30 days for the parties to the dispute to meet and confer.

3. ENFORCEMENT

- **3.1** Before moving to enforce the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment with respect to an alleged violation hereof or of Proposition 65 related to Avgas, CEH must follow these procedures:
- 3.1.1 In the event that CEH identifies an airport at which (1) one or more FBO Settling Defendant(s) sells Avgas but at which no warning signs have been posted or leaflets delivered as described in Section 2.1 of this Consent Judgment 90 days after the Effective Date, or (2) there is a violation of Section 2.3 of this Consent Judgment, then CEH or such person shall notify Settling Defendant in writing within 15 days of the date CEH or such other person was informed of or observed the alleged violation (the "Notice of Violation" or "NOV"). The NOV shall be sent to the person(s) identified pursuant to Section 7 herein. The NOV shall at a minimum set forth the date(s) the alleged violation(s) was observed, identify the address(es) of the airport(s) in question, and describe the alleged violation(s) with sufficient detail to allow the recipient to determine the basis of the claim being asserted. The NOV shall allege all violations that could have been raised with respect to each airport in question as of the date of the NOV.

- **3.1.2** In the event the recipient corrects the alleged violation(s) within sixty (60) days of receiving the NOV, CEH shall take no further enforcement action with respect to such alleged violation(s) under either this Consent Judgment, Proposition 65, or any other law.
- 3.1.3 In the event the recipient wishes to contest the allegations contained in any NOV, it shall notify CEH of such in writing within thirty (30) days of its receipt of the NOV. The recipient may provide any evidence to CEH or the notifying person in support of its position. In the event that, upon a good faith review of the evidence, CEH or the notifying person agrees with the recipient's position, no further action shall be taken. In the event the recipient provides evidence, and CEH disagrees with the recipient's position, it shall, within thirty (30) days, notify the recipient of such and provide the recipient, in writing, with the reasons for its disagreement. Thereafter, the notifying person and recipient shall meet and confer for a period of fifteen (15) days to attempt to resolve their dispute on mutually acceptable terms; if no such resolution results, CEH may seek to enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment against the recipient. In the event the recipient of an NOV fails to respond to the NOV within the allotted 30 days, CEH may seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

4. PAYMENTS

- 4.1 Payments by Settling Defendants. On January 9, 2015, or within thirty days after entry of this Consent Judgment, whichever is later, the Settling Defendants shall make a total settlement payment to CEH in the amount of \$550,000.00, in full satisfaction and consideration of the monetary component of the alleged violations pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.5, *et seq.*, which will be apportioned as set forth below. The amount that each Settling Defendant is responsible for paying is set forth in Exhibit A.
- **4.2** The settlement payment shall be made by check(s) payable to the Lexington Law Group Attorney-Client Trust Fund. The funds paid by the Settling Defendants shall be allocated as follows:
- **4.2.1** \$70,000 as a civil penalty pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), such money to be apportioned by CEH 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).

4.2.2 \$106,000 as a payment in lieu of civil penalty to CEH pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), and California Code of Regulations, Title 11, § 3203(b).

(a) Of the amount received as a payment in lieu of civil penalty, CEH or its counsel will hold \$5,000 in a trust account pending the delivery of warnings under Section 2.1. Within 120 days of the Effective Date, each FBO Defendant that chooses to seek partial reimbursement of the expenses it incurred for providing the warnings described in Section 2.1.2 shall submit to CEH documentation of the expenses it has incurred in delivering those warnings to residences pursuant to Section 2.1. Upon review of that documentation, within 150 days of the Effective Date, CEH shall disburse to each FBO Defendant 50% of the expenses for which it has submitted documentation, provided that the total amount that CEH shall be required to disburse under this provision shall not exceed \$5,000. If 50% the aggregate expenses for which FBO Defendants have submitted documentation exceeds \$5,000, then CEH shall disburse to each FBO Defendant its proportionately reduced share. If 50% the aggregate expenses for which FBO Defendants have submitted documentation does not exceed \$5,000, then the remainder of the \$5,000 amount that has not been disbursed to FBO Defendants will be disbursed to CEH as a payment in lieu of civil penalty.

(b) CEH will use the funds it receives as a payment in lieu of civil penalty to continue its work educating and protecting people from exposures to toxic chemicals. CEH may also use a portion of such funds to monitor compliance with this Consent Judgment and to purchase and test Settling Defendant's products to confirm compliance. In addition, as part of its Community Environmental Action and Justice Fund, CEH will use four percent (4%) of such funds to award grants to grassroots environmental justice groups working to educate and protect people from exposures to toxic chemicals. The method of selection of such groups can be found at the CEH web site at www.ceh.org/justicefund.

4.2.3 \$374,000 as reimbursement of a portion of CEH's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

5. **MODIFICATION**

2 3 4

5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

16

15

17

19

18

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27

- 5.1 Written Consent. This Consent Judgment may be modified from time to time by express written agreement of the Parties with the approval of the Court, or by an order of this Court upon motion and in accordance with law.
- 5.2 **Meet and Confer.** Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with all affected Parties prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.
- 5.3 **Addition of Opt-In Defendants.** In order to assure consistent treatment of similarly-situated market participants as well as more uniform and widely available warnings for Lead in Avgas, the Parties seek to allow other entities to opt-in to this Consent Judgment in the following process:
- **5.3.1** An entity is eligible to become an Opt-In Settling Defendant to the Amended Consent Judgment, if it (a) is a "person in the course of doing business" as that term is defined in California Health and Safety Code § 25249.11(b); and (b) distributes or offers Avgas for sale in the State of California or has done so in the past. The Opt-In Settling Defendants will either be fixed base operators that offer Avgas for sale (the "FBO Opt-In Settling Defendants") or distributors of Avgas (the "Distributor Opt-In Settling Defendants").
- **5.3.2** No later than 180 days after entry of the Consent Judgment, an entity that wishes to become an Opt-In Settling Defendant shall provide to CEH's Counsel, with a copy to Defense Liaison Counsel, as specified in Section 7, each of the following: (a) its Notice of Intent to Opt-In to Consent Judgment ("Notice of Intent") in the form attached hereto as Exhibit B; (b) an executed signature page to the proposed Amended Consent Judgment in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C; (c) any certification required under Section 5.3.3; and (d) the payments required by Section 5.3.4. Within twenty (20) days of its receipt of a Notice of Intent to Opt-In, CEH may reject any such Notice of Intent to Opt-In by providing notice of such rejection to the entity providing the Notice of Intent to Opt-In and to Defense Liaison Counsel and returning to the entity providing the Notice of Intent to Opt-In any and all funds received with such entity's Notice of Intent to Opt-In.

- 5.3.3 If a proposed Opt-In Settling Defendant has not previously received from CEH a 60-Day Notice of Violation of Proposition 65 related to Lead in Avgas, it shall also provide with its Notice of Intent to Opt-In a certification in the form attached hereto as Exhibit B2. Within twenty (20) days of the expiration of the 180 day opt-in period, CEH, to the extent it has not already done so, shall serve a 60-Day Notice of Violation of Proposition 65 pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d)(1), relating to Lead in Avgas upon each entity that has properly notified CEH of its intent to opt-in to the Consent Judgment.
- 5.3.4 Each FBO Opt-In Settling Defendant shall pay a total of \$7,500 for each of its California locations. Each Distributor Opt-In Settling Defendant shall pay a total of \$87,500. Payments pursuant to this section shall be made by check(s) payable to the Lexington Law Group Attorney-Client Trust Fund and delivered to Defense Liaison Counsel as set forth in Section 7.2. Within ten (10) days following entry of the Amended Consent Judgment, Defense Liaison Counsel shall deliver the check(s) to CEH's Counsel, who shall then distribute these funds as set forth below with ten (10) days of receipt of the check(s). These funds will be divided as follows:
- (a) First, for each FBO Opt-In Settling Defendant, the amount of \$955 for each of its California locations will be paid as a civil penalty pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(b), such money to be apportioned by CEH 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). For each Distributor Opt-In Settling Defendant, the amount of \$11,113 will be paid as a civil penalty pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b), such money to be apportioned by CEH 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).
- (b) The next \$75,000 in aggregate payments by Opt-In Settling

 Defendants shall, subject to Court approval, be paid to CEH's Counsel as compensation for reasonable and necessary time associated with administering the Opt-In program, including sending out 60-Day Notices, entering the Amended Consent Judgment and responding to inquiries regarding the Opt-In program, with any remainder payable to CEH's Counsel as reimbursement of unrecouped attorneys fees and costs incurred in this matter.

- (c) Fifty percent (50%) of all remaining payments by Opt-In Settling Defendants of up to \$750,000 shall be disbursed to Defense Liaison Counsel, who shall further distribute these funds to each of the Settling Defendants in accordance with the proportional amount that each Settling Defendant paid to its respective counsel for attorneys fees and costs incurred through October 31, 2014, to litigate this action and negotiate and finalize this Consent Judgment.
- (d) All remaining payments by Opt-In Settling Defendants shall be allocated as a payment in lieu of civil penalty to CEH and as attorneys' fees and costs to CEH's counsel as reimbursement of unrecouped attorneys fees and costs incurred in this matter of up to \$400,000, subject to Court approval. Such payments will be divided in the same proportion as the total payment by the Settling Defendants is allocated under Section 4.2. Once CEH's counsel has been reimbursed as set forth above, any remaining payments by Opt-In Settling Defendants shall be divided proportionately between civil penalty and payments to CEH in lieu of a civil penalty in accordance with sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 hereof.
- (e) Under no circumstances shall any sum collected under this Consent Judgment be used to defray or reimburse the amount paid by any Settling Defendant or Opt-In Settling Defendant pursuant to this Consent Judgment (as opposed to the attorneys' fees incurred by such Settling Defendant).
- 5.3.5 If after the close of the 180 day Opt-In period CEH has received all paperwork from less than ten (10) Opt-In Settling Defendants, CEH may at its option cancel the Opt-In by providing notice of such rejection to Defense Liaison Counsel and returning to each entity that provided a Notice of Intent to Opt-In any and all funds received with such entity's Notice of Intent to Opt-In.
- 5.3.6 Within 210 days of Entry of the Consent Judgment, and assuming it has received at least one notice of intent to opt-in and has not cancelled the Opt-In pursuant to Section 5.3.5, CEH shall file a noticed motion for approval of a proposed Amended Consent Judgment. Such motion will be made in accordance with Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(f)(4) and will seek the statutory findings required thereunder. The Amended Consent Judgment filed with the Court may only differ from the Consent Judgment in that it will include the Opt-In Settling Defendants,

attach the Opt-In Settling Defendants' signature pages, and deem the Complaint amended to add the Opt-In Settling Defendants as Defendants in this action upon entry of the Amended Consent Judgment. Except as specifically stated herein, nothing in the Amended Consent Judgment shall modify or in any way affect the rights or obligations of Settling Defendants and CEH as set forth herein. The motion for approval of the Amended Consent Judgment shall be set for hearing at least seventy (70) days after CEH serves the last 60-Day Notice of Violation of Proposition 65 regarding Lead in Avgas on the Opt-In Settling Defendants.

- 5.3.7 Within thirty (30) days following court approval of the Amended Consent Judgment as to an FBO Opt-In Settling Defendant, such party shall comply with the provisions of section 2.1. To the extent another FBO Opt-In Settling Defendant has already complied with the provisions of section 2.1 such that a sign is already posted or warnings have already been delivered to residences at the airport at which the FBO Opt-In Settling Defendant operates, then the FBO Opt-In Settling Defendant shall promptly reimburse its per capita share of the expenses incurred by the FBO Settling Defendant(s) operating at that airport in previously complying with section 2.1, upon presentation of appropriate documentation of such expenses.
- 5.3.8 The deadlines in this Order may be extended by written stipulation between CEH and Defense Liaison Counsel, following Defense Liaison Counsel's consultation with the Settling Defendants with no objections from them remaining unresolved.
- **5.3.9** Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall preclude CEH from resolving any claim against an entity that is not a Settling Defendant on different terms than are contained in the Consent Judgment or the Amended Consent Judgment.
- 5.4 Change in Settling Defendant Status. Following the Effective Date, should any Settling Defendant no longer qualify as a "person in the course of doing business" under Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.11(b), then such Settling Defendant shall provide notice to CEH together with proof sufficient to demonstrate that such Settling Defendant no longer so qualifies. CEH shall have 30 days in which to decide whether to dispute the notice provided hereunder. If CEH does not dispute such notice, the parties shall file a stipulation and proposed order or other appropriate motion requesting the Court's approval. Should CEH notify the noticing Settling Defendant that it

disputes the notice, the noticing Settling Defendant may file a motion in accordance with Sections 5.1 and 5.2. Upon Court approval, such Settling Defendant will have no further obligations under Section 2 of this Consent Judgment. Should CEH later believe that such Settling Defendant later qualifies as a "person in the course of doing business" under Cal. Health & Safety Code \$ 25249.11(b), CEH may provide such Settling Defendant with 30 days' notice, after which the parties may proceed by stipulation and order or by motion to resolve any dispute.

6. CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

- 6.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH on behalf of itself and the public interest and each Settling Defendant, and its parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities that are under common ownership, directors, officers, employees, and attorneys ("Defendant Releasees"), and each entity to whom they directly or indirectly distribute or sell Avgas, including but not limited to distributors, wholesalers, customers, retailers, franchisees, cooperative members, licensors, and licensees, ("Downstream Defendant Releasees") of any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted in the Complaint against Settling Defendants, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Defendant Releasees, based on failure to warn about alleged exposure to Lead contained in Avgas. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no FBO shall be released from any violation of Proposition 65 that was or could have been asserted in the Complaint unless it is a Settling FBO Defendant or an FBO Opt-In Settling Defendant.
- 6.2 This Consent Judgment is a full, final and binding resolution between CEH, in its individual capacity only, and each Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Defendant Releasees of any violation of Propostion 65 and any statutory or common law obligation that was or could have been asserted in the Complaint against Settling Defendant, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Defendant Releasees, based on the sale, use, or distribution of Avgas containing Lead. Notwithstanding the foregoing, no FBO shall be released from any claim that was or could have been asserted in the Complaint unless it is a Settling FBO Defendant or an FBO Opt-In Settling Defendant.
- **6.3** Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment by a Settling Defendant constitutes compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to Lead contained in Avgas.

8.2 If this Consent Judgment is not entered by the Court, it shall be of no force or effect and shall never be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in any proceeding for any purpose other than to allow the Court to determine if there was a material breach of Section 8.1.

9. ATTORNEYS' FEES

- 9.1 Should CEH prevail on any motion, application for an order to show cause, or other proceeding to enforce a violation of this Consent Judgment, CEH shall be entitled to its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred as a result of such motion or application. Should a Settling Defendant prevail on any motion application for an order to show cause, or other proceeding, the Settling Defendant may be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as a result of such motion or application upon a finding by the court that CEH's prosecution of the motion or application lacked substantial justification. For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term substantial justification shall carry the same meaning as used in the Civil Discovery Act of 1986, Code of Civil Procedure §§ 2016, et seq.
- **9.2** Except as otherwise provided in this Consent Judgment, each Party shall bear its own attorneys' fees and costs.
- **9.3** Nothing in this Section 9 shall preclude a Party from seeking an award of sanctions pursuant to law.

10. OTHER TERMS

- **10.1** The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.
- 10.2 This Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon CEH and Settling Defendants, and their respective divisions, subdivisions, and subsidiaries, and the successors or assigns of any of them.
- 10.3 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, or understandings related thereto, if any, are hereby merged herein and therein. There are no warranties, representations, or other agreements between the Parties except as expressly set forth herein. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than

those specifically referred to in this Consent Judgment have been made by any Party hereto. No other agreements not specifically contained or referenced herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the Parties hereto. No supplementation, modification, waiver, or termination of this Consent Judgment shall be binding unless executed in writing by the Party to be bound thereby. No waiver of any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed or shall constitute a waiver of any of the other provisions hereof whether or not similar, nor shall such waiver constitute a continuing waiver.

- 10.4 Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall release, or in any way affect any rights that any Settling Defendant might have against any other party, whether or not that party is a Settling Defendant.
- 10.5 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement or modify the Consent Judgment.
- 10.6 The stipulations to this Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts and by means of facsimile or portable document format (pdf), which taken together shall be deemed to constitute one document.
- 10.7 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.
- 10.8 The Parties, including their counsel, have participated in the preparation of this Consent Judgment, and this Consent Judgment is the result of the joint efforts of the Parties. This Consent Judgment was subject to revision and modification by the Parties and has been accepted and approved as to its final form by all Parties and their counsel: Accordingly, any uncertainty or ambiguity existing in this Consent Judgment shall not be interpreted against any Party as a result of the manner of the preparation of this Consent Judgment. Each Party to this Consent Judgment agrees that any statute or rule of construction providing that ambiguities are to be resolved against the drafting Party should not be employed in the interpretation of this Consent Judgment and, in this regard, the Parties hereby waive California Civil Code Section 1654.

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
2	Dated: Person 2014	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
3		By:
4		Name: CHARLIE PIZARRO
5		Title: Assectate DiRECTAL
6		
7		OTHER SIGNATORIES SHOWN ON EXHIBIT A
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
2526		
27		
28		

- 19 -[PROPOSED] CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
2	Dated:, 2014	CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
3		
4		By: Name:
5		Title:
6		
7		OTHER SIGNATORIES SHOWN ON EXHIBIT A
8		
9		
10	IT IS SO ORDERED:	
11	$\overline{\mathcal{D}}$	a Seory
12	Dated Dec. 10, 2014	HON. WYNNE CARVILL
13		HON. WYNNE CARVILL Judge of the Superior Court
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		•
		- 19 - CONSENT JUDGMENT

1		<u>EXHIBITS</u>
2		
3	Α.	Settling Defendants and Allocation of Payments
4	В.	Notice of Intent to Opt-In
5	C.	Signature Page of Opt-In Defendant
6	D.	Signage Locations for FBO Settling Defendants
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26 27		
$\binom{27}{28}$		

EXHIBIT A 1 **Settling Defendants** 2 I. FBO Settling Defendants 3 Settling Defendant: Air 88, Inc. d/b/a CrownAir Aviation 4 Airport Locations Identified in Complaint: 1 5 Settlement Payment Amount: \$7,029.62 6 Person(s) to Receive Notice Pursuant to Section 7.2: 7 8 RAY RICHMOND Name: 9 UP. OPERATIONS - GENERAL MGR Title: 10 5735 JOHN V MONTGOMERY DR. Address: 11 SAN DIEGO, CA 92123 12 E-mail: 13 14 IT IS SO STIPULATED. 15 Signed: 16 Name: 17 Title: 18 4.25.14 Date: 19 20 21 22 23 24

25

26

27

1	2. Settling Defendant: Air Rutter International LLC
2	Airport Locations Identified in Complaint: 1
3	Settlement Payment Amount: \$7,029.62
4	Person(s) to Receive Notice Pursuant to Section 7.2:
5	
6	Name: Robert A. Seidel
7	Title: President and Chief Executive Officer
8	Address: 4310 Donald Douglas Drive
9	Long Beach, CA 90808
10	E-mail: bseidel@jfijets.com
11	
12	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
13	Signed: KA JE
14	Name: Robert A. Seidel
15	Title: President and Chief Executive Officer
16	Date: November 25, 2014
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

1			
2	3. Settling De	fendant: AirFl	ite, Inc.
3	Airport Locat	ions Identified	in Complaint: 1
4	Settlement Pa	yment Amount	: \$7,029.62
5	Person(s) to R	Receive Notice P	Pursuant to Section 7.2:
6			
7	Name:	John Ta	ıry
8	Title:	Aviatio	n General Manager
9	Address:	3250 A	irFlite Way
10			
11	E-mail:	john_ta	ry@toyota.com
12			
13	IT IS SO STI	PULATED.	
14		Signed:	
15		Name:	John Tary
16		Title:	Aviation General Manager
17		Date:	11/25/14
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

1				
2	4. Settling De	4. Settling Defendant: APP Properties, Inc. d/b/a/ APP Jet Center, successor to		
3	Airport Prope	Airport Property Partners, LLC d/b/a APP Jet Center.		
4	Airport Loca	tions Identified in Complaint: 1		
5	Settlement Pa	Settlement Payment Amount: \$7,029.62		
6	Person(s) to I	Receive Notice Pursuant to Section 7.2:		
7				
8	Name:	Thomas Panico		
9	Title:	General Manager		
10	Address:	APP Jet Center 19990 Skywest Drive		
11		Hayward, CA 94541		
12	E-mail:	tpanico@appjetcenter.com		
13				
14	IT IS SO STI	PULATED.		
15		Signed:		
16		Name: Thom HARRAN		
17		Title:		
18	1	Date: 1/21/14		
19		• /		
20				
21				
22				
23				

25

26

27

1				
2	8.	Settling Def	endant: Atlan	tic Aviation Corporation; Atlantic Aviation FBO, Inc.;
3	0.	Setting Den		tic Aviation of Santa Monica, LP, jointly and severally
4		Airport Locati	ons Identified	in Complaint: 4
5		Settlement Pay	ment Amoun	t: \$28,118.48
6		Person(s) to Re	eceive Notice	Pursuant to Section 7.2:
7				
8		Name:	100	d Smith
9		Title:	VP-	Eisk Mant o Safety
0		Address:	6650	2 Pinecrest Dr., Suite 300
1			<u> Ha</u>	no, 1X 75024
12		E-mail:	todd, =	smith 6 atlanticaviation.com
13	:			
۱4		IT IS SO STIP	PULATED.	
15			Signed:	Jony Chiete-
16			Name:	Tommy Christenstn
17			Title:	Risk Management / Safety Specialist
18			Date:	12/9/2014
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				

23

24

25

26

27

1	
2	15. Settling Defendant: LancAir Corp. d/b/a San Diego Jet Center
3	Airport Locations Identified in Complaint: 1
4	Settlement Payment Amount: \$7,029.62
5	Person(s) to Receive Notice Pursuant to Section 7.2:
6	
7	Name: Tom Ricotte
8	Title: President
9	Address: 1424 Continintal St
10	SAN Diego CA 92154
11	E-mail:
12	
13	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
14	Signed: John Kicut
15	Name: Tom Ricotte
16	Title: Pres: Jent Date: 12-1-14
17	Date: 12-1-14
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
771	

1 2	16. Settling Defen	Landmark Aviation (including Landmark Aviation GSO-SAN, LLC and Piedmont Hawthorne Aviation, LLC), jointly and severally						
3	Airport Location	Airport Locations Identified in Complaint: 1						
4	Settlement Paym	Settlement Payment Amount: \$7,029.62						
5	Person(s) to Reco	eive Notice Pursuant to Section 7.2:						
6								
7	Name:	R. Allen Ashcraft, Jr.						
8	Title:	Executive VP and General Counsel						
9	Address:	1500 CityWest Boulevard, Suite 600						
10		Houston, Texas 77042						
11	E-mail:	aashcraft@landmarkaviation.com						
12								
13	IT IS SO STIPU	LATED.						
14		Signed:						
15		Name: R. Allen Asher If, Ir.						
16		Title: $EVP \cdot GC$ Date: $11-25-14$						
17		Date: 11-25-14						
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								

1					
2	17. Settling Defendant: Loyd's Aviation				
3	Airport Locations Identified in Complaint: 1				
4	Settlement Payment Amount: \$7,029.62				
5	Person(s) to Receive Notice Pursuant to Section 7.2:				
6					
7	Name: STEVEN L. LOYD				
8	Title: PRESIDENT				
9	Address: 1601 SKYWAY DRIVE				
10	BAKERSFIELD, CA. 93308				
11	E-mail: Sloyd@loydsqviqtion.com				
12					
13	IT IS SO STIPULATED.				
14	Signed:				
15	Name: STEVEN L. LOYD				
16	Title: President				
17	Date: November 26, 2014				
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					

27

11					
1					
2	23. Settling De	fendant: Signature Flight Support Corporation			
3	Airport Locations Identified in Complaint: 5				
4	Settlement Pa	yment Amount: \$35,148.10			
5	Person(s) to B	Receive Notice Pursuant to Section 7.2:			
6					
7	Name:	Jeffrey T. Bankowitz			
8	Title:	General Counsel – Flight Support			
9	Address:	201 South Orange Avenue, Suite 1100			
10		Orlando, Florida 32801			
11	E-mail:	jeff.bankowitz@bbaaviation.com			
12					
13	IT IS SO STI				
14		Signed: Maria a Sastre			
15		Name: Maria A. Sastre			
16		Title: President			
17		Date: Recember 1, 2014			
18					
19					
20					
21		APPROVED AS TO FORM:			
22		LEGAL DEPT.			
23					
24					

1	
2	24. Settling Defendant: South Bay Aviation, Inc.
3	Airport Locations Identified in Complaint: 1
4	Settlement Payment Amount: \$7,029.62
5	Person(s) to Receive Notice Pursuant to Section 7.2:
6	
7	Name: Richard Seals
8	Title: President
9	Address: 3481 Airport Drive, Suite 100
10	Torrance, CA 90505
11	E-mail: sealsr@ix.netcom.com
12	
13	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
14	Signed:
15	Name: Richard Seals
16	Title: President
17	Date: 12/11/
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

1	
2	26. Settling Defendant: Van Nuys Skyways d/b/a Million Air Burbank
3	Airport Locations Identified in Complaint: 1
4	Settlement Payment Amount: \$7,029.62
5	Person(s) to Receive Notice Pursuant to Section 7.2:
6	
7	Name: GAROLD & LCE
8	Title: CFO
9	Address: 2800 N. CLY bourn AVE Bursach, CA 91 VOT
10	Bursach, CA 91 VOT
11	E-mail: hee. millionaile g mai. com
12	
13	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
14	Signed:
15	Name: Manuald B LER
16	Title: EFO
17	Date: 11-25-2014
18	
19	
20	
21	
- (1	

II. Distributor Settling Defendants 1 **Settling Defendant:** Air Petro Corporation and World Fuel Services Corporation, 2 jointly and severally 3 Settlement Payment Amount: \$82,831 4 Person(s) to Receive Notice Pursuant to Section 7.2: 5 6 POSERT Alexander LAKE Name: 7 SVP-GENERAL Coursel Title: 8 9800 n.w. 4155 Address: 9 Missei FL 33178 10 ALAKE @ WESCORP, COM E-mail: 11 12 IT IS SO STIPULATED. 13 Signed: 14 Name: 15 Title: 16 Date: 17 18 19 20 21 22

23

24

25

26

27

23

24

25

26

27

3. Settling Defendant: Eastern Aviation Fuels, Inc.					
Settlement Payment Amount: \$62,500					
Person(s) to Receive Notice Pursuant to Section 7.2:					
Name: Robert L. Stallings, IV					
Title: President					
Address: 601 McCarthy Blvd.					
New Bern, NC 28562					
E-mail:					
IT IS SO STIPULATED.					
Signed:					
Name: Robert L. Stallings, IV					
Title: President					
Date: 11-25-14					

1				
2	4.	Settling Defen	dant: Dov	vnstream Aviation, LP
3		Settlement Pay	ment Amoun	it: \$82,831
4		Person(s) to Re	eceive Notice	Pursuant to Section 7.2:
5			_	
6		Name:	Rich	ard F. Dahlson
7		Title:	Altor	ney
8		Address:	Jack	son Walker, 901 Main St., le 600, Dallas, TX 75202
9			Sui.	le 600, Dallas, TX 75202
10		E-mail:	rdahl	son@jw.com
11				
12		IT IS SO STIP	ULATED.	,
13			Signed:	
14			Name:	William S. Conley
15			Title:	(120
16			Date:	11/26/2411
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				