SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement (Agreement) is entered into by and between the California Air Resources Board (ARB), with its principal office at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California, Prym Consumer USA, Inc. (Prym) with its principal place of business at 950 Brisack Road, Spartanburg, South Carolina, and ODIF USA (ODIF) with its principal place of business at 458 Danburg Road, Unit A18, New Milford, Connecticut.

RECITALS

1. ARB alleges that from May 2013 to February 2015 , Prym sold, supplied, and offered for sale in California **Dritz Quilting Spray-on Heat Set Adhesive** product which was subject to the volatile organic compound (VOC) limit for "Adhesive: Web Spray" category in Title 17, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 94509(a).

2. ARB alleges that the **Dritz Quilting Spray-on Heat Set Adhesive** product referenced in recital paragraph 1 contained concentrations of VOCs exceeding the 55 percent VOC limit for the "Adhesive: Web Spray" category specified in title 17, CCR, section 94509(a).

3. ARB alleges that from May 2013 to May 2014, Prym sold, supplied, and offered for sale in California **Dritz Spray Adhesive** product which was subject to the volatile organic compound (VOC) limit for "Adhesive: Mist Spray" category in Title 17, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 94509(a).

4. ARB alleges that the **Dritz Spray Adhesive** product referenced in recital paragraph 3 contained concentrations of VOCs exceeding the 65 percent VOC limit for the "Adhesive: Mist Spray" category specified in title 17, CCR, section 94509(a).

5. ARB alleges that from May 2013 to May 2014, Prym sold, supplied, and offered for sale in California **Dritz Quilting Spray Adhesive** product which was subject to the volatile organic compound (VOC) limit for "Adhesive: Mist Spray" category in Title 17, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 94509(a).

6. ARB alleges that the **Dritz Quilting Spray Adhesive** product referenced in recital paragraph 5 contained concentrations of VOCs exceeding the 65 percent VOC limit for the "Adhesive: Mist Spray" category specified in title 17, CCR, section 94509(a).

7. ARB alleges ODIF manufactured the three products described in recital paragraphs 1 to 6 as a private label for Prym.

8. ARB alleges that the containers of the three products described in recital paragraph 1 to 6 did not display the proper VOC categories or VOC category limits as specified in title 17, CCR, section 94512(d).

9. ARB alleges that if the allegations described in recital paragraphs 1 to 8 were proven, civil penalties could be imposed against Prym and ODIF as provided in Health and Safety Code Sections 42402 et seq. for each and every unit involved in the violations.

10. Prym admits the allegations described in recital paragraphs 1 to 6, but denies any liability resulting from said allegations. ODIF admits the allegations described in recital paragraphs 7 and 8, but denies any liability resulting from said allegations.

11. The parties agree to resolve this matter completely by means of this Agreement, without the need for formal litigation.

Therefore, the parties agree as follows:

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

1. Prym and ODIF shall not sell, supply, offer for sale, or manufacture for sale in California, any consumer products in violation of ARB consumer products regulations set forth in Title 17, CCR, Section 94500 et seq. however, the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement will remain valid and enforceable notwithstanding any future violations that may occur.

2. Prym or ODIF in settlement of the above-described violations of Title17, CCR, section 94509(a), agrees to pay a penalty to ARB in the amount of $12,500.00 payable to the California Air Pollution Control Fund, within ten (10) days of the execution of this Agreement.

3. This settlement shall apply to and be binding upon Prym, ODIF, and its officers, directors, receivers, trustees, employees, successors and assignees, subsidiary and parent corporations and upon ARB and any successor agency that may have responsibility for and jurisdiction over the subject matter of this settlement.

4. The parties stipulate that this Agreement shall be the final resolution of ARB claims regarding the above-described violations and shall have the same res judicata effect as a judgment in terms of acting as bar to any civil action by ARB against Prym, ODIF, and its officers, directors, receivers, trustees, employees, successors and assignees, subsidiary and parent corporations. This Agreement shall be deemed the recovery of civil penalties for purposes of precluding subsequent criminal action as provided in Health and Safety Code section 42400.7(a).

5. This Agreement shall be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of California, without regard to California's choice of law rules.

6. This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement and understanding between ARB, Prym and ODIF concerning the claims and settlement in this Agreement, and this Agreement fully supersedes and replaces any and all prior negotiations and agreement of any kind or nature, whether written or oral, between ARB, Prym and ODIF concerning these claims.

7. No agreement to modify, amend, extend, supersede, terminate, or discharge this Agreement, or any portion thereof, shall be valid or enforceable unless it is in writing and signed by all parties to this Agreement.

8. Each of the undersigned represents and warrants that he or she has full power and authority to enter into this Agreement.

9. **SB 1402 Statement.** California Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 39619.7 (Senate Bill 1402 - Dutton, Chapter 413, statutes of 2010) requires ARB to provide information on the basis for the penalties it seeks. This Agreement includes this information, which is also summarized here.

   The provision of law the penalty is being assessed under and why that provision is most appropriate for that violation.

   The penalty provision being applied in this case is HSC section 42402, et seq. because Prym and ODIF, supplied, offered for sale, or manufactured for sale consumer products in commerce in California in violation of the Consumer Products Regulations (Title 17 California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 94507, et seq.). The penalty provisions of HSC section 42402, et seq. apply to violations of the Consumer Products Regulations because the regulations were adopted under authority of HSC section 41712 which is in Part 4 of Division 26 of the Health and Safety Code. The penalty provisions of HSC section 42402, et seq. apply to requirements adopted pursuant to Part 4.

   The manner in which the penalty amount was determined, including aggravating and mitigating factors and per unit or per vehicle basis for the penalty.

   Penalties must be set at levels sufficient to discourage violations. ARB considered all relevant circumstances in determining penalties, including the eight factors specified in HSC section 42403.

   Under HSC section 42402, et seq. the penalty for strict liability violations of the Consumer Product Regulations are a maximum of $1,000 per day of violation, with each day being a separate violation. In cases like this involving unintentional first time alleged violations of the Consumer Product Regulations,

the ARB has sought and obtained penalties of approximately $20,000 per ton of excess emissions of VOCs attributable to the violation. This represents an average cost to retire a ton of volatile organic compound emission credits and reformulate a product to comply with the Consumer Product Regulations. However, in similar cases with extremely small amounts of excess emissions, ARB has historically obtained penalties that reflect that the violations occurred on at least three days (the day the product was purchased by ARB, the day it was supplied to the retailer, and the day it was manufactured for sale). The penalty in this case is $12,500.00 which includes minimum VOC violations for three products, products labeling procedural penalty, and the ARB's investigative cost. The penalty in this case was reduced because Prym and ODIF made unusually diligent efforts to comply and to cooperate with the investigation that including Prym self-disclosed the sales of the Dritz Quilting Spray Adhesive product and its formula. Penalties in future cases might be higher or lower on a per ton or per unit basis.

Is the penalty being assessed under a provision of law that prohibits the emission of pollution at a specified level, and, if so a quantification of the excess emissions, if it is practicable to do so.

The Consumer Product Regulations do not prohibit emissions above a specific level, but they do limit the concentration of VOCs in regulated products. In this case a quantification of the excess emissions attributable to the violations was practicable because Prym and ODIF made the product formulation and sales data necessary to make this quantification available to ARB. Based upon this information (which Prym and ODIF have designated as confidential), the violations were calculated to have caused 0.37 tons of excess emissions of volatile organic compounds to be emitted to the atmosphere in California.

10. Prym and ODIF acknowledge that ARB has complied with SB1402 in investigating and settling this case. Specifically, ARB has considered all relevant facts, including those listed at HSC section 42403, has explained the manner in which the penalty amount was calculated, has identified the provision of law under which the penalty amount is being assessed and had considered and determined that while this penalty is not being assessed a provision of law that prohibits the emission of pollutants at a specified level, it is practicable for ARB to quantify the excess emissions from the alleged violations, has done so and has included this information in this Agreement.

11. Final penalties were determined based on the unique circumstances of this matter, considered together with the need to remove any economic benefit from noncompliance the goal of deterring future violations and obtaining swift compliance, the consideration of past penalties in similar negotiated cases, and the potential costs and risk associated with litigating these particular violations. The penalty reflects violations extending over a number of days resulting in quantifiable harm to the environment considered together with the complete

circumstances of this case listed above. The penalty was discounted in this matter based on the factors described. Penalties in future cases might be smaller or larger on a per ton basis.

12. The final penalty in this case was based in part on confidential business information provided by Prym and ODIF that is not retained by ARB in the ordinary course of business. The penalty in this case was also based on confidential settlement communications between ARB, Prym, and ODIF that ARB does not retain in the ordinary course of business. The penalty also reflects ARB's assessment of the relative strength of its case against Prym and ODIF, the desire to avoid the uncertainty, burden and expense of litigation, obtains swift compliance with the law and removes any unfair advantage that Prym and ODIF may have secured from its actions.

CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD

Dated: 6/1/16

By: _____
Dr. Todd P. Sax, Chief
Enforcement Division

PRYM CONSUMER USA, INC.

Dated: 12 APRIL 2016

By: _____

Name: STEVE MILLS

Title: CEO

ODIF USA

Dated: 19 May 2016

By: _____

Name: MARK OBRIEN

Title: Operations Manager