SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement (Agreement) is entered into by and between the California Air Resource Board (ARB), with its principal office at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California, and UMA Enterprises, Inc. (UMA) with its principal place of business at: 660 W. Artesia Blvd., Compton, California.

RECITALS

1. ARB alleges that between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2009, UMA sold, supplied, and offered for sale in California products named Ocean Breeze Diffuser that were subject to the volatile organic compound (VOC) limit for "Air Freshener" category in Title 17, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 94509(a).

2. ARB alleges that between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2011, UMA sold, supplied, and offered for sale in California products named Green Tea Diffuser that were subject to the VOC limit for "Air Freshener" category in Title 17, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 94509(a).

3. ARB alleges that between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2009, UMA sold, supplied, and offered for sale in California products named Lilac Diffuser that were subject to the VOC limit for "Air Freshener" category in Title 17, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 94509(a).

4. ARB alleges that between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2009, UMA sold, supplied, and offered for sale in California products named Vanilla Diffuser including Exotic Vanilla Diffuser that were subject to the VOC limit for "Air Freshener" category in Title 17, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 94509(a).

5. ARB alleges that between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2009, UMA sold, supplied, and offered for sale in California products named Lavender Diffuser that were subject to the VOC limit for "Air Freshener" category in Title 17, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 94509(a).

6. ARB alleges that the all the diffuser products referenced in recital paragraph 1 to 5 contained concentrations of VOCs exceeding the 18 percent VOC limit for "Air Freshener: liquid/pump spray" specified in Title 17, CCR, section 94509(a).

7. ARB alleges that all the diffuser products referenced in recital paragraph 1 to 5 did not display the dates of manufactures as specified in Title 17, CCR, section 94512(b).

8. ARB alleges that if the allegations described in recital paragraph 1 to 7 were proven, civil penalties would be imposed against UMA as provided in Health and

Safety Code Sections 42402 et seq. for each and every unit involved in the violations.

9. UMA admits the allegations described in recital paragraphs 1 to 7, but denies any liabilities resulting from said allegations.

10. 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. UMA shall not sell, supply, offer for sale for use 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. UMA in settlement of the above-described alleged violations of Title 17, CCR, section 94509(a) agrees to pay a penalty in the amount of $20,000.00 payable to the California Air Pollution Control Fund, concurrent with the execution of this Agreement.

3. This settlement shall apply to and be binding upon UMA 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 UMA, 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 and UMA 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 and UMA 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 Settlement 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 is this case is HSC section 42402, et seq. because UMA sold, supplied, offered for sale, or manufactured for sale consumer products for 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.

HSC section 42402, et seq. provides strict liability penalties of $1,000 per day for violations of the Consumer Product Regulations. In cases like this involving unintentional first time violations of the Consumer Products Regulations, the ARB has sought and obtained penalties of approximately $17,000 per ton of excess emissions of volatile organic compounds attributable to the violation. This represents an average cost to retire a ton of volatile organic compound emission credits to comply with the Consumer Product Regulations. In addition, the ARB has in other similar cases sought and obtained further penalties for procedural violations. The penalty in this case is $20,000 which includes VOC excess emissions and date-code violations. The final amount was reduced in this case because the violation was a result of a one-time importation of product from a foreign manufacturer, UMA had ceased selling the product prior to notification by

ARB of the potential violation and UMA cooperated with the investigation. Penalties in future cases might be higher or larger on a 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 UMA agreed with ARB's laboratory analysis results and made sales data available to the ARB. Based upon this information (which UMA has designated as confidential), the violations were calculated to have caused the 1.76 tons of excess emissions of volatile organic compounds to be emitted to the atmosphere in California.

10. UMA acknowledges that ARB has complied with SB1402 in investigation 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 that excess emissions from the alleged violations, has done so and has included this information in this Settlement 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 UMA 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 and UMA that ARB does not retain in the ordinary course of business either. The penalty also, reflects ARB's assessment of the relative strength of its cases against UMA, the desire to avoid the uncertainty, burden and expense of litigation, obtain swift compliance with the law and remove any unfair advantage that UMA may have secured from its actions.

CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD

Dated: 3/4/2017

By: _____
Ellen M. Peter
Chief Counsel

UMA ENTERPRISES, INC.

Dated: _____

By: Naval Bansal
Naval Bansal
President