

agreement in the amount of \$14,8520; judgment in its favor on its claims for payments on the guaranty in the amount of \$148,450; (iv) interest on the sums; (v) attorney's fees; and (vi) any other relief the court deems fit. On September 24, 2021, the parties entered into a settlement agreement, in which a mutual release of all claims was agreed to, and Respondent/Counter Claimant paid Claimant/Counter Respondent the sum of \$125,000. The matter was subsequently dismissed with prejudice.

Concluded Arbitration and Litigation Involving Papa Murphy's International, L.L.C.

DTD Pizza LLC, Brian Watson, Alton Spears, LMP Enterprises LLC, Pizza Enterprises LLC, Alan and Denise Barnett, DOB Enterprises, Inc., Douglas and Lesia Billing, Rob & Bud's Pizza, Robert J. Dickerson Trust UA, Rob Dickerson, 4LM Enterprises, Inc., Jana and Randell Liles, Ben and Kim Mayfield, SEAMS Holdings LLC, Scott and Erica Shelby, Robert Hoersting, PM Savannah LLC, James and Mona King, Hans King, Pizza For 4 Kings Corp, Alamo Quality Pizza I, LLC., Quality Pizza III, LLC., Gerardo Torres, George Knost, Arkel Food Services, LLC., Reece Alexander Overcash, III, Angelo S. Chantilis, Jr., Double AA Partners, LLC., Jeffrey L Comish, John Stalker, and Papa's of Tennessee, LLC. v. Papa Murphy's International LLC, Papa Murphy's Company Stores, Inc., PMI Holdings Inc., Papa Murphy's Intermediate Inc., Papa Murphy's Holdings, Inc., Lee Equity Partners LLC, John D. Barr, Ken Calwell, Thomas H. Lee, Yoo Jin Kim, Benjamin Hochberg, John D. Schafer, Achi Yaffe, Janet Pirus, Victoria Blackwell, Gail Lawson, Dan Harmon, Scott Mullen, Jayson Tipp, Kevin King, Stephen Maeker, Steve Millard, Steve Figiola; Washington Superior Court, Clark County, Case No. 14-2-00904-0.

and

Mitch and Kristen Brink, Brink Holdings Inc., Angela Buchannan, Tim Forester, Z-Axis, Inc., Heather and Gary Nychyk, Bar N Pizza, LLC, John DeMattia, DeMattia LLC, a Texas Limited Liability Company, Harry and Terry Olson, Hot Pizza Inc., Steven Pyatt, Craig Braun, David Mraz, JIM LLC, Philip and Maria Ahn Wilson, Papa South, LLC, Steven and Holly Mead, Thomas Lance, PMG Tampa, LLC, Ilya and Chantal Rubin, Pie in the Sky LLC, Joanna and Glenn Patcha, Alchemy Foods LLC, Ian Hasinoff and Susan Lorimer, Eddrachillis LLC, Cole Kilen, Eye on the Pie LLC, Ann and Harvey Callegan, Just for Fun, LLC, Eugene and Joy Hill, Conn, Edward Turnbull, Turnbull Restaurant Group LP, Turnbull Restaurant Group GP, Conn, LLC, Loralie and Trey Bennett, Pizza Revolution of Fort Walton Beach LLC, Pizza Revolution of Panama City LLC, Pizza Revolution at Tyndall LLC, Steven Terry, Matthew and Cindy Terry, Alice and Douglas Worthington, Thomas Stephenson, Make Dough Enterprises Inc., Jared Richardson, Russell Crader, and Red Rust, LLC, v. Papa Murphy's International LLC, Papa Murphy's Company Stores, Inc., PMI Holdings Inc., Papa Murphy's Intermediate Inc., Murphy's Holdings, Inc., Lee Equity Partners LLC, John D. Barr, Ken Calwell, Thomas H. Lee, , Yoo Jin Kim, Benjamin Hochberg, John D. Schafer, Achi Yaffe, Janet Pirus, Victoria Blackwell, Gail Lawson, Dan Harmon, Scott Mullen, Jayson Tipp, Kevin King, Stephen Maeker, Steve Millard, Steve Figiola; Washington Superior Court, Clark County, Case No. 14-2-01743-3.

These two related actions were commenced in April 2014 and June 2014, respectively, by separate groups of current and former franchisees against us, certain members of our board of managers and executive team, and others in Washington Superior Court (Clark County), alleging misrepresentations involving financial performance representations in ITEM 19 of the franchise disclosure document the franchisees' local marketing obligations, among other things, and brought claims for violation of the Washington Franchise Investment Protection Act ("WFIPA"), fraud, negligent misrepresentation and breach of

contract. These two actions were consolidated in September 2014 under Case Number 14-2-00904-0.

Each of the plaintiff groups entered into settlements with Papa Murphy's in which they dismissed all of their claims against defendants with prejudice and the action was dismissed in June 2020. The settlements are as follows: (1) one plaintiff group dismissed its claims against Papa Murphy's for no consideration; (2) two plaintiff groups agreed to pay amounts ranging from \$5,000 to \$8,000 to Papa Murphy's and remained in the system; (3) Papa Murphy's agreed to pay one plaintiff group's advertising costs for one year, agreed to allow the franchisee to develop an additional franchise, and agreed to return the franchisee's initial development fee of \$10,000; (4) another plaintiff group agreed to remain in the system in exchange for Papa Murphy's paying 3.8% of the franchisees' sales towards local advertising for a period of two years and extending the franchise agreement's term for an additional ten years; (5) Papa Murphy's settled with fifteen different plaintiff groups and paid amounts ranging from \$10,000 per group to \$4 million per group; (6) Papa Murphy's agreed to purchase one plaintiff group's nine Papa Murphy's stores at an agreed upon value of the stores' assets plus \$500,000; and (7) Papa Murphy's agreed to purchase seven plaintiff groups' Papa Murphy's stores at an agreed upon value of the stores' assets.

Rob & Bud's Pizza, L.L.C. v. Papa Murphy's International, Inc. and Papa Murphy's International, L.L.C.; United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, Case No. 5:15-cv-05090-TLB.

In spring 2015, Papa Murphy's sent a notice of default to plaintiff for alleged defaults under the plaintiff's franchise agreements. In response, on April 17, 2015, the plaintiff brought an action seeking a declaratory judgment and injunction preventing Papa Murphy's from terminating the franchises. The plaintiff subsequently added claims in the case alleging that Papa Murphy's tortiously interfered with the plaintiff's employees and negligence in how Papa Murphy's handled the plaintiff's customer database, and sought compensatory damages, punitive damages and costs in an unspecified amount. The plaintiff was also a plaintiff in the LMP case described above. The case was dismissed with prejudice as part of a settlement with plaintiff in this case and the LMP case under which Papa Murphy's purchased plaintiff's nine Papa Murphy's stores at an agreed upon value of the stores' assets plus \$500,000.

PUBLIC AGENCY ACTIONS AGAINST MTY USA, AFFILIATES AND/OR THEIR PREDECESSORS

Concluded State Administrative Actions Involving SFF, L.L.C., successor in interest to SweetFrog Enterprises, L.L.C.

In the Matter of SweetFrog Enterprises, L.L.C. f.k.a. Imagination Enterprises, Inc., d/b/a Sweet Frog, Administrative Proceeding Before the Securities Commissioner of Maryland, Case No. 2012-0055.

As a result of an inquiry into the franchise related activities of SweetFrog Enterprises, L.L.C., ("SFE") the Maryland Securities Commissioner ("Commissioner") concluded that grounds existed to allege that SFE violated the registration and disclosure provisions of the Maryland Franchise Law in relation to the offer and sale of certain license agreements. SFE acknowledged that those license agreements constituted franchises as defined under the Maryland Franchise Law. SFE represented that it entered into license agreements with eight Maryland licensees during the time it was not registered to offer and sell franchises in Maryland. On August 29, 2012, the Commissioner and SFE agreed to enter into a consent order whereby

SFE, without admitting or denying any violations of the law, agreed to: (i) immediately and permanently cease from the offer and sale of franchises in violation of the Maryland Franchise Law; (ii) file and diligently pursue an application for an initial franchise registration in Maryland relating to the license agreements it offered and sold to Maryland licensees; and (iii) to offer to rescind the license agreements of all Maryland licensees to whom it sold unregistered franchises. We are not aware of any licensees that accepted the rescission and have made a good faith effort to obtain that information.

Concluded State Administrative Actions Involving Predecessor Blimpie Associates, Ltd.

In May 1992, Blimpie Associates, Ltd. (“Blimpie”) and Joseph Dornbush (formerly the President of Blimpie) (collectively “Respondents”) responded to a claim by the New York Department of Law that it had sold franchises during a period of time when Blimpie’s prospectus had not been updated by amendment. Without the admission of any wrongdoing, Respondents consented to the entry of an order in which Respondents agreed: (i) to entry of a judgment enjoining them from further violations of the New York Franchise Sales Act; and (ii) to pay the sum of \$18,000 to the State of New York as an additional allowance. Respondents paid the \$18,000 in May 1992 and executed the consent judgment on August 25, 1992.

Concluded State Administrative Actions Involving Maui Wowi Franchising, Inc., predecessor in interest to Kahala Franchising, L.L.C.

In the Matter of Maui Wowi Franchising, Inc., Before the Securities Commissioner of Maryland, Case No. 2005-0651.

On November 11, 2005, Maui Wowi Franchising, Inc., the predecessor franchisor of the Maui Wowi brand (“MWF”), entered into a Consent Order with the Securities Commissioner of Maryland (“Commissioner”) resulting from MWF inadvertently entering into four franchise agreements with Maryland residents after its registration in Maryland expired on June 9, 2004 (“Maryland Franchisees”). The Consent Order required MWF to cease and desist from the offer and sale of unregistered franchises in Maryland; to diligently pursue the completion of its then pending application; to register its Offering Circular in Maryland; to develop and implement new franchise law compliance procedures to ensure future compliance with the registration and disclosure provisions of Maryland Franchise Law; and to enroll an officer and a franchise compliance person in a franchise law compliance training program. Upon notification by the Commissioner, MWF sent to the Maryland Franchisees the registered Offering Circular, a copy of the Consent Order, and a letter notifying the Maryland Franchisees that they could rescind their franchise agreements. At this time, MWF is in full compliance with the Consent Order.

In the Matter of Maui Wowi Franchising, Inc., Before the Securities Commissioner of Maryland, Case No. 2007-0194.

On September 12, 2007, “MWF” entered into a Consent Order with the Maryland Commissioner resulting from MWF inadvertently entering into two franchise agreements with two Maryland residents (“Second Maryland Franchisees”) without delivering to them the appropriate Offering Circular. MWF was registered in the State of Maryland at the time of the offer and sale with an Offering Circular containing certain specific information required only by Maryland law. At the same time, MWF used a second form of Offering Circular in other states that did not contain all of the information required by Maryland law.

Prior to the execution of the franchise agreements with the Second Maryland Franchisees, MWF accidentally delivered to them the Offering Circular that did not contain the Maryland-specific information. We subsequently reported these mistakes to the Commissioner. The Consent Order required MWF to cease and desist from the offer and sale of franchises in Maryland in violation of the Maryland Franchise Law; to diligently pursue the completion of its then pending application to register its Offering Circular in Maryland; to implement additional compliance measures to ensure future compliance with the Maryland Franchise Law; to employ an approved franchise law compliance training program or trainer to monitor MWF's franchise activities in Maryland for two years; and to reimburse the Maryland Attorney General for its investigation and resolution costs in the total amount of \$2,500. Additionally, MWF was required to provide to the Second Maryland Franchisees the registered Offering Circular, a copy of the Consent Order, and a letter notifying the Second Maryland Franchisees that they have a right to rescind their franchise agreements. The Commissioner and MWF subsequently entered into an Amended Consent Order in which MWF elected to withdraw from the State of Maryland instead of employing a compliance monitor, with the agreement to employ a monitor if MWF was to re-register in the State of Maryland. MWF fully complied with the Amended Consent Order, and subsequently employed a compliance monitor and was granted registration in the State of Maryland.

Concluded State Administrative Actions, Arbitration, and Litigation Involving BF Acquisition Holdings, L.L.C. and/or its predecessors

State of Maryland Determination; Case Number 2012-0073.

In February 2012, the State of Maryland alleged that during the period January 1, 2009 to November 26, 2009, Triune, LLC ("Triune"): (i) did not retain signed acknowledgements of receipt reflecting the dates that its Franchise Disclosure Document was delivered to certain Maryland residents and non-residents; (ii) sold franchises to certain Maryland residents and non-residents without providing them with a copy of a 2009 Franchise Disclosure Document; (iii) sold franchises to certain Maryland residents and non-residents without providing them with a copy of a 2009 Franchise Disclosure Document that contained its 2008 financial statements with a going concern note from its auditors resulting from the unfavorable financial condition of its parent company; and (iv) sold franchises to certain Maryland residents and non-residents without including, or abiding with, a deferral condition in their Franchise Agreements that was imposed upon it by the State of Maryland, all as required by the Maryland Franchise Registration and Disclosure Law (the "Maryland Law") and in violation of the Maryland Law. Without admitting or denying the allegations, in September 2012, Triune voluntarily entered into a Consent Order with the Office of the Attorney General of Maryland and agreed to: (i) not violate the Maryland Law in the future; (ii) pay the Office of the Attorney General the sum of \$50,000 as a civil penalty; (iii) retain copies of all acknowledgments of receipt confirming dates that prospective Maryland franchisees received any Maryland Franchise Disclosure Documents; (iv) comply with the disclosure and antifraud provisions of the Maryland Franchise Law and the record keeping and escrow requirements of the Code of Maryland Regulations; and (v) send a copy of the Consent Order to certain Maryland franchisees.

State of Virginia Determination; Case Number SEC-2012-00027.

In February 2012, the Division of Securities and Retail Franchising of the State Corporation Commission (the "Commission") alleged that during 2009 Triune, LLC ("Triune"): (i) offered or sold franchises in

Virginia in 2009 that were not registered under the Virginia Retail Franchising Act (the “Virginia Act”); (ii) offered or sold franchises in Virginia without disclosing that it was not registered to do so; (iii) failed to provide material information regarding the parent company’s unfavorable financial condition and the potential impact that it could have on Triune as stated in a going concern note in its 2008 financial statements from its auditors; and (iv) failed to provide a prospective franchisee with a copy of its Franchise Disclosure Document as required by rule or order of the Commission at least 14 calendar days before the prospective franchisee signed a binding agreement or made any payment to it in connection with the sale or offer to sell a franchise in Virginia. Without admitting or denying the allegations, on November 26, 2012, Triune voluntarily entered into a Settlement Order with the Commission and agreed: (i) to not violate the Virginia Act in the future; (ii) to pay Virginia the sum of \$25,000 as a penalty and the sum of \$5,000 to defray the Commission’s costs of investigation; (iii) to offer certain Virginia franchisees a refund of their initial franchise fees; and (iv) to send a copy of the Settlement Order to certain Virginia franchisees.

Lawsuits Filed by Franchisor Kahala Franchising, L.L.C. Against Franchisees During Fiscal Year December 1, 2023 through November 30, 2024

Suit for Breach of Contract

Kahala Franchising, L.L.C. v. All About Food, Inc. and Chu Yup Lee a/k/a Michale Lee; In the Circuit Court of the Nineteenth Judicial Circuit Lake County, Illinois; Case No.: 2024LA00000001.

Suit for Forcible Entry and Detainer

Cold Stone Creamery Leasing Company, Inc. v. JRF, Inc.; Iowa District Court for Dallas County; Case No.: SCSC050015.

Other than these actions, no litigation is required to be disclosed in this Item.

ITEM 4: BANKRUPTCY

No bankruptcy is required to be disclosed in this franchise disclosure document.

ITEM 5: INITIAL FEES

Initial Franchise Fee – Bakeries

When you sign a franchise agreement for a Bakery, you will pay us the initial franchise fee in cash or other form of payment that will make the funds immediately available to us (such as wire transfer or cashier’s check). The initial franchise fee for a WETZEL’S PRETZELS Bakery is \$40,000.

The initial franchise fee is generally uniform to all franchisees, except that Wetzel’s Pretzels may waive or reduce the initial franchise fee for appropriate business reasons, in our sole discretion, including for franchisees who operate their franchises in non-traditional locations such as convenience stores, travel plazas or Walmart locations. For example, Wetzel’s Pretzels is testing the viability of Bakeries operating from colleges, military bases, universities and airports, where the franchise fee and agreement terms may vary. We may change or withdraw these programs at any time. In the past, Wetzel’s Pretzels has offered franchises at lower and varying initial fees and may continue to do so in the future. Typically,

for franchise bakeries in non-traditional locations, the initial franchise fee has been \$20,000 to \$25,000, depending on the type of non-traditional format.

Veteran's and Active-Duty Military Discount. If you provide acceptable documentation that you have received an honorable discharge from the U.S. Army, U.S. Navy, U.S. Marine Corps., U.S. Air Force or U.S. Coast Guard or if you are currently serving in any of the U.S. armed forces, and if you meet our program requirements, we offer a discount of 25% off of the initial franchise fee.

First Responder's Discount. If you are currently employed as a police officer, fire fighter or emergency medical technician/paramedic or was employed in that role and honorably discharged within the previous five years, and if you meet our program requirements and provide acceptable documentation, we offer a discount of 25% off of the initial franchise fee.

Existing Franchisee Discount. If you are a current franchisee of ours, are in good standing with us and meet our program requirements, we offer a discount of 25% off the initial franchise fee.

Minority and Women's Ownership Discount. For eligible women and minority owners, we offer a discount of 25% off the initial franchisee fee. To qualify for the discount, you must meet our then-current criteria, which currently include: being a U.S. Citizen; owning not less than 51% of the franchise-entity; holding 100% of the voting interest in the franchise-entity, and actively managing the day-to-day business of the franchise (see Item 15 for requirements on management).

The above discounts apply to certain purchases, as described above, and cannot be combined. If a discount applies, only one will be applied to the initial franchise fee, even if you qualify for more than one discount (Veteran's and Active-Duty Military Discount, First Responder's Discount, Existing Franchisee Discount and Minority and Women's Ownership Discount).

Initial Franchise Fee – Concession Truck or Trailer

If you will operate your franchise from a Concession Truck or Trailer, then the initial franchise fee is \$7,500 to be paid in cash or other form of payment that will make the funds immediately available to us (such as wire transfer or cashier's check). Currently, we do not offer discounts for subsequent Concession Trucks or Trailers. The initial franchise fee is generally uniform to all franchisees who will operate their franchises from Concession Trucks or Trailers, except that Wetzels Pretzels may waive or reduce the initial franchise fee for appropriate business reasons, in our sole discretion.

If you wish to add an additional Concession Truck or Trailer to be operated within the Mobile Area assigned to you (see Item 12 for more information about Mobile Areas), which will require our consent, you will pay an additional Concession Truck or Trailer Fee of \$5,000 per each additional Concession Truck or Trailer to be operated within the Mobile Area; there are no additional discounts on this fee.

Lease Review Fee (Bakeries Only)

When you sign a franchise agreement for a Bakery, you will pay us a fee ranging between \$3,500 and \$7,000 for the review of your lease; the fee will depend on the complexity of the lease and will be determined in our sole discretion. In the event that your lease is thereafter renewed or materially amended, you will pay us a fee of \$5,000 for reviewing the renewal or amendment of your lease. The

lease review fees (for an initial lease, renewal or amendment) must be paid to us prior to your execution of the same with the landlord. The review of your lease may be performed by us or a third-party vendor we hire. There is no lease review fee for a Concession Truck or Trailer. The review of your lease is not a guaranty that your Bakery will be successful at that location. The lease review is performed solely for the purpose of ensuring that your lease meets our minimum requirements for a lease for a Bakery. A copy of the Lease Review and/or Negotiation Agreement and Release is attached to the Franchise Agreement at Attachment 11.

Pre-Opening Purchases (Bakeries and Concession Trucks or Trailers)

Before opening your Franchised Business, you will purchase items such as grand opening banners and balloons, pan liners, name tags and job application forms from us. For WETZEL'S PRETZELS Bakeries or Concessions Trucks or Trailers, the total cost of all such items is unlikely to exceed \$5,000.

Remote Mobile Unit Fee (Bakeries Only)

If you and your landlord agree that you may operate a Remote Mobile Unit within the shopping mall or shopping center where your Bakery is located, we will grant you a license to operate the Remote Mobile Unit under a Remote Mobile Unit Addendum, Attachment 4 to the Franchise Agreement. The Remote Mobile Unit Fee, payable when you sign the Addendum, is \$5,000. This fee is not refundable, and is not necessarily uniform in all cases, as we may negotiate the amount of the fee in certain instances in our discretion. You may not operate a Remote Mobile Unit in connection with a Concession Truck or Trailer.

Deposit on Sublease (Bakeries Only)

Upon rare occasion, we must lease real property to secure a desirable location for a Bakery and sublease it to our franchisee because the landlord is reluctant to rent to the franchisee, with which the landlord is not familiar. Our policy is to obtain a fully refundable deposit equal to two (2) months' rent when a franchisee leases from us. The amount is not uniform and the average amount of two (2) months' rent is \$8,000-25,000, but may vary depending on location. In some cases, we may also require you to obtain a letter of credit to secure your sublease, in an amount, on terms, and on a form we prescribe, from a bank acceptable to us. We will not lease real property to secure a location for a Concession Truck or Trailer.

ITEM 6: OTHER FEES

FEE¹	AMOUNT	WHEN DUE	REMARKS
Royalties	7% of Adjusted Gross Revenue, except for "streetside" Bakeries will have a royalty rate of 5% of Adjusted Gross Revenue.	On Wednesday (or any other weekday designated by us) of each week	See note 2.
Advertising Fund Contributions	1% of Adjusted Gross Revenue except for "streetside" Bakeries will contribute 3% of Adjusted Gross Revenue	On Wednesday (or any other weekday designated by us) of each week	See note 2

Secret Shopper Fee	\$50 per shop	On invoice	Reimburses us for cost of service
Repeat Inspection Fee	\$500	On invoice	Only assessed if previous inspection revealed material default
Bi-Annual Convention Registration	\$1,500 plus incidental costs to attend	Before convention	We will debit your account for this fee whether or not you attend.
Ongoing Training Fees and Initial Training for New Managers	Cost plus 20%	When class begins	
Audit	All expenses of audit if underpayment exceeds 3% or if audit was undertaken because you did not submit annual financial statements in a timely manner	On invoice	See note 3. We may audit your records at your place of business or require you to send copies of specified records to us at your own expense.
Relocation Fee	\$7,500	Before relocation	Not applicable for Concession Trucks or Trailers
Renewal Fee	<p>For a renewal term between five and ten years, the renewal fee will be fifty percent (50%) of (a) our then- current initial franchise fee for a single Bakery (without any applicable discount) or (b) our then-current remote mobile fee for a Remote Mobile Unit, as applicable. For a Bakery or Remote Mobile Unit with a renewal term of less than five years, but at least one year, we will pro-rate the renewal fee by twenty percent (20%) each year. For example, for a three-year renewal term, you will pay sixty percent (60%) of the renewal fee.</p> <p>For a Concession Truck or Trailer: \$3,750</p>	On signing new franchise agreement, or an amendment in the case of a one-year extension	For each and all Franchised Businesses, including Remote Mobile Units. You will be required to remit to us a monthly fee of \$500 per month until such time as you have entered into a new lease (or sublease) or a renewal of your lease (or sublease).

Transfer Fee	<p>For a Bakery: \$40,000 during the first twelve (12) months, \$20,000 from then on.</p> <p>For non-traditional location (including, but not limited to a convenience store): \$20,000 during the first twelve (12) months, \$10,000 from then on.</p> <p>For a Concession Truck or Trailer: \$3,750</p>	With notice of intention to transfer	Will be partially refunded if Transfer is denied
Remote Mobile Unit Transfer Fee	½ of current Remote Mobile Unit Fee	Before Transfer completes	Not applicable for Concession Trucks or Trailers
Interest on Late Payments	Lower of 18% per year or highest rate allowed by law	As accrued	Compensation for loss of use of money
Base Rent	Monthly rent	Per your Sublease Agreement, if applicable, usually the first of each month	Upon occasion, we must lease real property to secure a desirable location and sublease it to our franchisee because the landlord is reluctant to rent to the franchisee. The amount of your rent is not uniform and generally it is a pass through of the rent we owe under the master lease, though we may mark-up the rent to account for our risks.
Sublease Fee	The initial Sublease Fee will be \$200 monthly or as agreed by Parties, in addition to the Base Rent.	As incurred	The Sublease Fee compensates us for administrative expenses. We may increase the Sublease Fee, from time to time, upon written notice to you, but not by more than \$100 per month in a 12-month period.

Late Fee for Financial Statements	\$100 per week, per store	On invoice	For failure to submit year-end Financial Statements according to the timeline communicated
Lease Review Fee	\$3,500 to \$7,000, depending on complexity of lease, as determined by us	Due upon execution of a Franchise Agreement or upon lease review if reviewed thereafter.	<p>We must review the terms of an initial lease, a renewal of a lease or a material amendment to a lease.</p> <p>In the event of a store sale or transfer, fee is responsibility of the buyer.</p> <p>The fee is also payable to us if we or a third-party we hire represents you in connection with negotiating an extension or renewal of your lease.</p>
Site Evaluation Fee for	\$750 after the first evaluation trip	As incurred	The Site Evaluation Fee is paid to us. This fee is not refundable. See note 4
Supplier Fee	You must reimburse us for our costs and expenses in inspecting a proposed supplier. We estimate that our costs and expenses are unlikely to exceed \$500.	As incurred	
Private Offering Fee	\$5,000	As incurred	
Technology Fees	Currently, we charge approximately \$300, but we may increase this fee as necessary	The technology fee may be charged monthly, or as incurred, in our discretion.	See note 5
Additional Concession Truck or Trailer Fee	\$5,000 per each additional Concession Truck or Trailer	As incurred	The Additional Concession Truck or Trailer Fee is paid to us if we agree to you operating an additional Concession Truck or Trailer in the Mobile Area assigned to you