

1 MICHAEL R. LOZEAU (CBN 142893)  
2 RICHARD T. DRURY (CBN 163559)  
3 LOZEAU | DRURY LLP  
4 410 12th Street, Suite 250  
5 Oakland, CA 94607  
6 Ph: 510-836-4200  
7 Fax: 510-836-4205  
8 Email: michael@lozeaudrury.com  
9 richard@lozeaudrury.com

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
11 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER

12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
13 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

14 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, ) Case No. \_\_\_\_\_  
15 a non-profit California corporation, )  
16 Plaintiff, ) **COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE**  
17 v. ) **RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES**  
18 TRIVITA, INC., an Arizona corporation, ) Health & Safety Code §25249.5, *et seq.*  
19 Defendant. )  
20 )  
21 )  
22 )  
23 )  
24 )  
25 )  
26 )

27 Plaintiff Environmental Research Center (“PLAINTIFF” or “ERC”) brings this action  
28 in the interest of the general public and, on information and belief, hereby alleges:

29 **INTRODUCTION**

30 1. This action seeks to remedy the continuing failure of Defendant TRIVITA, INC.  
31 (“DEFENDANT” or “TRIVITA”), to warn consumers in California that they are being  
32 exposed to lead, a substance known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects, and  
33 other reproductive harm. DEFENDANT manufactures, packages, distributes, markets, and/or  
34 sells or has sold in California certain products containing lead (collectively, the  
35 “PRODUCTS”):  
36

- 1 • **TriVita Inc. Garcinia Cambogia**
- 2 • **TriVita Inc. Bone Growth Factor**
- 3 • **TriVita Inc. Amazon Herb Perform Shake**
- 4 • **TriVita Inc. Leanology Nutritional Shake Creamy Vanilla**
- 5 • **TriVita Inc. GlucoManage Formula**
- 6 • **TriVita Inc. Leanology**
- 7 • **TriVita Inc. Leanology Appetite Control Soft Chews Chocolate Mocha**
- 8 **60 Soft Chews**
- 9 • **TriVita Inc. Nopalea Daily Cleanse**

10 2. Lead (hereinafter, the “LISTED CHEMICAL”) is a substance known to the State<sup>1</sup> of  
11 California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

12 3. The use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS causes exposures to the LISTED  
13 CHEMICAL at levels requiring a “clear and reasonable warning” under California’s Safe  
14 Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code (“H&S Code”)  
15 §25249.5, *et seq.* (also known as “Proposition 65”). DEFENDANT has failed to provide the  
16 health hazard warnings required by Proposition 65.

17 4. DEFENDANT’s past sales and continued manufacturing, packaging,  
18 distributing, marketing and/or sales of the PRODUCTS without the required health hazard  
19 warnings, causes individuals to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to levels of the  
20 LISTED CHEMICAL that violate Proposition 65.

21 5. PLAINTIFF seeks injunctive relief enjoining DEFENDANT from the continued  
22 manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or sales of the PRODUCTS in  
23 California without provision of clear and reasonable warnings regarding the risks of cancer,  
24 birth defects, and other reproductive harm posed by exposure to the LISTED CHEMICAL  
25

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> All statutory and regulatory references herein are to California law, unless otherwise specified.



1 The Notice was issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements of H&S Code  
2 §25249.7(d) and the statute’s implementing regulations regarding the notice of the violations to  
3 be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violator. The Notice included, *inter*  
4 *alia*, the following information: the name, address, and telephone number of the noticing  
5 individual; the name of the alleged violator; the statute violated; the approximate time period  
6 during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the violations, including the chemicals  
7 involved, the routes of toxic exposure, and the specific product or type of product causing the  
8 violations, and was issued as follows:

- 9 a. DEFENDANT was provided a copy of the Notice by Certified Mail.
- 10 b. DEFENDANT was provided a copy of a document entitled “The Safe  
11 Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A  
12 Summary,” which is also known as Appendix A to Title 27 of CCR §25903.
- 13 c. The California Attorney General was provided a copy of the Notice via  
14 online submission.
- 15 d. The California Attorney General was provided with a Certificate of Merit by  
16 the attorney for the noticing party, stating that there is a reasonable and  
17 meritorious case for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient  
18 to establish a basis for the certificate, including the identity of the persons  
19 consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts, studies, or other  
20 data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(h)(2).

21 11. At least 60-days have elapsed since PLAINTIFF sent the NOTICE to  
22 DEFENDANT. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and  
23 diligently prosecute a cause of action under H&S Code §25249.5, *et seq.* against  
24 DEFENDANT based on the allegations herein.

25 **PARTIES**

26 12. PLAINTIFF is a non-profit corporation organized under California’s

1 Corporation Law. ERC is dedicated to, among other causes, reducing the use and misuse of  
2 hazardous and toxic substances, consumer protection, worker safety, and corporate  
3 responsibility.

4 13. ERC is a person within the meaning of H&S Code §25118 and brings this  
5 enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(d).

6 14. DEFENDANT is a corporation organized under the State of Arizona's  
7 Corporation Law and is a person doing business within the meaning of H&S Code  
8 §25249.11.

9 15. DEFENDANT has manufactured, packaged, distributed, marketed and/or sold  
10 the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California and the County of Alameda. ERC is informed  
11 and believes, and thereupon alleges, that DEFENDANT continues to manufacture, package,  
12 distribute, market and/or sell the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California and in Alameda  
13 County.

14 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

15 16. The People of the State of California have declared in Proposition 65 their right  
16 “[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other  
17 reproductive harm.” (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65).

18 17. To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a  
19 “clear and reasonable warning” before being exposed to substances listed by the State of  
20 California as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. H&S Code §25249.6 states, in pertinent  
21 part:

22 No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally  
23 expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or  
24 reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such  
25 individual....

26 18. “‘Knowingly’ refers only to knowledge of the fact that a discharge of, release of,

1 or exposure to a chemical listed pursuant to Section 25249.8(a) of the Act is occurring. No  
2 knowledge that the discharge, release or exposure is unlawful is required.” (27 California Code  
3 of Regulations (“CCR”) § 25102(n).)

4 19. Proposition 65 provides that any person “violating or threatening to violate” the  
5 statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code §25249.7). The phrase  
6 “threatening to violate” is defined to mean creating “a condition in which there is a substantial  
7 likelihood that a violation will occur.” (H&S Code §25249.11(e)). Violators are liable for civil  
8 penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of the Act. (H&S Code §25249.7.)

9 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

10 20. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed the chemical lead  
11 as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity. Lead became subject to the warning  
12 requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the “clear and reasonable” warning  
13 requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on February 27, 1988. (27 CCR § 25000, *et seq.*;  
14 H&S Code §25249.5, *et seq.*). Due to the high toxicity of lead, the maximum allowable dose  
15 level for lead is 0.5 ug/day (micrograms a day) for reproductive toxicity. (27 CCR§ 25805(b).)

16 21. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed the chemicals lead  
17 and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer. Lead and lead compounds became  
18 subject to the warning requirement one year later and were therefore subject to the “clear and  
19 reasonable” warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on October 1, 1993. (27 CCR  
20 § 25000, *et seq.*; H&S Code §25249.6, *et seq.*). Due to the carcinogenicity of lead, the no  
21 significant risk level for lead is 15 ug/day (micrograms a day). (27 CCR § 25705(b)(1).)

22 22. To test DEFENDANT’s PRODUCTS for lead, PLAINTIFF hired a well-  
23 respected and accredited testing laboratory. The results of testing undertaken by PLAINTIFF  
24 of DEFENDANT’s PRODUCTS show that the PRODUCTS tested were in violation of the 0.5  
25 ug/day “safe harbor” daily dose limit set forth in Proposition 65’s regulations. Very significant  
26 is the fact that people are being exposed to lead through ingestion as opposed to other not as

1 harmful methods of exposure such as dermal exposure. Ingestion of lead produces much  
2 higher exposure levels and health risks than does dermal exposure to this chemical.

3 23. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANT, therefore, has knowingly and  
4 intentionally exposed the users and/or handlers of the PRODUCTS to the LISTED  
5 CHEMICAL without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.

6 24. The PRODUCTS have been sold by DEFENDANT for use in California  
7 since at least May 23, 2011. The PRODUCTS continue to be distributed and sold in  
8 California without the requisite warning information.

9 25. On May 23, 2014, ERC served DEFENDANT and each of the appropriate  
10 public enforcement agencies with a Proposition 65 Notice, a document entitled “Notice of  
11 Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5” that provided DEFENDANT  
12 and the public enforcement agencies with notice that DEFENDANT was in violation of  
13 Proposition 65 for failing to warn purchasers and individuals using the PRODUCTS that the  
14 use of the PRODUCTS exposes them to lead, a chemical known to the State of California to  
15 cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity (a true and copy of the 60-Day Notice is attached  
16 hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference).

17 26. As a proximate result of acts by DEFENDANT, as a person in the course of  
18 doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11, individuals throughout  
19 the State of California, including in the County of Alameda, have been exposed to the LISTED  
20 CHEMICAL without a clear and reasonable warning. The individuals subject to the illegal  
21 exposures include normal and foreseeable users of the PRODUCTS, as well as all other  
22 persons exposed to the PRODUCTS.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
24 **(Injunctive Relief for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* concerning**  
25 **the PRODUCTS described in the May 23, 2014, Prop. 65 Notice)**  
26 **Against DEFENDANT**

27. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 26,

1 inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.

2 28. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint DEFENDANT at all times  
3 relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, has violated H&S Code §25249.6 by,  
4 in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who use or  
5 handle the PRODUCTS set forth in the Notice to the LISTED CHEMICAL, without first  
6 providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6  
7 and 25249.11(f).

8 29. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANT has violated H&S Code § 25249.6  
9 and is therefore subject to an injunction ordering DEFENDANT to stop violating Proposition  
10 65, to provide warnings to all present and future customers, and to provide warnings to  
11 DEFENDANT's past customers who purchased or used the PRODUCTS without receiving a  
12 clear and reasonable warning.

13 30. An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by  
14 Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a).

15 31. Continuing commission by DEFENDANT of the acts alleged above will  
16 irreparably harm the citizens of the State of California, for which harm they have no plain,  
17 speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

18 Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays judgment against DEFENDANT, as set forth hereafter.

19 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
20 **(Civil Penalties for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* concerning the**  
21 **PRODUCTS described in PLAINTIFF's NOTICE)**  
22 **Against DEFENDANT**

23 32. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 31,  
24 inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.

25 33. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANT at all times  
26 relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, has violated H&S Code §25249.6 by,  
in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who use or



1 handle the PRODUCTS set forth in the Notice to the LISTED CHEMICAL, without first  
2 providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6  
3 and 25249.11(f).

4 34. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANT is liable, pursuant to H&S Code  
5 §25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per day per violation for each unlawful exposure  
6 to the LISTED CHEMICAL from the PRODUCTS.

7 Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays judgment against DEFENDANT, as set forth hereafter.

8 **THE NEED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

9 35. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1 through  
10 34, as if set forth below.

11 36. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANT has caused  
12 irreparable harm for which there is no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law. In the absence  
13 of equitable relief, DEFENDANT will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury  
14 by continuing to cause consumers to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED  
15 CHEMICAL through the use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS.

16 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

17 Wherefore, PLAINTIFF accordingly prays for the following relief:

18 A. a preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b),  
19 enjoining DEFENDANT, its agents, employees, assigns and all persons acting in concert or  
20 participating with DEFENDANT, from distributing or selling the PRODUCTS in California  
21 without first providing a clear and reasonable warning, within the meaning of Proposition 65,  
22 that the users and/or handlers of the PRODUCTS are exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL;

23 B. an injunctive order, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), compelling  
24 DEFENDANT to identify and locate each individual who has purchased the PRODUCTS since  
25 May 23, 2011, and to provide a warning to such person that the use of the PRODUCTS will  
26 expose the user to chemicals known to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive

1 harm;


2 C. an assessment of civil penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b),  
3 against DEFENDANT in the amount of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition  
4 65;

5 D. an award to PLAINTIFF of its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit  
6 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, as PLAINTIFF shall specify in further  
7 application to the Court; and,

8 E. such other and further relief as may be just and proper.  
9


10 DATED: October 31, 2014

Lozeau | Drury LLP

11  
12   
13 Michael R. Lozeau  
14 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
15 Environmental Research Center  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

# Exhibit A



T 510.836.4200  
F 510.836.4205

410 12th Street, Suite 250  
Oakland, Ca 94607

www.lozeaudrury.com  
michael@lozeaudrury.com

**VIA CERTIFIED MAIL**

Current CEO or President  
TriVita, Inc.  
16100 N. Greenway Hayden Loop  
Suite 950  
Scottsdale, AZ 85260

Current CEO or President  
TriVita, Inc.  
PO Box 15700  
Scottsdale, AZ 85267

Mark Allen  
(TriVita, Inc.'s Registered Agent for  
Service of Process)  
393 East Palm Lane  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

**VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION**

Office of the California Attorney General

**VIA PRIORITY MAIL**

District Attorneys of All California Counties  
and Select City Attorneys  
(See Attached Certificate of Service)

**Re: Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 *et seq.***

Dear Addressees:

I represent the Environmental Research Center ("ERC") in connection with this Notice of Violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, which is codified at California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 *et seq.* and also referred to as Proposition 65.

ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

The name of the Company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violator") is:

**TriVita, Inc.**

The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemicals in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- **TriVita Inc. Garcinia Cambogia - Lead**
- **TriVita Inc. Bone Growth Factor - Lead**
- **TriVita Inc. Amazon Herb Perform Shake - Lead**
- **TriVita Inc. Leanology Nutritional Shake Creamy Vanilla - Lead**
- **TriVita Inc. GlucoManage Formula – Lead**
- **TriVita Inc. Leanology – Lead**
- **TriVita Inc. Leanology Appetite Control Soft Chews Chocolate Mocha 60 Soft Chews- Lead**
- **TriVita Inc. Nopalea Daily Cleanse - Lead**

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

This letter is a notice to the Violator and the appropriate governmental authorities of the Proposition 65 violations concerning the listed products. This notice covers all violations of Proposition 65 involving the Violator currently known to ERC from the information now available. ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations. A summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with the copy of this letter to the Violator.

The Violator has manufactured, marketed, distributed, and/or sold the listed products, which have exposed and continue to expose numerous individuals within California to the identified chemical, lead. The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the purchase, acquisition, handling and/or recommended use of these products by consumers. The primary route of exposure to lead has been through ingestion, but may have also occurred through inhalation and/or dermal contact. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to lead. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product's label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide an appropriate warning to persons using and/or handling these products that they are being exposed to lead. Each of these ongoing violations has occurred on every day since May 23, 2011, as well as every day since the products were introduced in the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users.

Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*


May 23, 2014

Page 3

Pursuant to Section 25249.7(d) of the statute, ERC intends to file a citizen enforcement action sixty days after effective service of this notice unless the Violator agrees in an enforceable written instrument to: (1) reformulate the listed products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemicals; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and 3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons who purchased the above products in the last four years. Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and my client's objectives in pursuing this notice, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution to this matter. Such resolution will avoid both further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals and expensive and time consuming litigation.

ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall, and is located at 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. 619-500-3090. ERC has retained me in connection with this matter. We suggest that communications regarding this Notice of Violations should be directed to my attention at the above listed law office address and telephone number.

Sincerely,



Michael Lozeau

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to TriVita, Inc. and its Registered Agent for Service of Process only)

Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

**Re: Environmental Research Center's Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by  
TriVita, Inc.**

I, Michael Lozeau, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice in which it is alleged the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.
3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice.
4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: May 23, 2014

  
Michael Lozeau

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years of age, and am not a party to the within entitled action. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On May 23, 2014, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY"** on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current CEO or President  
TriVita, Inc.  
16100 N. Greenway Hayden Loop  
Suite 950  
Scottsdale, AZ 85260

Mark Allen  
(TriVita, Inc.'s Registered Agent for  
Service of Process)  
393 East Palm Lane  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Current CEO or President  
TriVita, Inc.  
PO Box 15700  
Scottsdale, AZ 85267

On May 23, 2014, I electronically served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** on the following party by uploading a true and correct copy thereof on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice>:

Office of the California Attorney General  
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting  
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000  
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On May 23, 2014, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties **on the Service List attached hereto**, and depositing it with the U.S. Postal Service with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Priority Mail.

Executed on May 23, 2014, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tiffany Capehart



Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*

May 23, 2014

Page 6

Service List

District Attorney, Alameda County 1225 Fallon Street, Suite 900 Oakland, CA 94612	District Attorney, Los Angeles County 210 West Temple Street, Suite 18000 Los Angeles, CA 90012	District Attorney, San Diego County 330 West Broadway, Suite 1300 San Diego, CA 92101	District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370
District Attorney, Alpine County P.O. Box 248 Markleeville, CA 96120	District Attorney, Madera County 209 West Yosemite Avenue Madera, CA 93637	District Attorney, San Francisco County 850 Bryant Street, Suite 322 San Francisco, CA 94103	District Attorney, Ventura County 800 South Victoria Ave, Suite 314 Ventura, CA 93009
District Attorney, Amador County 708 Court Street Jackson, CA 95642	District Attorney, Marin County 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903	District Attorney, San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Ave. Rm. 202 Stockton, CA 95202	District Attorney, Yolo County 301 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street Woodland, CA 95695
District Attorney, Butte County 25 County Center Drive, Suite 245 Oroville, CA 95965	District Attorney, Mariposa County Post Office Box 730 Mariposa, CA 95338	District Attorney, San Luis Obispo County 1035 Palm St, Room 450 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408	District Attorney, Yuba County 215 Fifth Street, Suite 152 Marysville, CA 95901
District Attorney, Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249	District Attorney, Mendocino County Post Office Box 1000 Ukiah, CA 95482	District Attorney, San Mateo County 400 County Ctr., 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor Redwood City, CA 94063	Los Angeles City Attorney's Office City Hall East 200 N. Main Street, Suite 800 Los Angeles, CA 90012
District Attorney, Colusa County 346 Fifth Street Suite 101 Colusa, CA 95932	District Attorney, Merced County 550 W. Main Street Merced, CA 95340	District Attorney, Santa Barbara County 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101	San Diego City Attorney's Office 1200 3 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Ste 1620 San Diego, CA 92101
District Attorney, Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553	District Attorney, Modoc County 204 S Court Street, Room 202 Alturas, CA 96101-4020	District Attorney, Santa Clara County 70 West Hedding Street San Jose, CA 95110	San Francisco, City Attorney City Hall, Room 234 1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett PL San Francisco, CA 94102
District Attorney, Del Norte County 450 H Street, Room 171 Crescent City, CA 95531	District Attorney, Mono County Post Office Box 617 Bridgeport, CA 93517	District Attorney, Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street, Room 200 Santa Cruz, CA 95060	San Jose City Attorney's Office 200 East Santa Clara Street, 16 <sup>th</sup> Floor San Jose, CA 95113
District Attorney, El Dorado County 515 Main Street Placerville, CA 95667	District Attorney, Monterey County Post Office Box 1131 Salinas, CA 93902	District Attorney, Shasta County 1355 West Street Redding, CA 96001	
District Attorney, Fresno County 2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000 Fresno, CA 93721	District Attorney, Napa County 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559	District Attorney, Sierra County PO Box 457 Downieville, CA 95936	
District Attorney, Glenn County Post Office Box 430 Willows, CA 95988	District Attorney, Nevada County 201 Commercial Street Nevada City, CA 95959	District Attorney, Siskiyou County Post Office Box 986 Yreka, CA 96097	
District Attorney, Humboldt County 825 5 <sup>th</sup> Street 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor Eureka, CA 95501	District Attorney, Orange County 401 West Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92701	District Attorney, Solano County 675 Texas Street, Ste 4500 Fairfield, CA 94533	
District Attorney, Imperial County 940 West Main Street, Ste 102 El Centro, CA 92243	District Attorney, Placer County 10810 Justice Center Drive, Ste 240 Roseville, CA 95678	District Attorney, Sonoma County 600 Administration Drive, Room 212J Santa Rosa, CA 95403	
District Attorney, Inyo County 230 W. Line Street Bishop, CA 93514	District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971	District Attorney, Stanislaus County 832 12 <sup>th</sup> Street, Ste 300 Modesto, CA 95354	
District Attorney, Kern County 1215 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301	District Attorney, Riverside County 3960 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501	District Attorney, Sutter County 446 Second Street Yuba City, CA 95991	
District Attorney, Kings County 1400 West Lacey Boulevard Hanford, CA 93230	District Attorney, Sacramento County 901 "G" Street Sacramento, CA 95814	District Attorney, Tehama County Post Office Box 519 Red Bluff, CA 96080	
District Attorney, Lake County 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453	District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Hollister, CA 95023	District Attorney, Trinity County Post Office Box 310 Weaverville, CA 96093	
District Attorney, Lassen County 220 South Lassen Street, Ste. 8 Susanville, CA 96130	District Attorney, San Bernardino County 316 N. Mountain View Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92415-0004	District Attorney, Tulare County 221 S. Mooney Blvd., Room 224 Visalia, CA 93291	

## APPENDIX A

### OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as "Proposition 65"). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA's implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

Proposition 65 appears in California law as Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13. The statute is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.<sup>1</sup> These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

#### *WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?*

***The "Governor's List."*** Proposition 65 requires the Governor to publish a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. This means that chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as

---

<sup>1</sup> All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

damage to female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at:

[http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65\\_list/Newlist.html](http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html).

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under this law. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

***Clear and reasonable warnings.*** A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies; for example, when exposures are sufficiently low (see below). The warning given must be “clear and reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

***Prohibition from discharges into drinking water.*** A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

#### ***DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?***

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

***Grace Period.*** Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

***Governmental agencies and public water utilities.*** All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

***Businesses with nine or fewer employees.*** Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

**Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer.** For chemicals that are listed as known to the State to cause cancer (“carcinogens”), a warning is not required if the business can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA’s website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

**Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question.** For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by a 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA’s website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

**Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in a Food.** Certain exposures to chemicals that occur in foods naturally (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant<sup>2</sup> it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

**Discharges that do not result in a “significant amount” of the listed chemical entering into any source of drinking water.** The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a “significant amount” of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A “significant amount” means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the “no significant risk” level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the “no observable effect” level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Section 25501(a)(4)

## *HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?*

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of the regulations and in Title 11, sections 3100-3103. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

## *FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...*

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at [P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov](mailto:P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov).

Revised: July, 2012

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.