

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  
27  
28

Michael Freund SBN 99687  
Ryan Hoffman SBN 283297  
Michael Freund & Associates  
1919 Addison Street, Suite 105  
Berkeley, CA 94704  
Telephone: (510) 540-1992  
Facsimile: (510) 540-5543

Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.

**FILED BY FAX**  
ALAMEDA COUNTY  
March 08, 2018  
CLERK OF  
THE SUPERIOR COURT  
By Alicia Espinoza, Deputy  
CASE NUMBER:  
**RG18896087**

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

**ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER,  
INC., a California non-profit corporation**

**Plaintiff,**

vs.

**KATE FARMS, INC. and DOES 1-100**

**Defendants.**

**CASE NO.**

**COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE  
AND DECLARATORY RELIEF AND  
CIVIL PENALTIES**

[Toxic Tort/Environmental (30)]  
Proposition 65, Health & Safety Code  
Section 25249.5 et seq.]

Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. hereby alleges:

**I**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. (hereinafter "Plaintiff" or "ERC") brings this action as a private attorney general enforcer and in the public interest pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivision (d). The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Health & Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq.) also known as "Proposition 65," mandates that businesses with ten or more employees must provide a "clear and reasonable warning" prior to exposing any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or

1 reproductive toxicity. Lead and cadmium are chemicals known to the State of California to  
2 cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm. This complaint seeks injunctive and  
3 declaratory relief and civil penalties to remedy the ongoing failure of Defendants Kate Farms,  
4 Inc. (“Kate Farms”) and Does 1-100 (hereinafter individually referred to as “Defendant” or  
5 collectively as “Defendants”), to warn consumers that they have been exposed to lead and/or  
6 cadmium from a number of Kate Farms’ nutritional health products as set forth in paragraph 3  
7 at levels exceeding the applicable Maximum Allowable Dose Level (“MADL”) and requiring a  
8 warning pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.6.

## 9 II

### 10 PARTIES

11 2. Plaintiff ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes,  
12 helping safeguard the public from health hazards by reducing the use and misuse of hazardous  
13 and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and  
14 encouraging corporate responsibility.

15 3. Defendant Kate Farms, Inc. is a business that develops, manufactures, markets,  
16 distributes, and/or sells nutritional health products that have exposed users to lead and/or  
17 cadmium in the State of California within the relevant statute of limitations period. These  
18 “SUBJECT PRODUCTS” (as identified in the Notice of Violation dated December 27, 2017  
19 attached hereto as **Exhibit A**) are: (1) KateFarms Komplete Meal Replacement Shake  
20 Chocolate (lead, cadmium), (2) KateFarms Komplete Meal Replacement Shake Vanilla (lead),  
21 (3) KateFarms Komplete Meal Replacement Shake Coffee (lead), (4) KateFarms Core  
22 Essentials Total Nutrition Vanilla (lead), and (5) KateFarms Core Essentials Total Nutrition  
23 Chocolate (lead). Kate Farms is a company subject to Proposition 65 as it employs ten or more  
24 persons, and has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant to this action.

25 4. Defendants Does 1-100, are named herein under fictitious names, as their true names  
26 and capacities are unknown to ERC. ERC is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that  
27 each of said Does is responsible, in some actionable manner, for the events and happenings  
28 hereinafter referred to, either through said Does’ conduct, or through the conduct of its agents,

1 servants or employees, or in some other manner, causing the harms alleged by ERC in this  
2 complaint. When said true names and capacities of Does are ascertained, ERC will seek leave  
3 to amend this complaint to set forth the same.

4 **III**

5 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6 5. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10,  
7 which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute  
8 to other trial courts. The statute under which this action is brought does not specify any other  
9 basis for jurisdiction.

10 6. This Court has jurisdiction over Kate Farms because Kate Farms has sufficient  
11 minimum contacts with California, and otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California  
12 market through the marketing, distribution, and/or sale of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS in the  
13 State of California so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts  
14 consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

15 7. The Complaint is based on allegations contained in the Notice of Violation dated  
16 December 27, 2017, served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Kate  
17 Farms. The Notice of Violation constitutes adequate notice to Kate Farms because it provided  
18 adequate information to allow Kate Farms to assess the nature of the alleged violations,  
19 consistent with Proposition 65 and its implementing regulations. A certificate of merit and a  
20 certificate of service accompanied each copy of the Notice of Violation, and both certificates  
21 comply with Proposition 65 and its implementing regulations. The Notice of Violation served  
22 on Kate Farms also included a copy of "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act  
23 of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary." Service of the Notice of Violation and accompanying  
24 documents complied with Proposition 65 and its implementing regulations. Attached hereto as  
25 **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of this Notice of Violation and associated documents.  
26 More than 60 days have passed since ERC mailed the Notice of Violation and no public  
27 enforcement entity has filed a complaint in this case.

28 ///

1 8. This Court is the proper venue for the action because the causes of action have arisen in  
2 the County of Alameda where some of the violations of law have occurred, and will continue to  
3 occur, due to the ongoing sale of Kate Farms' products. Furthermore, venue is proper in this  
4 Court under Code of Civil Procedure section 395.5 and Health & Safety Code section 25249.7.

5 **IV**

6 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

7 9. The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 is an initiative statute  
8 passed as "Proposition 65" by an overwhelming majority vote of the people in November of  
9 1986.

10 10. The warning requirement of Proposition 65 is contained in Health & Safety Code  
11 section 25249.6, which provides:

12 No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and  
13 intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to  
14 cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and  
15 reasonable warning to such individual, except as provided in Section  
16 25249.10.

17 11. Implementing regulations for Proposition 65 define expose as "to cause to ingest, inhale,  
18 contact via body surfaces or otherwise come into contact with a listed chemical." An individual  
19 may come into contact with a listed chemical through water, air, food, consumer products and  
20 any other environmental exposure as well as occupational exposures." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 27,  
21 § 25102, subd. (i).)

22 12. In this case, the exposures are caused by consumer products. Implementing regulations  
23 for Proposition 65 define a consumer product exposure as "an exposure which results from a  
24 person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or other reasonably foreseeable use of a  
25 consumer good, or any exposure that results from receiving a consumer service." (Cal. Code  
26 Regs., tit. 27, § 25602, subd. (b).)

27 13. Whenever a clear and reasonable warning is required under Health & Safety Code  
28 section 25249.6, the "method employed to transmit the warning must be reasonably calculated  
considering the alternative methods available under the circumstances, to make the warning



1 message available prior to exposure.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 27, §25601.) The warning  
2 requirement may be satisfied by a warning that appears on a product’s label or other labeling,  
3 shelf labeling, signs, a system of signs, public advertising identifying the system and toll-free  
4 information services, or any other system, that provides clear and reasonable warnings. (Cal.  
5 Code Regs., tit. 27, §25603.1, subd. (a)-(d).)

6 14. Proposition 65 establishes a procedure by which the State is to develop a list of  
7 chemicals “known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity.” (Health & Safety Code,  
8 § 25249.8.) There is no duty to provide a clear and reasonable warning until 12-months after  
9 the chemical is published on the State list. (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.10, subd. (b).)

10 15. Lead was listed as a chemical known to the State of California to cause developmental  
11 toxicity in the fetus and male and female reproductive toxicity on February 27, 1987. Lead was  
12 listed as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer on October 1, 1992. (State  
13 of California EPA OEHHA Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986  
14 Chemicals Known to the State to Cause Cancer and Reproductive Toxicity.) The MADL for  
15 lead as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity is 0.5 micrograms per day. (Cal. Code  
16 Regs., tit. 27, §25805, subd. (b).) The No Significant Risk Level for lead as a carcinogen is 15  
17 micrograms per day. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 27, §25705, subd. (b).)

18 16. Cadmium was officially listed as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity and  
19 male reproductive toxicity on May 1, 1997, while cadmium and cadmium compounds were  
20 listed as chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer on October 1, 1987. (State  
21 of California EPA OEHHA Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986  
22 Chemicals Known to the State to Cause Cancer and Reproductive Toxicity.) The MADL for  
23 cadmium as a chemical known to cause reproductive toxicity is 4.1 micrograms per day. (Cal.  
24 Code Regs., tit. 27, §25805, subd. (b).)

25 17. Proposition 65 provides that any person “violating or threatening to violate” Proposition  
26 65 may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. (Health & Safety Code, §25249.7,  
27 subd. (a).) To “threaten to violate” means “to create a condition in which there is a substantial  
28 probability that a violation will occur.” (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.11, subd. (e).)

1 Furthermore, violators are subject to a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation.  
2 (Health & Safety Code, § 25249.7, subd. (b)(1).)

3 18. Proposition 65 may be enforced by any person in the public interest who provides notice  
4 sixty days before filing suit to both the violator and designated law enforcement officials. The  
5 failure of law enforcement officials to file a timely complaint enables a citizen suit to be filed  
6 pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7, subdivisions (c) and (d).

7 **V**

8 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

9 19. Kate Farms has developed, manufactured, marketed, distributed, and/or sold the  
10 SUBJECT PRODUCTS containing lead and/or cadmium into the State of California.  
11 Consumption of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS according to the directions and/or  
12 recommendations provided for said products causes consumers to be exposed to lead at levels  
13 exceeding the 0.5 micrograms per day MADL and/or cadmium at levels exceeding the 4.1  
14 micrograms per day MADL and requiring a warning. Consumers have been ingesting these  
15 products for many years, without any knowledge of their exposure to lead and/or cadmium, very  
16 dangerous chemicals.

17 20. For many years, Kate Farms has knowingly and intentionally exposed numerous persons  
18 to lead and/or cadmium without providing a Proposition 65 warning. Prior to ERC's Notice of  
19 Violation and this Complaint, Kate Farms failed to provide a warning on the labels of the  
20 SUBJECT PRODUCTS. Kate Farms has at all times relevant hereto been aware that the  
21 SUBJECT PRODUCTS contained lead and/or cadmium and that persons using these products  
22 have been exposed to these chemicals. Kate Farms has been aware of the presence of lead  
23 and/or cadmium in the SUBJECT PRODUCTS and has failed to disclose the presence of these  
24 chemicals to the public, who undoubtedly believe they have been ingesting totally healthy and  
25 pure products pursuant to the company's statements. On the company's website  
26 (<https://www.katefarms.com>) various representations are conveyed regard the quality and  
27 beneficial nature of its products including but not limited to the following:

- 28
- "All good things. We bottled everything you need, and nothing you don't."

- 1 • “Our superfoods blend has the effective phytochemicals from 29 fruits and vegetables
- 2 without any of the allergens or caffeine from the source-ingredients.”
- 3 • “Kate Farms is strengthened by the heart and expertise of our Advisory Board.”
- 4 • “Nutritional data ..... for the clinicians we proudly partner with.”
- 5 • “Compare Our Formulas”
- 6 • “Kate Farms products provide essential nutrition in every bottle. Our formulas are based
- 7 on organic, plant-based protein and are free from dairy, gluten, soy, and corn – for
- 8 optimum bioavailability.”
- 9 • “We believe in listening to our bodies and fueling them with powerful ingredients that
- 10 they need to thrive, heal, and perform at levels we didn’t think possible.”
- 11 • “ We follow our passion to provide functional nutrition for all ranges of dietary and
- 12 medical needs, and we hope it becomes the beginning of something new for you.”

13 21. Both prior and subsequent to ERC’s Notice of Violation, Kate Farms failed to provide  
14 consumers of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS with a clear and reasonable warning that they have  
15 been exposed to chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects and  
16 other reproductive harm. This failure to warn is ongoing.

17 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
18 **(Violation of Section 25249.6 of the Health and Safety Code, Failure to Provide Clear and**  
19 **Reasonable Warning under Proposition 65)**

20 22. ERC refers to paragraphs 1-21, inclusive, and incorporates them herein by this  
21 reference.

22 23. By committing the acts alleged above, Kate Farms has, in the course of doing business,  
23 knowingly and intentionally exposed users of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS to lead and/or  
24 cadmium, chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other  
25 reproductive harm, without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individuals within  
26 the meaning of Health & Safety Code section 25249.6. In doing so, Kate Farms has violated  
27 Health & Safety Code section 25249.6, and continues to violate the statute with each successive  
28 sale of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS.

1 24. Said violations render Kate Farms liable for civil penalties, up to \$2,500 per day for  
2 each violation, and subject Kate Farms to injunction.

3 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
4 **(Declaratory Relief)**

5 25. ERC refers to paragraphs 1-24, inclusive, and incorporates them herein by this  
6 reference.

7 26. There exists an actual controversy relating to the legal rights and duties of the Parties,  
8 within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1060, between ERC and Kate Farms,  
9 concerning whether Kate Farms has exposed individuals to chemicals known to the State of  
10 California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm without providing clear  
11 and reasonable warning.

12 **VI**

13 **PRAYER**

14 WHEREFORE ERC prays for relief as follows:

15 1. On the First Cause of Action, for civil penalties for each and every violation according  
16 to proof;

17 2. On the First Cause of Action, and pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 25249.7,  
18 subdivision (a), for such temporary restraining orders, preliminary and permanent injunctive  
19 orders, or other orders as are necessary to prevent Kate Farms from exposing persons to lead  
20 and/or cadmium without providing clear and reasonable warning;

21 3. On the Second Cause of Action, for a declaratory judgment pursuant to Code of Civil  
22 Procedure section 1060 declaring that Kate Farms has exposed individuals to lead and/or  
23 cadmium without providing clear and reasonable warning; and

24 4. On all Causes of Action, for reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil  
25 Procedure section 1021.5 or the substantial benefit theory;

26 5. For costs of suit herein; and

27 /// ///

1 6. For such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.  
2

3 DATED: March 8, 2018

MICHAEL FREUND & ASSOCIATES



4  
5 \_\_\_\_\_  
6 Michael Freund  
7 Ryan Hoffman  
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
9 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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  
27  
28

EXHIBIT A



**Michael Freund & Associates**

1919 Addison Street, Suite 105  
Berkeley, CA 94704  
Voice: 510.540.1992 • Fax: 510.540.5543

**Michael Freund, Esq.**  
**Ryan Hoffman, Esq.**

OF COUNSEL:  
**Denise Ferkich Hoffman, Esq.**

December 27, 2017

**NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF  
CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.  
(PROPOSITION 65)**

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. 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.

ERC has identified violations of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65"), which is codified at California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*, with respect to the products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violator identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violator and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d), ERC intends to file a private enforcement action in the public interest 60 days after effective service of this notice unless the public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

**General Information about Proposition 65.** A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with this letter served to the alleged Violator identified below.

**Alleged Violator.** The name of the company covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violator") is:

**Kate Farms, Inc.**

**Consumer Products and Listed Chemicals.** The products that are the subject of this notice and the chemicals in those products identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

- 1. KateFarms Complete Meal Replacement Shake Chocolate – Lead, Cadmium**
- 2. KateFarms Complete Meal Replacement Shake Vanilla - Lead**
- 3. KateFarms Complete Meal Replacement Shake Coffee - Lead**
- 4. KateFarms Core Essentials Total Nutrition Vanilla - Lead**
- 5. KateFarms Core Essentials Total Nutrition Chocolate - 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.

Cadmium was officially listed as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity and male reproductive toxicity on May 1, 1997, while cadmium and cadmium compounds were listed as chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer on October 1, 1987.

It should be noted that ERC may continue to investigate other products that may reveal further violations and result in subsequent notices of violations.

**Route of Exposure.** The consumer exposures that are the subject of this notice result from the recommended use of these products. Consequently, the route of exposure to these chemicals has been and continues to be through ingestion.

**Approximate Time Period of Violations.** Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least December 27, 2014, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until these known toxic chemicals are either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemicals. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violator violated Proposition 65 because it failed to provide persons handling and/or using these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to these chemicals.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violator to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemicals, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals, as well as an expensive and time-consuming litigation.

ERC has retained me as legal counsel in connection with this matter. **Please direct all communications regarding this Notice of Violation to my attention at the law office address and telephone number indicated on the letterhead.**

Sincerely,



---

Michael Freund

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Kate Farms, Inc. and its Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

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

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

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

I, Michael Freund, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that 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 chemicals that are 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: December 27, 2017

---

Michael Freund

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903**

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 and over the age of 18 years of age. 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 December 27, 2017 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION 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 each of the parties listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO  
Kate Farms, Inc.  
101 Innovation Place  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108

Corporation Service Company  
(Kate Farms, Inc.'s Registered Agent  
for Service of Process)  
251 Little Falls Drive  
Wilmington, DE 19808

Current President or CEO  
Kate Farms, Inc.  
7850 Ruffner Avenue, Dept. 4000  
Van Nuys, CA 91406

Corporation Service Company which will do business in  
CA as CSC-Lawyers Incorporating Service (C1592199)  
(Kate Farms, Inc.'s Registered Agent for Service  
of Process)  
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N  
Sacramento, CA 95833

Current President or CEO  
Kate Farms, Inc.  
116 East Yanonali Street, Suite D  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

On December 27, 2017 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified 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)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded 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 December 27, 2017 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

December 27, 2017

Page 5

Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney  
Contra Costa County  
900 Ward Street  
Martinez, CA 94553  
sgrassini@contracostada.org

Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator  
Lassen County  
220 S. Lassen Street  
Susanville, CA 96130  
mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney  
Monterey County  
1200 Aguajito Road  
Monterey, CA 93940  
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

Allison Haley, District Attorney  
Napa County  
931 Parkway Mall  
Napa, CA 94559  
CEPD@countyofnapa.org

Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney  
Riverside County  
3072 Orange Street  
Riverside, CA 92501  
Prop65@rivcoda.org

Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney  
Sacramento County  
901 G Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Prop65@sacda.org

Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney  
San Francisco County  
732 Brannan Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
gregory.alker@sfgov.org

Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney  
San Joaquin County  
222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202  
Stockton, CA 95202  
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

Eric J. Dobroth, Deputy District Attorney  
San Luis Obispo County  
County Government Center Annex, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408  
edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney  
Santa Clara County  
70 W Hedding St  
San Jose, CA 95110  
EPU@da.sccgov.org

Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney  
Santa Cruz County  
701 Ocean Street  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us

Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney  
Sonoma County  
600 Administration Dr  
Sonoma, CA 95403  
jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney  
Tulare County  
221 S Mooney Blvd  
Visalia, CA 95370  
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us

Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney  
Ventura County  
800 S Victoria Ave  
Ventura, CA 93009  
daspecialops@ventura.org

Jeff W. Reising, District Attorney  
Yolo County  
301 Second Street  
Woodland, CA 95695  
cfepd@yolocounty.org

Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*  
December 27, 2017  
Page 6

On December 27, 2017 between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I served the following documents: **NOTICE OF VIOLATION, 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 at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by First Class Mail.

Executed on December 27, 2017, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.



---

Phyllis Dunwoody



Service List

District Attorney, Alameda County  
1225 Fallon Street, Suite 900  
Oakland, CA 94612

District Attorney, Alpine County  
P.O. Box 248  
Markleeville, CA 96120

District Attorney, Amador County  
708 Court Street, Suite 202  
Jackson, CA 95642

District Attorney, Butte County  
25 County Center Drive, Suite 245  
Oroville, CA 95965

District Attorney, Calaveras County  
891 Mountain Ranch Road  
San Andreas, CA 95249

District Attorney, Colusa County  
346 Fifth Street Suite 101  
Colusa, CA 95932

District Attorney, Del Norte County  
450 H Street, Room 171  
Crescent City, CA 95531

District Attorney, El Dorado County  
515 Main Street  
Placerville, CA 95667

District Attorney, Fresno County  
2220 Tulare Street, Suite 1000  
Fresno, CA 93721

District Attorney, Glenn County  
Post Office Box 430  
Willows, CA 95988

District Attorney, Humboldt County  
825 5th Street 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Eureka, CA 95501

District Attorney, Imperial County  
940 West Main Street, Ste 102  
El Centro, CA 92243

District Attorney, Inyo County  
P.O. Drawer D  
Independence, CA 93526

District Attorney, Kern County  
1215 Truxtun Avenue  
Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings County  
1400 West Lacey Boulevard  
Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County  
255 N. Forbes Street  
Lakeport, CA 95453

District Attorney, Los Angeles County  
Hall of Justice  
211 West Temple St., Ste 1200  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

District Attorney, Madera County  
209 West Yosemite Avenue  
Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin County  
3501 Civic Center Drive,  
Room 130  
San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mariposa County  
Post Office Box 730  
Mariposa, CA 95338

District Attorney, Mendocino County  
Post Office Box 1000  
Ukiah, CA 95482

District Attorney, Merced County  
550 W. Main Street  
Merced, CA 95340

District Attorney, Modoc County  
204 S Court Street, Room 202  
Alturas, CA 96101-4020

District Attorney, Mono County  
Post Office Box 617  
Bridgeport, CA 93517

District Attorney, Nevada County  
201 Commercial Street  
Nevada City, CA 95959

District Attorney, Orange County  
401 West Civic Center Drive  
Santa Ana, CA 92701

District Attorney, Placer County  
10810 Justice Center Drive,  
Ste 240  
Roseville, CA 95678

District Attorney, Plumas County  
520 Main Street, Room 404  
Quincy, CA 95971

District Attorney, San Benito County  
419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor  
Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney, San Bernardino County  
316 N. Mountain View  
Avenue  
San Bernardino, CA 92401

District Attorney, San Diego County  
330 West Broadway, Suite 1300  
San Diego, CA 92101

District Attorney, San Mateo County  
400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063

District Attorney, Santa Barbara County  
1112 Santa Barbara Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

District Attorney, Shasta County  
1355 West Street  
Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra County  
PO Box 457  
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou County  
Post Office Box 986  
Yreka, CA 96097

District Attorney, Solano County  
675 Texas Street, Ste 4500  
Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus County  
832 12th Street, Ste 300  
Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter County  
463 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Yuba City, CA 95991

District Attorney, Tehama County  
Post Office Box 519  
Red Bluff, CA 96080

District Attorney, Trinity County  
Post Office Box 310  
Weaverville, CA 96093

District Attorney, Tuolumne County  
423 N. Washington Street  
Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Yuba County  
215 Fifth Street, Suite 152  
Marysville, CA 95901

Los Angeles City Attorney's Office  
City Hall East  
200 N. Main Street, Suite 800  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

San Diego City Attorney's Office  
1200 3rd Avenue, Ste 1620  
San Diego, CA 92101

San Francisco, City Attorney  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr Carlton B Goodlett PL  
San Francisco, CA 94102

San Jose City Attorney's Office  
200 East Santa Clara Street,  
16th Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

## 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 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.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) 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?*

---

<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>.

**The "Proposition 65 List."** Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. 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 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 Proposition 65. 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. 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 to that chemical. 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 under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure 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 causing the exposure 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 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 Food.** Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (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 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

---

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

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.

#### *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 Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement 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.

A private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. For the following types of exposures, the Act provides an opportunity for the business to correct the alleged violation:

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

If a private party alleges that a violation occurred based on one of the exposures described above, the private party must first provide the alleged violator a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:  
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

*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: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.