

1 Safety Code (“H&S Code”) section 25249.5 (also known as and referred to hereinafter as
2 “Proposition 65”), businesses must provide persons with a “clear and reasonable warning” before
3 exposing individuals to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive harm.
4 DEFENDANTS manufacture, package, distribute, market, and/or sell in California certain
5 products containing lead (the “SUBJECT PRODUCTS”):

- 6 • **Scitec Nutrition Big Bang 3.0 Mango**
- 7 • **Scitec Nutrition Protein Delite Milk Chocolate**
- 8 • **Scitec Nutrition Jumbo Hardcore Brownie Praline**
- 9 • **Scitec Nutrition Jumbo Hardcore Banana-Yogurt**
- 10 • **Scitec Nutrition 100% Plant Protein Green Series Chocolate Praline**
- 11 • **Scitec Nutrition Revex-16**
- 12 • **Scitec Nutrition Protein Pudding Gourmet Dessert With Casein and**
13 **Whey Double Chocolate**
- 14 • **Scitec Nutrition Protein Pudding Gourmet Dessert With Casein and**
15 **Whey Vanilla Cream**
- 16 • **Scitec Nutrition Greens & Fruit Superfood Green Series Apple**

17 2. Lead (hereinafter, the “LISTED CHEMICAL”) is a chemical known to the State of
18 California to cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

19 3. Consumption of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS causes exposures to the LISTED
20 CHEMICAL at levels requiring a “clear and reasonable warning” under Proposition 65.
21 DEFENDANTS exposed consumers to the LISTED CHEMICAL and have failed to provide the
22 health hazard warnings required by Proposition 65.

23 4. DEFENDANTS’ continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing
24 and/or sales of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS without the required health hazard warnings, causes,
25 or threatens to cause, individuals to be involuntarily, unknowingly and unwittingly exposed to
26 levels of the LISTED CHEMICAL that violate Proposition 65.

27 **PARTIES**

28 5. PLAINTIFF is a non-profit corporation organized under California law. ERC is

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

3 6. ERC is a person within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11 and brings this
4 enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(d). H&S Code §
5 25249.7(d) specifies that actions to enforce Proposition 65 may be brought by a person in the
6 public interest, provided certain notice requirements are met and no other public prosecutor is
7 diligently prosecuting an action for the same violation(s).

8 7. SCITEC USA INC., individually and doing business as SCITEC NUTRITION, is
9 now, and was at all times relevant herein, a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware
10 and is a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11.

11 8. DEFENDANTS own, administer, direct, control and/or operate facilities and/or
12 agents, distributors, sellers, marketers or other retail operations who place their SUBJECT
13 PRODUCTS into the stream of commerce in California (including but not limited to Alameda
14 County) under the brand name SCITEC NUTRITION and other brand names, which contain the
15 LISTED CHEMICAL without first giving clear and reasonable warnings.

16 9. DEFENDANTS, separately and each of them, are or were, at all times relevant to the
17 claims in this Complaint and continuing through the present, legally responsible for compliance
18 with the provisions of Proposition 65. Whenever an allegation regarding any act or omission of a
19 DEFENDANT is made herein, such allegation shall be deemed to mean that DEFENDANT, or
20 its agent, officer, director, manager, supervisor, or employee did, or so authorized, or failed to do,
21 such acts while engaged in the affairs of DEFENDANT's business operations and/or while acting
22 within the course and scope of their employment or while conducting business for
23 DEFENDANT(S) for a commercial purpose.

24 10. In this Complaint, when reference is made to any act or omission of a DEFENDANT,
25 such allegation shall mean that the owners, officers, directors, agents, employees, contractors, or
26 representatives of DEFENDANT acted or authorized such actions, and/or negligently failed and
27 omitted to act or adequately and properly supervise, control or direct its employees and agents
28 while engaged in the management, direction, operation or control of the affairs of the business

1 organization. Whenever reference is made to any act or omission of any DEFENDANT, such
2 allegation shall be deemed to mean the act or omission of each DEFENDANT acting
3 individually, jointly, and severally as defined by Civil Code Section 1430 *et seq.*

4 11. PLAINTIFF does not know the true names, capacities and liabilities of
5 DEFENDANTS DOES Nos. 1-25, inclusive, and therefore sues them under fictitious names.
6 PLAINTIFF will amend this Complaint to allege the true name and capacities of the DOE
7 Defendants upon being ascertained. Each of these Defendants was in some way legally
8 responsible for the acts, omissions, and/or violations alleged herein.

9 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10 12. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article
11 VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction in all causes except those
12 given by statute to other trial courts.” The statute under which this action is brought does not
13 specify any other court with jurisdiction.

14 13. This Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANTS because they are business entities
15 that do sufficient business, have sufficient minimum contacts in California or otherwise
16 intentionally avail themselves of the California market, through the sale, marketing and use of
17 their SUBJECT PRODUCTS in California, to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by
18 the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

19 14. Venue in this action is proper in the Alameda County Superior Court because the
20 cause, or part thereof, arises in the County of Alameda since DEFENDANTS’ products are
21 marketed, offered for sale, sold, used, and/or consumed in this county.

22 **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

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

26 16. To effectuate this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a
27 “clear and reasonable warning” before being exposed to chemicals listed by the State of
28 California as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. H&S Code §25249.6 states, in pertinent

1 part:

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

6 17. An exposure to a chemical in a consumer product is one “that results from a person’s
7 acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or any reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer
8 good, including consumption of food.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 27, § 25600.1, subd. (e).)

9 18. Proposition 65 provides that any “person who violates or threatens to violate” the
10 statute may be enjoined in a court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code §25249.7). The phrase
11 “threaten to violate” is defined to mean creating “a condition in which there is a substantial
12 probability that a violation will occur” (H&S Code §25249.11(e)). Violators are liable for civil
13 penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of the Act. (H&S Code §25249.7.)

14 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

15 19. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical
16 known to cause reproductive toxicity. Lead became subject to the warning requirement one year
17 later and was therefore subject to the “clear and reasonable” warning requirements of Proposition
18 65 beginning on February 27, 1988. (27 California Code of Regulations (“CCR”) §25600, *et*
19 *seq.*; H&S Code §25249.5, *et seq.*).

20 20. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds
21 as chemicals known to cause cancer. Lead and lead compounds became subject to the warning
22 requirement one year later and were therefore subject to the “clear and reasonable” warning
23 requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on October 1, 1993. (27 CCR § 25600, *et seq.*; H&S
24 Code §25249.6, *et seq.*). Due to the high toxicity of lead, the maximum allowable dose level for
25 lead is 0.5 µg/day (micrograms a day) for reproductive toxicity and the no significant risk level
26 for carcinogens is 15µg/day (oral).

27 21. To test DEFENDANTS’ SUBJECT PRODUCTS for lead, PLAINTIFF hired a well-
28 respected and accredited testing laboratory. The results of testing undertaken by PLAINTIFF of

1 DEFENDANTS' SUBJECT PRODUCTS show that the SUBJECT PRODUCTS tested were in
2 violation of the 0.5 µg/day "safe harbor" daily dose limits set forth for lead in Proposition 65's
3 regulations. Very significant is the fact that people are being exposed to lead through ingestion
4 as opposed to other not as harmful methods of exposure such as dermal exposure. Ingestion of
5 lead produces much higher exposure levels and health risks than dermal exposure to this
6 chemical.

7 22. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANTS, therefore, have knowingly and
8 intentionally exposed the consumers of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS to the LISTED CHEMICAL
9 without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.

10 23. The SUBJECT PRODUCTS have allegedly been sold by DEFENDANTS for use
11 in California since at least July 2, 2015. The SUBJECT PRODUCTS continue to be distributed
12 and sold in California without the requisite warning information.

13 24. As a proximate result of acts by DEFENDANTS, as persons in the course of doing
14 business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11, individuals throughout the
15 State of California, including in the County of Alameda have been exposed to the LISTED
16 CHEMICAL without a clear and reasonable warning on the SUBJECT PRODUCTS. The
17 individuals subject to the violative exposures include normal and foreseeable users of the
18 SUBJECT PRODUCTS, as well as all other persons exposed to the SUBJECT PRODUCTS.

19 25. On July 2, 2018, ERC served SCITEC NUTRITION and each of the appropriate
20 public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "Notice of Violations of California Health
21 & Safety Code Section 25249.5" that provided SCITEC NUTRITION and the public
22 enforcement agencies with notice that SCITEC NUTRITION was in violation of Proposition 65
23 for failing to warn purchasers and individuals using the SUBJECT PRODUCTS that the
24 consumption of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS exposes them to lead, a chemical known to the State
25 of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity ("Prop. 65 Notice"). A true and correct
26 copy of the 60-Day Notice ("NOTICE") is attached hereto as Exhibit A and is hereby
27 incorporated by reference, and is available on the Attorney General's website located at
28 <http://oag.ca.gov/prop65>.

1 chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first
2 giving clear and reasonable warnings to such persons who consume the SUBJECT PRODUCTS
3 containing the LISTED CHEMICAL, pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).

4 32. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANTS are 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 SUBJECT PRODUCTS, in an amount in excess of \$1
7 million.

8
9 **THE NEED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

10 **(Injunctive Relief for Violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* concerning
11 the SUBJECT PRODUCTS described in the July 2, 2018 Prop. 65 Notice of Violation)
12 Against DEFENDANTS**

13 33. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1 through 34,
14 as if set forth below.

15 34. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANTS at all times relevant
16 to this action, and continuing through the present, have violated, or threaten to violate, H&S Code
17 §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals
18 in California to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer or reproductive
19 toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warnings to such persons who consume the
20 SUBJECT PRODUCTS containing the LISTED CHEMICAL, pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6
21 and 25249.11(f).

22 35. By the above-described acts, DEFENDANTS have violated, or threaten to violate,
23 H&S Code § 25249.6 and are therefore subject to preliminary and permanent injunctions ordering
24 DEFENDANTS to stop violating Proposition 65, to provide warnings to all present and future
25 customers, and to provide warnings to DEFENDANTS' past customers who purchased or used
26 the SUBJECT PRODUCTS without receiving a clear and reasonable warning.

27 36. A remedy of injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by H&S
28 Code §25249.7(a).

37. Continuing commission by DEFENDANTS of the acts alleged above will irreparably

1 harm the citizens of the State of California, for which harm they have no plain, speedy, or
2 adequate remedy at law.

3 38. In the absence of preliminary and then permanent injunctive relief, DEFENDANTS
4 will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury by continuing to cause consumers
5 to be involuntarily, unknowingly and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL through
6 the consumption of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS.

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays for the following relief:

9 A. A preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b),
10 enjoining DEFENDANTS, their agents, employees, assigns and all persons acting in concert or
11 participating with DEFENDANTS, from manufacturing, distributing, marketing or selling the
12 SUBJECT PRODUCTS in California without first providing a clear and reasonable warning,
13 within the meaning of Proposition 65, that the consumers of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS are
14 exposed to the LISTED CHEMICAL;

15 B. An injunctive order, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), compelling
16 DEFENDANTS to identify and locate each individual who has purchased the SUBJECT
17 PRODUCTS since July 2, 2015, and to provide a warning to such person that the consumption
18 of the SUBJECT PRODUCTS will expose the consumer to a chemical known to cause cancer,
19 birth defects, and other reproductive harm;

20 C. An assessment of civil penalties pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(b), against
21 DEFENDANTS in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65, in an
22 amount in excess of \$1 million, according to proof;

23 D. An award to PLAINTIFF of its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit
24 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 1032 *et. seq* and 1021.5, as PLAINTIFF shall
25 specify in further applications to the Court; and,

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 E. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

2
3 DATED: November 15, 2018

AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP

4
5
6 

7
8 _____
9 Matthew C. Maclear
10 Anthony M. Barnes
11 Attorneys for Plaintiff
12 Environmental Research Center, Inc.

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



Matthew Maclear
mcm@atalawgroup.com
415-568-5200

Anthony Barnes
amb@atalawgroup.com
415-326-3173

July 2, 2018

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

Dear Alleged Violators 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 Violators 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 Violators 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 Violators identified below.

Alleged Violators. The names of the companies covered by this notice that violated Proposition 65 (hereinafter the "Violators") are:

**Scitec USA Inc., individually and doing business as Scitec Nutrition
Ascendis Health Limited, individually and doing business as Scitec Nutrition
Scitec Nutrition UK Limited, individually and doing business as Scitec Nutrition**



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
July 2, 2018
Page 2

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

1. **Scitec Nutrition Big Bang 3.0 Mango - Lead**
2. **Scitec Nutrition Protein Delite Milk Chocolate - Lead**
3. **Scitec Nutrition Jumbo Hardcore Brownie Praline - Lead**
4. **Scitec Nutrition Jumbo Hardcore Banana-Yogurt - Lead**
5. **Scitec Nutrition 100% Plant Protein Green Series Chocolate Praline - Lead**
6. **Scitec Nutrition Revex-16 - Lead**
7. **Scitec Nutrition Protein Pudding Gourmet Dessert With Casein and Whey Double Chocolate - Lead**
8. **Scitec Nutrition Protein Pudding Gourmet Dessert With Casein and Whey Vanilla Cream - Lead**
9. **Scitec Nutrition Greens & Fruit Superfood Green Series Apple - 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.

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 this chemical has been and continues to be through ingestion.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least July 2, 2015, 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 this known toxic chemical is 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 chemical. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to this chemical.

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 Violators to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical, 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



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
July 2, 2018
Page 3

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 chemical, 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matthew Maclear". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "M".

Matthew Maclear
AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Scitec USA Inc., individually and doing business as Scitec Nutrition; Ascendis Health Limited, individually and doing business as Scitec Nutrition; Scitec Nutrition UK Limited, individually and doing business as Scitec Nutrition and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

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



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
July 2, 2018
Page 4

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.’s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Scitec USA Inc., individually and doing business as Scitec Nutrition; Ascendis Health Limited, individually and doing business as Scitec Nutrition; and Scitec Nutrition UK Limited, individually and doing business as Scitec Nutrition

I, Matthew Maclear, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the parties 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 Violators 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matthew Maclear". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Dated: July 2, 2018

Matthew Maclear



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
July 2, 2018
Page 5

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 July 2, 2018, 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
Scitec USA Inc., individually and doing
business as Scitec Nutrition
17470 N Pacesetter Way
Scottsdale, AZ 85255

Universal Registered Agents, Inc. (C3775216)
(Registered Agent for Scitec USA Inc., individually
and doing business as Scitec Nutrition)
560 Haight Street, #104
San Francisco, CA 94117

Current President or CEO
Scitec USA Inc., individually and doing
business as Scitec Nutrition
372 Hazelwood Logistics Center Drive
Hazelwood, MO 63042

CT Corporation System
(Registered Agent for Scitec USA Inc., individually
and doing business as Scitec Nutrition)
3800 N Central Avenue, Suite 460
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Universal Registered Agents, Inc.
(Registered Agent for Scitec USA Inc., individually
and doing business as Scitec Nutrition)
12 Timber Creek Lane
Newark, DE 19711

The Corporation Trust Company
(Registered Agent for Scitec USA Inc., individually
and doing business as Scitec Nutrition)
1209 N Orange Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

Current Director or CEO
Scitec Nutrition UK Limited, individually and
doing business as Scitec Nutrition
6 St. Andrew Street
London
EC4A 3AE
United Kingdom

Current President or CEO
Ascendis Health Limited, individually and doing
Business as Scitec Nutrition
31 Georgia Crescent East
Postnet Suite #252, Private Bag X21
Bryanston
Johannesburg, GT 2191
South Africa



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
July 2, 2018
Page 6

On July 2, 2018, 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 July 2, 2018, 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:

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

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

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

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

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

Kathryn L. Turner, Chief Deputy City Attorney
San Diego City Attorney
1200 Third Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
CityAttyCrimProp65@sandiego.gov

Allison Haley, District Attorney
Napa County
1127 First Street, Suite C
Napa, CA 94559
CEPD@countyofnapa.org

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



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

July 2, 2018

Page 7

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

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

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

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

Christopher Dalbey, Deputy District Attorney
Santa Barbara County
1112 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

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

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

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

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

On July 2, 2018, 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 July 2, 2018, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.


Phyllis Dunwoody



Notice of Violation of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 *et seq.*
 July 2, 2018
 Page 8

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 4th 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
 303 West Third Street
 San Bernardino, CA 92415

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, Shasta County
 1355 West Street
 Redding, CA 96001

District Attorney, Sierra County
 100 Courthouse Square, 2nd Floor
 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 2nd 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 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 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html>.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

¹ 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.

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 contaminant² 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

² 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.

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.