

1 RICHARD M. FRANCO (CBN 170970)
2 LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO
3 6500 Estates Drive
4 Oakland, CA 94611
5 Ph: 510-684-1022
6 Email: rick@rfrancolaw.com

7 SYLVIA SHIH-YAU WU (CBN 273549)
8 CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY
9 303 Sacramento Street, 2nd Floor
10 San Francisco, CA. 94111
11 Ph: 415-826-2770
12 Email: swu@centerforfoodsafety.org

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff
14 CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY

ENDORSED
FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY
OCT - 3 2018

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT,
-By Lanette Buffin, Deputy

15 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
16 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

17 CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY, a non-profit
18 corporation,

19 Plaintiff,

20 vs.

21 BEST NEST WELLNESS, LLC, a Colorado
22 limited liability company,

23 Defendant.

Case No. *RS* 19037790

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES

Health & Safety Code §25249.5, *et seq.*

24 Plaintiff Center for Food Safety ("PLAINTIFF") brings this action in the interests of
25 the general public and, on information and belief, hereby alleges:

26 INTRODUCTION

1. This action seeks to remedy the continuing failure of Defendant BEST NEST

1 WELLNESS, LLC (“BEST NEST” or “DEFENDANT”) to warn consumers in California that
2 they are being exposed to lead, a substance known to the State of California to cause cancer,
3 birth defects, and other reproductive harm. These exposures have occurred, and continue to
4 occur through Defendant’s manufacture, distribution, and sale to California consumers of the
5 following product containing lead (the “PRODUCT”):

- 6 • **Best Nest Wellness Mama Bird AM/PM Prenatal Multi+ Tablets**

7
8 2. Under California’s Proposition 65 (Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.*),¹ it is
9 unlawful for businesses to knowingly and intentionally expose individuals to chemicals known
10 to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm without providing clear and
11 reasonable warnings to such individuals prior to exposure.

12 3. When individuals consume the PRODUCT as directed, they are exposed to lead
13 at levels requiring a clear and reasonable warning under Proposition 65. DEFENDANT has
14 failed to provide any warnings to consumers that they are being exposed to lead as required by
15 Proposition 65.

16 4. DEFENDANT’s past and continued manufacture, distribution, and/or sale of the
17 PRODUCT without a clear and reasonable warning of lead exposure causes or threatens to
18 cause individuals to be involuntarily and unknowingly exposed to lead at levels that violate or
19 threaten to violate Proposition 65.

20 5. PLAINTIFF seeks injunctive relief enjoining DEFENDANT from the continued
21 manufacture, distribution, and/or sale of the PRODUCT in California without provision of
22 clear and reasonable warnings regarding the risks of cancer, birth defects, and other
23 reproductive harm posed by exposure to lead through the ingestion of the PRODUCT.

24 PLAINTIFF seeks an injunction compelling DEFENDANT to bring its business practices into
25

26 ¹ All statutory and regulatory references herein are to California law, unless otherwise specified.

1 compliance with Proposition 65 by providing a clear and reasonable warning to each individual
2 who has been and who in the future may be exposed to lead from the ingestion of the
3 PRODUCT. PLAINTIFF also seeks an order compelling DEFENDANT to identify and locate
4 each individual person who in the past has purchased the PRODUCT, and to provide to each
5 such purchaser a clear and reasonable warning that ingestion of the PRODUCTS will cause
6 exposures to lead.

7 6. In addition to injunctive relief, PLAINTIFF seeks an assessment of civil
8 penalties up to the maximum of \$2,500 per day per exposure authorized by Proposition 65 to
9 address DEFENDANT's failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings regarding exposures
10 to lead.

11 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

12 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Health and Safety Code
13 section 25249.7, which allows enforcement of Proposition 65 in any court of competent
14 jurisdiction, and pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the
15 Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial
16 courts." The cause of action alleged herein is not given by statute to other trial courts.

17 8. This Court has jurisdiction over DEFENDANT because, based on information
18 and belief, DEFENDANT is a business having sufficient minimum contacts with California, or
19 otherwise intentionally availing itself of the California market through the manufacture,
20 distribution and/or sale of the PRODUCT in the State of California, to render the exercise of
21 jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and
22 substantial justice.

23 9. Venue in this action is proper in the Alameda Superior Court because the
24 DEFENDANT has violated or threatens to violate California law in the County of Alameda.

25 PARTIES

26 10. PLAINTIFF is a non-profit corporation working to protect human health and the

1 environment by curbing the use of harmful food production technologies and by promoting
2 organic and other forms of sustainable agriculture. PLAINTIFF Center for Food Safety is a
3 person within the meaning of H&S Code §25118 and brings this enforcement action in the
4 public interest pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(d).

5 11. DEFENDANT BEST NEST WELLNESS, LLC, is a limited liability
6 company organized under the laws of the State of Colorado and is a person doing
7 business within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11.

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

14 STATUTORY BACKGROUND

15 13. 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 14. 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
individual....

25 15. "‘Knowingly’ refers only to knowledge of the fact that a discharge of, release of,
26 or exposure to a chemical listed pursuant to Section 25249.8(a) of the Act is occurring. No

1 knowledge that the discharge, release or exposure is unlawful is required.” (27 California Code
2 of Regulations (“CCR”) § 25102(n).)

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

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

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

21 FACTUAL BACKGROUND

22 19. The PRODUCT was tested for lead by a well-respected and accredited testing
23 laboratory. The results of testing of DEFENDANT’s PRODUCT show that it is in violation of
24 the 0.5 µg/day “safe harbor” daily limit for reproductive toxicity for lead set forth in
25 Proposition 65’s regulations.

26 20. Based on the test results, on July 24, 2019, PLAINTIFF sent a 60-Day Notice of

1 Proposition 65 Violation (“Notice”) to the requisite public enforcement agencies and to
2 DEFENDANT (a true and correct copy of the 60-Day Notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**
3 and incorporated by reference). The Notice was issued pursuant to, and in compliance with,
4 the requirements of H&S Code §25249.7(d) and the statute's implementing regulations
5 regarding the notice of the violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to
6 the violators. The Notice included, *inter alia*, the following information: the name, address,
7 and telephone number of the noticing individuals; the name of the alleged violator; the statute
8 violated; the approximate time period during which violations occurred; and descriptions of the
9 violations, including the chemical involved, the route of exposure, and the specific product or
10 type of product causing the violations, and was issued as follows:

- 11 a. DEFENDANT was provided a copy of the Notice by First Class Mail.
- 12 b. DEFENDANT was provided a copy of a document entitled “The Safe
13 Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A
14 Summary,” which is also known as Appendix A to Title 27 of CCR §25903.
- 15 c. The California Attorney General was provided a copy of the Notice via
16 online submission.
- 17 d. The California Attorney General was provided with a Certificate of Merit by
18 the attorney for the noticing parties, stating that there is a reasonable and
19 meritorious case for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient
20 to establish a basis for the certificate, including the identity of the persons
21 consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts, studies, or other
22 data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(h) (2).
- 23 e. The district attorneys, city attorneys or prosecutors of each jurisdiction
24 within which the PRODUCT is offered for sale within California were
25 provided with a copy of the Notice pursuant to H&S Code § 25249.7(d)(1).

26 21. At least 60 days have elapsed since PLAINTIFF sent the Notice to

1 DEFENDANT. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and
2 diligently prosecute a cause of action under H&S Code §25249.5, *et seq.* against
3 DEFENDANT based on the allegations herein.

4 22. On information and belief, the PRODUCT has been manufactured, distributed
5 and/or sold by DEFENDANT for consumption in California without the requisite warning
6 information since at least July 24, 2016. On information and belief, the PRODUCT continues
7 to be distributed and sold in California without the requisite warning information.

8 23. At all times relevant to this action, DEFENDANT has knowingly and
9 intentionally exposed users of the PRODUCT to lead without first giving clear and reasonable
10 warning to such individuals.

11 24. As a proximate result of acts by DEFENDANT, as a person in the course of
12 doing business within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §25249.11, individuals throughout
13 the State of California, including in the County of Alameda, have been exposed to lead without
14 first receiving a clear and reasonable warning. The individuals subject to the illegal exposures
15 include normal and foreseeable consumers of the PRODUCTS.

16 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
17 **(Violation of Health and Safety Code § 25249.5, *et seq.* concerning the PRODUCT**
18 **described in the July 24, 2019 Prop. 65 Notice)**
19 **Against DEFENDANT**

20 25. PLAINTIFF re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 24,
21 inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.

22 26. Defendant is a person doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety
23 Code section 25249.11.

24 27. Lead is listed by the State of California as a chemical known to cause cancer
25 and reproductive harm.

26 28. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, DEFENDANT, at all times

1 relevant to this action, has and continues to knowingly and intentionally expose individuals
2 who ingest the PRODUCT to lead without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to
3 such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).

4 29. An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by
5 Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a).

6 30. Continuing commission by DEFENDANT of the acts alleged above will
7 irreparably harm the citizens of the State of California, for which harm they have no plain,
8 speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

9 Wherefore, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against DEFENDANT, as set forth
10 hereafter.

11
12 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

13 Wherefore, PLAINTIFF accordingly prays for the following relief:

14 A. a preliminary and permanent injunction, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(a),
15 enjoining DEFENDANT, its agents, employees, assigns, and all persons acting in concert or
16 participating with DEFENDANT, from distributing or selling the PRODUCT in California
17 without first providing a clear and reasonable warning, within the meaning of Proposition 65,
18 that the consumers of the PRODUCT are exposed to lead;

19 B. an injunction, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(a), compelling DEFENDANT to
20 identify and locate each individual who has purchased the PRODUCT since July 24, 2016, and
21 to provide a warning to such persons that ingestion of the PRODUCT will expose the
22 consumer to chemicals known to cause birth defects and other reproductive harm;

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

25 D. an award to PLAINTIFF of its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit
26 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, as PLAINTIFF shall specify in further

1 application to the Court; and,

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

3
4 DATED: October 3, 2019

LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO

5
6 

7
8 Richard M. Franco
9 Attorney for Plaintiff
10 Center for Food Safety
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

EXHIBIT A

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

LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD M. FRANCO

6500 ESTATES DRIVE
OAKLAND, CA 94611
510.684.1022
RICK@RFRANCOLAW.COM

July 24, 2019

To: President or CEO- Best Nest Wellness, LLC
California Attorney General
City Attorneys for Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco and San Jose
District Attorneys for 58 Counties (See attached Certificate of Service)

Re: Notice of Violations of California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act (Health and Safety Code Section 25249.5 *et seq.*) (Proposition 65)

Dear Addressees:

I represent Center for Food Safety 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 and Safety Code Section 22249.5 *et seq.*, also known as Proposition 65. Center for Food Safety is a national nonprofit public interest and environmental advocacy organization working to protect human health and the environment by curbing the use of harmful food production practices and by promoting organic and other forms of sustainable agriculture. This letter serves to provide notification to you and to the public enforcement agencies listed above of the violations of Proposition 65 detailed herein.

This letter constitutes notice that the entities listed below have violated and continue to violate the warning provisions of Proposition 65. Specifically, the entities listed below have violated and continue to violate the warning requirement in California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, which provides that "[n]o person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual..."

Violators: The name of the entity that violated Proposition 65 as described in this Notice is Best Nest Wellness, LLC (hereinafter referred to as the "Violator".)

Listed Chemical: The violations described herein involve exposure to the listed chemical 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.

Product Causing Violations: The following consumer product is the subject of this notice because it is causing exposures to lead in violation of Proposition 65:

- **Best Nest Wellness Mama Bird AM/PM Prenatal Multi+ tablets**

Nature of Violation: The alleged Violator knowingly and intentionally exposed and continue to expose consumers in the State of California to lead without first providing a clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning. The Violator has manufactured, marketed, distributed and/or sold the above-identified products to California consumers, which have exposed and continue to expose California consumers to the listed chemical lead without providing the required Proposition 65 warning.

Route of Exposure: Use of the product identified in this notice results in exposures to lead, primarily via ingestion of the product.

Duration of Violations: The violations have been occurring since at least July 24, 2018, and are ongoing.

A summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is enclosed with the copy of this notice sent to the Violator.

Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d), Center for Food Safety intends to file a citizen enforcement action sixty days after service of this notice unless the Violator agrees in an enforceable written instrument to (1) recall products already sold in California; (2) reformulate the products so as to eliminate further exposures to the listed chemical or provide clear and reasonable warnings for products sold in California in the future; and (3) pay an appropriate civil penalty. Center for Food Safety is interested in pursuing a reasonable and constructive resolution to this matter, in order to avoid both further unwarned consumer exposures to lead and expensive and time-consuming litigation.

George Kimbrell is Legal Director of Center for Food Safety and is located in Center for Food Safety's Pacific Northwest Office, at 2009 NE Alberta St., Ste. 207, Portland, Oregon 97211. Center for Food Safety also maintains a California office at 303 Sacramento St., 2nd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94111. Center for Food Safety has retained me in connection with this matter. Please direct all correspondence concerning this notice to my attention at the above-listed law office address and telephone number.

Notice of Violation
July 24, 2019
Page 3 of 4

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Franco', written in a cursive style.

Richard M. Franco

Attachments: Certificate of Merit
Certificate of Service
OEHHA Summary (to Violators and their Registered Agents for
Service of Process only)
Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

Re: Center for Food Safety's Notice of Proposition Violations to Best Nest Wellness, LLC

I, Richard M. Franco, declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice in which is alleged that the parties identified in the notice violated California Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
2. I am an attorney for the noticing party, Center for Food Safety.
3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have review 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 these consultants and other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for a 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, additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate has been served on the Attorney General, including the information identified in California Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(h)(2), i.e., the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier and the facts, studies or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: July 24, 2019



Richard M. Franco

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years old and am not a party to this action. My business address is 6500 Estates Drive, Oakland, CA 94611, located in Alameda County, where the mailing occurred.

On July 24, 2019, I served the following documents: **(1) NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT (HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.); (2) CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; and (3) THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY** on the following entities by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid and addressed as listed below, and depositing it with the U.S. Postal Service:

| | |
|---|--|
| Current President or CEO Best Nest Wellness, LLC 387 Corona Street, Suite 616 Denver, CO 80218 | Madhavi Gupta (Agent for Service of Process for Best Nest Wellness, LLC) 387 Corona Street, Suite 616 Denver, CO 80218 |
|---|--|

On July 24, 2019, I served the following documents: **1) NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT (HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.); (2) CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; and (3) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPORTING CERTIFICATE OF MERIT PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE § 25149.7(d)(1) and 11 CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS § 3102** 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 24, 2019, I served the following documents: **1) NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT (HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.); and (2) CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each party listed below:

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Stacey Grassini, Deputy District Attorney Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553 sgrassini@contracostada.org</p> | <p>Gregory Alker, Assistant District Attorney San Francisco County 732 Brannan Street San Francisco, CA 94103 gregory.alker@sfgov.org</p> |
| <p>Michelle Latimer, Program Coordinator Lassen County 220 S. Lassen Street Susanville, CA 96130 mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us</p> | <p>Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney San Francisco City Attorney 1390 Market Street, 7th Floor San Francisco, CA 94102 Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org</p> |
| <p>Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney Monterey County 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us</p> | <p>Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Atty Santa Clara County 70 W. Hedding Street San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org</p> |
| <p>Allison Haley, District Attorney Napa County 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org</p> | <p>Steven R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr. Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org</p> |
| <p>Paul E. Zellerbach, District Attorney Riverside County 3072 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501 Prop65@rivdoea.org</p> | <p>Phillip J. Cline, District Attorney Tulare County 221 S. Mooney Blvd. Visalia, CA 95370 Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us</p> |
| <p>Anne Marie Schubert, District Attorney Sacramento County 901 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Prop65@sacda.gov</p> | <p>Gregory D. Totten, District Attorney Ventura County 800 S. Victoria Ave Ventura, CA 93009 daspecialops@ventura.org</p> |
| <p>Chrisopher Dalbey, Deputy District Atty Santa Barbara County 1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101 DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us</p> | <p>Jeff W. Ressig, District Attorney Yolo County 301 Second Street Woodland, CA 95695 cfepd@yolocounty.org</p> |
| <p>Mark Ankcorn, Deputy City Attorney San Diego City Attorney 1200 Third Ave San Diego, CA 92101 CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov</p> | <p>Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney Alameda County 7776 Oakport Street, Suite 650 Oakland, CA 94621 CEPDProp65@acgov.org</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>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</p> | <p>Tori Verber Salazar, District Attorney San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Avenue, Room 202 Stockton, CA 95202 DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org</p> |
| <p>Barbara Yook, District Attorney Calaveras County 891 Mountain Ranch Road San Andreas, CA 95249 Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us</p> | <p>Jeffrey S. Rosell, District Attorney Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street Santa Cruz, CA 95060 Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us</p> |
| <p>Thomas L. Hardy, District Attorney Inyo County 168 North Edwards Street Independence, CA 93526 inyoda@inyocounty.us</p> | |

On July 24, 2019, I served the following documents: 1) **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT (HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION 25249.5 ET SEQ.);** (2) **CERTIFICATE OF MERIT** on each of the entities on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid and addressed as listed on the attached Service List, and depositing it with the U.S. Postal Service.

Executed on July 24, 2019 in Oakland, California.



Richard M. Franco

Service List

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

District Attorney
Amador County
708 Court Street
Jackson, CA 95642

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

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 St.
Ste 102
El Centro, CA 92243

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 St.
Lakeport, CA 95453

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

District Attorney
Madera County
209 West Yosemite Ave.
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 W. Civic Center Dr.
Santa Ana, CA 92701

District Attorney
Placer County
10810 Justice Center Dr.
Suite 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 St.
San Bernardino, CA 92415

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

District Attorney
San Mateo County
400 Country 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 St., Ste 4500
Fairfield, CA 94533

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

District Attorney
Sutter County
463 Second 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 St., Ste. 800
Los Angeles, CA 90012

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