Electronically Filed Superior Court of CA County of Contra Costa 10/26/2026 9:30 PM By: C. Padilla, Deputy

EMILY CULBERTSON (SBN 282560)
AKEMPIS P.C.
730 Arizona Avenue, 2nd Floor
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Tel: (424) 433-4760
Email: emilyculbertson@akempis.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Public Protection Alliance LLC

Per local Rule, This case is assigned to Judge Hiramoto, Joni T., for all purposes.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

PUBLIC PROTECTION ALLIANCE LLC, a California limited liability company, Plaintiff, vs. DAANA NATURAL PRODUCTS AND SERVICES INC, a Delaware corporation, and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No.: C26-03642 **COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES** (Cal. Health & Safety Code section 25249.5 *et seq.*) UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE

SUMMONS ISSUED

Processed by Court on 10/29/2026 11:25 AM

Plaintiff Public Protection Alliance LLC hereby alleges:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff Public Protection Alliance LLC ("Plaintiff" or "PPA") brings this action as a private attorney general enforcer and in the public interest of the citizens of the State of California. Under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 ("Proposition 65"), "[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 . . ."

2. Defendants Daana Natural Products and Services Inc ("Daana") and Does 1 through 100 ("Doe Defendants," collectively with Daana, the "Defendants") exposed and continue to expose individuals to aflatoxins, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer, by manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing peanut oil, including Daana Peanut Oil: Certified USDA Organic, Extra Virgin, Cold Pressed (the "Product"), a peanut oil product containing aflatoxins. Daana knows and intends that consumers will ingest the Product.

3. Defendants failed to provide clear and reasonable warnings to consumers and other individuals in California about exposures to aflatoxins in connection with the manufacture, import, sale, or distribution of the Product.

4. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief compelling Defendants to sufficiently warn consumers in California before exposing them to aflatoxins in the Product. (Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.7, subdivision (a).) Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties against Defendants for violations of Proposition 65 along with attorneys' fees and costs. (Health & Saf. Code, § 25249.7, subd. (b).)

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff PPA is a California limited liability company acting in the interest of the general public seeking to further, among other causes, the protection of the environment, toxin reduction, the promotion and improvement of human health, the improvement of consumer rights, and corporate accountability. It brings this action in the public interest pursuant to Health and

Safety Code section 25249.7.

6. Daana is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware, with a business address of 6185 168th Place SE, Bellevue, Washington 98006. Daana sells the Product to consumers through the Amazon.com marketplace under the seller name "Daana Farmers Network." Daana manufactures, imports, sells, and/or distributes the Product in California, including in Contra Costa County.

7. Does 1 through 100 are named herein under fictitious names as their true names and capacities are unknown to PPA. PPA is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each Doe is responsible, in some actionable manner, for the events and happenings hereinafter referred to, either through said Doe's conduct, or through the conduct of its agents, servants or employees, or in some other manner, causing the harms alleged by PPA in this Complaint. When said true names and capacities of Does are ascertained, PPA will seek leave to amend this Complaint to set forth the same.

8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all relevant times, each of the Defendants was—and remains—a person in the course of doing business within the meaning of Health and Safety Code section 25249.11 and is subject to Proposition 65.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts. The Health and Safety Code statute upon which this action is based does not give jurisdiction to any other court. (Health & Saf. Code § 25249.7.)

10. This Court is the proper venue for the action because the causes of action have arisen in the County of Contra Costa where some of the violations of law have occurred and continue to occur. Furthermore, venue is proper in this Court under California Code of Civil Procedure sections 393, 395, and 395.5.

11. Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in the State of California or otherwise purposefully avail themselves of the California market. Exercising jurisdiction over Defendants would be consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

12. On or around April 13, 2026, Plaintiff served 60-Day Notice of Violation California Attorney General No. 2026-01656 ("Notice") on Daana, the California Attorney General, the Contra Costa County District Attorney's Office, other public enforcers, and others, along with a certificate of merit, signed by counsel, and certificate of service. Plaintiff served the confidential factual basis supporting the certificate of merit on the California Attorney General. The Notice served on Daana also included a copy of "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary." The Notice alleged that Daana violated Proposition 65 by failing to sufficiently warn individuals in California of the exposures to aflatoxins in the Product. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the Notice and associated documents. More than sixty days have passed since PPA served the Notice and no public enforcement agency has commenced and is diligently prosecuting an action against the violation in the Notice.

STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND

13. The warning requirement of Proposition 65 is contained in California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6, which provides:

> No 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 . . .

14. The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA"), a department of CalEPA, is the lead agency in charge of the implementation of Proposition 65. OEHHA administers the Proposition 65 program and promulgates regulations that govern Proposition 65 in general, including warnings to comply with the statute. The regulations define "expose" as "to cause to ingest, inhale, contact via body surfaces or otherwise come into contact with a listed chemical. An individual may come into contact with a listed chemical through water, air, food, consumer products and any other environmental exposure as well as occupational exposures." (Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25102, subdivision (i).)

15. In this case, the exposures are caused by consumer products. A consumer product is defined as "any article, or component part thereof, including food, that is produced, distributed, or sold for the personal use, consumption or enjoyment of a consumer." (27 Cal. Code Regs., §

25600.1, subd. (d).) A consumer product exposure is "an exposure that results from a person's acquisition, purchase, storage, consumption, or any reasonably foreseeable use of a consumer product, including consumption of a food." (27 Cal. Code Regs., § 25600.1, subd. (e).)

16. To qualify as a clear and reasonable warning under the regulatory safe harbor, consumer product warnings "must be prominently displayed on a label, labeling, or sign, and must be displayed with such conspicuousness as compared with other words, statements, designs or devices on the label, labeling, or sign, as to render the warning likely to be seen, read, and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use." (27 Cal. Code Regs., § 25601, subd. (c).) The safe harbor requires that consumer product warnings be provided at each point of display of the product, via an electronic device or process prior to purchase, or on the product warning label. (27 Cal. Code Regs., § 25602, subd. (a).) For online purchases of consumer products, the warning must also appear on the product page, through a "WARNING" hyperlink on the display page, or before checkout is completed. (27 Cal. Code Regs., § 25602, subd. (b).)

17. Aflatoxin was listed as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer on January 1, 1988. Aflatoxins are mycotoxins produced by molds including *Aspergillus flavus* and *Aspergillus parasiticus*, and are commonly found in foodstuffs including maize, peanuts, cottonseed, and tree nuts. (See OEHHA, Aflatoxins, Chemical Listing Details, available at https://oehha.ca.gov/chemicals/aflatoxins.)

18. OEHHA has established specific safe harbor levels for many chemicals listed under Proposition 65. For carcinogens, the safe harbor level is the "No Significant Risk Level," or "NSRL." The State of California has not established an NSRL for aflatoxins. Accordingly, no safe harbor has been adopted and Defendants bear the burden of proving that any exposure to aflatoxins from the Product poses no significant risk. (Health & Saf. Code, § 25249.10, subd. (c).)

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

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

20. Proposition 65 may be enforced by any person in the public interest who provides notice sixty days before filing suit to both the violator and designated law enforcement officials. A private enforcer may bring suit more than sixty days after notice if no public prosecutor has commenced and is diligently prosecuting an action against the violation. (Health & Saf. Code § 25249.7, subd. (d).)

STATEMENT OF FACTS

21. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed the Product containing aflatoxins without giving a clear and reasonable warning in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. These violations occurred from at least October 31, 2025, and continue to occur.

22. Daana distributed the Product on Amazon.com and elsewhere, at times selling the Product under the seller name "Daana Farmers Network." Daana accepts orders from and ships the Product to California addresses.

23. Laboratory testing of the Product detected aflatoxins.

24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Daana did not provide any Proposition 65 warning for aflatoxins in connection with the Product prior to receiving the Notice, and that during the period of the violations alleged herein Daana sold the Product to consumers in California, including in Contra Costa County, without a clear and reasonable warning. Defendants continue to expose California consumers to aflatoxins in the Product without a clear and reasonable warning.

25. Defendants knew or, through reasonable diligence, should have known, that consumption of the Product caused exposure to aflatoxins.

CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(VIOLATION OF PROPOSITION 65 – AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

26. PPA incorporates by reference each and every allegation contained above.

27. Proposition 65 mandates that citizens be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, and other reproductive harm.

28. Defendants manufactured, imported, sold, and/or distributed the Product, which contains aflatoxins, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. These violations have occurred since at least October 31, 2025.

29. In manufacturing, importing, selling, and/or distributing the Product, Defendants failed to provide a clear and reasonable warning to consumers and individuals in California who are exposed to aflatoxins through the reasonably foreseeable use of the Product.

30. The Product exposes individuals to aflatoxins through ingestion. The Product consists of peanut oil sold for cooking and consumption, and this exposure is a natural and foreseeable consequence of Defendants placing the Product into the stream of commerce. Defendants intend that consumers will ingest the Product, exposing them to aflatoxins.

31. Defendants knew or should have known that the Product contained aflatoxins and exposed individuals to aflatoxins in the manner described above. Aflatoxin contamination of peanuts and peanut products is widely known in the food industry and is the subject of a long-standing U.S. Food and Drug Administration action level. The Notice further informed Defendants of the presence of aflatoxins in the Product.

32. Defendants' actions in this regard were deliberate and not accidental.

33. Defendants are liable for civil penalties up to $2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65 pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b). Injunctive relief is also appropriate pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(a).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE Plaintiff prays for relief against Defendants as follows:

1. Civil penalties in the amount of $2,500 per day for each violation according to proof;
2. An injunction against Defendants from selling, offering for sale, distributing and/or otherwise placing the Product into California without either reducing the aflatoxin levels in the Product such that no Proposition 65 warnings are required or providing clear and reasonable warnings;

3. Reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 or any other applicable theory; and

4. For such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted:

DATED: October 26, 2026

EMILY CULBERTSON
AKEMPIS P.C.
Attorney for Public Protection Alliance LLC

Exhibit A

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act

AFLATOXINS IN PEANUT OIL

04/13/2026

This Notice of Violation ("Notice") is provided to you pursuant to and in compliance with California Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d).

- For general information regarding the California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act ("Proposition 65"), see the attached summary provided by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (copies of summary not provided to public enforcement agencies).
- This Notice is provided by Public Protection Alliance LLC, 2450 Colorado Ave, Suite 100E, Santa Monica CA 90404. Public Protection Alliance is a California company acting in the interest of the general public seeking to further, among other causes, the protection of the environment, toxin reduction, the promotion and improvement of human health, the improvement of consumer rights, and corporate accountability. Public Protection Alliance designates its counsel, Emily Culbertson, as the responsible individual with regard to this Notice.

Description of Violation:

- Violators: The names and addresses of the violators are identified in the table below.
- Time Period of Exposure: The violations have been occurring since at least 10/31/2025 and are continuing to this day.
- Provision of Proposition 65: This Notice covers the warning provision of Proposition 65, which is found at California Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6.
- Chemical(s) Involved: The name of the listed chemical involved in these violations is aflatoxins.
- Type of Product: The specific type of product causing these violations is peanut oil. Non-exclusive examples of this specific type of product are listed in the table below.
- Description of Exposure: Ordinary use of the products identified in this Notice results in human exposures to aflatoxins because aflatoxins are found in the peanut oil. The route of exposure for the violation is ingestion. These exposures occur in

homes, workplaces, and everywhere else throughout California where consumers may be exposed to the peanut oil.

- No clear and reasonable Proposition 65 warning is provided with these products regarding the presence of aflatoxins in the products.

Violators and Products Subject to this Notice

Names and Addresses of Violators	Non-Exclusive Examples of the Products	UPC or Further Description of the Non-Exclusive Exemplar
Daana Natural Products and Services Inc 6185 168th Pl. SE Bellevue, WA 98006	Daana Peanut Oil: Certified USDA organic, extra virgin, cold pressed, 12 oz	ASIN B07V1P97H3
Amazon.com Services LLC 410 Terry Avenue North Seattle, WA 98109	Daana Peanut Oil: Certified USDA organic, extra virgin, cold pressed, 12 oz	ASIN B07V1P97H3

Resolution of Noticed Claims:

- Public Protection Alliance intends to file a citizen enforcement lawsuit against the alleged violators unless such violators agree in a binding written instrument to: (1) recall all products already sold; (2) provide clear and reasonable warnings for products sold or otherwise provided to consumers in the future or reformulate such products to eliminate the aflatoxins exposures; and (3) pay an appropriate civil penalty based on the factors enumerated in California Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

- Alleged violators should contact Public Protection Alliance through its counsel identified below to discuss resolution of this matter. It should be noted that Public Protection Alliance cannot (1) finalize any settlement until after the 60-day notice period has expired; nor (2) speak for the Attorney General or any District or City Attorney who received Public Protection Alliance's 60-day Notice. Therefore, while reaching an agreement with Public Protection Alliance will resolve its claims, such agreement may not satisfy the public prosecutors.

Preservation of Relevant Evidence:

- This notice also serves as a demand that the alleged Violators preserve and maintain all relevant evidence, including all electronic documents and data, pending resolution of this matter. Such relevant evidence includes but is not limited to all documents related to the presence or potential presence of aflatoxins in the peanut


oil; purchase and sales information for such products; efforts to comply with Proposition 65 with respect to such products; advertising and marketing material related to such products; testing reports related to such products; communications with any person relating to the presence or potential presence of aflatoxins in such products; any representative exemplars of any such products sold to customers or consumers by the alleged violator in the year preceding this Notice through the date of any trial of the claims alleged in this Notice.

Request for Names and Contact Information

- The retailer is hereby requested to promptly provide the names and contact information for the manufacturers, producers, packagers, importers, suppliers, and/or distributors of the products identified in this Notice per Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, §25600.2(g).

Please direct any inquiries regarding this Notice to Public Protection Alliance's counsel, Emily Culbertson, at Akempis PC, 730 Arizona Ave, Floor 2, Santa Monica CA 90401, (424) 433-4760, emilyculbertson@akempis.com.

AKEMPIS P.C.



Emily Culbertson
Attorney for Public Protection Alliance LLC

Enclosures:

Certificate of Merit
Certificate of Service
Appendix A ("The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary") (sent only to the Violators)
Factual information sufficient to establish the basis of the Certificate of Merit (sent only to Attorney General)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT
Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(d)

I, Emily Culbertson, hereby declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached sixty-day notice in which it is alleged the parties identified in the notice have violated Health and Safety Code section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.


2. I am an attorney with Akempis P.C., and I represent the noticing party, Public Protection Alliance, LLC.

3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who has reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the action.

4. Based on the information obtained through those consultations, and on all 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 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. The copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General attaches to it factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in Health and Safety Code section 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.

04/13/2026



Emily Culbertson
Attorney for Public Protection Alliance LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Emily Culbertson, hereby declare:

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to this action. My business address is 730 Arizona Ave, 2nd Floor, Santa Monica CA 90401 and my email address is emilyculbertson@akempis.com.

On 04/13/2026, I served the following documents on all interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof in the manner and at the addresses indicated below:

☒ **BY CERTIFIED MAIL**: I am readily familiar with the practice for collection and processing for correspondence for certified mailing by LetterStream, a printing and mailing company that sends certified mail via the U.S. Postal Service. I transmitted a PDF version of the documents noted below to LetterStream on 04/13/2026 for printing and mailing in the ordinary course of business to the names and addresses on the attached service lists. The printed correspondence will be deposited by LetterStream in the mail with the U.S. Postal Service.

Please see attached service list for recipients sent by Certified Mail.

Contents mailed: NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENVIRONMENT ACT; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENVIRONMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

☒ **BY MAIL:** I am readily familiar with the practice for collection and processing for correspondence for mailing by LetterStream, a printing and mailing company that sends certified mail via the U.S. Postal Service. I transmitted a PDF version of the documents noted below to LetterStream on 04/13/2026 for printing and mailing in the ordinary course of business to the names and addresses on the attached service lists. The printed correspondence will be deposited by LetterStream in the mail with the U.S. Postal Service.

Please see attached service list for recipients sent by Mail.

Contents mailed: NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENVIRONMENT ACT; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT.

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC MAIL**: I transmitted a PDF version of the documents noted below via email to the email address(es) indicated on the attached service list before 5 p.m. on the date executed.

Please see attached service list for recipients sent by Electronic Mail


Contents emailed: NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENVIRONMENT ACT; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT.

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC UPLOAD:** I transmitted a PDF version of the documents noted below to the Office of Attorney General of California via the Proposition 65 File a 60-Day Notice website at https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice at before 5 p.m. on the date executed.

Contents uploaded: NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENVIRONMENT ACT; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; CONFIDENTIAL SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT.

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

Executed on 04/13/2026 at Los Angeles, California.



Emily Culbertson

SERVICE LIST BY CERTIFIED MAIL:

Daana Natural Products and Services Inc
6185 168th Pl. SE
Bellevue, WA 98006

Daana Natural Products and Services Inc
c/o Registered Agent
National Registered Agents, Inc.
1209 Orange Street, Wilmington DE 19801

Amazon.com Services LLC
410 Terry Avenue North
Seattle, WA 98109

Amazon.com Services LLC
c/o Registered Agent
CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive
Sacramento, CA 95833

SERVICE LIST BY MAIL:

Amador County DA
708 Court Street, #202
Jackson, CA 95642

Butte County DA
25 County Center Drive, Suite 245
Oroville, CA 95965

Colusa County, DA
310 6th Street
Colusa, CA 95932

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

Glenn County DA
P.O. Box 430
Willows, CA 95988

Humboldt County DA
825 5th Street, 4th Floor Eureka, CA 95501

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

Kern County DA
1215 Truxtun Ave.
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Kings County DA
1400 West Lacey Blvd.
Hanford, CA 93230

Lake County DA
255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

City of LA, City Atty
200 N. Main Street #800
Los Angeles, CA 90012

LA County DA
211 W. Temple St, Ste. 1200
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Madera County DA
300 South G Street, Suite 300
Madera, CA 93637

Mendocino County DA
P.O. Box 1000
Ukiah, CA 95482

Modoc County DA
204 S. Court Street, Room 202
Alturas, CA 96101

Mono County DA
P.O. Box 2053
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

San Benito County DA
419 4th Street
Hollister, CA 95023

San Bernardino County DA
303 W. Third Street
San Bernardino, CA 92415

San Mateo County DA
400 County Center, Third Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Shasta County DA
1355 West Street
Redding, CA 96001

Sierra County DA
100 Courthouse Square
Downieville, CA 95936

Siskiyou County DA
P.O. Box 986
Yreka, CA 96097

Solano County DA
675 Texas Street, Suite 4500
Fairfield, CA 94533

Stanislaus County DA
832 12th Street, Suite 300
Modesto, CA 95354

Sutter County DA
463 2nd Street, Suite 102
Yuba City, CA 95991

Tehama County DA
P.O. Box 519
Red Bluff, CA 96080

Trinity County DA
P.O. Box 310
Weaverville, CA 96093

Tuolumne County DA
423 N. Washington Street
Sonora, CA 95370

Yuba County DA
215 5th. Street, Suite 152
Marysville, CA 95901

SERVICE LIST BY ELECTRONIC MAIL:

Alameda County
Ursula Jones Dickson, DA 7677 Oakport St., Ste 650
Oakland, CA 94621
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Alpine County
Robert K. Priscaro DA
P.O.Box 248
Markleville, CA 96120
prop65enf@alpinecountyca.gov

Calaveras County
Barbara Yook DA
891 Mountain Ranch Rd.
San Andreas, CA 95249
Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us

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

El Dorado County
James Clinchard, ADA
778 Pacific Street
Placerville, CA 95667
EDCDAPROP65@edcda.us

Fresno County
Lisa A. Smittcamp, DA
2100 Tulare Street
Fresno, CA 93721
consumerprotection@fresnocountyca.gov]

Inyo County
Thomas L. Hardy, DA
168 North Edwards Street
Independence, CA 93526
inyoda@inyocounty.us

Lassen County
Devin Chandler, Prog. Coord.
2950 Riverside Dr
Susanville, CA 96130
dchandler@co.lassen.ca.us

Marin County
Lori E. Frugoli, DA
3501 Civic Center Dr, Rm 145
San Rafael, CA 94903
consumer@marincounty.g ov

Mariposa County
Walter W. Wall, DA
P.O. Box 730
Mariposa, CA 95338
mcda@mariposacounty.org

Merced County
Kimberly Lewis, DA
550 West Main Street
Merced, CA 95340
Prop65@countyofmerced.com

Monterrey County
Jeannine M. Pacioni, DA
1200 Aguajito Road
Monterey , CA 93940
Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us

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

Nevada County
Clifford H. Newell, DA
201 Commercial Street
Nevada City, CA 95959
DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us

Orange County
Todd Spitzer, DA
300 N. Flower Street
Santa Ana, CA 92703
Prop65Notice@ocdapa.or g

Placer County
Morgan Briggs Gire, DA
10810 Justice Center Drive
Roseville, CA 95678
prop65@placer.ca.gov

Plumas County
David Hollister, DA
520 Main St.
Quincy, CA 95971
davidhollister@countyofplumas.com

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

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

San Diego County
Summer Stephan, DA
330 West Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101
SanDiegoDAProp65@sdcda.org

San Diego City
Mark Ankcorn, Dep City Atty
1200 Third Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov

San Francisco County
Brooke Jenkins, DA
350 Rhode Island Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
Prop65@sfgov.org

San Francisco City
Henry Lifton, Dep City Atty
1390 Market St, 7th Fl.
San Francisco, CA 94102
Prop65@sfcityatty.org

San Joaquin County
Tori Verber Salazar, DA
222 E. Weber Ave., Rm 202
Stockton, CA 95202
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org

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

Santa Barbara County
Christopher Dalbey, Deputy DA
1112 Santa Barbara St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
DAProp65@co.santabarbara.ca.us

Santa Clara County
Bud Porter, Supervising Deputy DA
70 W Hedding St.
San Jose, CA 95110
EPU@da.sccgov.org

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

Sonoma County
Carla Rodriguez, DA
600 Adminstration Dr, Rm 212J
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
ECLD@sonomacounty.org

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

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

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

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?

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

[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.

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 contaminant[2] 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 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.

---

[2] See Section 25501(a)(4).

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of 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.