2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28





TANYA A. GULESSERIAN (State Bar No. 198640) CHRISTINA M. CARO (State Bar No. 250797) ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO 601 Gateway Blvd., Suite 1000 South San Francisco, CA 94080-7037

Telephone: (650) 589-1660 Fax No.: (650) 589-5062

Email: tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com ccaro@adamsbroadwell.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.

PEG CAREW TOLEDO (State Bar No. 181227) PEG CAREW TOLEDO, LAW CORPORATION 3001 Douglas Blvd., Suite 340 Roseville, CA 95661-3853 Telephone: (916) 462-8950 Fax No.: (916) 791-0175

Email: peg@toledolawcorp.com

Attorneys for Defendants CYANOTECH CORPORATION and NUTREX HAWAII, INC.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER,) CASE NO. RG 15791194 INC., a California non-profit corporation,

Plaintiff,

CYANOTECH CORPORATION, NUTREX HAWAII, INC. and DOES 1-100,

Defendants.

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq.

Action Filed: October 28, 2015 Trial Date: None Set

00071299.3 PCT

ν.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 On October 28, 2015, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), a non-profit corporation, as a private enforcer, and in the public interest, initiated this action by filing a Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief and Civil Penalties (the "Complaint") pursuant to the provisions of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), against Cyanotech Corporation and Nutrex Hawaii, Inc. (collectively "Cyanotech") and DOES-100. In this action, ERC alleges that the products manufactured, distributed or sold by Cyanotech, as more fully described below, contain lead, a chemical listed under Proposition 65 as a carcinogen and reproductive toxin, and that such products expose consumers at a level requiring a Proposition 65 warning. The product is Nutrex Hawaii Inc. Green Complete Natural Vanilla Bean Flavor ("Covered Product"). ERC and Cyanotech are referred to individually as a "Party" or collectively as the "Parties."
- 1.2 ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.
- 1.3 Cyanotech is a business entity that employs ten or more persons. Cyanotech arranges the manufacture, distribution and sale of the Covered Products.
- 1.4 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC's Notice of Violation, dated June 15, 2015, that was served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Cyanotech. A true and correct copy of the Notice of Violation is attached as Exhibit A. More than 60 days have passed since the Notice of Violation was mailed and uploaded to the Attorney General's website, and no designated governmental entity has filed a complaint against Cyanotech with regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.
- Product exposes persons in California to lead without first providing clear and reasonable warnings in violation of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.6. Cyanotech denies all material allegations contained in the Notice of Violation and Complaint and specifically denies 00071299.3 PCT

that the Covered Product required a Proposition 65 warning or otherwise caused harm to any person. Cyanotech asserts that any detectible levels of lead in the Covered Products are the result of naturally occurring lead levels, as provided for in California Code of Regulations, Title 27, Section 25501(a).

- 1.6 The Parties have entered into this Consent Judgment in order to settle, compromise and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged and costly litigation. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission by any of the Parties, or by any of their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, franchisees, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers. Except for the representations made above, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be construed as an admission by Cyanotech or ERC of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law, nor shall compliance with this Consent Judgment be construed as an admission by Cyanotech or ERC of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law, at any time, for any purpose.
- 1.7 Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in any other or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.
- 1.8 The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which it is entered as a Judgment by this Court.

2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

For purposes of this Consent Judgment and any further court action that may become necessary to enforce this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Cyanotech as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in Alameda County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims up through and including the Effective Date which were or could have been asserted in this action based on the facts alleged in the Notice of Violation and the Complaint.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, REFORMULATION, TESTING AND WARNINGS

3.1 Clear and Reasonable Warnings

00071299.3 PCT

 Six months after the Effective Date of this Consent Judgment, Cyanotech shall be permanently enjoined from Distributing into California, manufacturing for sale in California, and/or directly selling to a consumer in the State of California any Covered Product for which the maximum daily dose recommended on the label contains more than 0.5 micrograms (mcg) of lead, as calculated in accordance with the formula set forth in Section 3.4 and pursuant to the testing done in accordance with Section 3.6, unless Cyanotech complies with at least one of the required warning requirements set forth in Section 3.2 and Section 3.3. The term "Distributing into California" or "Distribute into California" means to ship any of the Covered Products into California for sale in California, or to sell or provide any of the Covered Products to any person or entity that Cyanotech knows will sell the Covered Product in California.

The warning shall be provided with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices on the container or labeling as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use. No other statements may accompany the warning on the product label. The warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings on the container or labeling, as applicable, and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print. The warning shall be contained in the same section of the container or labeling, as applicable, which states other safety warnings concerning the use of the Covered Product.

3.2 The Warning Language

The warning language shall be one of the following:

[California Proposition 65] WARNING [(California Proposition 65)] This product contains [lead,] [a] chemical[s] known [to the State of California] to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm.

[California Proposition 65] WARNING [(California Proposition 65)] This product contains [lead,] [a] substance[s] known [to the State of California] to cause [cancer and] birth defects or other reproductive harm.

The text in brackets in the warnings above is optional except that the words "cancer and" shall be included in the warning only if the maximum recommended daily dose stated on the Covered Product's label contains more than 15 micrograms (mcg) of lead as calculated in accordance with the formula set forth in Section 3.4 below.

00071299.3 PCT

3.3 Warning Method

For those Covered Products that are subject to the warning requirement of Section 3.1, Cyanotech shall provide the warning language in Section 3.2 on the Covered Product. The warning above shall be permanently affixed to or printed on the labeling of each Covered Product with such conspicuousness as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices on the container or labeling as to render it likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use.

3.4 Calculation of Lead Levels

For purposes of this Consent Judgment and determining Cyanotech's compliance with Proposition 65, daily lead exposure levels shall be calculated using the following formula: micrograms of lead per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings of the product per day (using the largest number of servings in a recommended dosage appearing on the product label) which equals micrograms of lead exposure per day.

3.5 Reformulated Covered Products

A Reformulated Covered Product is one for which the maximum recommended daily serving on the label contains no more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day as calculated pursuant to Section 3.4.

3.6 Testing and Quality Control Methodology

- (a) Beginning within one year of the Effective Date, Cyanotech shall conduct testing of the Covered Products for lead content for a minimum of four (4) consecutive years, except that the testing requirement of this Consent Judgment does not apply to any of the Covered Products for which Cyanotech has provided the warning specified in Section 3.2. For purposes of determining which warning, if any, is required pursuant to Section 3.2, the second-highest lead detection results of the fivé (5) randomly selected samples of the Covered Products will be controlling.
- (b) All testing for lead required by this Consent Judgment shall be performed using Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry ("ICP-MS") or any other testing method subsequently agreed to in writing by the Parties.

00071299.3 PCT

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

(c) All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed by an independent third-party laboratory certified by the California Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program or a laboratory that is registered with the United States Food & Drug Administration.

- (d) If no warning has been provided pursuant to Section 3.2, Cyanotech shall test each of the Covered Products at least once a year for a minimum of four (4) consecutive years by testing five (5) randomly selected samples of each Covered Product (in the form intended for sale to the end-user) which Cyanotech intends to sell or is manufacturing for sale in California, directly selling to a consumer in California, or Distributing into California. If tests conducted pursuant to this Section demonstrate that no warning is required for a Covered Product during each of four (4) consecutive years, then the testing requirements of this Section will no longer be required as to that Covered Product. However, if during or after the four (4) year period, Cyanotech changes ingredient suppliers for any of the Covered Products and/or reformulates any of the Covered Products, Cyanotech shall test that Covered Product annually for at least four (4) consecutive years after such change is made.
- (e) Cyanotech shall retain all test results and documentation for a period of four (4) years from the date of each test. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall limit Cyanotech's ability to conduct, or require that others conduct, additional testing of the Covered Products, including the raw materials used in their manufacture.

4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1 In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, payment in lieu of civil penalties, attorney's fees, and costs, Cyanotech shall make a total payment of \$85,000.00 to ERC within ten (10) days of the Effective Date. Cyanotech shall make this payment by wire transfer to ERC's escrow account, for which ERC will give Cyanotech the necessary account information. Said payment shall be for the following:
- 4.2 \$21,320.00 shall be payable as civil penalties pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). Of this amount, ERC shall remit 75% \$15,990.00 to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") and \$5,330.00 shall be retained by ERC. California Health and Safety Code section 25249.12(c)(1) & (d). ERC will be 00071299.3 PCT 5

responsible for forwarding the civil penalty.

- 4.3 \$650.21 shall be payable to ERC as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable costs incurred in bringing this action.
- 4.4 \$21,323.19 shall be payable to ERC in lieu of further civil penalties, for the day-to-day business activities such as (1) continued enforcement of Proposition 65, which includes work, analyzing, researching and testing consumer products that may contain Proposition 65 chemicals, focusing on the same or similar type of ingestible products that are the subject matter of the current action; (2) the continued monitoring of past consent judgments and settlements to ensure companies are in compliance with Proposition 65; and (3) giving a donation of \$1,066.00 to the Center for Environmental Health to address reducing toxic chemical exposures in California.
- 4.5 \$23,785.50 shall be payable to Adams Broadwell Joseph and Cardozo as reimbursement of ERC's attorney's fees while \$17,921.10 shall be distributed to ERC for its inhouse legal fees.
- 4.6 In the event that Cyanotech fails to remit the Total Settlement Payment owed under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment on or before the Due Date, Cyanotech shall be deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this Consent Judgment. ERC shall provide written notice of the delinquency to Cyanotech via electronic mail. If Cyanotech fails to deliver the Total Settlement payment within five (5) days from the written notice, the Total Settlement Payment shall become immediately due and payable and shall accrue interest at the statutory judgment interest rate provided in the Code of Civil Procedure section 685.010. Additionally, Cyanotech agrees to pay ERC's reasonable attorney's fees and costs for any efforts to collect the payment due under this Consent Judgment.

5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 5.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified (i) by written stipulation of the Parties or pursuant to Section 5.3 and (ii) upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment.
- 5.2 If Cyanotech seeks to modify this Consent Judgment under Section 5.1, then

 Cyanotech must provide written notice to ERC of its intent ("Notice of Intent"). If ERC seeks to

 meet and confer regarding the proposed modification in the Notice of Intent, then ERC must

 6

 provide written notice to Cyanotech within thirty (30) days of receiving the Notice of Intent. If ERC notifies Cyanotech in a timely manner of ERC's intent to meet and confer, then the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith as required in this Section. The Parties shall meet in person or via telephone within thirty (30) days of ERC's notification of its intent to meet and confer. Within thirty (30) days of such meeting, if ERC disputes the proposed modification, ERC shall provide to Cyanotech a written basis for its position. The Parties shall continue to meet and confer for an additional thirty (30) days in an effort to resolve any remaining disputes. The Parties may agree in writing to different deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.

- 5.3 In the event that Cyanotech initiates or otherwise requests a modification under Section 5.1, and the meet and confer process leads to a joint motion or joint application of the Consent Judgment, Cyanotech shall reimburse ERC its costs and reasonable attorney's fees for the time spent in the meet-and-confer process and filing and arguing the motion or application.
- 5.4 Where the meet-and-confer process does not lead to a joint motion or joint application in support of a modification of the Consent Judgment, then either Party may seek judicial relief on its own.

6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 6.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify or terminate this Consent Judgment.
- 6.2 Only after it complies with Section 15 below may any Party, by motion or application for an order to show cause filed with this Court, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment.
- 6.3 If ERC alleges that any Covered Product fails to qualify as a Reformulated Covered Product (for which ERC alleges that no warning has been provided), then ERC shall inform Cyanotech in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information sufficient to permit Cyanotech to identify the Covered Products at issue. Cyanotech shall, within thirty (30) days following such notice, provide ERC with testing information, from an independent third-party laboratory meeting the requirements of Section 3.6, demonstrating Defendant's compliance with the Consent Judgment, if warranted. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior 7

to ERC taking any further legal action.

7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

7.1 This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Consent Judgment shall have no application to Covered Products which are distributed or sold exclusively outside the State of California and which are not used by California consumers.

8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

- 8.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Cyanotech and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates under common ownership of Cyanotech, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of Cyanotech), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and all other upstream and downstream entities in the distribution chain of any Covered Product, and the predecessors, successors and assigns of any of them (collectively, "Released Parties), from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages, penalties, fees, costs and expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered Products regarding lead up through and including six months from the Effective Date ("the Compliance Date").
- 8.2 It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice of Violation or the Complaint and relating to the Covered Products will develop or be discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, on one hand, and Cyanotech, on the other hand, acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims up through the Effective Date, including all rights of action therefore. ERC and Cyanotech acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 8.1 and 8.2 above may include unknown claims, and nevertheless waive California Civil Code section 1542 as to any such unknown claims.

California Civil Code section 1542 reads as follows:

00071299.3 PCT

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

ERC on behalf of itself only, on the one hand, and Cyanotech, on the other hand, acknowledge and understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code section 1542.

- 8.3 Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to constitute compliance by any Released Party with Proposition 65 regarding alleged exposures to lead in the Covered Products as set forth in the Notice of Violation and the Complaint.
- 8.4 Nothing in this Consent Judgment is intended to apply to any occupational or environmental exposures arising under Proposition 65, nor shall it apply to any of Cyanotech's products other than the Covered Products.
- 8.5 ERC and Cyanotech each release and waive all claims they may have against each other for any statements or actions made or undertaken by them in connection with the Notice of Violation or the Complaint up through and including the Effective Date; provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party's right to seek to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

9. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS

In the event that any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are held by a court to be unenforceable, the validity of the remaining enforceable provisions shall not be adversely affected.

10. GOVERNING LAW

The terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

11. PROVISION OF NOTICE

All notices required to be given to either Party to this Consent Judgment by the other shall be in writing and sent to the following agents listed below by: (a) first-class, registered, or certified mail; (b) overnight courier; or (c) personal delivery. Courtesy copies via email may also be sent.

00071299,3 PCT

1	FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER:	
2	Lane Daniel, Mariouse Counsel	
3	STITE CHIMING DOLLAGOING BUILD TOU	
4		
5	With a copy to:	
6	Christina M. Caro Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo	
7	601 Gateway Blvd., Suite 1000 South San Francisco, CA 94080-7037	
8		
9	FOR CYANOTECH CORPORATION AND NUTREX, HAWAII, INC.:	
10	Jennifer Johansen Cyanotech Corporation	
11	73-4460 Queen Kaahumanu Highway, Suite 102 Kailua-Kona, HI 96740	
12	With a copy to:	
13	Peg Carew Toledo	
14	Peg Carew Toledo, Law Corporation 3001 Douglas Blvd., Suite 340	
15	Roseville, CA 95661-3853	
16	12. COURT APPROVAL	
17	12.1 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be void and have no	
18	force or effect. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this Consent Judgment.	
19	12.2 If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment,	
20	the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible	
21	prior to the hearing on the motion.	
22	12.3 ERC shall comply with California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f) and	
23	with Title II of the California Code Regulations, Section 3003.	
24	13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS	
25	This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be	
26	deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed as valid as	
27	the original signature.	
28	14. DRAFTING	
	00071299.3 PCT 10	
	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT	

The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for each Party to this Consent Judgment prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms with counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and construction of this Consent Judgment entered thereon, the terms and provisions shall not be construed against any Party.

15. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES

If a dispute arises with respect to either Party's compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall meet in person, by telephone, and/or in writing and endeavor to resolve the dispute in an amicable manner. No action or motion may be filed in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute beforehand.

16. ENFORCEMENT

ERC may, by motion or order to show cause, before the Superior Court of Alameda County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment.

17. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION

17.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any Party. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.

17.2 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.

18. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, make the findings pursuant to California

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent
2	Judgment.
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED:
4	
5	Dated: 8/4/, 2016 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER
6	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER
7	
8	Charles Septilistall, Experitive Director
9	Deted: A & 2016
10	Dated: Aug 8, 2016 CYANOTECH CORPORATION
11	H IN CO. 1.
12	By: Lentel Grennling Interim President + CKO
13	
14	Dated: As 8, 2016 NUTREX HAWAII, INC.
15	•
16	By: Send Cymph. Interior President + CEO
17	Interior President + CEO
18	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
19	Dated: August 9, 2016 ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH &
20	Dated: Muguit . 2016 ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
21	
22	By
23	Christina Caro Attorneys for Plaintiff
24	Environmental Research Center, Inc.
	Dated: Huxus 45 2016 PEG CAREW TOLEDO, LAW CORPORATION
25 26	
27	By: Tex Can bled
	OPeg Carew Toledo Attorneys for Defendants
28	Cyanotech Corporation and Nutrex Hawaii, Inc.
	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT
	3441-014j

JUDGMENT:

Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing, this Consent Judgment is approved and Judgment is hereby entered according to its terms.

Dated: 4 8 2016

Judge of the Superior Court

00071299.3 PCT

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

3441-014j

EXHIBIT A



Environmental Research Center

3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400 San Diego, CA 92108 619-500-3090

June 15, 2015

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

Dear Alleged Violators and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I am the Executive Director of Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"). 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 product 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 this product. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violators and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to Section 25249.7(d) of the statute, 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.

<u>General Information about Proposition 65</u>. A copy of a summary of Proposition 65, prepared by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, is attached with the copy of 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:

Cyanotech Corporation Nutrex Hawaii, Inc.

<u>Consumer Product and Listed Chemical</u>. The product that is the subject of this notice and the chemical in that product identified as exceeding allowable levels are:

Nutrex Hawaii Inc. Green Complete Natural Vanilla Bean Flavor - 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.

Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq. June 15, 2015
Page 2

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 purchase, acquisition, handling and recommended use of this product. Consequently, the primary route of exposure to this chemical has been and continues to be through ingestion, but may have also occurred and may continue to occur through inhalation and/or dermal contact.

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least June 15, 2012, as well as every day since the product was 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 product. 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 handling and/or using this product 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 product so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemical, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of this product; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above product 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.

Please direct all questions concerning this notice to ERC at the above listed address and telephone number.

Sincerely,

Chris Heptinstall
Executive Director

Environmental Research Center

Attachments

Certificate of Merit Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Cyanotech Corporation, Nutrex Hawaii, Inc., and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

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

Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq. June 15, 2015
Page 3

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Cyanotech Corporation and Nutrex Hawaii, Inc.

- I, Chris Heptinstall, declare:
- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged 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 the Executive Director 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.

l l tuitla

,	Jan
Dated: June 15, 2015	
	Chris Heptinstall

Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq. June 15, 2015
Page 4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

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

On June 15, 2015, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY" on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it in a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current President or CEO Cyanotech Corporation 73-4460 Queen Kaahumanu Highway Suite 102 Kailua Kona, HI 96740

Current President or CEO Cyanotech Corporation 6100 Neil Road, Suite 500 Reno, NV 89511

Current President or CEO Nutrex Hawaii, Inc. 73-4460 Queen Kaahumanu Highway Suite 102 Kailua Kona, Hl 96740 The Corporation Trust Company of Nevada (Cyanotech Corporation's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 311 South Division Street Carson City, NV 89703

Jole Deal (Cyanotech Corporation's Registered Agent for Service of Process) 73-4460 Queen Kaahumanu Highway Suite 102 Kailua Kona, HI 96740

Jole Deal (Nutrex Hawaii, Inc.'s Registered Agent for Service of Process) 73-4460 Queen Kaahumanu Highway Suite 102 Kailua Kona, HI 96740

On June 15, 2015, 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 Post Office Box 70550 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On June 15, 2015, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it with the U.S. Postal Service with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Priority Mail.

Executed on June 15, 2015, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Phyllis Dunwoody

Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code §25249.5 et seq. June 15, 2015

Page 5

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 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, Contra Costa County 900 Ward Street Martinez, CA 94553

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 230 W. Line Street Bishop, CA 93514

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, Lassen County 220 South Lassen Street, Ste. 8 Susanville, CA 96130 District Attorney, Los Angeles County 210 West Temple Street, Suite 18000 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, Monterey County Post Office Box 1131 Salinas, CA 93902

District Attorney, Napa County 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559

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, Riverside County 3960 Orange Street Riverside, CA 92501

District Attorney, Sacramento County 901 "G" Street Sacramento, CA 95814

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

District Attorney, San Bernardino County 316 N. Mountain View Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92415-0004 District Attorney, San Diego County 330 West Broadway, Suite 1300 San Diego, CA 92101

District Attorney, San Francisco County 850 Bryant Street, Suite 322 San Francsico, CA 94103

District Attorney, San Joaquin County 222 E. Weber Ave. Rm. 202 Stockton, CA 95202

District Attorney, San Luis Obispo County 1035 Palm St, Room 450 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

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

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

District Attorney, Santa Clara County 70 West Hedding Street San Jose, CA 95110

District Attorney, Santa Cruz County 701 Ocean Street, Room 200 Santa Cruz, CA 95060

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

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

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

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

District Attorney, Sonoma County 600 Administration Drive, Room 212J Santa Rosa, CA 95403

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

District Attorney, Sutter County 446 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, Tulare County 221 S. Mooney Blvd., Room 224 Visalia, CA 93291 District Attorney, Tuolumne County 423 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370

District Attorney, Ventura County 800 South Victoria Ave, Suite 314 Ventura, CA 93009

District Attorney, Yolo County 301 2nd Street Woodland, CA 95695

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

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

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

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

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