

Michael Freund SBN 99687 1 Ryan Hoffman SBN 283297 2 Michael Freund & Associates **ALAMEDA COUNTY** 1919 Addison Street, Suite 105 3 Berkeley, CA 94704 JAN 1 6 2018 Telephone: (510) 540-1992 4 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Facsimile: (510) 540-5543 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff 6 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER. INC 7 PERKINS COIE LLP MEREDITH A JONES-McKEOWN, SBN 233301 HANNAH S WOREK, SBN 312940 505 Howard Street, Suite 1000 10 San Francisco, California 94105-3201 Telephone: 415-344-7097 11 Facsimile: 415-344-7050 Attorney for Defendant 12 SPARTAN BRANDS, INC., individually and doing 13 business as BEAUTIFUL NUTRITION 14 15 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 16 **COUNTY OF ALAMEDA** 17 ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CASE NO. RG17851427 18 CENTER, INC., a California non-profit STIPULATED CONSENT corporation 19 **JUDGMENT** Plaintiff, 20 Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 et seq. VS. 21 Action Filed: SPARTAN BRANDS, INC., individually Trial Date: None set 22 and doing business as BEAUTIFUL **NUTRITION and DOES 1-100** 23 Defendants. 24 25 INTRODUCTION 26 1. 27 1.1 On February 28, 2017, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), a 28 non-profit corporation, as a private enforcer and in the public interest, initiated this action by

Page 1 of 13

Case No. RG17851427

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

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 Spartan Brands, Inc., individually and doing business as Beautiful Nutrition ("Beautiful Nutrition"), and Does 1-100. In this action, ERC alleges that one of the products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Beautiful Nutrition contains lead, a chemical listed under Proposition 65 as a carcinogen and reproductive toxin, and exposes consumers to this chemical at a level requiring a Proposition 65 warning. This product (referred to hereinafter as the "Covered Product") is: Beautiful Nutrition LLC Beautritious Skin Firming Collagen Cocktail Line Reducing Drink Mix.

- 1.2 ERC and Beautiful Nutrition are hereinafter referred to individually as a "Party" or collectively as the "Parties."
- 1.3 ERC is a 501 (c)(3) 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.
- 1.4 For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties agree that Beautiful Nutrition is a business entity that has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant to this action, and qualifies as a "person in the course of business" within the meaning of Proposition 65. Beautiful Nutrition manufactures, distributes, and/or sells the Covered Product.
- 1.5 The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC's Notice of Violation dated December 16, 2016 that was served on the California Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Beautiful Nutrition ("Notice"). A true and correct copy of the 60-Day Notice dated December 16, 2016 is attached hereto as Exhibit A and is incorporated herein by reference. More than 60 days have passed since the Notice was served on the Attorney General, public enforcers, and Beautiful Nutrition and no designated governmental entity has filed a complaint against Beautiful Nutrition with regard to the Covered Product or the alleged violations.
 - 1.6 ERC's Notice and Complaint allege that use of the Covered 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. Beautiful Nutrition denies all material allegations contained in the Notice and Complaint.

- 1.7 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 nor compliance with 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, franchisees, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or retailers of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law.
- 1.8 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 current or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.
- 1.9 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, personal jurisdiction over Beautiful Nutrition 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 and Complaint.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, REFORMULATION, TESTING AND WARNINGS

3.1 Beginning on the Effective Date, Beautiful Nutrition shall be permanently enjoined from manufacturing for sale in the State of California, "Distributing into the State of California", or directly selling in the State of California, any Covered Product which exposes a person to a "Daily Lead Exposure Level" of more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day when

used in accordance with the manufacturer's directions on the label of the Covered Product unless it meets the warning requirements under Section 3.2.

- 3.1.1 As used in this Consent Judgment, the term "Distributing into the State of California" shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that Beautiful Nutrition knows will sell the Covered Product in California.
- 3.1.2 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" shall be measured in micrograms, and 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.

3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings

If Beautiful Nutrition is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, the following warning must be utilized ("Warning"):

WARNING: Consuming this product can expose you to chemicals including lead which isknown to the State of California to cause cancer and birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food.

Beautiful Nutrition shall use the phrase "cancer and" in the Warning only if the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is greater than 15 micrograms of lead as determined pursuant to the quality control methodology set forth in Section 3.4.

The Warning shall be securely affixed to or printed upon the container or label of each Covered Product. In addition, for any Covered Product sold over the internet by Beautiful Nutrition, the Warning shall appear such that the consumer views the warning prior to completing the checkout process when a California delivery address is indicated for any purchase of any Covered Product. If a warning is displayed on the checkout page, it must be clear which product(s) are subject to the warning.

The Warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety warnings also appearing on its website or on the label or container of Beautiful Nutrition's product

packaging and the word "WARNING" shall be in all capital letters and in bold print. No statements intended to or likely to have the effect of diminishing the impact of, or reducing the clarity of, the Warning on the average lay person shall accompany the Warning. Further, no statements may accompany the Warning that state or imply that the source of the listed chemical has an impact on or results in a less harmful effect of the listed chemical.

Beautiful Nutrition must display the above Warning with such conspicuousness, as compared with other words, statements, design of the label, container, or on its website, as applicable, to render the Warning likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase or use of the product.

3.3 Reformulated Covered Products

A Reformulated Covered Product is one for which the "Daily Lead Exposure Level" is no greater than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day when used in accordance with the manufacturer's directions. Any allegation that a Covered Product is not in compliance with this section shall be verified through testing by an independent testing agency.

4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT

- 4.1 In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, additional settlement payments, attorney's fees, and costs, Beautiful Nutrition shall make a total payment of \$16,000.00 ("Total Settlement Amount") to ERC within 5 days of the Effective Date ("Due Date"). Beautiful Nutrition shall make this payment by wire transfer to ERC's escrow account, for which ERC will give Beautiful Nutrition the necessary account information. The Total Settlement Amount shall be apportioned as follows:
- 4.2 \$1,000.00 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$750.00) of the civil penalty to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA") for deposit in the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Fund in accordance with California Health and Safety Code section 25249.12(c). ERC will retain the remaining 25% (\$250.00) of the civil penalty.
- 4.3 \$2,324.12 shall be distributed to ERC as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable costs incurred in bringing this action.

4.4 \$1,650.00 shall be distributed to Michael Freund as reimbursement of ERC's attorney's fees, \$3,750.00 shall be distributed to Ryan Hoffman as reimbursement of ERC's attorney's fees, while \$7,275.88 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees. Except as explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.

4.6 In the event that Beautiful Nutrition fails to remit the Total Settlement Amount owed under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment on or before the Due Date, Beautiful Nutrition shall be deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this Consent Judgment. ERC shall provide written notice of the delinquency to Beautiful Nutrition via electronic mail. If Beautiful Nutrition fails to deliver the Total Settlement Amount within five (5) days from the written notice, the Total Settlement Amount shall accrue interest at the statutory judgment interest rate provided in the California Code of Civil Procedure section 685.010. Additionally, Beautiful Nutrition 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 only as to injunctive terms (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 Beautiful Nutrition seeks to modify this Consent Judgment under Section 5.1, then Beautiful Nutrition 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 provide written notice to Beautiful Nutrition within thirty (30) days of receiving the Notice of Intent. If ERC notifies Beautiful Nutrition 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 Beautiful Nutrition 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. Should it become necessary, the Parties may agree in writing to different deadlines for the meet-and-confer period.

5.3 Where the meet-and-confer process does not lead to a joint motion or 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 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 Beautiful Nutrition in a reasonably prompt manner of its test results, including information sufficient to permit Beautiful Nutrition to identify the Covered Product at issue. Beautiful Nutrition shall, within thirty (30) days following such notice, provide ERC with testing information, from an independent third-party laboratory meeting the requirements of Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4, demonstrating Beautiful Nutrition's compliance with the Consent Judgment, if warranted. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter prior to ERC taking any further legal action.

7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

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

8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED

8.1 This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding release of claims between ERC and Beautiful Nutrition and its respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees,

agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers (not including private label customers of Beautiful Nutrition), 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"). ERC, on behalf of itself and acting in the public interest of the State of California, hereby fully releases and discharges the 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 from the handling, use, or consumption of the Covered Product, as to any alleged violation of Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations arising from the failure to provide Proposition 65 warnings on the Covered Product regarding lead up to and including the Effective Date.

- 8.2 ERC on its own behalf only, and Beautiful Nutrition on its own behalf only, further waive and release any and all claims they may have against each other for all actions or statements made or undertaken in the course of seeking or opposing enforcement of Proposition 65 in connection with the Notice and 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.
- 8.3 It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties, arising out of the facts alleged in the Notice and Complaint, and relating to the Covered Product, will develop or be discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, and Beautiful Nutrition on behalf of itself only, acknowledge that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims up through and including the Effective Date, including all rights of action therefore. ERC and Beautiful Nutrition 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:

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.

Page 9 of 13

Case No. RG17851427

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT

1	Ryan Hoffman
2	Michael Freund & Associates 1919 Addison Street, Suite 105
3	Berkeley, CA 94704
4	Telephone: (510) 540-1992 Facsimile: (510) 540-5543
5	SPARTAN BRANDS, INC., individually and doing business as
6	BEAUTIFUL NUTRITION
7	Gary Grey President
8	451 Park Ave South, Fifth Floor
	New York, NY 10016
9	With a copy to:
10	PERKINS COIE LLP MEREDITH A JONES-McKEOWN
11	505 Howard Street, Suite 1000
12	San Francisco, California 94105-3201 Telephone: 415-344-7097
13	Facsimile: 415-344-7050
14	12. COURT APPROVAL
15	12.1 Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, ERC shall notice a
16	Motion for Court Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this
17	Consent Judgment.
18	12.2 If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment,
19	the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible
20	prior to the hearing on the motion.
21	12.3 If this Stipulated Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be
22	void and have no force or effect.
23	13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS
24	This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be
25	deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed to be as valid
26	as the original signature.
27	
28	
	Page 10 of 13 STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT Case No. RG1785142
- 11	Case No. 100 Control Condition Case No. 101/03142

Case No. RG17851427

14. DRAFTING

The terms of this Consent Judgment have been reviewed by the respective counsel for each Party prior to its signing, and each Party has had an opportunity to fully discuss the terms and conditions with legal counsel. The Parties agree that, in any subsequent interpretation and construction of this Consent Judgment, no inference, assumption, or presumption shall be drawn, and no provision of this Consent Judgment shall be construed against any Party, based on the fact that one of the Parties and/or one of the Parties' legal counsel prepared and/or drafted all or any portion of the Consent Judgment. It is conclusively presumed that all of the Parties participated equally in the preparation and drafting of this Consent Judgment.

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 and confer 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. In any action
brought by ERC to enforce this Consent Judgment, ERC may seek whatever fines, costs,
penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment.

To the extent the failure to comply with the Consent Judgment constitutes a violation of
Proposition 65 or other laws, ERC shall not be limited to enforcement of this Consent Judgment,
but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are provided by
law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws.

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

Page 11 of 13

1	been made by any Party. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to
2	herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.
3	17.2 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully
4	authorized by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment.
5	18. REQUEST FOR FINDINGS, APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND ENTRY OF
6	CONSENT JUDGMENT
7	This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The
8	Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed
9	regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to:
10	(1) Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a fair and
11	equitable settlement of all matters raised by the allegations of the Complaint that the matter has
12	been diligently prosecuted, and that the public interest is served by such settlement; and
13	(2) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section
14	25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment.
15	IT IS SO STIPULATED: Dated: 7//8/ , 2017
16	ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH
17	CENTER, INC.
18	By Stris Hopersty Xxee Hive Director
19	
20	Dated:
21	
22	By: Gu-/Cary
23	115. 12:57 2 7
24	
25	
26	
28	
20	Page 12 of 13
	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT Case No. RG17851427
1	!

1	APPROVED AS TO FORM:
2	Dated: 7/20, 2017 MICHAEL FREUND & ASSOCIATES
3	90 10 30
4	By: Michael Freund
5	Ryan Hoffman
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.
7	1 1. 10
8	Dated: July 19, 2017 PERKINS COIE LLP
9	By: Hell
10	Meredith A Jones-Mckeown
11	Hannah S Worek Attorney for Defendant Spartan Brands,
12	Inc., individually and doing business as Beautiful Nutrition
13	
14	ORDER AND JUDGMENT
15	Based upon the Parties' Stipulation, and good cause appearing, this Consent Judgment is
16	approved and Judgment is hereby entered according to its terms.
17	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED.
18	111/2
19	Dated: 1/16/18 .2017
20	Judge of the Superior Court
21 22	
23	
24	a
25	
26	
27	
28	
	Page 13 of 13
	STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT Case No. RG17851427

Michael Freund & Associates

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

Michael Freund, Esq. Ryan Hoffman, Esq.

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

December 16, 2016

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

Dear Alleged Violator and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

I represent Environmental Research Center, Inc. ("ERC"), 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108; Tel. (619) 500-3090. ERC's Executive Director is Chris Heptinstall. ERC is a California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by bringing about a reduction in the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees, and encouraging corporate responsibility.

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

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

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

Spartan Brands, Inc., individually and doing business as Beautiful Nutrition

<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:

Beautiful Nutrition LLC Beautritious Skin Firming Collagen Cocktail Line Reducing Drink Mix - Lead

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed lead as a chemical known to cause developmental toxicity, and male and female reproductive toxicity. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer.

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

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

Exhibit A

Approximate Time Period of Violations. Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least December 16, 2013, 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 Violator violated Proposition 65 because it 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 Violator 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.

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

Sincerely,

Ryan Hoffman

Attachments

Certificate of Merit Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Spartan Brands, Inc., individually and doing business as Beautiful Nutrition) Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to AG only)

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT

Re: Environmental Research Center, Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by Spartan Brands, Inc., individually and doing business as Beautiful Nutrition

I, Ryan Hoffman, declare:

- 1. This Certificate of Merit accompanies the attached 60-day notice in which it is alleged that the party identified in the notice violated California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
 - 2. I am an attorney for the noticing party.
- 3. I have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, or other data regarding the exposure to the listed 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 Violator will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
- 5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: December 16, 2016

Ryan Hoffman

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 December 16, 2016, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; "THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY" on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party listed below and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Certified Mail:

Current CEO or President Spartan Brands, Inc., individually and doing business as Beautiful Nutrition 451 Park Avenue South, 5th Floor New York, NY 10016

Current CEO or President Spartan Brands, Inc., individually and doing business as Beautiful Nutrition 220 East 23rd Street, Suite 601 New York, NY 10010 Current CEO or President Spartan Brands, Inc., individually and doing business as Beautiful Nutrition Post Office Box 467 New York, NY 10156

Current CEO or President Spartan Brands, Inc., individually and doing business as Beautiful Nutrition 1210 Sesqui Street Allentown, PA 18103

On December 16, 2016, I verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1) were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General's website, which can be accessed at https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice:

Office of the California Attorney General Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000 Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On December 16, 2016, I verified the following documents NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to each of the parties listed below:

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

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

Dije Ndreu, Deputy District Attorney Monterey County 1200 Aguajito Road Monterey, CA 93940 Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us Gary Lieberstein, District Attorney Napa County 931 Parkway Mall Napa, CA 94559 CEPD@countyofnapa.org

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

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

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

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

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

Yen Dang, Supervising Deputy District Attorney Santa Clara County 70 W Hedding St San Jose, CA 95110 EPU@da.sccgov.org Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney Sonoma County 600 Administration Dr Sonoma, CA 95403 jbarnes@sonoma-county.org

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

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

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

On December 16, 2016, I served the following documents: NOTICE OF VIOLATION, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT on each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the parties on the Service List attached hereto, and depositing it at a U.S. Postal Service Office with the postage fully prepaid for delivery by Priority Mail.

Executed on December 16, 2016, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

Phyllis Ourney

Service List

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

District Attorney, Plumas County 520 Main Street, Room 404 Quincy, CA 95971 District Attorney, San Benito County 419 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Hollister, CA 95023

District Attorney,San Bernardino County 316 N. Mountain View Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92415-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 CCR Appendix A

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. Please refer to the statute and OEHHA's 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. 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 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 say 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 Periods. 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 employe a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer. For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses "no significant risk." This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific "No Significant Risk Levels" (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at:

http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq*. of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question. For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the "no observable effect level" divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at:

http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq*. of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food. Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501. Discharges that do not result in a "significant amount" of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a "significant amount" of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A "significant amount" means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the "no significant risk" level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the "no observable effect" level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys. Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, but only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business accused of the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. The notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in Section 25903 of Title 27 and sections 3100-3103 of Title 11. A private party may not pursue an independent enforcement action under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an enforcement action within sixty days of the notice.

A business found to be in violation of Proposition 65 is subject to civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation. In addition, the business may be ordered by a court to stop committing the violation.

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

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off- premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;

- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

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

A private party may not file an action against the alleged violator for these exposures, or recover in a settlement any payment in lieu of penalties any reimbursement for costs and attorney's fees, if the notice was served on or after October 5, 2013, and the alleged violator has done *all* of the following within 14 days of being served notice:

- Corrected the alleged violation;
- Agreed to pay a civil penalty of \$5B500 (subject to change as noted below) to the private party within 30 days; and
- Notified the private party serving the notice in writing that the violation has been corrected.

The written notification to the private-party must include a notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form completed by the alleged violator as directed in the notice. On April 1, 2019, and every five years thereafter, the dollar amount of the civil penalty will be adjusted by the Judicial Council based on the change in the annual California Consumer Price Index. The Judicial Council will publish the dollar amount of the adjusted civil penalty at each five-year interval, together with the date of the next scheduled adjustment.

An alleged violator may satisfy these conditions only one time for a violation arising from the same exposure in the same facility or on the same premises. The satisfaction of these conditions does not prevent the Attorney General, a district attorney, a city attorney of a city of greater than 750,000 population, or any full-time city prosecutor with the consent of the district attorney, from filing an enforcement action against an alleged violator. The amount of any civil penalty for a violation shall be reduced to reflect any payment made by the alleged violator for the same alleged violation to a private-party.

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included with this notice and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html. The notice is reproduced here:

Page 1

Date: December 16, 2016

Name of Noticing Party or attorney for Noticing Party: Environmental Research Center, Inc.

Address: 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108

Phone number: 619-500-3090

SPECIAL COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE

PROOF OF COMPLIANCE

You are receiving this form because the Noticing Party listed above has alleged that you are violating California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 (Prop. 65).

The Noticing Party may not bring any legal proceedings against you for the alleged violation checked below if:

- 1. You have actually taken the corrective steps that you have certified in this form
- 2. The Noticing Party has received this form at the address shown above, accurately completed by you, postmarked within 14 days of your receiving this notice
- 3. The Noticing Party receives the required \$500 penalty payment from you at the address shown above postmarked within 30 days of your receiving this notice.
- 4. This is the first time you have submitted a Proof of Compliance for a violation arising from the same exposure in the same facility on the same premises.

PART 1: TO BE COMPLETED BY THE NOTICING PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR THE NOTICING PARTY

IMPORTANT NOTES:

- 1. You have no potential liability under California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 if your business has nine (9) or fewer employees.
- 2. Using this form will NOT prevent the Attorney General, a district attorney, a city attorney, or a prosecutor in whose jurisdiction the violation is alleged to have occurred from filing an action over the same alleged violations, and that in any such action, the amount of civil penalty shall be reduced to reflect any payment made at this time.

Page 2

Date: December 16, 2016

Name of Noticing Party or attorney for Noticing Party: Environmental Research Center, Inc.

Address: 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400, San Diego, CA 92108

Phone number: 619-500-3090

PART 2: TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ALLEGED VIOLATOR OR AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

Certification of Compliance Accurate completion of this form will demonstrate that you are now in compliance with California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 for the alleged violation listed above. You must complete and submit the form below to the Noticing Party at the address shown above, postmarked within 14 days of you receiving this notice. I hereby agree to pay, within 30 days of completion of this notice, a civil penalty of \$500 to the Noticing Party only and certify that I have complied with Health and Safety Code §25249.6 by (check only one of the following): Description Posting a warning or warnings about the alleged exposure that complies with the law, and attaching a copy of that warning and a photograph accurately showing its placement on my premises; Posting the warning or warnings demanded in writing by the Noticing Party, and attaching a copy of that warning and a photograph accurately its placement on my premises; OR ☐ Eliminating the alleged exposure, and attaching a statement accurately describing how the alleged exposure has been eliminated. Certification My statements on this form, and on any attachments to it, are true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and are made in good faith. I have carefully read the instructions to complete this form. I understand that if I make a false statement on this form, I may be subject to additional penalties under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65). Signature of alleged violator or authorized representative Date Name and title of signatory 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 2014

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.

² See Section 25501(a)(4).

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.

HISTORY

- 1. New Appendix A filed 4-22-97; operative 4-22-97 pursuant to Government Code section 11343.4(d) (Register 97, No. 17).
- 2. Amendment filed 1-7-2003; operative 2-6-2003 (Register 2003, No. 2).
- 3. Change without regulatory effect renumbering title 22, section 12903 and Appendix A to title 27, section 25903 and Appendix A, including amendment of appendix, filed 6-18-2008 pursuant to section 100, title 1, California Code of Regulations (Register 2008, No. 25).
- 4. Amendment filed 11-19-2012; operative 12-19-2012 (Register 2012, No. 47).
- 5. Amendment of appendix and Note filed 11-19-2014; operative 1-1-2015 (Register 2014, No. 47). This database is current through 9/18/15 Register 2015, No. 38
- 27 CCR Appendix A, 27 CA ADC Appendix A