


**FILED**  
Superior Court of California  
County of Alameda  
05/06/2024

Clad Flake, Executive Officer/Clerk of the Court  
By:  Deputy  
M. Williams

1 Charles W. Poss (SBN 325366)  
2 Environmental Research Center, Inc.  
3 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400  
4 San Diego, CA 92108  
5 Ph: (619) 500-3090  
6 Email: charles.poss@erc501c3.org

7 Attorney for Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc.

8 Bao M. Vu (SBN 277970)  
9 Kelly V. Beskin (SBN 341084)  
10 Stoel Rives LLP  
11 1 Montgomery St, Suite 3230  
12 San Francisco, CA 94104  
13 Email: bao.vu@stoel.com  
14 kelly.beskin@stoel.com

15 Attorneys for Defendants Elmhurst Milked LLC and Elmhurst Milked  
16 Direct LLC

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

19 **ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH**  
20 **CENTER, INC., a California non-profit**  
21 **corporation**

22 **Plaintiff,**

23 **vs.**

24 **ELMHURST MILKED LLC; ELMHURST**  
25 **MILKED DIRECT LLC; and DOES 1-100**

26 **Defendants.**

27 **CASE NO. 23CV030405**

28 **AMENDED STIPULATED CONSENT**  
**JUDGMENT**

Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.*

Action Filed: April 3, 2023

Trial Date: None set

1 **1. INTRODUCTION**

2 On April 3, 2023, Plaintiff Environmental Research Center, Inc. (“ERC”), a non-profit  
3 corporation, as a private enforcer and in the public interest, initiated this action by filing a  
4 Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief and Civil Penalties pursuant to the provisions  
5 of California Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 *et seq.* (“Proposition 65”), against

Electronically Received 01/18/2024 08:39 AM

1 Elmhurst Milked LLC and Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC (collectively “Elmhurst”) and Does 1-  
2 100. Subsequently, on May 19, 2023, an Amended Complaint was filed (the operative  
3 Complaint, hereinafter referred to as “Complaint”). In this action, ERC alleges that a number  
4 of products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Elmhurst contain lead and/or mercury and/or  
5 inorganic arsenic compounds, not including inorganic arsenic oxides (“arsenic”), chemicals  
6 listed under Proposition 65 as carcinogens and/or reproductive toxins, and expose consumers  
7 to these chemicals at a level requiring a Proposition 65 warning. These products (referred to  
8 hereinafter individually as a “Covered Product” or collectively as “Covered Products”) are: (1)  
9 Elmhurst Plant Based Oat Creamer Unsweetened (lead), (2) Elmhurst Milked Oats Chocolate  
10 (lead, mercury, arsenic) (3) Elmhurst Oat Latte Matcha (mercury), (4) Elmhurst Oat Latte  
11 Flash Brew (mercury), (5) Elmhurst Milked Oats Blueberry (lead, mercury), (6) Elmhurst  
12 Milked Cashews Barista Approved (lead), and (7) Elmhurst Plant Based Oat Barista Made  
13 From Whole Grain Oats (mercury).

14 **1.1** ERC and Elmhurst are hereinafter referred to individually as a “Party” or  
15 collectively as the “Parties.”

16 **1.2** ERC is a 501 (c)(3) California non-profit corporation dedicated to, among other  
17 causes, helping safeguard the public from health hazards by reducing the use and misuse of  
18 hazardous and toxic chemicals, facilitating a safe environment for consumers and employees,  
19 and encouraging corporate responsibility.

20 **1.3** The Complaint is based on allegations contained in ERC’s Notices of Violation  
21 dated January 5, 2023, January 12, 2023, and March 9, 2023 that were served on the California  
22 Attorney General, other public enforcers, and Elmhurst (“Notices”). True and correct copies of  
23 the 60-Day Notices dated January 5, 2023, January 12, 2023, and March 9, 2023 are attached  
24 hereto as **Exhibits A, B, and C** and each is incorporated herein by reference. More than 60  
25 days have passed since the Notices were served on the Attorney General, public enforcers, and  
26 Elmhurst and no designated governmental entity has filed a Complaint against Elmhurst with  
27 regard to the Covered Products or the alleged violations.

28 **1.4** ERC’s Notices and Complaint allege that use of the Covered Products by

1 California consumers exposes them to lead and/or mercury and/or arsenic without first  
2 receiving clear and reasonable warnings from Elmhurst, which is in violation of California  
3 Health and Safety Code section 25249.6.

4 **1.5** For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the Parties stipulate that Elmhurst is a  
5 business entity that has employed ten or more persons at all times relevant to this action, and  
6 qualifies as a “person in the course of doing business” within the meaning of Proposition 65.  
7 Elmhurst manufactures, distributes, and/or sells the Covered Products or has done so in the past.

8 **1.6** Elmhurst disputes all material allegations in the Notices and Complaint and  
9 vehemently asserts that it has manufactured, distributed, produced, sold, and offered for sale  
10 only products, including but not limited to the Covered Products, that have been in compliance  
11 with all applicable laws, regulations, standards, and guidance, including state, federal,  
12 international, and industry-specific ones and including Proposition 65. Nevertheless, it  
13 stipulates to be bound by this Consent Judgment in order to settle, compromise, and resolve  
14 disputed claims to avoid the cost, expense, uncertainty, and burden inherently associated with  
15 trial of the allegations in the Notices and Complaint. ERC likewise enters into this Consent  
16 Judgment in order to settle, compromise, and resolve disputed claims and thus avoid prolonged  
17 and costly litigation. Nothing in this Consent Judgment nor compliance with this Consent  
18 Judgment shall constitute or be construed as an admission by any of the Parties or by any of  
19 their respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies,  
20 subsidiaries, divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers, suppliers, distributors, wholesalers, or  
21 retailers of any fact, issue of law, or violation of law.

22 **1.7** Except as expressly set forth herein, nothing in this Consent Judgment shall  
23 prejudice, waive, or impair any right, remedy, argument, or defense the Parties may have in  
24 any current or future legal proceeding unrelated to these proceedings.

25 **1.8** The Effective Date of this Consent Judgment is the date on which it is entered  
26 as a Judgment by this Court.

## 27 **2. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

28 **2.1** For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, including any further court

1 action that may become necessary to enforce this Consent Judgment, the Parties stipulate that  
2 this Court has personal and subject matter jurisdiction over the allegations of violations  
3 contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Elmhurst as to the acts alleged in the  
4 Complaint, that venue is proper in Alameda County, and that this Court has jurisdiction to  
5 enter this Consent Judgment as a full and final resolution of all claims up through and  
6 including the Effective Date that were or could have been asserted in this action based on the  
7 facts alleged in the Notices and Complaint.

8 **3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, REFORMULATION, TESTING AND WARNINGS**

9 **3.1** Beginning on the Effective Date, Elmhurst shall be permanently enjoined from  
10 manufacturing for sale in the State of California, “Distributing into the State of California,” or  
11 directly selling in the State of California, any Covered Product that exposes a person to a  
12 “Daily Lead Exposure Level” of more than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day and/or a “Daily  
13 Mercury Exposure Level” of more than 0.3 micrograms of mercury per day and/or a “Daily  
14 Arsenic Exposure Level” of more than 10 micrograms of arsenic per day unless it meets the  
15 warning requirements under Section 3.2.

16 **3.1.1** As used in this Consent Judgment, the term “Distributing into the State  
17 of California” shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in  
18 California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that Elmhurst knows or has reason to  
19 know will sell the Covered Product in California.

20 **3.1.2** For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the “Daily Lead Exposure  
21 Level” shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula:  
22 micrograms of lead per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the  
23 product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings  
24 of the product per day (using the largest number of recommended daily servings appearing on  
25 the label), which equals micrograms of lead exposure per day. If the label contains no  
26 recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one.

27 **3.1.3** In calculating the Daily Lead Exposure Level for a Covered Product,  
28 Elmhurst shall be allowed to deduct the amount of lead which is deemed “naturally occurring” in

any ingredient listed in **Table 1** that is contained in that Covered Product under the following conditions: For each year that Elmhurst claims entitlement to a “naturally occurring” allowance, Elmhurst shall provide ERC with the following information: (a) Elmhurst must produce to ERC a written list of each ingredient in the Covered Product, and the amount, measured in grams, of each such ingredient contained therein, for which a “naturally occurring” allowance is claimed; (b) Elmhurst must provide ERC with documentation of laboratory testing, conducted during the year for which the “naturally occurring” allowance is claimed, that complies with Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4 and that shows the amount of lead, if any, contained in any ingredient listed in **Table 1** that is contained in the Covered Product and for which Elmhurst intends to deduct “naturally occurring” lead; (c) If the laboratory testing reveals the presence of lead in any ingredient listed in **Table 1** that is contained in the Covered Product, Elmhurst shall be entitled to deduct the amount of lead contained in each such ingredient, up to the full amount of the allowance for that ingredient as listed in **Table 1** but not to exceed the total amount of lead actually contained in that ingredient in the Covered Product; and (d) If the Covered Product does not contain an ingredient listed in **Table 1**, Elmhurst shall not be entitled to a deduction for “naturally occurring” lead in the Covered Product for that ingredient. The information required by Sections 3.1.3 (a) and (b) shall be provided to ERC within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date, or anniversary thereof, for any year that Elmhurst shall claim entitlement to the “naturally occurring” allowance:

**TABLE 1**

<b>INGREDIENT</b>	<b>ALLOWANCES OF AMOUNT OF LEAD</b>
Cocoa Powder	Up to 1.0 microgram/gram
Chocolate Liquor	Up to 1.0 microgram/gram
Cocoa Butter	Up to 0.1 micrograms/gram
Calcium (elemental)	Up to 0.8 micrograms/gram
Ferrous Fumarate	Up to 0.4 micrograms/gram
Zinc Oxide	Up to 8.0 microgram/gram

1	Magnesium Oxide	Up to 0.4 micrograms/gram
2	Magnesium Carbonate	Up to 0.332 micrograms/gram
3	Magnesium Hydroxide	Up to 0.4 micrograms/gram
4	Zinc Gluconate	Up to 0.8 micrograms/gram
5	Potassium Chloride	Up to 1.1 micrograms/gram
6		

7                   **3.1.4** For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the “Daily Mercury Exposure  
8 Level” shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula:  
9 micrograms of mercury per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the  
10 product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings  
11 of the product per day (using the largest number of recommended daily servings appearing on  
12 the label), which equals micrograms of mercury exposure per day. If the label contains no  
13 recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one.

14                   **3.1.5** For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the “Daily Arsenic Exposure  
15 Level” shall be measured in micrograms, and shall be calculated using the following formula:  
16 micrograms of arsenic per gram of product, multiplied by grams of product per serving of the  
17 product (using the largest serving size appearing on the product label), multiplied by servings  
18 of the product per day (using the largest number of recommended daily servings appearing on  
19 the label), which equals micrograms of arsenic exposure per day. If the label contains no  
20 recommended daily servings, then the number of recommended daily servings shall be one.

21                   **3.1.6** As used in this Consent Judgment, the term “Distributing into the State  
22 of California” shall mean to directly ship a Covered Product into California for sale in  
23 California or to sell a Covered Product to a distributor that Elmhurst knows or has reason to  
24 know will sell the Covered Product in California.

25                   **3.2 Clear and Reasonable Warnings**

26                   If Elmhurst is required to provide a warning pursuant to Section 3.1, one of the following  
27 warnings must be utilized (“Warning”):


28 ///

1           **OPTION 1:**

2           **WARNING:** Consuming this product can expose you to chemicals including [lead] [and]  
3           [mercury][and][arsenic] which is [are] known to the State of California to cause [cancer  
4           and] birth defects or other reproductive harm. For more information go to  
5           [www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food](http://www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food).

6           or

7           **OPTION 2:**

8           ** WARNING:** Cancer and Reproductive Harm – [www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food](http://www.P65Warnings.ca.gov/food).

9           Elmhurst shall use the phrase “cancer and” in the Warning if Elmhurst has reason to  
10          believe that the “Daily Lead Exposure Level” is greater than 15 micrograms of lead as determined  
11          pursuant to the quality control methodology set forth in Section 3.4 or if Elmhurst has reason to  
12          believe that another Proposition 65 chemical is present which may require a cancer warning. For  
13          the Option 2 Warning, a symbol consisting of a black exclamation point in a yellow equilateral  
14          triangle with a bold black outline shall be placed to the left of the text of the Warning, in a size no  
15          smaller than the height of the word “**WARNING,**” and the word “**WARNING**” shall be in all  
16          capital letters and bold print. Where the sign, label or shelf tag for the product is not printed using  
17          the color yellow, the symbol may be printed in black and white. As identified in the brackets, the  
18          warning shall appropriately reflect whether there is lead, mercury, arsenic, or all three chemicals  
19          present in each of the Covered Products, but if there is a chemical present at a level that requires a  
20          cancer warning, the chemical requiring use of the phrase “cancer and” in the Warning shall  
21          always be identified.

22          The Warning shall be securely affixed to or printed upon the label of each Covered  
23          Product and it must be set off from other surrounding information and enclosed in a box. In  
24          addition, for any Covered Product sold over the internet, the Warning shall appear on the  
25          checkout page when a California delivery address is indicated for any purchase of any Covered  
26          Product (“Internet Warning”). An asterisk or other identifying method must be utilized to  
27          identify which products on the checkout page are subject to the Internet Warning. In no event  
28          shall any Internet Warning be contained in or made through a link.

1 The Warning shall be at least the same size as the largest of any other health or safety  
2 warnings also appearing on the website or on the label and the word “**WARNING**” shall be in all  
3 capital letters and in bold print. No statements intended to or likely to have the effect of  
4 diminishing the impact of the Warning on the average lay person shall accompany the Warning.  
5 Further no statements may accompany the Warning that state or imply that the source of the listed  
6 chemical has an impact on or results in a less harmful effect of the listed chemical.

7 Elmhurst must display the above Warning with such conspicuousness, as compared with  
8 other words, statements or designs on the label, or on its website, if applicable, to render the  
9 Warning likely to be read and understood by an ordinary individual under customary conditions  
10 of purchase or use of the product. Where a sign or label used to provide the Warning for a  
11 Covered Product includes consumer information about the Covered Product in a language  
12 other than English, the Warning must also be provided in that language in addition to English.

13 For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the term “label” means a display of written,  
14 printed or graphic material that is printed on or affixed to a Covered Product or its immediate  
15 container or wrapper.

16 The requirements of Section 3.2 shall apply to neither: (i) any Covered Product that  
17 “enters the stream of commerce” prior to the Effective Date (for purposes of this Consent  
18 Judgment, the term “enters the stream of commerce” means that the Covered Product is put  
19 into final packaging for consumer sale and is no longer in the possession of or under the  
20 control of Elmhurst); nor (ii) any Covered Product that is put into final packaging for consumer  
21 sale within 60 days following the Effective Date, but which remains in the possession of or  
22 under the control of Elmhurst, so long as said Covered Product is sold with an Internet  
23 Warning (collectively “Interim Covered Products”). Sale of Interim Covered Products  
24 consistent with this provision shall be deemed in compliance with this Consent Judgment and  
25 subject to Section 8.

### 26 **3.3 Conforming Covered Products**

27 A Conforming Covered Product is a Covered Product for which the “Daily Lead Exposure  
28 Level” is no greater than 0.5 micrograms of lead per day and/or the “Daily Mercury Exposure



1 Level” is no greater than 0.3 micrograms of mercury per day and/or the “Daily Arsenic Exposure  
2 Level” is no greater than 10 micrograms of arsenic per day as determined by the exposure  
3 methodology set forth in Section 3.1.2 and the quality control methodology described in Section  
4 3.4, and that is not known by Elmhurst to contain other chemicals that violate Proposition 65’s  
5 safe harbor thresholds.

### 6 **3.4 Testing and Quality Control Methodology**

7 **3.4.1** Beginning within one year of the Effective Date, Elmhurst shall arrange  
8 for lead, mercury, and arsenic testing of the Covered Products at least once a year for a  
9 minimum of three consecutive years by arranging for testing of one (1) randomly selected  
10 sample of each of the Covered Products, in the form intended for sale to the end-user, which  
11 Elmhurst intends to sell or is manufacturing for sale in California, directly selling to a  
12 consumer in California or “Distributing into the State of California.” If tests conducted  
13 pursuant to this Section demonstrate that no Warning is required for a Covered Product during  
14 each of three consecutive years, then the testing requirements of this Section will no longer be  
15 required as to that Covered Product. However, if during or after the three-year testing period,  
16 Elmhurst materially reformulates any of the Covered Products, Elmhurst shall test that  
17 Covered Product annually for at two (2) consecutive years after such change is made.

18 **3.4.2** For purposes of measuring the “Daily Lead Exposure Level” and/or the  
19 “Daily Mercury Exposure Level” and/or the “Daily Arsenic Exposure Level,” of a Covered  
20 Product, the lead and/or mercury and/or arsenic detection result of one (1) randomly selected  
21 sample of the Covered Product will be controlling. Should use of said detection results in the  
22 calculations required under Sections 3.1.2, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4 exceed the levels enumerated under  
23 Section 3.1, Elmhurst shall, at its option, have the right to test three (3) different randomly  
24 selected samples of the Covered Product(s) in compliance with Section 3.4 to test for lead,  
25 mercury, and/or arsenic, and the highest detection result shall be used, and binding, as to the  
26 calculations required under Section 3.1.2 and controlling for purposes of Section 3.1 for said  
27 Covered Product. If Elmhurst chooses not to conduct the additional testing permitted by this  
28 Section 3.4.2, then the detection result(s) from the original testing shall be controlling.

1           **3.4.3** All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed using a  
2 laboratory method that complies with the performance and quality control factors appropriate  
3 for the method used, including limit of detection and limit of quantification, sensitivity,  
4 accuracy and precision that meets the following criteria: Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass  
5 Spectrometry (“ICP-MS”) achieving a limit of quantification of less than or equal to 0.005  
6 mg/kg.

7           **3.4.4** All testing pursuant to this Consent Judgment shall be performed by an  
8 independent third party laboratory certified by the California Environmental Laboratory  
9 Accreditation Program or an independent third-party laboratory that is registered with the  
10 United States Food & Drug Administration.

11           **3.4.5** Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall limit Elmhurst’s ability to  
12 conduct, or require that others conduct, additional testing of the Covered Products, including  
13 the raw materials used in their manufacture.

14           **3.4.6** Within thirty (30) days of ERC’s written request, Elmhurst shall deliver  
15 lab reports obtained pursuant to Section 3.4 to ERC. Elmhurst shall retain all test results and  
16 documentation for a period of two years from the date of each test, and provide test results to  
17 ERC upon ERC’s written request, not to exceed once per 365 calendar days.

18       **4. SETTLEMENT PAYMENT**

19           **4.1** In full satisfaction of all potential civil penalties, additional settlement  
20 payments, attorney’s fees, and costs, Elmhurst shall make a total payment of \$165,000.00  
21 (“Total Settlement Amount”) to ERC within 10 business days of Elmhurst’s receipt of ERC’s  
22 service of Notice of Entry of this Consent Judgment (“Due Date”). Elmhurst shall make this  
23 payment by wire transfer to ERC’s account, for which ERC will give Elmhurst the necessary  
24 account information. The Total Settlement Amount shall be apportioned as follows:

25           **4.2** \$45,000.00 shall be considered a civil penalty pursuant to California Health and  
26 Safety Code section 25249.7(b)(1). ERC shall remit 75% (\$33,750.00) of the civil penalty to  
27 the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (“OEHHA”) for deposit in the Safe  
28 Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Fund in accordance with California Health and Safety

1 Code section 25249.12(c). ERC will retain the remaining 25% (\$11,250.00) of the civil  
2 penalty.

3 **4.3** \$10,522.19 shall be distributed to ERC as reimbursement to ERC for reasonable  
4 costs incurred in bringing this action.

5 **4.4** \$33,000.00 shall be distributed to ERC as an Additional Settlement Payment  
6 (“ASP”), pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 11, sections 3203, subdivision (d)  
7 and 3204. ERC will utilize the ASP for activities that address the same public harm as  
8 allegedly caused by Defendants in this matter. These activities are detailed below and support  
9 ERC’s overarching goal of reducing and/or eliminating hazardous and toxic chemicals in  
10 dietary supplement products in California. ERC’s activities have had, and will continue to  
11 have, a direct and primary effect within the State of California because California consumers  
12 will be benefitted by the reduction and/or elimination of exposure to lead and/or mercury  
13 and/or arsenic in dietary supplements and/or by providing clear and reasonable warnings to  
14 California consumers prior to ingestion of the products.

15 Based on a review of past years’ actual budgets, ERC is providing the following list of  
16 activities ERC engages in to protect California consumers through Proposition 65 citizen  
17 enforcement, along with a breakdown of how ASP funds will be utilized to facilitate those  
18 activities: (1) ENFORCEMENT (up to 65-80%): obtaining, shipping, analyzing, and testing  
19 dietary supplement products that may contain lead and/or mercury and/or arsenic and are sold  
20 to California consumers. This work includes continued monitoring and enforcement of past  
21 consent judgments and settlements to ensure companies are in compliance with their  
22 obligations thereunder, with a specific focus on those judgments and settlements concerning  
23 lead and/or mercury and/or arsenic. This work also includes investigation of new companies  
24 that ERC does not obtain any recovery through settlement or judgment; (2) VOLUNTARY  
25 COMPLIANCE PROGRAM (up to 10-20%): maintaining ERC’s Voluntary Compliance  
26 Program by acquiring products from companies, developing and maintaining a case file, testing  
27 products from these companies, providing the test results and supporting documentation to the  
28 companies, and offering guidance in warning or implementing a self-testing program for lead

1 and/or mercury and/or arsenic in dietary supplement products; and (3) “GOT LEAD”  
2 PROGRAM (up to 5%): maintaining ERC’s “Got Lead?” Program which reduces the numbers  
3 of contaminated products that reach California consumers by providing access to free testing  
4 for lead in dietary supplement products (Products submitted to the program are screened for  
5 ingredients which are suspected to be contaminated, and then may be purchased by ERC,  
6 catalogued, sent to a qualified laboratory for testing, and the results shared with the consumer  
7 that submitted the product).

8 ERC shall be fully accountable in that it will maintain adequate records to document  
9 and will be able to demonstrate how the ASP funds will be spent and can assure that the funds  
10 are being spent only for the proper, designated purposes described in this Consent Judgment.  
11 ERC shall provide the Attorney General, within thirty days of any request, copies of  
12 documentation demonstrating how such funds have been spent.

13 **4.5** \$76,477.81 shall be distributed to ERC for its in-house legal fees. Except as  
14 explicitly provided herein, each Party shall bear its own fees and costs.

15 **4.6** In the event that Elmhurst fails to remit the Total Settlement Amount owed  
16 under Section 4 of this Consent Judgment on or before the Due Date, Elmhurst shall be  
17 deemed to be in material breach of its obligations under this Consent Judgment. ERC shall  
18 provide written notice of the delinquency to Elmhurst via electronic and U.S. mail to Elmhurst  
19 and its counsel at the addresses provided at Section 11. If Elmhurst fails to deliver the Total  
20 Settlement Amount within five (5) days from the written notice, the Total Settlement Amount  
21 shall accrue interest at the statutory judgment interest rate provided in the California Code of  
22 Civil Procedure section 685.010. Additionally, Elmhurst agrees to pay ERC’s reasonable  
23 attorney’s fees and costs for any efforts to collect the payment due under this Consent  
24 Judgment.

25 **5. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT/HANDLING OF DISPUTES**

26 **5.1** This Consent Judgment may be modified only as to injunctive terms (i) by  
27 written stipulation of the Parties and upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment  
28 signed by the Parties or (ii) by motion of either Party pursuant to an agreement to modify the

1 Consent Judgment and upon entry by the Court of a modified consent judgment signed by the  
2 Parties. If a dispute arises with respect to any proposed modification or either Party's  
3 compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment entered by the Court, the Parties shall  
4 meet and confer in good faith in person, by remote meeting, by telephone, and/or in writing  
5 and endeavor to resolve any dispute in an amicable manner. No action or motion may be filed  
6 in the absence of such a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute beforehand.

7 **5.2** In the event that Elmhurst initiates or otherwise requests a modification under  
8 Section 5.1, and the meet and confer process leads to a stipulation or agreed-upon motion or  
9 application for a modification of the Consent Judgment, Elmhurst shall reimburse ERC its  
10 costs and reasonable attorney's fees, as deemed by the Court or stipulation of the parties, for  
11 the time spent in the meet-and-confer process and filing and arguing the stipulation, motion or  
12 application.

13 **6. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION, ENFORCEMENT OF CONSENT**  
14 **JUDGMENT**

15 **6.1** This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce, modify, or  
16 terminate this Consent Judgment.

17 **6.2** If ERC alleges that any Covered Product fails to qualify as a Conforming  
18 Covered Product (for which ERC alleges that no Warning has been provided), then ERC shall  
19 inform Elmhurst in a reasonably prompt manner of its allegation and provide Elmhurst with its  
20 supporting test results and sufficient additional information to permit Elmhurst to identify the  
21 Covered Products at issue. Elmhurst shall, within thirty (30) days following such notice,  
22 provide ERC with testing information, from an independent third-party laboratory meeting the  
23 requirements of Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4, demonstrating Elmhurst's compliance with the  
24 Consent Judgment. The Parties shall first attempt to resolve the matter in an amicable manner  
25 by meeting and conferring in good faith in person, by remote meeting, by telephone, and/or in  
26 writing prior to ERC taking any further legal action.

27 **7. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT**

28 This Consent Judgment may apply to, be binding upon, and benefit the Parties and their

1 respective officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries,  
2 divisions, franchisees, licensees, customers (excluding private labelers), distributors, wholesalers,  
3 retailers, predecessors, successors, and assigns. This Consent Judgment shall have no application  
4 to any Covered Product that is distributed or sold exclusively outside the State of California and  
5 that is not used by California consumers.

6 **8. BINDING EFFECT, CLAIMS COVERED AND RELEASED**

7 **8.1** This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between ERC, on  
8 behalf of itself and in the public interest, and Elmhurst and its respective officers, directors,  
9 shareholders, employees, agents, parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliated entities,  
10 related entities, commonly-owned entities, suppliers, franchisees, licensees, customers (not  
11 including private label customers of Elmhurst), distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and all other  
12 upstream and downstream entities in the distribution chain of any Covered Product, and the  
13 predecessors, successors, and assigns of any of them (collectively, “Released Parties”).

14 **8.2** ERC, acting in the public interest, releases the Released Parties from any and all  
15 claims for violations of Proposition 65 up through the Effective Date based on exposure to lead  
16 and/or mercury and/or arsenic from the Covered Products as set forth in the Notices of  
17 Violation. ERC, on behalf of itself only, hereby fully releases and discharges the Released  
18 Parties from any and all claims, actions, causes of action, suits, demands, liabilities, damages,  
19 penalties, fees, costs, and expenses asserted, or that could have been asserted from the  
20 handling, use, or consumption of the Covered Products, as to any alleged violation of  
21 Proposition 65 or its implementing regulations arising from the failure to provide Proposition  
22 65 warnings on the Covered Products regarding lead and/or mercury and/or arsenic up to and  
23 including the Effective Date.

24 **8.3** ERC on its own behalf only, and Elmhurst on its own behalf only, further waive  
25 and release any and all claims they may have against each other for all actions or statements  
26 made or undertaken in the course of seeking or opposing enforcement of Proposition 65 in  
27 connection with the Notices and Complaint up through and including the Effective Date,  
28 provided, however, that nothing in Section 8 shall affect or limit any Party’s right to seek to

1 enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

2       **8.4** It is possible that other claims not known to the Parties, arising out of the facts  
3 alleged in the Notices and Complaint, and relating to the Covered Products, will develop or be  
4 discovered. ERC on behalf of itself only, and Elmhurst on behalf of itself only, acknowledge  
5 that this Consent Judgment is expressly intended to cover and include all such claims up  
6 through and including the Effective Date, including all rights of action therefore. ERC and  
7 Elmhurst acknowledge that the claims released in Sections 8.2 and 8.3 above may include  
8 unknown claims, and nevertheless waive California Civil Code section 1542 as to any such  
9 unknown claims. California Civil Code section 1542 reads as follows:

10           A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE  
11           CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO  
12           EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE  
13           AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY  
14           AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED  
15           PARTY.

14 ERC on behalf of itself only, and Elmhurst on behalf of itself only, acknowledge and  
15 understand the significance and consequences of this specific waiver of California Civil Code  
16 section 1542.

17       **8.5** Compliance with the terms of this Consent Judgment shall be deemed to  
18 constitute compliance with Proposition 65 by any of the Released Parties regarding alleged  
19 exposures to lead and/or mercury and/or arsenic in the Covered Products as set forth in the  
20 Notices and Complaint.

21       **8.6** Nothing in this Consent Judgment is intended to apply to any occupational or  
22 environmental exposures arising under Proposition 65, nor shall it apply to any of Elmhurst's  
23 products other than the Covered Products.

24       **9. SEVERABILITY OF UNENFORCEABLE PROVISIONS**

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

28 ///

1     **10. GOVERNING LAW**

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

4     **11. PROVISION OF NOTICE**

5             Unless otherwise stated herein, all notices required to be given to either Party to this  
6 Consent Judgment by the other shall be in writing and sent to the following agents listed below  
7 via first-class mail or via electronic mail where required. Courtesy copies via email may also be  
8 sent.

9     **FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC.:**

10 Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director, Environmental Research Center  
11 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400  
12 San Diego, CA 92108  
13 Ph: (619) 500-3090  
14 Email: [chris.heptinstall@erc501c3.org](mailto:chris.heptinstall@erc501c3.org)

15 With a copy to:  
16 Charles W. Poss  
17 Environmental Research Center, Inc.  
18 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 400  
19 San Diego, CA 92108  
20 Ph: (619) 500-3090  
21 Email: [charles.poss@erc501c3.org](mailto:charles.poss@erc501c3.org)

22     **FOR ELMHURST MILKED LLC; ELMHURST MILKED DIRECT LLC:**

23 Tyson R. Prince  
24 Vice President & Corporate Counsel  
25 1150 Maple Road  
26 Elma, New York 14059  
27 Email: [Tprince@steubenfoods.com](mailto:Tprince@steubenfoods.com)

28 With a copy to:  
29 Bao M. Vu  
30 Kelly V. Beskin  
31 Stoel Rives LLP  
32 1 Montgomery St, Suite 3230  
33 San Francisco, CA 94104  
34 Email: [bao.vu@stoel.com](mailto:bao.vu@stoel.com)  
35             [kelly.beskin@stoel.com](mailto:kelly.beskin@stoel.com)



1     **12. COURT APPROVAL**

2             **12.1** Upon execution of this Consent Judgment by the Parties, ERC shall notice a  
3 Motion for Court Approval. The Parties shall use their best efforts to support entry of this  
4 Consent Judgment.

5             **12.2** If the California Attorney General objects to any term in this Consent Judgment,  
6 the Parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the concern in a timely manner, and if possible  
7 prior to the hearing on the motion.

8             **12.3** If this Stipulated Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, it shall be  
9 void and have no force or effect.

10     **13. EXECUTION AND COUNTERPARTS**

11             This Consent Judgment may be executed in counterparts, which taken together shall be  
12 deemed to constitute one document. A facsimile or .pdf signature shall be construed to be as valid  
13 as the original signature.

14     **14. DRAFTING**

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

23     **15. GOOD FAITH ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE DISPUTES**

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

28     ///

1     **16. ENFORCEMENT**

2             ERC may, by motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of Alameda  
3 County, enforce the terms and conditions contained in this Consent Judgment. In any action  
4 brought by ERC to enforce this Consent Judgment, ERC may seek whatever fines, costs,  
5 penalties, or remedies as are provided by law for failure to comply with the Consent Judgment.  
6 To the extent the failure to comply with the Consent Judgment constitutes a violation of  
7 Proposition 65 or other laws, ERC shall not be limited to enforcement of this Consent  
8 Judgment, but may seek in another action whatever fines, costs, penalties, or remedies as are  
9 provided by law for failure to comply with Proposition 65 or other laws.

10     **17. ENTIRE AGREEMENT, AUTHORIZATION**

11             **17.1** This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and  
12 understanding of the Parties with respect to the entire subject matter herein, including any and  
13 all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments, and understandings related thereto. No  
14 representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have  
15 been made by any Party. No other agreements, oral or otherwise, unless specifically referred to  
16 herein, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any Party.

17             **17.2** Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully  
18 authorized by the Party he or she represents to stipulate to this Consent Judgment.

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

21             This Consent Judgment has come before the Court upon the request of the Parties. The  
22 Parties request the Court to fully review this Consent Judgment and, being fully informed  
23 regarding the matters which are the subject of this action, to:

24             (1) Find that the terms and provisions of this Consent Judgment represent a fair and  
25 equitable settlement of all matters raised by the allegations of the Complaint that the matter has  
26 been diligently prosecuted, and that the public interest is served by such settlement; and


27             (2) Make the findings pursuant to California Health and Safety Code section  
28 25249.7(f)(4), approve the Settlement, and approve this Consent Judgment.

1 (3) Retain jurisdiction, pursuant to Section 664.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure, after  
2 the Consent Judgment is entered in order to enforce, modify, or terminate this Consent Judgment.

3 **IT IS SO STIPULATED:**


4 Dated: 1/9/, 2024

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH  
CENTER, INC.

5  
6 By:   
7 Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director


8 Dated: January 8, 2024

ELMHURST MILKED LLC

9  
10   
11 By: Tyson Prince  
12 Its: Vice President & Corp. Counsel

13 Dated: January 8, 2024


ELMHURST MILKED DIRECT LLC

14  
15   
16 By: Tyson Prince  
17 Its: Vice President & Corp. Counsel

18 **APPROVED AS TO FORM:**


19 Dated: January 9, 2024

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH  
CENTER, INC.

20  
21 By:   
22 Charles W. Poss  
23 In-House Counsel

24 Dated: January 8, 2024

STOEL RIVES LLP

25  
26 By:   
27 Bao M. Vu  
28 Kelly V. Beskin  
Attorneys for Defendants Elmhurst  
Milked LLC and Elmhurst Milked Direct  
LLC

**ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

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

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED.

Dated: 05/06/2024, 2024



\_\_\_\_\_  
Judge of the Superior Court

**Brad Seligman / Judge**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# **EXHIBIT A**



## Environmental Research Center

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

January 5, 2023

### 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 In-House Counsel for 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 products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violators identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violators and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to 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.

**General Information about Proposition 65.** 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:

**Elmhurst Milked LLC  
Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC**

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

- 1. Elmhurst Plant Based Oat Creamer Unsweetened - Lead**
- 2. Elmhurst Milked Oats Chocolate – Lead, Mercury**
- 3. Elmhurst Oat Latte Matcha - Mercury**
- 4. Elmhurst Oat Latte Flash Brew - Mercury**

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.

On July 1, 1990, the State of California officially listed mercury and mercury compounds as chemicals known to cause developmental toxicity and male and female reproductive toxicity.

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


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

**Approximate Time Period of Violations.** Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least January 5, 2020, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until these known toxic chemicals are either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemicals. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to these chemicals.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violators to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemicals, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals, as well as expensive and time-consuming litigation.

Please direct all questions concerning this notice to my attention, or Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director of ERC, at the above listed address and telephone number.

Sincerely,



---

Charles Poss  
In-House Counsel  
Environmental Research Center

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Elmhurst Milked LLC, Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC, and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

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 Elmhurst Milked LLC and Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC**

I, Charles Poss, 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 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 chemicals that are 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.

Dated: January 5, 2023

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles Poss



**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903**

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

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On January 5, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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 each of the parties 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  
Elmhurst Milked LLC and  
Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC  
1150 Maple Rd  
Elma, NY 14059

National Registered Agents, Inc.  
(Registered Agent for Elmhurst Milked LLC and  
Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC)  
1209 N. Orange St  
Wilmington, DE 19801

National Registered Agents, Inc.  
(Registered Agent for Elmhurst Milked LLC)  
7700 E Arapahoe Rd, Ste 220  
Centennial, CO 80112

The LLC  
(Registered Agent for Elmhurst Milked LLC)  
1150 Maple Rd  
Elma, NY 14059

On January 5, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General’s website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice> :

Office of the California Attorney General  
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting  
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000  
Post Office Box 70550  
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On January 5, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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:

Nancy O’Malley, District Attorney  
Alameda County  
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650  
Oakland, CA 94621  
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Barbara Yook, District Attorney  
Calaveras County  
891 Mountain Ranch Road  
San Andreas, CA 95249  
Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us

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

January 5, 2023

Page 5

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

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

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

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

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

Kimberly Lewis, District Attorney  
Merced County  
550 West Main St  
Merced, CA 95340  
Prop65@countyofmerced.com

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

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

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

Todd Spitzer, District Attorney  
Orange County  
300 N Flower St  
Santa Ana, CA 92703  
Prop65notice@da.ocgov.com

Morgan Briggs Gire, District Attorney  
Placer County  
10810 Justice Center Drive  
Roseville, CA 95678  
Prop65@placer.ca.gov

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

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

Summer Stephan, District Attorney  
San Diego County  
330 West Broadway  
San Diego, CA 92101  
SanDiegoDAProp65@sdca.org

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

Alexandra Grayner, Assistant District Attorney  
San Francisco District Attorney's Office  
350 Rhode Island Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org

Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney  
San Francisco City Attorney  
1390 Market Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org  
Starla.Sousa@sfcityatty.org

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

January 5, 2023

Page 6

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

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

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

Jill Ravitch, District Attorney  
Sonoma County  
600 Administration Dr  
Sonoma, CA 95403  
Jeannie.Barnes@sonoma-county.org

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

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

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


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

Nora V. Frimann, City Attorney  
San Jose City Attorney  
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 96113  
Proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov

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

On January 5, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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 First Class Mail.

Executed on January 5, 2023, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.



Phyllis Dunwoody

**Service List**

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, Colusa  
County  
310 6<sup>th</sup> St  
Colusa, CA 95932

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

District Attorney, El Dorado  
County  
778 Pacific St.  
Placerville, CA 95667

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

District Attorney, Humboldt  
County  
825 5th Street 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Eureka, CA 95501

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

District Attorney, Kern County  
1215 Truxtun Avenue  
Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings  
County  
1400 West Lacey Boulevard  
Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County  
255 N. Forbes Street  
Lakeport, CA 95453

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

District Attorney, Madera  
County  
209 West Yosemite Avenue  
Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin  
County  
3501 Civic Center Drive,  
Room 130  
San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mendocino  
County  
Post Office Box 1000  
Ukiah, CA 95482

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

District Attorney, San  
Bernardino County  
303 West Third Street  
San Bernadino, CA 92415

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

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

District Attorney, Sierra  
County  
Post Office Box 457  
100 Courthouse Square, 2<sup>nd</sup>  
Floor  
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou  
County  
Post Office Box 986  
Yreka, CA 96097  
District Attorney, Solano  
County  
675 Texas Street, Ste 4500  
Fairfield, CA 94533

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

District Attorney, Sutter  
County  
463 2<sup>nd</sup> 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

## APPENDIX A

### OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as "Proposition 65"). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: [http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65\\_list/Newlist.html](http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html).

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

***Clear and reasonable warnings.*** A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be “clear and reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

***Prohibition from discharges into drinking water.*** A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

#### *DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?*

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

***Grace Period.*** Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

***Governmental agencies and public water utilities.*** All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

***Businesses with nine or fewer employees.*** Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

**Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer.** For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

**Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question.** For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

**Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food.** Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Section 25501(a)(4).

## *HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?*

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

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

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

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

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



A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:  
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

*FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...*

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at [P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov](mailto:P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov).

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

# **EXHIBIT B**



## Environmental Research Center

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

January 12, 2023

### 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 In-House Counsel for 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 products identified below. These violations have occurred and continue to occur because the alleged Violators identified below failed to provide required clear and reasonable warnings with these products. This letter serves as a notice of these violations to the alleged Violators and the appropriate public enforcement agencies. Pursuant to 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.

**General Information about Proposition 65.** 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:

**Elmhurst Milked LLC**  
**Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC**

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

- 1. Elmhurst Milked Oats Blueberry – Lead, Mercury**
- 2. Elmhurst Milked Cashews Barista Approved - Lead**
- 3. Elmhurst Plant Based Oat Barista Made From Whole Grain Oats - Mercury**

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.

On July 1, 1990, the State of California officially listed mercury and mercury compounds as chemicals known to cause developmental toxicity and male and female reproductive toxicity.

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

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

**Approximate Time Period of Violations.** Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least January 12, 2020, as well as every day since the products were introduced into the California marketplace, and will continue every day until clear and reasonable warnings are provided to product purchasers and users or until these known toxic chemicals are either removed from or reduced to allowable levels in the products. Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be provided prior to exposure to the identified chemicals. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product label. The Violators violated Proposition 65 because they failed to provide persons ingesting these products with appropriate warnings that they are being exposed to these chemicals.

Consistent with the public interest goals of Proposition 65 and a desire to have these ongoing violations of California law quickly rectified, ERC is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter that includes an enforceable written agreement by the Violators to: (1) reformulate the identified products so as to eliminate further exposures to the identified chemicals, or provide appropriate warnings on the labels of these products; (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty; and (3) provide clear and reasonable warnings compliant with Proposition 65 to all persons located in California who purchased the above products in the last three years. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures to the identified chemicals, as well as expensive and time-consuming litigation.

Please direct all questions concerning this notice to my attention, or Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director of ERC, at the above listed address and telephone number.

Sincerely,



---

Charles Poss  
In-House Counsel  
Environmental Research Center

Attachments

Certificate of Merit

Certificate of Service

OEHHA Summary (to Elmhurst Milked LLC, Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC, and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)

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 Elmhurst Milked LLC and Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC**

I, Charles Poss, 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 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 chemicals that are 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.

Dated: January 12, 2023

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles Poss

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903**

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

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On January 12, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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 each of the parties 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  
Elmhurst Milked LLC and  
Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC  
1150 Maple Rd  
Elma, NY 14059

National Registered Agents, Inc.  
(Registered Agent for Elmhurst Milked LLC and  
Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC)  
1209 N. Orange St  
Wilmington, DE 19801

National Registered Agents, Inc.  
(Registered Agent for Elmhurst Milked LLC)  
7700 E Arapahoe Rd, Ste 220  
Centennial, CO 80112

The LLC  
(Registered Agent for Elmhurst Milked LLC)  
1150 Maple Rd  
Elma, NY 14059

On January 12, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General’s website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice> :

Office of the California Attorney General  
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting  
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000  
Post Office Box 70550  
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On January 12, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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:

Nancy O’Malley, District Attorney  
Alameda County  
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650  
Oakland, CA 94621  
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

Barbara Yook, District Attorney  
Calaveras County  
891 Mountain Ranch Road  
San Andreas, CA 95249  
Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us

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

January 12, 2023

Page 5

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

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

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

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

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

Kimberly Lewis, District Attorney  
Merced County  
550 West Main St  
Merced, CA 95340  
Prop65@countyofmerced.com

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

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

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

Todd Spitzer, District Attorney  
Orange County  
300 N Flower St  
Santa Ana, CA 92703  
Prop65notice@da.ocgov.com

Morgan Briggs Gire, District Attorney  
Placer County  
10810 Justice Center Drive  
Roseville, CA 95678  
Prop65@placer.ca.gov

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

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

Summer Stephan, District Attorney  
San Diego County  
330 West Broadway  
San Diego, CA 92101  
SanDiegoDAProp65@sdca.org

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

Alexandra Grayner, Assistant District Attorney  
San Francisco District Attorney's Office  
350 Rhode Island Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org

Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney  
San Francisco City Attorney  
1390 Market Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org  
Starla.Sousa@sfcityatty.org

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

January 12, 2023

Page 6

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

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

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

Jill Ravitch, District Attorney  
Sonoma County  
600 Administration Dr  
Sonoma, CA 95403  
Jeannie.Barnes@sonoma-county.org

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

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

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


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

Nora V. Frimann, City Attorney  
San Jose City Attorney  
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 96113  
Proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov

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

On January 12, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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 First Class Mail.

Executed on January 12, 2023, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

  
Phyllis Dunwoody



**Service List**

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, Colusa  
County  
310 6<sup>th</sup> St  
Colusa, CA 95932

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

District Attorney, El Dorado  
County  
778 Pacific St.  
Placerville, CA 95667

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

District Attorney, Humboldt  
County  
825 5th Street 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Eureka, CA 95501

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

District Attorney, Kern County  
1215 Truxtun Avenue  
Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings  
County  
1400 West Lacey Boulevard  
Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County  
255 N. Forbes Street  
Lakeport, CA 95453

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

District Attorney, Madera  
County  
209 West Yosemite Avenue  
Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin  
County  
3501 Civic Center Drive,  
Room 130  
San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mendocino  
County  
Post Office Box 1000  
Ukiah, CA 95482

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

District Attorney, San  
Bernardino County  
303 West Third Street  
San Bernadino, CA 92415

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

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

District Attorney, Sierra  
County  
Post Office Box 457  
100 Courthouse Square, 2<sup>nd</sup>  
Floor  
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou  
County  
Post Office Box 986  
Yreka, CA 96097  
District Attorney, Solano  
County  
675 Texas Street, Ste 4500  
Fairfield, CA 94533

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

District Attorney, Sutter  
County  
463 2<sup>nd</sup> 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

## APPENDIX A

### OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as “Proposition 65”). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: [http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65\\_list/Newlist.html](http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html).

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

***Clear and reasonable warnings.*** A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be “clear and reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

***Prohibition from discharges into drinking water.*** A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

#### *DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?*

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

***Grace Period.*** Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

***Governmental agencies and public water utilities.*** All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

***Businesses with nine or fewer employees.*** Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.

**Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer.** For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

**Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question.** For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

**Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food.** Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Section 25501(a)(4).

## *HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?*

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

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

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

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

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

A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:  
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

*FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...*

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at [P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov](mailto:P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov).

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

# **EXHIBIT C**



## Environmental Research Center

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

March 9, 2023

### 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 In-House Counsel for 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.

**General Information about Proposition 65.** 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:

**Elmhurst Milked LLC  
Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC**

**Consumer Product and Listed Chemical.** The product that is the subject of this notice and the chemical in that product identified as exceeding allowable levels is:

**Elmhurst Milked Oats Chocolate – Arsenic (inorganic arsenic compounds)**

On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed arsenic (inorganic arsenic compounds) as a chemical 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.

**Approximate Time Period of Violations.** Ongoing violations have occurred every day since at least March 9, 2020, 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 ingesting 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 expensive and time-consuming litigation.

Please direct all questions concerning this notice to my attention, or Chris Heptinstall, Executive Director of ERC, at the above listed address and telephone number.

Sincerely,



---

Charles Poss  
In-House Counsel  
Environmental Research Center

Attachments

- Certificate of Merit
- Certificate of Service
- OEHHA Summary (to Elmhurst Milked LLC, Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC, and their Registered Agents for Service of Process only)
- 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 Elmhurst Milked LLC and Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC**

I, Charles Poss, 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 an attorney for the noticing party.

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

4. Based on the information obtained through those consultants, and on other information in my possession, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged Violators will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.

5. Along with the copy of this Certificate of Merit served on the Attorney General is attached additional factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in California Health & Safety Code §25249.7(h)(2), i.e., (1) the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and (2) the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons.

Dated: March 9, 2023



---

Charles Poss

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE PURSUANT TO 27 CCR § 25903**

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

I am a citizen of the United States and over the age of 18 years of age. My business address is 306 Joy Street, Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia 30742. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.

On March 9, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified 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”** were served on the following parties when a true and correct copy thereof was sent via electronic mail to the parties listed below, through their attorneys pursuant to agreement:

Elmhurst Milked LLC  
Elmhurst Milked Direct LLC  
c/o Bao M. Vu and Kelly V. Beskin  
Stoel Rives LLP  
1 Montgomery Street, Suite 3230  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Email: bao.vu@stoel.com  
kelly.beskin@stoel.com

On March 9, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, I verified the following documents **NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS, CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.5 ET SEQ.; CERTIFICATE OF MERIT; ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AS REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §25249.7(d)(1)** were served on the following party when a true and correct copy thereof was uploaded on the California Attorney General’s website, which can be accessed at <https://oag.ca.gov/prop65/add-60-day-notice> :

Office of the California Attorney General  
Prop 65 Enforcement Reporting  
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000  
Post Office Box 70550  
Oakland, CA 94612-0550

On March 9, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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:

Nancy O’Malley, District Attorney  
Alameda County  
7677 Oakport Street, Suite 650  
Oakland, CA 94621  
CEPDProp65@acgov.org

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

Barbara Yook, District Attorney  
Calaveras County  
891 Mountain Ranch Road  
San Andreas, CA 95249  
Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us

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

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

March 9, 2023

Page 5

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

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

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

Kimberly Lewis, District Attorney  
Merced County  
550 West Main St  
Merced, CA 95340  
Prop65@countyofmerced.com

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

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

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

Todd Spitzer, District Attorney  
Orange County  
300 N Flower St  
Santa Ana, CA 92703  
Prop65notice@da.ocgov.com

Morgan Briggs Gire, District Attorney  
Placer County  
10810 Justice Center Drive  
Roseville, CA 95678  
Prop65@placer.ca.gov

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

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

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

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

Alexandra Grayner, Assistant District Attorney  
San Francisco District Attorney's Office  
350 Rhode Island Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org

Valerie Lopez, Deputy City Attorney  
San Francisco City Attorney  
1390 Market Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org  
Starla.Sousa@sfcityatty.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, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

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

March 9, 2023

Page 6

edobroth@co.slo.ca.us

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

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

Nora V. Frimann, City Attorney  
San Jose City Attorney  
200 E. Santa Clara Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 96113  
Proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov

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

Jill Ravitch, District Attorney  
Sonoma County  
600 Administration Dr  
Sonoma, CA 95403  
Jeannie.Barnes@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 March 9, 2023, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, 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 First Class Mail.

Executed on March 9, 2023, in Fort Oglethorpe, Georgia.



Phyllis Dunwoody

**Service List**

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, Colusa  
County  
310 6<sup>th</sup> St  
Colusa, CA 95932

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

District Attorney, El Dorado  
County  
778 Pacific St.  
Placerville, CA 95667

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

District Attorney, Humboldt  
County  
825 5th Street 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Eureka, CA 95501

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

District Attorney, Kern County  
1215 Truxtun Avenue  
Bakersfield, CA 93301

District Attorney, Kings  
County  
1400 West Lacey Boulevard  
Hanford, CA 93230

District Attorney, Lake County  
255 N. Forbes Street  
Lakeport, CA 95453

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

District Attorney, Madera  
County  
209 West Yosemite Avenue  
Madera, CA 93637

District Attorney, Marin  
County  
3501 Civic Center Drive,  
Room 130  
San Rafael, CA 94903

District Attorney, Mendocino  
County  
Post Office Box 1000  
Ukiah, CA 95482

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

District Attorney, San  
Bernardino County  
303 West Third Street  
San Bernadino, CA 92415

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

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

District Attorney, Sierra  
County  
Post Office Box 457  
100 Courthouse Square, 2<sup>nd</sup>  
Floor  
Downieville, CA 95936

District Attorney, Siskiyou  
County  
Post Office Box 986  
Yreka, CA 96097  
District Attorney, Solano  
County  
675 Texas Street, Ste 4500  
Fairfield, CA 94533

District Attorney, Stanislaus  
County  
832 12th Street, Ste 300

Modesto, CA 95354

District Attorney, Sutter  
County  
463 2<sup>nd</sup> 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

## APPENDIX A

### OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): A SUMMARY

The following summary has been prepared by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), the lead agency for the implementation of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (commonly known as “Proposition 65”). A copy of this summary must be included as an attachment to any notice of violation served upon an alleged violator of the Act. The summary provides basic information about the provisions of the law, and is intended to serve only as a convenient source of general information. It is not intended to provide authoritative guidance on the meaning or application of the law. The reader is directed to the statute and OEHHA implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING THE BASIS FOR THE ALLEGATIONS IN THE NOTICE RELATED TO YOUR BUSINESS, CONTACT THE PERSON IDENTIFIED ON THE NOTICE.

The text of Proposition 65 (Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13) is available online at: <http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65law72003.html>. Regulations that provide more specific guidance on compliance, and that specify procedures to be followed by the State in carrying out certain aspects of the law, are found in Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 25102 through 27001.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated. The statute, regulations and relevant case law are available on the OEHHA website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>.

female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: [http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65\\_list/Newlist.html](http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html).

Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under Proposition 65. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving listed chemicals must comply with the following:

***Clear and reasonable warnings.*** A business is required to warn a person before “knowingly and intentionally” exposing that person to a listed chemical unless an exemption applies. The warning given must be “clear and reasonable.” This means that the warning must: (1) clearly make known that the chemical involved is known to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm; and (2) be given in such a way that it will effectively reach the person before he or she is exposed to that chemical. Some exposures are exempt from the warning requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

***Prohibition from discharges into drinking water.*** A business must not knowingly discharge or release a listed chemical into water or onto land where it passes or probably will pass into a source of drinking water. Some discharges are exempt from this requirement under certain circumstances discussed below.

#### *DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?*

Yes. You should consult the current version of the statute and regulations (<http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/index.html>) to determine all applicable exemptions, the most common of which are the following:

***Grace Period.*** Proposition 65 warning requirements do not apply until 12 months after the chemical has been listed. The Proposition 65 discharge prohibition does not apply to a discharge or release of a chemical that takes place less than 20 months after the listing of the chemical.

***Governmental agencies and public water utilities.*** All agencies of the federal, state or local government, as well as entities operating public water systems, are exempt.

***Businesses with nine or fewer employees.*** Neither the warning requirement nor the discharge prohibition applies to a business that employs a total of nine or fewer employees. This includes all employees, not just those present in California.



**Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer.** For chemicals that are listed under Proposition 65 as known to the State to cause cancer, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure occurs at a level that poses “no significant risk.” This means that the exposure is calculated to result in not more than one excess case of cancer in 100,000 individuals exposed over a 70-year lifetime. The Proposition 65 regulations identify specific “No Significant Risk Levels” (NSRLs) for many listed carcinogens. Exposures below these levels are exempt from the warning requirement. See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of NSRLs, and Section 25701 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

**Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question.** For chemicals known to the State to cause reproductive toxicity, a warning is not required if the business causing the exposure can demonstrate that the exposure will produce no observable effect, even at 1,000 times the level in question. In other words, the level of exposure must be below the “no observable effect level” divided by 1,000. This number is known as the Maximum Allowable Dose Level (MADL). See OEHHA's website at: <http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/getNSRLs.html> for a list of MADLs, and Section 25801 *et seq.* of the regulations for information concerning how these levels are calculated.

**Exposures to Naturally Occurring Chemicals in Food.** Certain exposures to chemicals that naturally occur in foods (i.e., that do not result from any known human activity, including activity by someone other than the person causing the exposure) are exempt from the warning requirements of the law. If the chemical is a contaminant<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Section 25501(a)(4).

## *HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?*

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

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

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

- An exposure to alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent onsite consumption is permitted by law;
- An exposure to a Proposition 65 listed chemical in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises that is primarily intended for immediate consumption on- or off-premises. This only applies if the chemical was not intentionally added to the food, and was formed by cooking or similar preparation of food or beverage components necessary to render the food or beverage palatable or to avoid microbiological contamination;
- An exposure to environmental tobacco smoke caused by entry of persons (other than employees) on premises owned or operated by the alleged violator where smoking is permitted at any location on the premises;
- An exposure to listed chemicals in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking non-commercial vehicles.

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


A copy of the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form is included in Appendix B and can be downloaded from OEHHA's website at:  
<http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/p65law72003.html>.

*FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW OR REGULATIONS...*

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900 or via e-mail at [P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov](mailto:P65Public.Comments@oehha.ca.gov).

Revised: May 2017

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 25249.12, Health and Safety Code. Reference: Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.7, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11, Health and Safety Code.

<b>SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA</b>	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS: Rene C. Davidson Courthouse 1225 Fallon Street, Oakland, CA 94612	<b>FILED</b> Superior Court of California County of Alameda 05/06/2024
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, INC., a California non-profit corporation	Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court By:  Deputy M. Williams
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: ELMHURST MILKED LLC et al	
<b>CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 1010.6</b>	CASE NUMBER: 23CV030405

I, the below named Executive Officer/Clerk of Court of the above-entitled court, do hereby certify that I am not a party to the cause herein, and that on this date I served one copy of the Stipulated Judgment entered herein upon each party or counsel of record in the above entitled action, by electronically serving the document(s) from my place of business, in accordance with standard court practices.


BAO M. VU  
STOEL RIVES LLP  
bao.vu@stoel.com

Charles Poss  
Environmental Research Center, Inc.  
charles.poss@erc501c3.org

Dated: 05/06/2024

Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court

By:



M. Williams, Deputy Clerk