

# **CONSUMER DEFENSE GROUP ACTION**

---

950 South Coast Drive, Suite 220

Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Telephone: (714) 850-9390

Facsimile: (714) 850-9392

## **60 Day Notice of Intent to Sue Voit Development Co. Under Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6**

Consumer Defense Group Action, a California corporation (hereinafter "CDG" or the "Noticing Party") hereby gives Notice of Intent to Sue Under Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 (the "Notice") to Bob Voit, President of Voit Development Co. (hereinafter referred to as "VOIT" or "the Violator"), as well as the governmental entities on the attached proof of service. The Noticing Party must be contacted through Anthony G. Graham at the above address.

This Notice is intended to inform VOIT that it has violated Proposition 65, the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act (commencing with Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5) (hereinafter "Proposition 65") by failing and refusing to post clear and reasonable warnings at the facilities listed on Exhibit A hereto (which are owned/managed by VOIT ) (hereinafter "the Facilities") that VOIT permits the smoking of tobacco products at the Facilities, which exposes customers, visitors and employees to tobacco smoke in the areas where smoking is permitted.

### **Summary of Violation:**

Proposition 65 requires that when a party, such as the Violator, has been and is knowingly and intentionally exposing its customers, the public and/or its employees to chemicals designated by the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity ("the Designated Chemicals") it has violated the statute unless, prior to such exposure, it provides clear and reasonable warning of that potential exposure to the potentially exposed persons (Health & Safety Code Section 24249.6). Tobacco smoke is one of the Designated Chemicals. Secondhand tobacco smoke has also been identified as a toxic air contaminant by the California Air Resources Board.

The Violator, in the ordinary course of business, controls much of the conduct and actions of its customers, visitors and employees at the Facilities listed on Exhibit A to this Notice (hereinafter, "the Facilities"). One of the actions the Violator controls is whether or not to allow its customers, visitors and employees at the Facilities to smoke cigarettes and cigars. At certain designated areas at each of the Facilities the Violator has prohibited smoking and has posted signs barring smoking in those areas. The Violator strictly enforces that prohibition.

However, the Violator has also specifically chosen to allow its customers, visitors and employees at each of the Facilities to smoke cigarettes and cigars in certain areas. Those areas are the entrances to the Facilities and in the walkways and common areas where the Violator allows persons to congregate and smoke, and in addition, at larger Facilities, in the areas surrounding ATM machines which are situated in the wall of the buildings and in seating areas close to the entrances to the Facilities. In those areas the Violator has chosen to allow its customers, visitors and employees to be exposed to tobacco smoke via the breathing of second hand tobacco smoke and via contact with their skin and clothing. The Violator has however specifically chosen to ignore the requirements of Proposition 65 and has failed to post clear and reasonable warnings at those areas so that its customers, visitors and employees, who may

not wish to be exposed, can be warned that, upon entering and/or using the bank facilities in those areas, they may be exposed to tobacco smoke.

Persons representing CDG have personally visited many of your Facilities from the period August 1, 2005 and February 15, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as the "Investigation Period"). During those investigations CDG discovered that the Facilities are owned and/or managed by VOIT, and that VOIT has more than nine employees. Those investigations showed that VOIT has chosen to allow its customers, visitors and employees at the Facilities to congregate at or near the entrances to the Facilities and to smoke tobacco products, and has specifically chosen to allow smoking in certain areas. Those areas are the entrances to the Facilities and in the walkways and common areas where the Violator allows persons to congregate and smoke, and in addition, at larger Facilities, in the areas surrounding ATM machines which are situated in the wall of the buildings and in seating areas close to the entrances to the Facilities.

In the Facilities and areas noted VOIT has chosen to allow its customers, visitors and employees to be exposed to tobacco smoke via the breathing of second hand tobacco smoke and via contact with their skin and clothing. Evidence that the smoking of tobacco products was taking place and had taken place at the noted areas at the Facilities was seen by the investigators for CDG at the Facilities during the Investigation Period, including persons seen smoking in these areas and the presence of cigarette butts on the ground and/or in waste containers in those areas. The obvious and conspicuous presence of such smokers, the cigarette butts on the ground, as well as the presence of cigarette disposal receptacles/ashtrays in those areas is evidence of the knowledge of VOIT that such activities occurred in those areas and were permitted by VOIT.

The investigation by CDG at the Facilities showed that VOIT has specifically chosen to ignore the requirements of Proposition 65 and has failed to post clear and reasonable warnings in the areas noted above where smoking is permitted so that its customers, visitors and employees, who may not wish to be exposed, can be warned that, upon entering any of those areas, they may be exposed to tobacco smoke, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity.

It is clear therefore that for the entire period of time that VOIT has owned and/or controlled the Facilities prior to the Investigation Period, VOIT has failed to post clear and reasonable warning signs at the Facilities in compliance with Proposition 65. Given that the maximum period of potential liability pursuant to Proposition 65 (the operative statute pursuant to which a complaint will be filed against VOIT) is four years, this Notice is intended to inform VOIT that it has been in violation of Proposition 65 from the time period from four years prior to the last date of the Investigation Period noted above, for every day upon which VOIT owned and/or controlled any Facility listed on Exhibit A.

The written reports prepared by the investigators for CDG, prepared contemporaneously with the investigations conducted during the Initial Investigation Period, has been provided to the Office of the Attorney General responsible for Proposition 65 enforcement.

#### **Environmental Exposures:**

While in the course of doing business, at the locations in the attached Exhibit A, for up to four years prior to 02/01/2006, the Violator has been and is knowingly and intentionally exposing its customers and the public to tobacco smoke and other chemicals listed below and designated by the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning of that fact to the exposed persons (Health & Safety Code Section 24249.6). The source of exposures is tobacco smoke. The areas where exposures occur are the entrances to the Facilities and in the walkways and common areas where the Violator allows persons to congregate and smoke, and in addition, at larger

Facilities, in the areas surrounding ATM machines which are situated in the wall of the buildings and in seating areas close to the entrances to the Facilities.

**Occupational Exposures:**


While in the course of doing business, at the locations in the attached Exhibit A, for up to four years prior to 02/01/2006, the Violator has been and is knowingly and intentionally exposing employees of the violator to tobacco and tobacco smoke and other chemicals listed below and designated by the State of California to cause cancer and reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning of that fact to the exposed person (Health & Safety Code Section 25249.6). The source of exposure includes tobacco and tobacco smoke at the locations in Exhibit A. Employees include and are not limited to security personnel, maintenance workers, service personnel and administrative personnel. Such exposure takes place in the areas where exposures occur, that is, the entrances to the Facilities and in the walkways and common areas where the Violator allows persons to congregate and smoke, and in addition, at larger Facilities, in the areas surrounding ATM machines which are situated in the wall of the buildings and in seating areas close to the entrances to the Facilities.

The route of exposure for Occupational Exposures and Environmental Exposures to the chemicals listed below has been inhalation, ingestion and dermal contact with tobacco smoke at the locations in the attached Exhibit A. In other words, via the breathing of tobacco smoke and contact with the skin at those locations. For each such type and means of exposure, the Violator has exposed and is exposing the above referenced persons to:

**SEE ATTACHED LIST OF CARCINOGENS/TOXINS**

Proposition 65 requires that notice and intent to sue be given to the Violator 60 days before the suit is filed. With this letter, Consumer Defense Group Action gives notice of the alleged violations to the Violator and the appropriate governmental authorities. Consumer Defense group Action will seek injunctive relief either requiring the posting of clear and reasonable warning signs pursuant to Proposition 65 or alternatively that the Facilities be smoke-free except for specifically designated and well-signed areas where smoking would be permitted. This notice covers all violations of Proposition 65 that are currently known to Consumer Defense Group Action from information now available to them. CDG continues to investigate the other Facilities owned and/or managed by the Violator and reserves the right to amend this Notice to include additional Facilities and/or exposures. With the copy of this notice submitted to the violations, a copy is provided of "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary."

Dated: February 24, 2006

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Anthony G. Graham, Esq.

**Exhibit A**

**VOIT DEVELOPMENT CO.**

Bob Voit/President  
Voit Development  
21700 Oxnard Street, Ste. 350  
Woodland Hills, CA. 91367

1855 1st Ave San Diego, CA 92101	16644 W Bernardo Dr San Diego, CA 92127
1901 E 1st St Santa Ana, CA 92705	731 E Ball Rd Bldg 4 Ball Road Business Park Anaheim, CA 92805
11777 Bernardo Plaza Ct San Diego, CA 92128	900 N Broadway Santa Ana, CA 92701
1600 N Broadway Santa Ana, CA 92706	1011 Camino Del Rio S San Diego, CA 92108

## LIST OF CARCINOGENS

Acetaldehyde	Acetamide
Acrylonitrile	4-Aminobiphenyl
(4-Aminodiphenyl)	Aniline
Ortho-Anisidine	Arsenic (inorganic arsenic compounds)
Benz[a]anthracene	Benzene
Benzo[b]fluoranthene	Benzo[j]fluoranthene
Benzo[k]fluoranthene	Cadmium
Captan	Chromium (hexavalent compounds)
Chrysene	Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT)
Bibenz[a,h]anthracene	7H-Dibenzo[c,g]carbazole
Dibenzo[a,e]pyrene	Dibenzo[a,h]pyrene
Dibenzo[a,i]pyrene	Dibenzo[a,l]pyrene
1,1-Dimethylhydrazine (UDMH)	Formaldehyde (gas)
Hydrazine	Lead and lead compounds
1-Naphthylamine	2-Naphthylamine
Nickel and certain nickel compounds	2-Nitropropane
N-Nitrosodi-n-butylamine	N-Nitrosodiethanolamine
N-Nitrosodiethylamine	N-Nitrosomethylethylamine
N-Nitrosomorpholine	N-Nitrosornicotine
N-Nitrosopiperidine	N-Nitrosopyrrolidine
Ortho-Toluidine	Tobacco Smoke
Urethane (Ethyl carbamate)	

## LIST OF REPRODUCTIVE TOXINS

Arsenic (inorganic Oxides)	Cadmium
Carbon disulfide	Carbon monoxide
Lead	Nicotine
Toluene	Tobacco Smoke
Urethane	

**CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**  
**Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d)**

I, Anthony G. Graham, hereby declare:

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


2. I am member of the State Bar of California, a partner of the law firm of Graham & Martin, LLP, and attorney for noticing party Consumer Defense Group Action.

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

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

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

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Costa Mesa, California on February 3, 2006.

A handwritten signature in black ink is written over a solid horizontal line. The signature is cursive and appears to read "Cheryl Gahn".

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 Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, 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 its implementing regulations (see citations below) for further information.

Proposition 65 appears in California law as Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5 through 25249.13. 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 22 of the California Code of Regulations, Sections 12000 through 14000.

#### WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

**The "Governor's List."** Proposition 65 requires the Governor to publish a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer, or birth defects or other reproductive harm. This list must be updated at least once a year. Over 550 chemicals have been listed as of May 1, 1996. Only those chemicals that are on the list are regulated under this law. Businesses that produce, use, release or otherwise engage in activities involving those 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. 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. Exposures are exempt from the warning requirement if they occur less than twelve months after the date of listing of the chemical.

**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. Discharges are exempt from this requirement if they occur less than twenty months after the date of listing of the chemical.

#### DOES PROPOSITION 65 PROVIDE ANY EXEMPTIONS?

Yes. The law exempts:

**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.

**Exposures that pose no significant risk of cancer.** For chemicals that are listed as known to the State to cause cancer ("carcinogens"), a warning is not required if the business 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 for more than 250 listed carcinogens.

**Exposures that will produce no observable reproductive effect at 1,000 times the level in question.** For chemicals known to the State to cause birth defects or other reproductive harm ("reproductive toxicants"), a warning is not required if the business 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 (NOEL)," divided by a 1,000-fold safety or uncertainty factor. The "no observable effect level" is the highest dose level which has not been associated with an observable adverse reproductive or developmental effect.

**Discharges that do not result in a "significant amount" of the listed chemical entering into 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 enter any drinking water source, 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" "no observable effect" test if an individual were exposed to such amount in drinking water.

#### HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

Enforcement is carried out through civil lawsuits. These lawsuits may be brought by the Attorney General, any district attorney, or certain city attorneys (those in cities with a population exceeding 750,000). Lawsuits may also be brought by private parties acting in the public interest, only after providing notice of the alleged violation to the Attorney General, the appropriate district attorney and city attorney, and the business caused the violation. The notice must provide adequate information to allow the recipient to assess the nature of the alleged violation. A notice must comply with the information and procedural requirements specified in regulations (Title 22, California Code of Regulations, Section 129). A private party may not pursue an enforcement action directly under Proposition 65 if one of the governmental officials noted above initiates an action within sixty days of the notice.

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

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION...

Contact the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's Proposition 65 Implementation Office at (916) 445-6900.

§ 14000. Chemicals Required by State or Federal Law Have Been Tested for Potential to Cause Cancer or Reproductive Toxicity, but Which Have Not Been Adequately Tested As Required.

(a) The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 requires the Governor to publish a list of chemicals formally require state or federal agencies to have testing for carcinogenicity or reproductive toxicity, but that the state's qualified experts have not found been adequately tested as required (Health and Safety Code 2524



Readers should note a chemical is not included in the following listing as requiring additional testing for that particular toxicological endpoint. However, the "data gap" may continue to exist, for purposes of the state or federal agency's requirements. Additional information on the requirements for testing may be obtained from the specific agency identified below.

(b) Chemicals required to be tested by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation.

The Birth Defect Prevention Act of 1984 (SB 950) mandates that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (CDPR) review chronic toxicology studies supporting the registration of pesticidal active ingredients. Missing or unacceptable studies are identified as data gaps. The studies are conducted to fulfill generic data requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), which is administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The studies are reviewed by CDPR according to guidelines and standards promulgated under FIFRA. Thus, older studies may not meet current guidelines.

The existence of a data gap for a compound does not indicate a total lack of information on the carcinogenicity or reproductive toxicity of the compound. In some cases, information exists in the open scientific literature, but SB 950 requires specific additional information. A data gap does not necessarily indicate that an oncogenic or reproductive hazard exists. For the purposes of this list, a data gap is still considered to be present until the study is reviewed and found to be acceptable.

Following is a listing of SB 950 data gaps for oncogenicity, reproduction, and teratology studies for the first 200 pesticidal active ingredients. This list will change as data gaps are filled by additional data or replacement studies.

For purposes of this section, "onc mouse" means oncogenicity in mice, "onc rat" means oncogenicity in rats, "repro" means reproduction, "tera rodent" means teratogenicity in rodents, "tera rabbit" means teratogenicity in rabbits.

Chemical	Testing Needed
Bendiocarb	onc rat, repro, tera rodent
Chloroneb	onc rat, onc mouse, repro, tera rodent, tera rabbit
PCT Petroleum distillates, aromatic	repro, onc rat onc rat, onc mouse, repro, tera rodent, tera rabbit

(c) Chemicals required to be tested by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Toxic Substances.

Under Section 4(s) of the Toxic Substances Control Act, testing of a chemical is required when that chemical may present an unreasonable risk, or is produced in substantial quantities and enters the environment in substantial quantities, or may have significant or substantial human exposure.

For purposes of this section, "tera" means teratogenicity, "tox" means reproductive toxicity, "onc" means oncogenicity.

Chemical	Testing Needed
Alkyl (C12-13) glycidyl ether	tox, tera
t-Amyl methyl ether	tox, tera
Bisphenol A diglycidyl ether	onc, tox
Cyclohexane*	tox, tera
Glycidyl methacrylate*	tera
1,6-Hexamethylene diisocyanate	tox, tera
N-Methylpyrrolidone	onc, tox, tera
Phenol	tox

The toxic substances Control Act on health effects testing programs for cyclohexane and glycidyl methacrylate have been completed and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's review of the testing program data is currently underway.

(d) Chemicals required to be tested by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Pesticide Programs

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is responsible for the regulation of pesticides under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). FIFRA requires EPA to register pesticides based on data adequate to demonstrate that they will not result in unreasonable adverse effects to people or the environment when used in accordance with their EPA-approved labels.

In 1988, FIFRA was amended to strengthen EPA's pesticide regulatory authority and responsibilities to reregister pesticides registered prior to 1984 to ensure they meet today's stringent scientific and regulatory standards. Reregistration requires registrants to develop up-to-date data bases for each pesticide active ingredient. As part of the reregistration process, modifications may be made to registrations, labels or tolerances to ensure they are protective of human health and the environment. Also, reregistration reviews will identify any pesticides where regulatory action may be necessary to deal with unreasonable risks. EPA has been directed to accelerate the reregistration process so that the entire process is completed by 1997. The 1988 amendments set out a five-phase schedule to accomplish this task with deadlines applying to both pesticide registrants and the EPA. These amendments are requiring a substantial number of new studies to be conducted and old studies to be reformatted for EPA review to ensure they are adequate. EPA may, in the future, request additional data or information to further evaluate any concerns over the safety of pesticide products.

The chemicals listed below are those for which data are unavailable or inadequate to characterize oncogenicity, teratogenicity, or reproductive effects potential. For purposes of this section, "onc" means oncogenicity, "tera" means teratogenicity, and "repro" means reproductive toxicity.

Chemical	Data Requirements
Acrolein	onc, tera
Alkyl imidazolines	tera
Ametryn	repro, tera
4-Aminopyridine	onc, repro, tera
4-T-Amylphenol	onc, repro
Aquashade	onc, repro, tera
Bensulide	onc, repro, tera
Benzisothiazoline-3-one	onc, repro, tera
Brodifacoum	repro
Bromonitrostyrene	tera
Buzan 77	repro
Chlorfuretol methyl	tera
Chlorophacinone	tera
Chloropicrin	onc, repro
Chromated arsenicals	tera
Cycloate	onc
Cypermethrin	onc, repro, tera
DCNA	repro, tera
Dibromodicyanobutane	tera
Diclofop-methyl	onc, tera
Dicrotophos	onc, repro
Dihalodialkylhydantoins	onc, repro, tera
Dimethipin	onc, repro, tera
Dimethyldithiocarbamate	onc, repro, tera
Dinocap and its compounds	tera
Diphacinone and salts	onc, repro, tera
Diphenylamine	onc, tera
Dipropyl isocinchomerate	repro
Diuron	onc

Chemical	Data Requirements
Dodine	onc, repro, tera
Endothal and salts	onc, repro, tera
Ethofumesate	onc
Ethoxyquin	tera
Fenthion	tera
Fenvalerate	onc, repro, tera
Fluvalinate	repro, tera
Hydroxy-methylthiocarbamate	tera
Imazalil	onc
Inorganic chlorates	onc, repro, tera
Inorganic sulfites	onc, repro, tera
Iodine-potassium iodide	tera
Iprodione	tera
Irgasan	onc, repro, tera
Lampicide	onc, repro
Magnesium phosphide	onc
Malathion	onc
Maneb	onc, tera
MCPE and salts	tera
Melfluidic and salts	tera
Mepiquat chloride	tera
Metolachlyde	onc, tera
Methoxychlor	onc, repro, tera
Methyl isothiocyanate	tera
Methyl parathion	tera
Methylthiocarbamate	repro
MGK 264	tera
Mollinate	repro
Naphthalene	onc
Naphthaleneacetic acid	onc, repro
Naphthoic salts	tera
Napropamide	repro
Niclosamide	onc, tera
Nicotine and derivatives	onc, tera
Nitrapyrin	onc, tera
4-Nitrophenol	onc, repro, tera
Oethflinone	tera
Oil of Pennyroyal	tera
Oxadiazole salts	onc, repro, tera
Oxadiazon	repro
Oxyfluorfen	onc
Pebulate	tera
Perflusidone	tera
Pheamediphum	onc
Phenol and salts	tera
2-Phenylphenol and salts	onc, tera
Pink oils	tera
Piperonyl butoxide	tera
Poly (hexamethylene biguanide)	onc, repro
Polyethoxylated aliphatic alcohols	onc, repro, tera
Prometon	tera
Propachlor	onc

Chemical	Data Requirements
Propanil	onc, repro
Propetamphos	tera
Propiconazole	onc
Propylene oxide	tera
Pyrazon	onc, repro
Pyrethrin and derivatives	onc, tera
Pyrimidinone	onc, tera
Sethoxydim	onc
Siduron	onc, repro, tera
Sodium fluoride	tera
Sulfomeuron-methyl	onc, tera
TBT-containing compounds	onc, tera
TCMB	onc, repro, tera
Temephos	onc, tera
Tetrachlorovinphos	onc
Tetramethrin	onc
Thiabendazole and salts	onc, repro, tera
Thidiazuron	onc, repro, tera
Thiodiazinon	tera
Thiophanate-methyl	onc, tera
Thiram	onc
Triadimenfon	onc, repro
Triclopyr and salts	onc
Verolac	onc, repro

Revised: January 1, 1998

#### History

1. New section submitted to OAL for printing only pursuant to Government Code section 11343.8 (Register 89, No. 17).
2. Amendment submitted to OAL for printing only pursuant to Government Code section 11343.8 (Register 90, No. 2).
3. Amendment submitted to OAL for printing only pursuant to Government Code section 11343.8 (Register 91, No. 17).
4. Editorial correction of subsection (d) (Register 91, No. 31).
5. Editorial correction of printing error (Register 91, No. 43).
6. Editorial correction instituting inadvertently omitted amendment. Submitted to OAL for printing only pursuant to Government Code section 11343.8 (Register 93, No. 20).
7. Editorial correction of printing errors (Register 93, No. 45).
8. Amendment of subsection (d) filed 8-1-94. Submitted to OAL for printing on (Register 94, No. 31).
9. Amendment of subsections (b), (c), and (d) filed 12-23-94. Submitted to OAL for printing only (Register 95, No. 1).
10. Amendment submitted to OAL for printing only pursuant to Government Code section 11343.8 (Register 95, No. 52).
11. Amendment filed 1-30-97; operative 1-30-97. Submitted to OAL for printing only pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.3 (Register 97, No. 5).
12. Amendment of subsections (b), (c) and (d) filed 2-13-98; operative 2-13-98. Submitted to OAL for printing only pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 25249.3 (Register 98, No. 7).

(The next page is 201.)

Animal bioassay data is admissible and generally indicative of potential effects in humans.

For purposes of this regulation, substances are present occupationally when there is a possibility of exposure either as a result of normal work operations or a reasonably foreseeable emergency resulting from workplace operations. A reasonably foreseeable emergency is one which a reasonable person should anticipate based on usual work conditions, a substance's particular chemical properties (e.g., potential for explosion, fire, reactivity), and the potential for human health hazards. A reasonably foreseeable emergency includes, but is not limited to, spills, fires, explosions, equipment failure, rupture of containers, or failure of control equipment which may or do result in a release of a hazardous substance into the workplace.

(b) Administrative Procedure Followed by the Director for the Development of the Initial List. The Director shall hold a public hearing concerning the initial list. The record will remain open 30 days after the public hearing for additional written comment. Requests to exempt a substance in a particular physical state, volume, or concentration from the provisions of Labor Code sections 6390 to 6399.2 may be made at this time. If no comments in opposition to such a request are made at the public hearing or received during the comment period, or if the Director can find no valid reason why the request should not be considered, it will be incorporated during the Director's preparation of the list.

After the public comment period the Director shall formulate the initial list and send it to the Standards Board for approval. After receipt of the list or a modified list from the Standards Board, the Director will adopt the list and file it with the Office of Administrative Law.

(c) Concentration Requirement. In determining whether the concentration requirement of a substance should be changed pursuant to Labor Code section 6383, the Director shall consider valid and substantial evidence. Valid and substantial evidence shall consist of clinical evidence or toxicological studies including, but not limited to, animal bioassay tests, short-term in vitro tests, and human epidemiological studies. Upon adoption, a regulation indicating the concentration requirement for a substance shall consist of a footnote on the list.

(d) Procedures for Modifying the List. The Director will consider petitions from any member of the public to modify the list or the concentration requirements, pursuant to the procedures specified in Government Code section 11347.1. With petitions to modify the list, the Director shall make any necessary deletions or additions in accordance with the procedures herein set forth for establishing the list. The Director will review the existing list at least every two years and shall make any necessary additions or deletions in accordance with the procedures herein set forth for establishing the list.

(e) Criteria for Modifying the List. Petitions to add or remove a substance on the list, modify the concentration level of a substance, or reference when a particular substance is present in a physical state which does not pose any human health risk must be accompanied with relevant and sufficient scientific data which may include, but is not limited to, short-term tests, animal studies, human epidemiological studies, and clinical data. If the applicant does not include the complete content of a referenced study or other document, there must be sufficient information to permit the Director to identify and obtain the referenced material. The petitioner bears the burden of justifying any proposed modification of the list.

The Director shall consider all evidence submitted, including negative and positive evidence. All evidence must be based on properly designed studies for toxicological endpoints indicating adverse health effects in humans, e.g., carcinogenicity, mutagenicity, neurotoxicity, organ damage/effects.

For purposes of this regulation, animal data is admissible and generally indicative of potential effects in humans.

The absence of a particular category of studies shall not be used to prove the absence of risk.

Inherent insensitivities, negative results must be reevaluated in light of the limits of sensitivity of each study, its test design, and the protocol followed.

In evaluating different results among proper tests, as a general rule, positive results shall be given more weight than negative results for purposes of including a substance on the list or modifying the list in reference to concentration, physical state or volume, so that appropriate information may be provided regarding those positive results. In each case, the relative sensitivity of each test shall be a factor in resolving such conflicts.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 6380, Labor Code. Reference: Sections 6361, 6380, 6380.5, 6382 and 6383, Labor Code.

#### HISTORY

1. New article 5 (section 337) filed 11-5-81; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 81, No. 45).
2. Amendment of subsection (d) filed 1-15-87; effective upon filing pursuant to Government Code section 11346.2(d) (Register 87, No. 3).
3. Editorial correction of HISTORY 2. (Register 91, No. 19).

### § 338. Special Procedures for Supplementary Enforcement of State Plan Requirements Concerning Proposition 65.

(a) This section sets forth special procedures necessary to comply with the terms of the approval by the United States Department of Labor of the California Hazard Communication Standard, pertaining to the incorporation of the occupational applications of the California Safe Drinking and Toxic Enforcement Act (hereinafter Proposition 65), as set forth in 62 Federal Register 31159 (June 6, 1997). This approval specifically placed certain conditions on the enforcement of Proposition 65 with regard to occupational exposures, including that it does not apply to the conduct of manufacturers occurring outside the State of California. An person proceeding "in the public interest" pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d) (hereinafter "Supplemental Enforcer") or any district attorney or city attorney or prosecutor pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(c) (hereinafter "Public Prosecutor"), who alleges the existence of violations of Proposition 65, with respect to occupational exposures as incorporated into the California Hazard Communication Standard (hereinafter "Supplemental Enforcement Matter"), shall comply with the requirements of this section. No Supplemental Enforcement Matter shall proceed except in compliance with the requirements of this section.

(b) 22 CCR § 12903, setting forth specific requirements for the content and manner of service of sixty-day notices under Proposition 65, in effect on April 22, 1997, is adopted and incorporated by reference. In addition, any sixty-day notice concerning a Supplemental Enforcement Matter shall include the following statement:

"This notice alleges the violation of Proposition 65 with respect to occupational exposures governed by the California State Plan for Occupational Safety and Health. The State Plan incorporates the provisions of Proposition 65, as approved by Federal OSHA on June 6, 1997. This approval specifically placed certain conditions with regard to occupational exposures on Proposition 65, including that it does not apply to the conduct of manufacturers occurring outside the State of California. This approval also provides that an employer may use the means of compliance in the general hazard communication requirements to comply with Proposition 65. It also requires that supplemental enforcement is subject to the supervision of the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Accordingly, any settlement, civil complaint, or substitute court orders in this matter must be submitted to the Attorney General.

(c) A Supplemental Enforcer or Public Prosecutor who commences a Supplemental Enforcement Matter shall serve a file-endorsed copy of the complaint upon the Attorney General within ten days after filing with the Court.

(d) A Supplemental Enforcer or Public Prosecutor shall serve upon the Attorney General a copy of any motion, or opposition to a motion,

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this case. I am a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. My business address is 950 South Coast Drive, Suite 220, Costa Mesa, California 92626.

I SERVED THE FOLLOWING:

- 1.) 60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue Under Health & Safety Code Section 24249.6
- 2.) The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary (*only sent to violators*)

by enclosing a true copy of the same in a sealed envelope addressed to each person whose name and address is shown below and depositing the envelope in the United States mail with the postage fully prepaid:

Date of Mailing: February 24, 2006  
Place of Mailing: Costa Mesa, California

NAME AND ADDRESS OF EACH PERSON TO WHOM DOCUMENTS WERE MAILED:

Bob Voit/President  
Voit Development Co.  
21700 Oxnard Street, Ste. 350  
Woodland Hills, CA. 91367

California Attorney General  
(Proposition 65 Enforcement Division)  
1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor  
Oakland, CA


San Diego City Attorney  
1200 3rd Ave. Ste. 1620  
San Diego, CA 92101

San Diego County District Attorney  
330 Broadway  
San Diego, CA 92101

Orange County District Attorney  
700 Civic Center Dr. W., 2<sup>nd</sup> Fl.  
Santa Ana, CA 92701

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

Dated: February 24, 2006



---