

---

October 29, 2017**VIA CERTIFIED MAIL**

Randy Lewis, President/CEO  
United Industries Corporation  
d/b/a in California as Chemisco, Inc.  
1 Rider Trail Plaza Drive  
Earth City, Missouri 63045

Andreas Rouve, President/CEO  
Spectrum Brands, Inc., and  
Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc.  
3001 Deming Way  
Middleton, Wisconsin 53562

Jeffrey Bezos, Managing Member  
Amazon.com LLC  
410 Terry Avenue North  
Seattle, Washington 98109

**VIA U.S. MAIL and EMAIL**

District Attorney's Office for all Counties in  
California and applicable City Attorneys  
(See Attached - Certificate of Service)

**VIA CERTIFIED MAIL**

*(Registered Agent for Service of Process):*  
United Industries Corporation  
d/b/a in California as Chemisco, Inc.  
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service  
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N  
Sacramento, California 95833

*(Registered Agent for Service of Process):*  
Spectrum Brands, Inc., and  
Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc.  
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service  
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N  
Sacramento, California 95833

*(Registered Agent for Service of Process):*  
Amazon.com LLC  
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service  
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N  
Sacramento, California 95833

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

State of California Department of Justice  
Office of the Attorney General  
Proposition 65 Enforcement Reporting  
Filing link: [oag.ca.gov/prop65](http://oag.ca.gov/prop65)

**Sixty-Day Notice of Intent to Sue for Violations of the Safe Drinking Water  
and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65")**

**(California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq.)**

Dear Alleged Violators and the Appropriate Public Enforcement Agencies:

We represent The Chemical Toxin Working Group, Inc., a California non-profit corporation, a/k/a as The Healthy Living Foundation ("HLF" or "CTWG"), an organization based dedicated to reducing the amount of chemical toxins in consumer products, the



promotion of human health, environmental safety, and improvement of worker and consumer safety. David Steinman created HLF to effectuate his commitments as a consumer health advocate, environmentalist, journalist, publisher and author. His major books include "Diet for a Poisoned Planet" (1990, 2007); "The Safe Shopper's Bible" (1995); "Living Healthy in a Toxic World" (1996); and "Safe Trip to Eden: Ten Steps to Save the Planet Earth from Global Warming Meltdown" (2007), along with his many publications as the publisher of the "Healthy Living Magazine" and its associated websites and periodicals.

Through this Notice of Violation (this "Notice"), HLF is acting "in the public interest" pursuant to Proposition 65, and seeks to reduce and/or eliminate exposures to malathion by consumers and workers from exposure to malathion in pesticide/insecticide products produced, distributed and/or sold by United Industries Corporation, Chemisco, Inc., Spectrum Brands, Inc., Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc. and Amazon.com LLC, among other retailers.

This Notice constitutes written notification that United Industries Corporation, Chemisco, Inc., Spectrum Brands, Inc., Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc. and Amazon.com LLC (the "Noticed Parties") have violated the warning requirements of Proposition 65, the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act (codified at California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5, *et seq*). The product subject to this Notice of Violation (the "specified product") and the chemical in the specified product identified as exceeding allowable levels is the following:

■ ***Spectracide Malathion Insect Spray Concentrate – Malathion***

The Noticed Parties have manufactured, marketed, distributed and/or sold the specified product which has exposed and continues to expose numerous individuals within California to malathion. This chemical was listed pursuant to Proposition 65 as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health have established worker exposure levels for malathion. In addition to use by consumers for personal and property pest control, including property owners, households, and outdoorsman, Malathion is used in California occupationally by gardeners and farmers. Its use in California is documented and includes human studies from workers' exposures. An example of occupational use in California is when malathion is applied to roses, tomatoes or other plants by hand held lance sprayers or to perimeters of office and other business buildings. The potential dermal exposure of applicators to this insecticide has been measured.



Pursuant to Title 8, C.C.R. § 338(b), please be advised that in addition to exposure to consumers in a non-occupational capacity, “[t]his 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. The 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 substantive court order in this matter must be submitted to the Attorney General.”

With respect to the specified product listed above, the violation: commenced on the latter of the date that the specified product was first offered for sale in California or the date upon which California law codified the allowable level of the relevant chemical surpassed by the specified product; has continued every day since the relevant date the violation commenced; and will continue every day henceforth until malathion is removed from the specified product, reduced to allowable levels, or until a “clear and reasonable” warning is provided to consumers, including occupational users, by the Noticed Parties in accordance with the law. The primary route of exposure has been through inhalation and/or dermal contact as explained more fully above, but may have also occurred through ingestion.

Proposition 65 requires that a “clear and reasonable” warning be provided prior to exposure to certain listed chemicals. The Noticed Parties are in violation of Proposition 65 because the Noticed Parties have failed to provide a warning to consumers, including occupational users, that they are being exposed to malathion. While in the course of doing business, the Noticed Parties are “knowingly and intentionally” exposing consumers, including occupational users, to malathion without first providing a “clear and reasonable” warning. See Cal. Health and Safety Code § 25249.6. The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product’s label. See Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 25603.1, subd. (a). The Noticed Parties have not provided any Proposition 65 warnings on the specified product’s label or any other appropriate warnings that persons handling, ingesting and/or otherwise using the specified product are being exposed to malathion.

Proposition 65 requires that notice and intent to sue be provided to a violator 60-days before a suit is filed in connection therewith. With this Notice, HLF gives written notice of its intent to sue the Noticed Parties for alleged violations of Proposition 65, and to notify the appropriate governmental authorities of its intent. This Notice covers all



violations of Proposition 65 that are currently known to the noticing party from information now available as specifically related to the violating product sold through the Noticed Parties, and other manufacturers, distributors and/or retailers. HLF is continuing its investigation that may reveal further violations.

Pursuant to Title 27, C.C.R. § 25903(b), copies of the documents entitled (i) "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary", referenced as Appendix "A", and (ii) "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): Special Compliance Procedure", referenced as Appendix "B", are attached hereto for reference by the Noticed Parties.

Pursuant to Title 11, C.C.R. § 3100, a "Certificate of Merit" is attached hereto.

HLF is interested in a prompt resolution of this matter with an enforceable written agreement by the Noticed Parties to (1) eliminate or reduce malathion to an allowable level in, or provide appropriate warning on the labels of, the specified product; and (2) pay an appropriate civil penalty. Such a resolution will prevent further unwarned consumer exposures and expensive and time-consuming litigation.

In keeping with its public interest mission and to expeditiously rectify these ongoing violations of California law, HLF is interested in seeking a constructive resolution of this matter without engaging in costly and protracted litigation. Please direct all communications regarding this Notice to my office on behalf of HLF.

If you have any questions, please contact my office at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your time and consideration with respect to this urgent matter.

Sincerely,  
**KHANSARI LAW CORP., APC**



---

Andre A. Khansari, Esq.  
(Attachments)

Attachments:

1. Certificate of Merit;
2. Certificate of Service;
3. Additional Supporting Information for Certificate of Merit (to Attorney General only); and

4. Appendix "A" – "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary", and Appendix "B" – "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): Special Compliance Procedure" (to the Noticed Parties only)

Cc: The Chemical Toxin Working Group, Inc. (via email only)



## **CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

**Re: The Chemical Toxin Working Group Inc.'s Notice of Proposition 65 Violations by United Industries Corporation, Chemisco, Inc., Spectrum Brands, Inc., Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc. and Amazon.com LLC**

I, Andre A. Khansari, hereby declare:

1. This Certificate of Merit (this "Certificate") accompanies the attached Notice of Violation dated October 29, 2017 (the "NOV") in which it is alleged that the parties identified in the NOV ("alleged violators") have violated California Health and Safety Code Section 25249.6 by failing to provide clear and reasonable warnings.
2. I am the attorney for the noticing party The Chemical Toxin Working Group, Inc., a/k/a The Healthy Living Foundation. The NOV alleges that the alleged violators have exposed persons in California to the listed chemical that is the subject of this Certificate. Please refer to the NOV for additional details regarding the product(s) name and alleged violations.
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 alleged exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of this Certificate. I have reviewed the laboratory testing results for the chemical subject to the NOV and relied on these results. The testing was conducted by a reputable testing laboratory, with proper accreditation, and by experienced scientists. The facts, studies and other data derived through this investigation demonstrate that the alleged violators expose persons, including workers, to the listed chemical that is the subject of this Certificate.
4. Based on the information obtained through these consultants and on other information in my possession, I believe there is sufficient evidence that the listed product(s) in the NOV expose individuals, including workers, to unlawfully high levels of the specified chemical. Furthermore, I believe there is a reasonable and meritorious case for the private action. I understand that "reasonable and meritorious case for the private action" means that the information provides a credible basis that all elements of the plaintiff's case can be established and that the information did not prove that the alleged violator(s) will be able to establish any of the affirmative defenses set forth in the statute.
5. The copy of this Certificate served on the California Attorney General attaches to it factual information sufficient to establish the basis for this certificate, including the information identified in Health & 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.

Dated: October 29, 2017



---

Andre A. Khansari, Esq.  
Attorney for The Chemical Toxin Working Group, Inc.

## 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.

## APPENDIX B

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

#### THE SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 (PROPOSITION 65): SPECIAL COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE

This Appendix B contains the notice of special compliance procedure and proof of compliance form 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"). Under the Act, a private party may not file an enforcement action based on certain exposures if the alleged violator meets specific conditions. These exposures are:

- 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.

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

- Corrected the alleged violation;
- Agreed to pay a civil penalty of \$500 (subject to change in 2019 and every five years thereafter) to the private party within 30 days; and



- Notified the private party serving the notice in writing that the violation has been corrected.

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

When a private party sends a notice of alleged violation that alleges one or more of the exposures listed above, the notice must include a notice of special compliance procedure, and a proof of compliance form to be completed by the alleged violator as directed in the notice.

The notice and proof of compliance form is reproduced here:

Date:  
Name of Noticing Party or attorney for Noticing Party:  
Address:  
Phone number:

Page 1

**SPECIAL COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE**  
**PROOF OF COMPLIANCE**

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

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

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

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

The alleged violation is for an exposure to: (check one)

\_\_\_Alcoholic beverages that are consumed on the alleged violator's premises to the extent on-site consumption is permitted by law.

\_\_\_A chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity in a food or beverage prepared and sold on the alleged violator's premises for immediate consumption on or off premises to the extent: (1) the chemical was not intentionally added; and (2) the chemical 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.

\_\_\_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.

\_\_\_Chemicals known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity in engine exhaust, to the extent the exposure occurs inside a facility owned or operated by the alleged violator and primarily intended for parking noncommercial vehicles.

**IMPORTANT NOTES:**

(1) You have no potential liability under California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 if your business has nine (9) or fewer employees.

(2) Using this form will NOT prevent the Attorney General, a district attorney, a city attorney, or a prosecutor in whose jurisdiction the violation is alleged to have occurred from filing an action over the same alleged violations, and that in any such action, the amount of civil penalty shall be reduced to reflect any payment made at this time.

Date:

Page 2

Name of Noticing Party or attorney for Noticing Party:

Address:

Phone number:

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

**Certification of Compliance**

Accurate completion of this form will demonstrate that you are now in compliance with California Health and Safety Code §25249.6 for the alleged violation listed above. You must complete and submit the form below to the Noticing Party at the address shown above, postmarked within 14 days of you receiving this notice.

I hereby agree to pay, within 30 days of completion of this notice, a civil penalty of \$500 to the Noticing Party only and certify that I have complied with Health and Safety Code §25249.6 by (check only one of the following):



☐ Posting a warning or warnings about the alleged exposure that complies with the law, and attaching a copy of that warning and a photograph accurately showing its placement on my premises;

☐ Posting the warning or warnings demanded in writing by the Noticing Party, and attaching a copy of that warning and a photograph accurately showing its placement on my premises; OR

☐ Eliminating the alleged exposure, and attaching a statement accurately describing how the alleged exposure has been eliminated.

### **Certification**

My statements on this form, and on any attachments to it, are true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and are made in good faith. I have carefully read the instructions to complete this form. I understand that if I make a false statement on this form, I may be subject to additional penalties under the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of alleged violator or authorized representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name and title of signatory

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

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

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within entitled action or process. My business address is **11845 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 1000, Los Angeles, California 90064.**

On October 29, 2017, I served the following documents:

- (i) **Notice of Violations by United Industries Corporation, Chemisco, Inc., Spectrum Brands, Inc., Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc. and Amazon.com LLC, for Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq.,**
- (ii) **Certificate of Merit, and**
- (iii) **Appendix "A" – "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary", and Appendix "B" – "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): Special Compliance Procedure" (to the Noticed Parties only),**

on the following parties by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to the party below, and causing each envelope to be deposited at a United States Postal Service Office in Los Angeles, California for delivery by Certified Mail:

Randy Lewis, President/CEO  
United Industries Corporation  
d/b/a in California as Chemisco, Inc.  
1 Rider Trail Plaza Drive  
Earth City, MO 63045

Andreas Rouve, President/CEO  
Spectrum Brands, Inc., and  
Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc.  
3001 Deming Way  
Middleton, WI 53562

Jeffrey Bezos, Managing Member  
Amazon.com LLC  
410 Terry Avenue North  
Seattle, WA 98109

*(Registered Agent for Service of Process):*

*(Registered Agent for Service of Process):*

United Industries Corporation  
d/b/a in California as Chemisco, Inc.  
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service  
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N  
Sacramento, CA 95833

Spectrum Brands, Inc., and  
Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc.  
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service  
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N  
Sacramento, CA 95833

Amazon.com LLC  
c/o CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service  
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N  
Sacramento, CA 95833

On October 29, 2017, I served the following documents:

- (i) **Notice of Violations by United Industries Corporation, Chemisco, Inc., Spectrum Brands, Inc., Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc. and Amazon.com LLC, for Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq.,**
- (ii) **Certificate of Merit, and**
- (iii) **Additional Information and Supporting Documentation Required by Title 11, C.C.R. §3102,**

on the following party by filing electronically a true and correct copy thereof as permitted through the website of the California Office of the Attorney General via link at [oag.ca.gov/prop65](http://oag.ca.gov/prop65):

State of California Department of Justice  
Office of the Attorney General

On October 29, 2017, I served the following documents:

- (i) **Notice of Violations by United Industries Corporation, Chemisco, Inc., Spectrum Brands, Inc., Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc. and Amazon.com LLC, for Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq., and**
- (ii) **Certificate of Merit,**

on each of the parties on the service list attached hereto (see attached "**Service List**") by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the District Attorney and City Attorney offices listed on the attached service list, and causing each envelope to be deposited at a United States Postal Service mail box for delivery by First Class Mail, except for the Contra Costa County District Attorney, Lassen County District Attorney, Riverside County District Attorney, Sacramento County District Attorney, San Francisco County District Attorney, Napa County District Attorney, San Joaquin County District Attorney, San Luis Obispo County District Attorney, Santa Clara County District Attorney, Sonoma County District Attorney, Tulare County District Attorney, Ventura County District Attorney, Monterey County District Attorney, and Yolo County District Attorney, which have requested electronic service only via the following email addresses: [sgrassini@contracostada.org](mailto:sgrassini@contracostada.org); [mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us](mailto:mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us); [prop65@rivcoda.org](mailto:prop65@rivcoda.org); [prop65@sacda.org](mailto:prop65@sacda.org); [Gregory.alker@sfgov.org](mailto:Gregory.alker@sfgov.org); [cepd@countyofnapa.org](mailto:cepd@countyofnapa.org); [daconsumer.environmental@sjcda.org](mailto:daconsumer.environmental@sjcda.org); [edobroth@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:edobroth@co.slo.ca.us); [epu@da.sccgov.org](mailto:epu@da.sccgov.org); [jbarnes@sonoma-county.org](mailto:jbarnes@sonoma-county.org); [prop65@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:prop65@co.tulare.ca.us); [daspecialops@ventura.org](mailto:daspecialops@ventura.org); [Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:Prop65DA@co.monterey.ca.us); and [cfeprd@yolocounty.org](mailto:cfeprd@yolocounty.org).

I, Andre A. Khansari, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on October 29, 2017, in the City and County of Los Angeles, California.



---

Andre A. Khansari