CLIFFWOOD LAW FIRM, PC

12100 WILSHIRE BLVD, SUITE 800 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025

VIA PRIORITY MAIL INTERNATIONAL

Current President or CEO Productos Chata Sa De Cv, 80140, Cam. Real, Culiacán Rosales, Sin., Mexico

VIA CERTIFIED FIRST CLASS MAIL

Current president or CEO Ralphs 1100 W. Artesia Blvd. Compton, Ca 90220

Current President or CEO Instacart Inc. 50 Beale St. #600 San Francisco, CA 94105

Current President or CEO Chata Imports Inc. 1515 E Katella Unit 2101 Anaheim, CA 92805

Douglas C. McMillon or Current President or CEO Walmart Stores, Inc. 702 S.W. 8th St Bentonville, AR 72712

Current President or CEO Walmart Inc. % C T Corporation System, Reg. Agent 818 West Seventh Street, Suite 930 Los Angeles, CA 90017

Current President or CEO Cordialsa USA 24900 Pitkin Rd Suite 190 Spring, TX 77386

Luis A Arango Cordialsa USA 24900 Pitkin Rd STE-190 Houston, TX 77386 Current President or CEO Cordialsa USA 6279 E Slauson Ave, STE 102 Commerce, CA 90040

Agent of Service Or Juan Managar Consuegra Cordialsa USA 6043 NW 167th St Hialeah, FL 33015

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

State of California Department of Justice Office of Attorney General of California Filing link: oag.ca.gov/prop65

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

District Attorneys of California Counties and City Attorneys, as in the Certificate of Service

VIA E-MAIL

District Attorneys of California Counties and City Attorneys, as in the Certificate of Service

CLIFFWOOD LAW FIRM, PC

12100 WILSHIRE BLVD, SUITE 800 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025

RE: Lead Chata Imports Inc., Ralphs, Instacart Inc., Walmart Stores Inc., Walmart Inc., Cordialsa USA

June 1, 2022

60-DAY NOTICE OF INTENT TO SUE

for violations of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986

Dear Alleged Violators and Public Enforcement Agencies,

Cliffwood Law Firm, PC represents Clean Product Advocates, LLC ("CPA"), a California company supporting public health and advocating for the reduction of chemical toxins in consumer products. By sending this notice of violation of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code § 25249.5 *et seq.*, CPA is acting as an "in the public interest" pursuant to Proposition 65.

As described below, CPA has identified violations of the warning prong of California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 ("Proposition 65" or "Act"), codified at Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 et seq. by Chata Imports Inc., Ralphs, Instacart Inc., Walmart Stores Inc., Walmart Inc., Cordialsa USA (collectively, the "Violators").

Pursuant to § 25249.7(d) of the statute, CPA intends to bring an enforcement action against the Violators sixty (60) days after the effective service of this notice unless public enforcement agencies have commenced and are diligently prosecuting an action to rectify these violations.

This Notice covers the violations of Proposition 65 that are currently known to CPA from information now available as specifically related to the violating products listed below and manufactured, distributed or/and sold by and through the Violators. Cliffwood Law Firm is continuing its investigation that may reveal further violations.

The Specified Product(s) subject to this Notice, the chemical(s) in the Specified Product(s) identified as exceeding allowable levels, and the Violators responsible for sales of the Specified Products, are as follows:

Specified Products	Violative	Noticed Party
	chemical	
Chilorio Shredded Seasoned Pork Meat,	Lead	Chata Imports, Inc.
UPC 7501023535027		Ralphs
		Instacart Inc.,

Walmart Stores, Inc. Walmart, Inc.
Cordialsa USA

The primary route of exposure has been through ingestion.

Noticed Parties have manufactured, marketed, distributed and/or sold the Specified Products which, according to the test results, have exposed and continue to expose consumers within the State of California to lead.

Lead ("lead") is listed pursuant to Proposition 65 as a chemical known to the State of California to cause developmental toxicity, reproductive toxicity, and cancer. Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 requires that a "clear and reasonable" warning be provided prior to exposure to chemicals listed under Proposition 65. The Noticed Parties are in violation of Proposition 65 because the Noticed Parties have failed to provide a warning to consumers that they are being exposed to lead. While in the course of doing business, the Noticed Parties are knowingly and intentionally exposing consumers to lead without first providing a "clear and reasonable" warning.

The method of warning should be a warning that appears on the product's label. See Cal. Code Regs. tit. 27, § 25602, subd. (a)(3), and subd. (b) for internet purchases also at the point of sale, as applicable. The Noticed Parties have not provided any Proposition 65 warnings as required by law or any other appropriate warnings that person's handling, ingesting and/or otherwise using the Specified Products are being exposed to lead.

With respect to each 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; has continued every day since the relevant date the violation commenced; and will continue every day henceforth until lead is removed from each Specified Product, reduced to allowable levels, or until a "clear and reasonable" warning is provided to consumers by the Noticed Parties, as applicable, in accordance with the law.

Pursuant to Title 27, C.C.R. § 25903(b), copies of the following documents are attached hereto for reference by the Notices Parties:

(i) "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary."

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

CPA intends to file a lawsuit after 60 days based on the facts set forth in this Notice. Meanwhile we encourage a prompt resolution of this matter within the said period of 60 days where the Noticed Parties agree in a written agreement to (1) eliminate or reduce lead to an allowable level in the Specified Products or, as an alternative, (2) provide a Proposition 65- compliant warning on the label of the Specified Products and at the point of sale; and (3) pay applicable civil penalties and costs of bringing this action.

Prompt action of the Noticed Parties on this Notice will prevent further consumer exposures to a dangerous chemical without warning, therefore rectifying these alleged ongoing violations of the

California law and afford the Noticed Parties the opportunity to avoid increasing costs associated with noncompliance and costly litigation.

Please direct all communications regarding this Notice to this office.

Sincerely,

Ell

Elham (Ellie) Shabatian

CLIFFWOOD LAW FIRM, PC 12100 WILSHIRE BLVD SUITE 800 LOS ANGELES, CA 90025 310-200-3227 ellie@cliffwoodlaw.com

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Certificate of Merit;
- 2. Confidential Factual Information supporting Certificate of Merit (to Attorney General only);
- 3. Certificate of Service;
- 4. Appendix "A" "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary" (to the Noticed Parties only);

To: Notice of Violation: Noticing Party: Noticed Parties:

California Attorney General June 1, 2022 Clean Product Advocates, LLC Chata Imports, Inc. Productos Chata Sa De Cv Ralphs Instacart, Inc. Walmart Stores, Inc. Walmart, Inc. Cordialsa USA

CERTIFICATE OF MERIT Health and Safety Code Section 25249.7(d) To the Notice of Violation

to the Notice of Violation

I, Elham (Ellie) Shabatian, attorney at law, hereby declare:

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.

I am the attorney for the Noticing Party.

I have reviewed the facts of this case and have consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience and expertise who have reviewed facts, studies, and/or other data regarding the alleged exposures to the listed chemical that is the subject of the attached Notice of Violation dated June 1, 2022 (the "Notice").

I have reviewed the laboratory testing results for the chemical subject to the Notice and rely on these results. The testing was conducted by a reputable accredited testing laboratory and by experienced scientists with doctoral and other degrees in relevant sciences. The facts, studies and other data derived through this investigation overwhelmingly demonstrate that the alleged violators have exposed persons to the listed chemical that is the subject of the Notice and is known to the State of California to cause reproductive and/or developmental harm, and/or cancer.

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.

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.

Dated: June 1, 2022

Elham (Ellie) Shabatian

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Alexander Berry, am over the age of eighteen years and am not a party to the action, process or case related to or arising out of the Notice of Violation being served under this Certificate of Service. My address is 1432 Fairbanks Pl., Los Angeles, CA 90026.

On June 1, 2022, between 11:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Pacific Time, I served the following documents:

- 1. Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq. by Chata Imports Inc., Ralphs, Instacart Inc., Walmart Stores Inc., Walmart Inc., Cordialsa USA;
- 2. Certificate of Merit;
- Appendix "A" "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary;"

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

	1
Current President or CEO	Douglas C. McMillon or Current President or CEO
Ralphs	Walmart Stores, Inc.
1100 W. Artesia Blvd.	702 S.W. 8th St
Compton, Ca 90220	Bentonville, AR 72712
Current president or CEO	Current President or CEO
Instacart Inc.	Walmart Inc.
50 Beale St. #600	% C T Corporation System, Reg. Agent
San Francisco, CA 94105	818 West Seventh Street, Suite 930
	Los Angeles, CA 90017
Current President or CEO	Current President or CEO
Productos Chata Sa De Cv, 80140,, Cam. Real,	Cordialsa USA
Culiacán Rosales, Sin., Mexico	24900 Pitkin Rd Suite 190
	Spring, TX 77386
Current President or CEO	Luis A Arango
Chata Imports Inc.	Cordialsa USA
1515 E Katella Unit 2101	24900 Pitkin Rd STE-190, Houston, TX, 77386,
Anaheim, CA 92805	USA
Current President or CEO	Agent of Service
Cordialsa USA	Or Juan Managar Consuegra
6279 E Slauson Ave, STE 102	Cordialsa USA
Commerce, CA 90040	6043 NW 167th St
	Hialeah, FL 33015

On June 1, 2022, between 11:00 a.m. and 11:30 p.m. Pacific Time, I served the following documents:

- 1. Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq. by Chata Imports Inc., Ralphs, Instacart Inc., Walmart Stores Inc., Walmart Inc., Cordialsa USA;
- 2. Certificate of Merit;
- 3. Confidential Factual Information and Supporting Documentation Required by Title 11, C.C.R. § 3102

on the following parties 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:

State of California Department of Justice; Office of the Attorney General of California.

On June 1, 2022 between 11:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Pacific Time, I served the following documents:

- Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq. by Chata Imports Inc., Ralphs, Instacart Inc., Walmart Stores Inc., Walmart Inc., Cordialsa USA;
- 2. Certificate of Merit

on the following parties below by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed to each of the District Attorney and City Attorney offices listed below, and causing each envelope to be deposited at a United States Postal Service mail box for delivery by First Class Mail:

District Attorney Alpine	District Attorney Lake County	District Attorney Sierra
County PO Box 248	255 North Forbes Street	County PO Box 457
Markleeville, CA 96120	Lakeport, CA 95453	Downieville, CA 95936
District Attorney	District Attorney	District Attorney's Office
Amador County	Los Angeles County	Siskiyou County Courthouse
708 Court Street, Suite 202	Hall of Justice 211 West	311 Fourth Street, Room 204
Jackson, CA 95642	Temple St. Ste 1200 Los	Yreka, CA 96097
	Angeles, CA 90012	
District Attorney	District Attorney	District Attorney
Butte County	Madera County	Solano County
25 County Center Drive,	209 West Yosemite Avenue	675 Texas Street, Ste 4500
Suite 245	Madera, CA 93637	Fairfield, CA 94533
Oroville, CA 95965		
District Attorney Colusa	District Attorney	District Attorney
County 310 6th Street	Marin County	Stanislaus County
Colusa, CA 95932	3501 Civic Center Drive,	832 12th Street, Ste 300
	Room 130	Modesto, CA 95354
	San Rafael, CA 94903	
District Attorney	District Attorney	District Attorney
Del Norte County	Mendocino County	Sutter County
	PO Box 1000	

450 LL Street Swite 171		
450 H Street, Suite 171	Ukiah, CA 95482	446 Second Street Yuba City,
Crescent City, CA 95531		CA 95991
District Attorney EL Dorado	District Attorney	District Attorney Tehama
County 778 Pacific Street	Modoc County	County PO Box 519
Placerville, CA 95667	204 S Court Street, Room 202	Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Alturas, CA 96101-4020	
District Attorney	District Attorney Orange	District Attorney
Mono County	County 300 N Flower St.	Trinity County
Post Office Box 617	Santa Ana, CA 92703	Post Office Box 310
Bridgeport, CA 93517		Weaverville, CA 96093
District Attorney	District Attorney San Benito	District Attorney
Glenn County	County 419 4th Street	Tuolumne County
Post Office Box 430 Willows,	Hollister, CA 95023	423 North Washington St.
CA 95988		Sonora, CA 95370
District Attorney	District Attorney	District Attorney Yuba County
Humboldt County	San Bernardino County	215 Fifth Street, Suite 152
825 5th Street 4th Floor	316 No. Mountain View	Marysville, CA 95901
Eureka, CA 95501	Avenue	
	San Bernardino, CA 92415	
District Attorney	District Attorney	Los Angeles City Attorney's
Imperial County	San Mateo County	Office
940 West Main Street, Suite	400 County Ctr., 3rd Floor	City Hall East
102	Redwood City, CA 94063	200 N. Main Street, Suite 800
El Centro, CA 92243		Los Angeles, CA 90012
District Attorney	District Attorney	District Attorney
Kern County	Shasta County	Kings County
1215 Truxtun Avenue	1355 West Street	1400 West Lacey Blvd.
Bakersfield, CA 93301	Redding, CA 96001	Hanford, CA 93230

On June 1, 2022 between 11:00 a.m. and 11:30 p.m. Pacific Time, I served the following documents:

- Notice of Violations of California Health & Safety Code Section 25249.5 et seq. by Chata Imports Inc., Ralphs, Instacart Inc., Walmart Stores Inc., Walmart Inc., Cordialsa USA;
- 2. Certificate of Merit

on each of the parties below, all of which have requested electronic service only via the following email addresses:

Alameda County District Attorney	Calaveras County District Attorney
CEPDProp65@acgov.org	Prop65Env@co.calaveras.ca.us
Contra Costa County District Attorney	Inyo County District Attorney
sgrassini@contracostada.org	inyoda@inyocounty.us
Lassen County District Attorney	Mariposa County District Attorney

mlatimer@co.lassen.ca.us	mcda@mariposacounty.org
Merced County District Attorney	Monterey County District Attorney
Prop65@countyofmerced.com	Pro65DA@co.monterey.ca.us
Napa County District Attorney	Nevada County District Attorney
CEPD@countyofnapa.org	DA.Prop65@co.nevada.ca.us
Placer County District Attorney	Plumas County District Attorney
Prop65@placer.ca.gov	davidhollister@countyofplumas.com
Riverside County District Attorney	Sacramento County District Attorney
Prop65@rivcoda.org	Prop65@sacda.org
San Diego City Attorney	San Diego County District Attorney
CityAttyProp65@sandiego.gov	SanDiegoDAProp65@sdcda.org
San Francisco County District Attorney	San Francisco City Attorney
alexandra.grayner@sfgov.org	Valerie.Lopez@sfcityatty.org
San Joaquin County District Attorney DA	San Luis Obispo County District Attorney
DAConsumer.Environmental@sjcda.org	edobroth@co.slo.ca.us
Santa Barbara County District Attorney	Santa Clara County District Attorney
DAProp65@co.santa-barbara.ca.us	EPU@da.sccgov.org
Santa Cruz County District Attorney	Sonoma County District Attorney
Prop65DA@santacruzcounty.us	jbarnes@sonoma-county.org
Tulare County District Attorney	Ventura County District Attorney
Prop65@co.tulare.ca.us	daspecialops@veutura.org
Yolo County District Attorney	San Jose City Attorney's Office
cfepd@yolocounty.org	proposition65notices@sanjoseca.gov
District Attorney Fresno	District Attorney of Roseville
consumerprotection@fresnocountyca.gov	pwp65@place.ca.gov

I, Alexander Berry, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature

June 1, 2022

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 27001.¹ These implementing regulations are available online at: http://oehha.ca.gov/prop65/law/P65Regs.html.

WHAT DOES PROPOSITION 65 REQUIRE?

The "Proposition 65 List." Under Proposition 65, the lead agency (OEHHA) publishes a list of chemicals that are known to the State of California to cause cancer and/or reproductive toxicity. Chemicals are placed on the Proposition 65 list if they are known to cause cancer and/or birth defects or other reproductive harm, such as damage to female or male reproductive systems or to the developing fetus. This list

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

must be updated at least once a year. The current Proposition 65 list of chemicals is available on the OEHHA website at: <u>http://www.oehha.ca.gov/prop65/prop65_list/Newlist.html</u>.

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 contaminant² it must be reduced to the lowest level feasible. Regulations explaining this exemption can be found in Section 25501.

Discharges that do not result in a "significant amount" of the listed chemical entering any source of drinking water. The prohibition from discharges into drinking water does not apply if the discharger is able to demonstrate that a "significant amount" of the listed chemical has not, does not, or will not pass into or probably pass into a source of drinking water, and that the discharge complies with all other applicable laws, regulations, permits, requirements, or orders. A "significant amount" means any detectable amount, except an amount that would meet the "no significant risk" level for chemicals that cause cancer or that is 1,000 times below the "no observable effect" level for chemicals that cause reproductive toxicity, if an individual were exposed to that amount in drinking water.

HOW IS PROPOSITION 65 ENFORCED?

² See Section 25501(a)(4).

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.

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.