

CALIFORNIA PROP. 65 WARNING REQUIREMENT FOR THC MAKES CBD, HEMP AND CANNABIS PRODUCTS A TARGET

Feb 02, 2021

The California Proposition 65 warning requirement for THC took effect on January 3, making cannabis, hemp and CBD products a likely target for private enforcement actions.

Although under federal law CBD products are allowed to contain up to 0.3 percent THC, or Δ 9-Tetrahydrocannabinol, no safe harbor level of exposure to THC has been established under Prop. 65. That means private enforcers can argue that any detectable amount can subject a product to the Prop. 65 warning requirement. Companies can work with consultants to develop a safe use determination for THC, but until it is established and accepted, enforcement actions will be a material risk. Notably, the Prop. 65 listing applies to Δ 9-THC, although the Prop. 65 requirements may still be triggered by residual Δ 9-THC present in other THC products, like Δ 8-THC distillates.

At the same time that THC was added to the Prop. 65 list, California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment added a reproductive harm endpoint for cannabis (marijuana) smoke, which was already identified as a carcinogen under Prop. 65. That means that although cannabis products intended to be smoked may already bear a Prop. 65 warning related to cancer, the reproductive harm warning should also be included.

As for THC, the listing raises Prop. 65 considerations for a much broader range of cannabis, hemp and CBD products, such as oils, edibles, beverages, and vape cartridges. Plaintiff groups are expected to aggressively target these products, expanding on a multi-year trend of pursuing marijuana-based businesses for Prop. 65 violations.

For more information, please do not hesitate to contact one of the authors or your BCLP relationship lawyer.

MEET THE TEAM



Merrit M. Jones

San Francisco

merrit.jones@bclplaw.com

+1 415 675 3435



Thomas S. Lee

San Francisco

tom.lee@bclplaw.com

+1 415 675 3447

This material is not comprehensive, is for informational purposes only, and is not legal advice. Your use or receipt of this material does not create an attorney-client relationship between us. If you require legal advice, you should consult an attorney regarding your particular circumstances. The choice of a lawyer is an important decision and should not be based solely upon advertisements. This material may be "Attorney Advertising" under the ethics and professional rules of certain jurisdictions. For advertising purposes, St. Louis, Missouri, is designated BCLP's principal office and Kathrine Dixon (kathrine.dixon@bclplaw.com) as the responsible attorney.