



1700 W Burbank Boulevard,
Burbank, CA 91506

t | 213.493.6300
d | 213.539.3630
f | 213.336.3704

Fawn@abramsonlabor.com
www.AbramsonLaborGroup.com

October 17, 2025

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL (RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED)

Agent for Service of Process for Tetra Tech, Inc. & Tetra Tech BAS, Inc.:
CT Corporation System,
330 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203

Re: Pierre Redmond v. Tetra Tech, Inc. and Tetra Tech BAS, Inc.

Dear Labor and Workforce Development Agency, Tetra Tech, Inc., and Tetra Tech BAS, Inc.:

This letter shall serve as Pierre Redmond's ("Mr. Redmond") written notice as required by California Labor Code 2699.3(a)(1) of the specific provisions of the Labor Code allegedly violated by Tetra Tech, Inc. and Tetra Tech BAS, Inc. (collectively, "Tetra Tech"), including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Mr. Redmond intends to seek civil penalties against Tetra Tech under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") on his own behalf and on behalf of all other non-exempt employees currently or formerly employed by Tetra Tech in California during the statutory period ("Aggrieved Employees"). Mr. Redmond is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that there are at least 100 Aggrieved Employees in the statutory period.

Labor Code Provisions Alleged to Have Been Violated

Mr. Redmond alleges Tetra Tech violated the following Labor Code provisions: Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802.

Facts and Theories Supporting Each Alleged Violation

Mr. Redmond was employed by Tetra Tech in Los Angeles, California as a non-exempt environmental technician from approximately April 2025 to approximately May 2025.

Minimum and Overtime Wages

Throughout the statutory period, Tetra failed to pay Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees at least the legal minimum wage and overtime wage for all hours worked due to Tetra Tech's policy and practice of rounding Mr. Redmond's and other Aggrieved Employees' time worked. Further, Tetra Tech required Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees to work on workdays beyond Tetra Tech's alternative workweek schedule without adequate overtime and double time compensation. As a result, Tetra Tech failed to pay Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees for all minimum, straight time, and overtime wages due in violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198.

Meal Periods

Throughout the statutory period, Tetra Tech failed to provide Mr. Redmond and other

Aggrieved Employees with 30-minute meal periods for every 5 hours worked as required by Labor Code § 512. Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees frequently worked shifts over five hours and did not receive lawful meal periods because they were discouraged from taking meal periods, were interrupted during their meal periods, were required to remain on call during meal periods, and/or were not scheduled to be relieved at the appropriate intervals to receive all lawful meal periods, among other reasons. Further, when Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees worked shifts over ten hours, they did not receive a second meal period. As a result, their meal periods were missed, late, short, and/or interrupted. Tetra failed to pay Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees an additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when they suffered a meal period violation. As a result, Tetra Tech failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premiums in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

Rest Periods

Throughout the statutory period, Tetra Tech failed to authorize and permit Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees to take 10-minute rest periods for every 4 hours worked or major fraction thereof. Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees were required and/or incentivized to work through their rest periods, discouraged from taking their rest periods, required to remain on call during their rest periods, and/or were not relieved of all duties in order to take all rest periods. Tetra Tech failed to pay Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees an additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when they suffered a rest period violation. As a result, Tetra Tech failed to permit rest periods and pay rest period premiums in violation of Labor Code § 226.7.

Reimbursement

Throughout the statutory period, Tetra Tech failed to reimburse necessary business expenses in violation of Labor Code § 2802. Specifically, Tetra Tech required Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees to download mobile applications on their personal devices that were used for work. Tetra Tech failed to reimburse Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees for the expense of using their personal devices for work purposes.

Wage Statements

Due to Tetra Tech's wage, meal period, rest period, and deduction violations as alleged above, Tetra Tech failed to provide Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements that accurately reported gross wages earned, total hours worked, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate in violation of Labor Code § 226. This failure was knowing and intentional.

Timing of Wage Payments

Due to Tetra Tech's wage, meal period, rest period, and deduction violations as alleged above, Tetra Tech failed to pay all wages due during Mr. Redmond's and other Aggrieved Employees' employment and at the end of their employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, and 210. This failure was willful and intentional.

Recordkeeping

Due to Tetra Tech's wage, meal period, rest period, and deduction violations as alleged above, Tetra Tech failed to maintain accurate and complete records showing the hours worked each day by Mr. Redmond and other Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174



and 1174.5.

Based on these violations, Mr. Redmond seeks civil penalties, injunctive relief, and attorneys' fees and costs under PAGA. Enclosed and incorporated herein is the class action complaint Mr. Redmond will be filing on behalf of himself and all other Aggrieved Employees against Tetra Tech. Mr. Redmond intends to amend the complaint to add a cause of action under PAGA 65 days after the date of this notice pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A).

Thank you for your assistance on this matter. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,
ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Fawn F. Bekam", is written over a light blue circular stamp.

Fawn F. Bekam

Enclosure: Class Action Complaint