

JOSEPH W. COTCHETT (#36324; jcotchett@cpmlegal.com)
PHILIP L. GREGORY (#95217; pgregory@cpmlegal.com)
PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY (#24541; pmccloskey@cpmlegal.com)

COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY

840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200
Burlingame, CA 94010
Telephone: (650) 697-6000
Facsimile: (650) 697-0577

STUART GROSS
(#251019; sgross@gross-law.com)

GROSS LAW

The Embarcadero
Pier 9, Suite 100
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415-671-4628
Facsimile: 415-480-6688

SHARON E. DUGGAN (#105108;
foxsduggan@aol.com)

ATTORNEY AT LAW

370 Grand Avenue Suite 5
Oakland, CA 94610
Telephone: 510-271-0825
Facsimile: 510-271-0829

Attorneys for Petitioners

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF DEL NORTE**

FRIENDS OF DEL NORTE; ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION INFORMATION CENTER, a non-profit
corporation; CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, a
non-profit corporation,

Petitioners

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION;
MALCOLM DOUGHERTY in his official capacity as
Director of the California Department of Transportation; and
DOES 1-50,

Respondents.

CASE NO. CVPT 13-1154

**FIRST AMENDED VERIFIED
PETITION FOR WRIT OF
MANDATE AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

[CCP §§ 526, 1085, 1094.5;
PRC §§ 21168, 21168.6,
21168.9]

Petitioners, FRIENDS OF DEL NORTE ("Friends"), ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION INFORMATION CENTER ("EPIC"), and the CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL
DIVERSITY ("CBD"), collectively referenced as "Petitioners," allege as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. On April 10, 2013, the State of California Department of Transportation
("Caltrans") approved a project captioned "197/199 Safe STAA Access Project" (the "197/199

Project” or “Project”) to allow major modifications to segments of State Highways 197 and 199 to allow access by large STAA trucks. Caltrans certified an Environmental Impact Report (the “EIR”) for this Project, without complying with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq., and its implementing regulations, California Code of Regulations, title 14, sections 15000 et seq. (the “CEQA Guidelines”). When it finally completed the EIR, Caltrans failed, among other things, to evaluate the Project’s significant environmental effects, mitigate those impacts, and adopt necessary alternatives. Therefore, Petitioners respectfully request that any approval of the 197/199 Project and certification of the EIR be set aside as detailed below.

PARTIES

2. Petitioner **FRIENDS OF DEL NORTE** (“Friends”) is a non-profit public interest group established in 1973 in Crescent City and Gasquet, California, designed to protect the local environment and educate our citizenry on the benefits of planning for living in a pristine setting. For forty years, Friends has volunteered resources to foster public dialogue about natural resources throughout the region, by attending federal, state and local meetings and public hearings working to influence elected leaders in planning for a healthy future in Del Norte County and its bioregion. In part through monitoring local planning issues, Friends’ two hundred local and northern California members have tirelessly worked to protect the pristine qualities of the Wild and Scenic Smith River and its salmon and steelhead fisheries habitat, scenic corridors of Highways 199 and 101, ancient Redwood Forests, the Lake Earl Coastal Lagoon and the wild Pacific coastline. Friends believes that, without deliberate attention and care, these great natural treasures will be compromised or degraded over time and lost to future generations. Friends is proud of its record of success in helping to foster the 40,000 acre expansion of Redwood National and State Parks, the 180,000 acre Siskiyou Wilderness Area, the Smith River National Recreation Area in the Six Rivers National Forest, long-term protection of the Point St. George Heritage Area through acquisition by Del Norte County, better management of Lake Earl Coastal Lagoon resulting in higher biodiversity, and participation at the stakeholder level to successfully promote the creation of the Marine Life Protection Act for Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino

1 Counties. Over the years, Friends has worked successfully alongside Caltrans to help create the
2 arched bridge on Highway 199 over Myrtle Creek, to protect the scenic qualities of our local
3 highways, and to help plan the Cushing Creek realignment project on Highway 101 to save old
4 growth redwood trees bordering this scenic highway. Friends will continue to work with federal,
5 state and local agencies in planning to protect our natural resources. Friends actively participated
6 in the review and comment process for the 197/199 Project being challenged herein.

7 3. Petitioner **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION INFORMATION CENTER**
8 (“EPIC”) is a non-profit public interest organization formed to promote environmental values
9 and environmental protection. EPIC is located in California and has approximately 2,000
10 members, who live throughout California. EPIC is beneficially interested in the aesthetic
11 enjoyment and continued productivity of land, forest, and other water resources, in the
12 preservation of wildlife and protected species including the Marbled Murrelet, the Northern
13 Spotted Owl and anadromous salmonids at self-perpetuating population levels, in protection of
14 old growth Redwoods and Douglas fir, watersheds, and in the protection of other natural
15 resources and our environment. Members of EPIC travel throughout California for personal,
16 aesthetic, and recreational pursuits, including hiking, bird watching, and enjoying California’s
17 incredible beauty. Members of EPIC regularly visit and enjoy northern California natural
18 resources, including the remarkably beautiful and majestic Wild and Scenic Smith River and
19 parks and lands along it and within the Highways 197 and 199 corridors. EPIC members’
20 depend for their livelihood, health, culture, and well-being on the viability of vegetation and land
21 throughout California. EPIC’s members rely upon water from throughout California. Members
22 of EPIC also observe, study, recreate, gather, or otherwise enjoy the unique biologic, scientific,
23 and aesthetic benefits of the Smith River and Patrick Creek, and the corridors and lands accessed
24 by Highways 197, 199, and 101. EPIC members experience these benefits as important and
25 unique State and public resources. EPIC fully participated in the review and comment process
26 for the 197/199 Project in an effort to protect these important resources.

27 4. Petitioner **CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY** (“CBD”) is a
28 non-profit, public interest corporation with more than 42,000 members. CBD has offices in

1 Joshua Tree, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, California; as well as offices in Arizona, New
2 Mexico, Oregon, Vermont, and Washington, D.C. CBD is actively involved in wildlife and
3 habitat protection issues throughout the United States, and has members throughout our country,
4 thousands of whom reside in California. CBD's members and staff include individuals with
5 educational, scientific, spiritual, recreational and other interests in protection of natural resources,
6 including the Marbled Murrelet, the Northern Spotted Owl, and protected salmonid species.
7 CBD's members and staff enjoy the biological, recreational and aesthetic values of the public
8 lands and parks, where protected species such as the Northern Spotted Owl live, and rivers which
9 provide refugia for protected salmonid species such as the Coho, Chinook, and Steelhead. CBD's
10 members and staff have participated in efforts to protect and preserve the habitat essential to the
11 continued survival of these species. CBD brings this action on its own behalf and on behalf of its
12 adversely affected members and staff.

13 5. The above-described health, recreational, scientific, cultural, inspirational,
14 educational, aesthetic, and other interests of Petitioners will be adversely and irreparably injured
15 by Respondents' failure to comply with CEQA and its implementing regulations. These are
16 actual, concrete injuries to Petitioners and their members that would be redressed by the relief
17 sought herein. Petitioners have no adequate remedy at law.

18 6. Petitioners sue on behalf of themselves, as well as their members and supporters.
19 Petitioners are comprised of residents of the State of California who are united by the following
20 common interests of law and fact: an "interested person" in the aesthetic enjoyment and
21 protection of California's resources, including its water and water quality, streams and wetlands,
22 air quality, biological resources, fish and wildlife, and environment.

23 7. Respondent **CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**
24 ("Caltrans") is a public and state agency within the State of California, with its headquarters in
25 Sacramento, California. Caltrans is the lead agency for the 197/199 Project under CEQA.
26 Caltrans obtained federal funding from the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA") and is
27 the lead federal agency for the 197/199 Project based on the delegation of authority to Caltrans
28 by FHWA, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327, to provide environmental review pursuant to the National

1 Environmental Policy Act 42 U.S.C. 4331 ("NEPA"), consultation, and any other action on
2 behalf of the FHWA. Caltrans is the agency which prepared and certified a Final Environmental
3 Impact Report/Environmental Assessment and Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation ("FEIR")
4 for the 197/199 Project. Caltrans approved the 197/199 Project on April 10, 2013. Thereafter,
5 Caltrans submitted to the State Clearinghouse for posting a CEQA Notice of Determination,
6 which was posted on April 15, 2013, as well as a subsequent CEQA Notice of Determination
7 posted on June 6, 2013

8 8. Respondent **MALCOLM DOUGHERTY** is the Director of the California
9 Department of Transportation, and in this capacity resides in the County of Sacramento. As
10 Director, Mr. Dougherty is responsible for maintenance and operations of roadways comprising
11 the California state highway system. Mr. Dougherty is sued in his official capacity.

12 9. Petitioners do not know the true names and capacities of Respondents fictitiously
13 named herein as DOES 1 through 50, inclusive. Petitioners are informed and believe, and
14 thereon allege, that such fictitiously named Respondents are responsible in some manner for the
15 acts or omissions complained of or pending herein. Petitioners will amend this Petition to allege
16 the fictitiously named Respondents' true names and capacities when ascertained.

17 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

18 10. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections
19 526 and 1085 (alternatively section 1094.5), as well as Public Resources Code sections 21168,
20 21168.5, and 21168.9.

21 11. Venue is proper in this Court under Code of Civil Procedure section 392.

22 12. Petitioners have complied with the requirements of Public Resources Code
23 section 21167.5 by serving a written notice of Petitioners' intention to commence this action on
24 Caltrans and its Director on May 10, 2013. A copy of this written notice and proof of service is
25 attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

26 13. Petitioners will comply with the requirements of Public Resources Code section
27 21167.6 by concurrently filing a notice of their election to prepare the record of administrative
28 proceedings relating to this Action.

1 14. Petitioners are complying with the requirements of Public Resources Code section
2 21167.7 by sending a copy of this Amended Verified Petition to the California Attorney General
3 on July 7, 2013. The Declaration of Service transmitting this Petition is attached hereto as
4 **Exhibit B.**

5 15. Petitioners through their representatives and members have performed any and all
6 conditions precedent to the filing of this instant action and have exhausted any and all available
7 administrative remedies to the extent required by law.

8 16. At all times mentioned herein, Respondents have been able to deny the approvals
9 and reject certification of the FEIR for the Project. Notwithstanding such ability, Respondents
10 have failed and continues to fail to perform its duty to deny and reject the 197/199 Project.

11 17. Petitioners have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy in the course of ordinary law
12 unless this Court grants the requested writ of mandate to require Respondents to set aside their
13 approval of the Project. In the absence of such remedies, Respondents' approval will remain in
14 effect in violation of state law.

15 18. If Respondents are not ordered to withdraw approval of the 197/199 Project and
16 certification of the FEIR, the People of California, as well as the land, watershed, wildlife,
17 economic, and environmental values subject to and affected by the Project, will suffer
18 immediate, irreparable, and permanent damage.

19 19. Petitioners bring this action on the ground that Petitioners and their members, as
20 residents, landowners, citizens, and taxpayers of the State of California, will suffer irreparable
21 injuries if Respondents' actions herein are not set aside immediately. Such injuries include, but
22 are not limited to, deterioration of air quality, water quality, fish and other biological resources,
23 public safety, natural quiet, and open space.

24 20. Petitioners are groups of citizens, taxpayers, and residents of the State of
25 California. Petitioners are organizations comprised of individuals who have participated on
26 behalf of Friends, EPIC, and CBD in the review of the 197/199 Project and are concerned about
27 the effects of the proposed Project on the environment. Petitioners have standing to bring this
28 action.

1 21. In pursuing this action, Petitioners will confer a substantial benefit on the People
2 of the State of California and therefore are entitled to recover from Respondents reasonable
3 attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, or other appropriate
4 provision of law.

5 22. Caltrans filed a Notice of Determination regarding its approval of the 197/199
6 Project with the State Clearinghouse on April 15, 2013. This action is timely filed.

7 23. After the original Petition was filed on May 14, 2013 and this original Petition
8 was personally served on Respondents, Respondents created a new June 6, 2013 decision date
9 and issued a different Notice of Determination. On June 7, 2012, this new Notice of
10 Determination was received by the State Clearing House. Petitioners are informed and believe
11 and thereon allege that this new Notice of Determination purports to change documentation of
12 determinations for the Project, including, but not limited to, findings and a mitigation reporting
13 or monitoring plan. Despite repeated requests to Caltrans for a copy of Respondents' new or
14 different decision, Petitioners have been unable to secure a copy from Caltrans as of the date this
15 First Amended Petition was signed. Petitioners file this First Amended Verified Petition and Writ
16 of Mandate and Injunctive Relief to preserve any and all rights which may arise as a consequence
17 of any actions taken by Respondents on or about June 6, 2013.

18 **FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

19 24. Caltrans' 197/199 Project is intended to open up two existing narrow highways to
20 large transportation trucks, referred to herein as STAA trucks. These trucks are longer and
21 slightly wider than California legal trucks. Caltrans is developing one major project – a STAA
22 network in Northern California, by widening the major roadways – Highways 101, 299, and
23 197/199 – which access Humboldt and Del Norte Counties. The 197/199 Project is but one
24 piece of this initiative, which in itself will have significant adverse environmental effects, and
25 will contribute to cumulative impacts associated with this larger network development. The
26 STAA network poses a significant and unnecessary risk to the North Coast region.

27 25. To allow STAA truck access, the 197/199 Project will widen Highways 197 and
28 199 in seven locations, along the Wild and Scenic Smith River, considered one of the “crown

1 jewels” of the National Wild and Scenic River System. The Smith River is a refugia for
2 California’s last salmon, including protected Coho salmon, Chinook salmon, Steelhead, and
3 Coastal Cutthroat Trout. It is the only drinking water source for Crescent City. The Smith River
4 is a spectacular wild river, with intense scenic views and providing a host of recreational
5 opportunities.

6 26. Highway 199 winds through the Middle Fork of the Smith River Canyon, is
7 designated as an U.S. Forest Service scenic byway through the Smith River National Recreation
8 Area, and is listed as eligible for inclusion in the State Scenic Highway Program. It provides
9 dramatic views of the Smith River. It links Northern California in Del Norte County to inland
10 regions of Oregon, accessing Interstate Highway 5 at Grants Pass. Highway 197 also is located
11 along the Smith River, and is also eligible as a State Scenic Highway. It is primarily a more local
12 route, providing access to homes and public recreational facilities along the Smith River,
13 including Ruby Van Deventer County Park. It has limited sight distance, narrow shoulders, large
14 redwood trees next to the road, and sharp curves. There are approximately 70 drive-ways along
15 the portion of Highway 197 included as part of the 197/199 Project.

16 27. Caltrans’ 197/199 Project is actually four projects. On Highway 197, Caltrans has
17 two projects, referred to as Ruby 1 and Ruby 2. On Highway 199, Caltrans proposes two
18 projects: Patrick Creek Narrows (Locations 1, 2 and 3), and the Narrows and Washington Curve.
19 On Highway 197, Caltrans will likely widen the roads in these locations; extend, replace, or
20 repair culverts and drainage. On Highway 199, near Patrick’s Creek, Caltrans will do major
21 excavation and cut into rock slopes, install at least one retaining wall, replace a bridge, and
22 increase road widths.

23 28. Caltrans claims there are substandard curves and/or substandard shoulders along
24 these traveled ways and narrow lanes, for which Caltrans proposes so-called “improvements” at
25 “spot locations.” If any one of these “improvements” does not occur, Caltrans admits that it will
26 need to reassess whether there is a need for any of the Project’s “improvements.” Caltrans
27 claims it will make “specific geometric improvements” within the 197/199 Project area. By
28 using a computer modeling software, AutoTURN, Caltrans claims it has designed the widening

1 or realignment needed at specific locations for STAA truck access. Because these claimed
2 “improvements,” in and of themselves, are insufficient to provide compliance with Caltrans’
3 highway design standards for elements such as sight and stopping distance, shoulder width, and
4 adequate curve dimensions, Caltrans must approve exceptions to its highway design criteria as
5 part of the 197/199 Project . In this way, Caltrans has approved a project which only
6 theoretically enables the intended STAA access and is not consistent with STAA requirements
7 for additions.

8 29. The 197/199 Project as approved will have significant adverse impacts on the
9 Wild and Scenic Smith River, old-growth Redwood and Douglas fir trees and their root systems,
10 and fish and wildlife species protected by state and/or federal laws. It will adversely impact
11 tourism and recreational opportunities in both the short and long term, particularly within the
12 Smith River National Recreation Area, Six Rivers National Forest, Redwoods National and State
13 Parks, Jedediah Smith State Park, and Ruby Van Deventer County Park. Because of the
14 extensive work intended in and around Patrick’s Creek, it will adversely affect the steep and
15 geologically unstable Smith River Canyon slopes, as well as rare plants and species found only in
16 the Smith River serpentine soils.

17 30. The 197/199 Project will increase motorist and pedestrian safety hazards on
18 Highways 197, 199, and 101, and pose a significant compromise to public safety. Among other
19 things, the Project will develop an alternative route for STAA trucks to avoid Interstate 5,
20 particularly during the winter months when Interstate 5 at the Siskiyou Summit (the highest point
21 on Interstate 5) is closed due to weather conditions. Because Caltrans must depend on
22 exceptions to its design standards, the increased presence of these large trucks, during already
23 dangerous winter conditions on these narrow roads, will expose all cars and traffic to an
24 increased risk of accidents and injury. Safety hazards also will increase from the likelihood of
25 truck cargo spills, including increased hazardous materials, that threaten water quality and
26 endanger the sole supply of drinking water.

27 31. Caltrans issued its notice of preparation for the EIR on September 2, 2008 and
28 released its draft EIR on June 29, 2010, permitting public comment until August 23, 2010. More

1 than two years later, on September 18, 2012, Caltrans recirculated its draft EIR, and public
2 comment closed on November 5, 2012. Petitioners participated in this review process and
3 submitted comments. Caltrans approved its 197/199 Project and certified the EIR on April 10,
4 2013, and its Notice of Determination was posted with the State Clearinghouse on April 15,
5 2013. Thereafter, Respondents created a new June 6, 2013 decision date and issued a second
6 Notice of Determination also on June 6, 2013.

7 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(Violation of CEQA)**

9 32. Petitioners incorporate by reference all the allegations contained in the previous
10 paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

11 33. CEQA and its CEQA Guidelines requires the lead agency for a project to prepare
12 an EIR that complies with the requirements of the statute. The lead agency also must provide for
13 public review and comment on the project and associated environmental documentation. An EIR
14 must provide sufficient environmental analysis such that decision-makers can intelligently
15 consider environmental consequences when acting on proposed projects.

16 34. Respondents violated CEQA by certifying an EIR for the Project that is
17 inadequate and fails to comply with CEQA. Among other things, Respondents:

- 18 a. Failed to provide a stable and consistent description of the 197/199 Project;
- 19 b. Failed to evaluate the impacts of the entire 197/199 Project, including, but not
20 limited to: degradation of the Wild and Scenic Smith River and its outstandingly remarkable
21 values and resources; increased motorist and pedestrian safety risks; water quality risks and
22 endangerment of public drinking water; degradation and loss of biological resources, plants, and
23 vegetation, including old growth trees; harm to protected salmonids and their habitat;
24 diminishment of natural and recreational resources within designated National Recreation Areas,
25 state and federal parks, and other public lands; community fragmentation; and the effects on
26 climate change.
- 27 c. Failed to adopt a consistent and appropriate environmental "baseline" for
28 analysis of the Project's environmental impacts and improperly assumed, for example, that the

1 197/199 Project would not significantly increase traffic, create hazardous exposure, or damage
2 the pristine Wild and Scenic Smith River and its resources;

3 d. Failed to adequately disclose or analyze the Project's significant impacts on the
4 environment, including, but not limited to, the Project's impacts on hydrology, water quality,
5 water supply, groundwater flow and recharge, biological resources (included threatened,
6 endangered, and sensitive species), geology, traffic and circulation, noise, air quality, aesthetics,
7 and hazardous materials;

8 e. Failed to analyze significant cumulative and growth-inducing impacts resulting
9 from development of a STAA network within Northern California for STAA trucks and from
10 reasonably foreseeable projects underway and planned to develop this STAA network;

11 f. Improperly deferred impact analysis and mitigation measures and failed to ensure
12 that the 197/199 Project impacts would be mitigated; and

13 g. Failed to adequately consider a reasonable range of alternatives, including the "no
14 build" alternative for some or all of the Project locations.

15 35. Respondents also violated CEQA by failing to adequately respond to comments
16 on the EIR, including, but not limited to, ignoring or dismissing in a cursory fashion analysis of
17 traffic impacts, requests for additional information, and suggestions of feasible mitigation
18 measures and alternatives for consideration by Caltrans.

19 36. As a result of the foregoing defects, Respondents prejudicially abused their
20 discretion by certifying an EIR that does not comply with CEQA and by approving the 197/199
21 Project in reliance thereon. Accordingly, Respondent's certification of the EIR and approval of
22 the 197/199 Project must be set aside.

23 WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray for relief as hereinafter set forth.

24 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **(Violation of CEQA: Inadequate Findings)**

26 37. Petitioners incorporate by reference all the allegations contained in the previous
27 paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

28 38. CEQA requires that a lead agency's findings for the approval of a project be

1 supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record. CEQA further requires that a lead
2 agency provide an explanation of how evidence in the record supports the conclusions it has
3 reached.

4 39. Respondents violated CEQA by not adopting findings as required. To the extent
5 Respondents claim Caltrans did adopt findings, they are inadequate as a matter of law in that they
6 are not supported by substantial evidence in the record, including, but not limited to, the
7 determination that certain impacts would be less than significant, that mitigation measures would
8 avoid or lessen the Project's significant effects on the environment, and/or that certain mitigation
9 measures or alternatives are infeasible or do not meet the 197/199 Project objectives.

10 40. As a result of the foregoing defects, Respondents prejudicially abused their
11 discretion by adopting findings that do not comply with CEQA and by approving the 197/199
12 Project in reliance thereon. Accordingly, Respondent's certification of the EIR and approval of
13 the 197/199 Project must be set aside.

14 WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray for relief as hereinafter set forth.

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Violation of CEQA: Failure to Adopt Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan)**

17 41. Petitioners incorporate by reference all the allegations contained in the previous
18 paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

19 42. CEQA requires that, whenever an agency finds that potential adverse impacts
20 exist which can be mitigated, it is required to adopt a mitigation monitoring program to ensure
21 that the mitigation measures are followed. (Pub. Res. Code §21081.6.)

22 43. Respondents have prejudicially abused their discretion by failing to adopt a legally
23 adequate reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures identified for the Project.

24 WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray for relief as hereinafter set forth.

25 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

26 WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray for judgment and further relief as follows:

27 1. For alternative and peremptory writs of mandate directing Respondents to vacate and
28 set aside their certification of the EIR and approval of the 197/199 Project;

1 2. For alternative and peremptory writs of mandate directing Respondents to comply
2 with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, and to take any other action as required by Public Resources
3 Code section 21168.9;

4 3. For a temporary stay, temporary restraining order, and preliminary and permanent
5 injunctions restraining Respondents and their agents, servants, employees, contractors, and all others
6 acting in concert with Respondents on their behalf, from taking any action to implement or further
7 approve or construct the 197/199 Project, pending full compliance with the requirements of CEQA
8 and the CEQA Guidelines;

9 4. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5 or
10 other appropriate provision of law;

11 5. For costs of suit under California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 1032 and 1033.5; and

12 6. For such other and further equitable or legal relief as the Court deems proper.
13

14 DATED: July 3, 2013

15
16 By _____

SHARON E. DUGGAN

Attorneys for Petitioners
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

VERIFICATION

I, Sharon E. Duggan, do declare:


1. I am an attorney at law duly admitted and licensed to practice before all courts of this State. I have my professional office in the County of Alameda, at 370 Grand Avenue, Suite 5 in Oakland, California.

2. I am an attorney of record for Petitioners Environmental Protection Information Center, the Friends of Del Norte, and Center for Biological Diversity.

3. I have read the foregoing First Amended Verified Writ of Mandate and Injunctive Relief and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except for those matters based on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true. This Verification is signed by me rather than by the Petitioners because I have my office in Oakland in Alameda County, a different County than where the Petitioners reside and exist, in Humboldt, Del Norte, and San Francisco Counties respectively, and are not able to sign the verification.

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

Executed on the day of July 3, 2013 in Oakland, California.


Sharon E. Duggan

LAW OFFICES OF SHARON E. DUGGAN

370 Grand Avenue Suite 5

Oakland, CA 94610

(510) 271-0825

Facsimile: (510) 271-0829

May 10, 2013

Director Malcolm Dougherty
California Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 942873
Sacramento, CA 94273-0001


RE: 197/199 Safe STAA Access Project Final Environmental Impact
Report/Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(f) Evaluation

Dear Director Dougherty and the California Department of Transportation:

This is to advise you that this office has been retained to and will file claims against the California Department of Transportation Game on behalf of the Environmental Protection Information Center and others challenging Department approvals of the 197/199 Safe STAA Access Project and its Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment and Section 4(f) Evaluation. These claims shall be filed on or before May 15, 2013. This notice is sent to you pursuant to Public Resources Code 21167.5.

This action shall be premised upon, among other things, violations of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Very truly yours,


Sharon E. Duggan

sed/fw

Exhibit A

1 **DECLARATION OF SERVICE**

2 I, Sharon E. Duggan, do declare,

3 I am, and was at the time of the service hereinafter mentioned over the age of eighteen
4 and not a party to the above-entitled cause. My business address is 370 Grand Avenue Suite 5,
Oakland, CA 94610 and I am a resident of or employed in the County of Alameda, California.

5 On the date set forth below, I served the First Amended Verified Petition for Writ of
6 Mandate and Injunctive Relief on the parties and the California State Attorney General,
addressed as

7 Kamala Harris
8 California State Attorney General
450 Golden Gate Avenue Suite 11000
9 San Francisco, CA 94102

Derek S. Van Hoften/Janet Wong
Dept. of Transportation Legal Division
595 Market Street Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105

10 **XXX BY FIRST CLASS MAIL** by depositing a sealed envelope in the United States Postal
11 Service in the ordinary course of business on the same day it is collected in San
Francisco, California postage fully prepaid.

12 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
13 foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on July 3, 2013 in Oakland,
14 California.

15 
16 SHARON E. DUGGAN
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28