


SMILAND CHESTER LLP

601 WEST FIFTH STREET
SUITE 1100
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071
TELEPHONE: (213) 891-1010
FACSIMILE: (213) 891-1414
www.smilandlaw.com



Mary C. Alden

Email: malden@smilandlaw.com

237022

The Honorable Cynthia T. Brown
Chief, Section of Administration
Surface Transportation Board
395 E. Street, S.W., Room 100
Washington, DC 20423-0001

ENTERED
Office of Proceedings
November 12, 2014
Part of
Public Record

November 6, 2014

Subject: *Time Extension to Intervene and Reply to STB Finance docket No. 35861 Petition for Declaratory Order*

Dear Ms. Brown:

On behalf of the Roar Foundation, a 501(c) (3) organization, we hereby request an extension for the time in which to intervene and file an opposition to the above Petition for Declaratory Order filed by the High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA). The Roar Foundation is a stakeholder in the High Speed Rail project and accordingly has standing to object to the HSRA's Petition.

We became aware of the Petition on November 5, 2016¹. Although the Petition seeks declaratory relief with respect to the Fresno-Bakersfield Segment only, the Petition, should it be granted, will be relied upon presumably for all segments, including the Palmdale-Burbank High Speed Rail Train segment which is of direct concern to our client². In fact, the HSRA specifically references the Palmdale-Burbank segment in footnote 8 of its Petition, wherein it states, "Similarly in July 2014, the Authority, as lead Agency under CEQA, issued an EIR

¹ Notice of the Petition was given only to the parties of the seven lawsuits filed with respect to the Fresno-Bakersfield Segment, inter alia, *Coffee-Brimhall LLC v. California High-Speed Rail Authority* (Case No. 34-2014-80001859); *County of Kings, et al., v. California High Speed Rail Authority* (Case No. 34-2014-80001861); *County of Kern v. California High-speed Rail Authority* (Case No. 34-2014-80001863); *First Free Will Baptist Church of Bakersfield v. California High Speed Rail Authority* (Case No. 34-2014-80001864); *Dignity Health v. California High-Speed Rail Authority* (Case No. 34-2014-80001865); *City of Bakersfield v. California High-speed Rail Authority* (Case No. 34-2014-80001908); *City of Shafter v. California High-Speed Rail Authority* (Case No. 34-2014-80001908).

² The Roar Foundation operates a big cat animal preserve, Shambala, in Acton California. The Roar Foundation submitted scoping comments with respect to the various proposed alignments for the Palmdale to Burbank segment of the High Speed Rail on September 10, 2014.

Surface Transportation Board

November 6, 2014

Page 2

before the Surface Transportation Board (STB) will likely affect the rights of all stakeholders of all segments. Clearly the Authority is seeking to prevent other stakeholders from seeking remedies otherwise available under CEQA by establishing a precedent with the STB (without notice to such stakeholders and an opportunity to be heard). It should be noted that the Programmatic Environmental Reports certified by the HSRA in 2005 and 2008 clearly state that the HSR Project is subject to CEQA compliance, which, admittedly on page 10 of the Petition, includes injunctive relief and other remedies that are available to stakeholders after an EIR is certified.³ After having advised stakeholders at public scoping meetings (as well as in the PEIRs issued in 2005 and 2008) that the HSRA is required to follow CEQA, it now seeks to avoid one of the most important remedies afforded stakeholders for its failure to comply.

Additionally, HSRA is requesting expedited relief for its Petition which should not be granted. The Authority, at page 16 of its Petition, states that "To facilitate expedited consideration, the Authority has served a copy of this Petition for Declaratory Order on all counsel of record of the Petitioners in the Lawsuits." However, the result of the STB's ruling on this expedited request affects not only the litigants in the Lawsuits, but all other stakeholders who would potentially be bound by this ruling. Therefore, expedited consideration should not be granted in this case. It is our view that it is most appropriate that the STB postpone its decision until the California Supreme Court can render a final judicial determination on whether the Interstate Commerce Commission Termination Act (ICCTA) preempts CEQA under the circumstances being litigated in the Lawsuits. At the very least the STB should permit full briefing of the issues briefed in the Petition so that the STB can make its decision based upon a full understanding of the law presented, which raises issues not addressed by the previous cases cited by the Petitioner in its Petition.

For the above reasons, we respectfully request that the Surface Transportation Board grant additional time for intervention and briefing so that these very important issues can be properly briefed by all affected stakeholders.

Very truly yours,



Mary C. Alden

³ 2005 EIR, Section 1.1 states "The proposed HST system in the Bay Area to Central Valley corridor is subject to environmental review under CEQA and the Authority is both the project sponsor and the lead agency for CEQA compliance." 2008 EIR, Section 1.1 states "The proposed HST system in the Bar Area to Central Valley corridor is subject to environmental review under CEQA and the Authority is both the project sponsor and the lead agency for CEQA compliance."

1 PROOF OF SERVICE

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
3)ss
4 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

5 I, Felicia Herbstreith, I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I
6 am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. My business address is Smiland
7 Chester LLP, 601 W. Fifth Street, Eleventh Floor, Los Angeles, California 90071.

8 On **November 7, 2014**, I served the foregoing document described as,
9 **CORRESPONDENCE DATED NOVEMBER 6, 2014 TO HON. CYNTHIA T. BROWN**
10 **REGARDING TIME EXTENSION TO INTERVENE AND REPLY TO STB FINANCE**
11 **DOCKET NO. 35861 PETITION FOR DECLARATORY ORDER** on all parties in said
12 action as follows:

13 **BY U.S. MAIL:** On the above date, in Los Angeles, California, the document was
14 placed in an envelope addressed as follows:

15 *SEE ATTACHED MAILING LIST*

16 The envelope was sealed and placed for collection and mailing following ordinary
17 business practices. I am readily familiar with the business' practice for collection and processing
18 of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. The correspondence would
19 be deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of
20 business with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am aware that on motion of party served, service
21 is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one (1) day
22 after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

23 **BY EXPRESS SERVICE CARRIER:** On that date, the document was placed in an
24 envelope designated by Federal Express with delivery fees provided for, addressed
25 as follows:

26 The envelope was sealed and marked for overnight delivery and:

- 27 deposited in a box regularly maintained by Federal Express.
- 28 delivered to an authorized courier authorized by Federal Express to receive documents. [CCP § 1013(c)]

[XX] (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on **November 7, 2014**, at Los Angeles, California.


Felicia Herbstreith

SERVICE LIST

1
2 The Honorable Cynthia T. Brown
3 Chief, Section of Administration
4 Surface Transportation Board
5 395 "E" Street, S.W., Room 100
6 Washington, D.C. 20423-0001

7 Kevin M. Sheys
8 Nossaman LLP
9 1666 "K" Street, N.W., Suite 500
10 Washington, D.C. 20006

11 Jessica Tucker-Mohl
12 Deputy Attorney General
13 1300 "I" Street, P.O. Box 944255
14 Sacramento, CA 94224-2550

15 Danae Aitchison
16 Deputy Attorney General
17 1300 "I" Street, P.O. Box 944255
18 Sacramento, CA 94224-2550

19 Jacqueline Ayer
20 2010 West Avenue "K," No. 701
21 Lancaster, CA 93536
22 **[Resident of California]**

23 James Arnone, Esq.
24 Latham & Watkins LLP
25 355 South Grand Avenue
26 Los Angeles, CA 90071
27 **[Attorneys for Party of Record]**

28 Douglas Carstens, Esq.
29 Chatten-Brown & Carstens
30 2200 Pacific Coast Highway, Suite 318
31 Hermosa Beach, CA 90254
32 **[Attorneys for Party of Record]**

33 Charles Collins
34 1115 Truxton Avenue, Fourth Floor
35 Bakersfield, CA 93301

36 //

1 William C. Descary
2 604 Plover Court
3 Bakersfield, CA 93309-1336

4 Virginia Gennaro
5 1600 Truxtun Avenue, Fourth Floor
6 Bakersfield, CA 93301

7 Jamie Hall
8 Channel Law Group, LLP
9 207 East Broadway, Suite 201
10 Long Beach, CA 90802

11 George F. Martin
12 Law Offices of Borton Petrini, LLP
13 5060 California Avenue, Suite 700
14 Post Office Box 2026
15 Bakersfield, CA 93303-2026

16 Michelle Ouellette
17 Best Best & Krieger LLP
18 Post Office Box 1028
19 Riverside, CA 92502-1028

20 Stuart M. Flashman
21 5626 Ocean View Drive
22 Oakland, CA 92618-1533

23 Richard S. Edelman, Esq.
24 O'Donnell, Schwartz and Anderson, P.C.
25 1300 "L" Street, N.W., Suite 1200
26 Washington, D.C. 20005

27 Al Franken
28 United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Blain I. Green
Four Embarcadero Center, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94126-2824

Diane L. Harkey
State Capitol
Post Office Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249-0073

1 Jason W. Holder
2 Holder Law Group
3 339 15th Street, Suite 202
4 Oakland, CA 94612

4 Amy Klobuchar
5 U.S. Senate
6 B40 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg.
7 Washington, D.C. 20510

7 Scott A. Kronland
8 Altshuler Berzon LLP
9 177 Post Street, Suite 300
10 San Francisco, CA 94108

10 Andy Vidak
11 13775 Lacey Boulevard
12 Hanford, CA 93230

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28