# **Public Comment**

Council File: 13-1103-S1

Title: 14415 Sylvan Street / Old Fire Station 39 /

**Exploring Potential Economic Development** 

# **Public Comment**

Council File: 13-1103

Title: Van Nuys Fire Station No. 39

# Van Nuys residents sue city over planned Oxnard Street fire station

By Dakota Smith, Los Angeles Daily News Posted: 08/01/16, 7:27 PM PDT

Marking another legal fight over a planned Van Nuys fire station, a group of San Fernando Valley residents filed a lawsuit against the city of Los Angeles over the project.

Filed in Los Angeles Superior Court on Friday, the lawsuit challenges the environmental analysis for the 18,500-square-foot planned station at Oxnard Street and Vesper Avenue and asks the court to invalidate the station's approval.

This is the neighbors' second lawsuit against the city over the \$20 million station. Besides the Van Nuys residents, several other groups, including the Wilmington-based Coalition for a Safe Environment, an environmental health and justice nonprofit, are also listed as petitioners in the suit.

"This isn't an appropriate place for the station," said Jeffrey Lynn, who lives about 500 feet from the planned station and is one of the residents suing the city.

Lynn argues siren noise from exiting trucks will be a nuisance and questions whether soil contamination on the site is a risk for neighbors.

The Los Angeles City Council approved the station in July despite objections from some nearby residents. At that meeting, area Councilwoman Nury Martinez argued that the site is appropriate because of the neighborhood's commercial feel. A planned 400-foot sound wall will act as a buffer for homes from the siren noise, Martinez also argued.

Supporters, including the Los Angeles Fire Department, contend the new station is needed to replace the Valley's oldest firehouse, the 1930s-era Station 39 on Sylvan Street.

Martinez wasn't available Monday to comment on the lawsuit.

Neighbors first sued the city over the council's approval of the firehouse in June 2014, arguing the noise and other environmental effects from the proposed project weren't studied.

The lawsuit prompted City Hall to rescind the project's approval in December 2014 and order a fuller environmental report, which was finalized in June.

Asked about this new lawsuit, City Attorney Mike Feuer's spokesman, Rob Wilcox, said his office was reviewing the filing.

			2 7 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
	1	Mark R. Wolfe, CSB No. 176753	8
	2	M. R. WOLFE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 555 Sutter Street, Suite 405	FILED Superior Could of California
	3	San Francisco, CA 94102	Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles
	4	Telephone: (415) 369-9400 Fax: (415) 369-9405	JUL 2 8 2016
	5	mrw@mrwolfeassociates.com	Sherri R. Carter, Executive Ottocer/Clerk
	6	Association and	Moses Soto Deputy
	7	Attorney for Petitioners	1 BRAZILE
	8	THE SUPERIOR COU	JRT OF CALIFORNIA
	9	COUNTY OF I	LOS ANGELES
		CENTRAL	DISTRICT
	10		
	11	THE TIARA GROUP 2, COALITION FOR	Case No.: <b>BS 1 6 3 7 6 3</b>
	12	A SAFE ENVIRONMENT, CALIFORNIA	Case Ivo
	13	KIDS IAQ, COMMUNITY DREAMS;	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
	14	Petitioners,	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
	15	vs.	(Code Civ. Proc. §1094.5; Pub. Res. Code §§
	16	CITY OF LOS ANGELES,	21168; 21168.5 et seq.)
	1.7	n l	
	18	Respondent;	
	19	DODG4 1 1 05 1 1 1	
	20	DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,	By Fax
	21	Real Parties in Interest.	
	22		
	23		
	24		REC PAY REC REC
	25		CIT/CASE: LEA/DEF#;  RECEIPT #; DATE PAID; PAYMENT; RECEIVED; CHECHECHECHECHECHECHECHECHECHECHECHECHEC
	26		表 N
CE)	27		BS1637 CCH524 07/28/ \$435.00 K:
O2 N-2	28		BS163763 CCH52488 07/28/16 435.00 :
ÇEQ ÇEQ ÇEQ	<b>~</b> ∪		$\Xi$
たート くぶつ M. R. Wolfe & Ass	ociates, PC	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE	# 4
555 Sutter Street, San Francisco, C (415) 369-9	Suite 405 A 94102	Tiara Group 2, et al. v. City of Los Angeles Case No.	48 PM 310 \$435.00 \$0.00 \$0.00
		**************************************	ଦ୍ରୁଷ୍ଟି ର

#### INTRODUCTION

	With this lawsuit, Petitioners THE TIARA GROUP 2, COALITION FOR A SAFE
	ENVIRONMENT, CALIFORNIA KIDS IAQ, and COMMUNITY DREAMS ("Petitioners")
	challenge the July 1, 2016 action of Respondent CITY OF LOS ANGELES ("City"), taken by
	and through its City Council, certifying an environmental impact report ("EIR") and approving
	the construction and operation of Van Nuys Fire Station No. 39 (W.O. E170094B), to be
	located on the 14600 block of Oxnard Street in the community of Van Nuys within the City
	("Project"). Petitioners contend the City violated applicable provisions of the California
	Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq. As certified by the
	City, the Project's EIR fails to identify, evaluate, and/or require mitigation for all direct, indirect,
	and cumulative environmental impacts the Project will foreseeably cause. As a result, there is no
-	substantial evidence in the record to support the City's findings that nearly all the Project's
	environmental impacts will be less than significant after mitigation. Instead, substantial evidence
	in the record shows the Project will have several significant unmitigated environmental effects
	that the EIR either failed to identify, failed to evaluate adequately, or failed to mitigate where
	feasible.

Petitioners accordingly seek a peremptory writ of mandate under Code of Civil

Procedure section 1094.5, and Public Resources Code section 21168 and/or 21168.5,

commanding the City to set aside its certification of the EIR and its approval of the Project.

Petitioners further seek a stay of the effect of the City's actions during the pendency of these proceedings. Finally, Petitioners seek an award of costs and attorneys' fees under Code of Civil

Procedure section 1021.5, together with any other relief the Court deems necessary and proper

In support whereof, Petitioners allege:

#### **PARTIES**

#### Tiara Group 2

1. Petitioner TIARA GROUP 2 is an unincorporated association of residents, citizens, property owners, taxpayers and electors residing in the Van Nuys community of the City of Los Angeles. Its organizational purpose includes advocating for equitable and

M. R. Wolfe & Associates, PC
555 Sutter Street, Suite 405
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 369-9400

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE

Tiara Group 2, et al. v. City of Los Angeles
Case No.

responsible land use development policies, maintaining political accountability by elected local officials, and diligent enforcement of land use planning and environmental laws in and around Van Nuys and Los Angeles. Tiara Groups 2's membership includes but is not limited to Jeffrey Lynn and Robina Suwol, both of whom are citizens of Los Angeles over the age of eighteen living in the residential area immediately adjacent to the Project.

2. Tiara Group 2 and certain of its individual members objected to the City's approvals of the Project orally and/or in writing prior to the close of the final public hearing on the Project before the Los Angeles City Council.

#### Coalition for a Safe Environment

- 3. Petitioner COALITION FOR A SAFE ENVIRONMENT ("CFASE") is an unincorporated, non-profit, membership-based association maintaining a principal place of business in Wilmington, California, and with members in over 25 cities in California and in Baja California, Mexico. Its organizational purpose includes protection, promotion, preservation and restoration of the environment and natural resources, advocating for equitable and responsible land use development policies, maintaining political accountability by elected local officials, and diligent enforcement of land use planning and environmental laws in and around Los Angeles. CFASE members live and/or work in the Van Nuys area of the City near the Project site.
- 4. Petitioner CFASE objected to the City's approvals of the Project orally and/or in writing prior to the close of the final public hearing on the Project before the Los Angeles City Council.

#### California Kids IAQ

5. Petitioner CALIFORNIA KIDS IAQ is an unincorporated, non-profit, membership-based association maintaining a principal place of business in Wilmington, California. Its organizational purpose includes advocating for equitable and responsible land use development policies, maintaining political accountability by elected local officials, and diligent enforcement of land use planning and environmental laws in and around Los Angeles. Its members live and/or work in the Van Nuys area of the City near the Project site.

25
26
(37
27
(37
27
(37
28
(37
28
(37
28
(37
4. R. Wolfe & Associates, PC
555 Surfer Street, Suite 405
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 369-9400

12 13

15

14

16 17

18 19

20 21

23 24

22

25 26

27 28

は個人が確認される (37) 1. R. Wolfe & Associates, PC 555 Sutter Street, Suite 405 1 Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 369-9400

6. Petitioner CALIFORNIA KIDS IAQ objected to the City's approvals of the Project orally and/or in writing prior to the close of the final public hearing on the Project before the Los Angeles City Council.

## Community Dreams

- 7. Petitioner COMMUNITY DREAMS is an unincorporated, non-profit, membership-based association maintaining a principal place of business in Wilmington, California. Its organizational purpose includes advocating for equitable and responsible land use development policies, maintaining political accountability by elected local officials, and diligent enforcement of land use planning and environmental laws in and around Los Angeles. Its members live and/or work in the Van Nuys area of the City near the Project site.
- Petitioner COMMUNITY DREAMS objected to the City's approvals of the Project orally and/or in writing prior to the close of the final public hearing on the Project before the Los Angeles City Council.
- 9. All Petitioners and their respective members maintain a direct and regular geographic nexus with the City of Los Angeles and the Van Nuys area, and will suffer direct harm as a result of any adverse environmental and/or public health impacts caused by the Project.
- 10. Petitioners have a clear and present right to, and beneficial interest in, the City's performance of its duties to comply with CEQA. As comprising Los Angeles citizens, homeowners, taxpayers, workers, and/or electors, Petitioners' members are within the class of persons to whom the City owes such duties.
- By this action, Petitioners seek to protect the interests of their members and the 11. public at large, and to enforce a public duty owed to them by the City. Because the claims asserted and the relief sought in this petition are broad-based and of a public as opposed to a purely private or pecuniary nature, direct participation in this litigation by Petitioners' individual members is not necessary.
- Petitioners and/or their respective individual members or constituents presented oral and/or written comments in opposition to the Project prior to and/or during the public

hearings culminating in the City's July 1, 2016 approval actions, and raised or supported all 1 2 objections to the Project and alleged grounds for noncompliance with CEQA and other 3 applicable law presented herein. City of Los Angeles 4 Respondent CITY OF LOS ANGELES ("City") is a California Charter City 5 13. 6 situated in Los Angeles County. On or around July 1, 2016, the City, acting through its City 7 Council, certified an EIR under CEQA and approved the construction and operation of Van 8 Nuys Fire Station No. 39 (W.O. E170094B). At all times relevant hereto, the City served as the "lead agency" under CEQA responsible for evaluating the environmental impacts of the Project. 10 Does 11 14. Petitioner currently does not know the true names of Real Parties In Interest 12 DOES 1 through 25 inclusive, and therefore names them by such fictitious names. Petitioner will seek leave from the court to amend this petition to reflect the true names and capacities of 13 DOES 1 through 25 inclusive if and when ascertained. 14 15 **JURISDICTION & VENUE** 16 15. This action is brought pursuant to Public Resources Code sections 21167, 21168, and 21168.5, and Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5. Venue is proper in Los Angeles 17 18 County under Code of Civil Procedure section 395. The action is filed in the Central District in 19 accordance with Los Angeles County Superior Court Local Rule 3.232(b). 20 FACTUAL BACKGROUND Project Description 21 22 16. The Project consists of the construction of a two-story, approximately 18,533-23 square-foot fire station on an approximately 1.19-acre site located on the corner of Oxnard 24 Street and Vesper Avenue in the Van Nuys area of Los Angeles. The new facility would replace 25 the existing Fire Station 39, which currently operates approximately one-half mile to the 26 northeast. The Project site is located in an urban mixed-use residential setting, surrounded by small commercial and manufacturing businesses to the north and east, a Department of

26 CED 27 DD 28 DD 1. R. Wolfe & Associates, PC 555 Sutter Street, Suire 405 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 369-9400

1011

12

13 14

15

1617

18 19

20

2122

2324

25

26

27 28

CPD M. R. Wolfe & Associates, PC 555 Sutter Street, Suite 405 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 369-9400 Water and Power building to the west, and numerous single-family residences immediately to the south. The site lies within the Van Nuys-North Sherman Oaks Community Plan Area, and is bounded by Aetna Street to the north, Oxnard Street to the South, Vesper Avenue to the east, and Cedros Avenue to the west. Currently an undeveloped vacant lot, the site contains an abandoned underground storage tank ("UST") in its northeastern portion, and a 10,000-gallon gasoline UST and former 900-gallon kerosene UST in its eastern portion.

18. Once built, the Project would house three fire engines, one ladder truck, two rescue ambulances, and one battalion chief vehicle, together with an above-ground, 4,000 gallon diesel fuel storage tank. Approximately 40 parking spaces would be provided on-site to accommodate staff, emergency vehicles, and visitors. Additionally, 12 covered parking spaces intended for parking and storage of reserve apparatus would be included under the proposed project. The Project also includes construction of a wall approximately 400 feet long and 6 to 8 feet high in the existing Oxnard Street public right of way, between the sidewalk on the south side of Oxnard Street and the abutting residential properties between Vesper Avenue and Cedros Avenue.

# Relevant Procedural History

- 19. The City adopted a mitigated negative declaration under CEQA and approved the Project in June, 2014. Members of Petitioner Tiara Group 2 filed a petition for writ of mandate challenging the City's reliance on a negative declaration in lieu of an EIR. The case settled before trial, with the City agreeing to rescind its approval and to prepare an EIR for the Project.
- 20. In March, 2016, the City released a draft EIR for public comment in accordance with CEQA. The draft EIR concluded the Project would have no significant environmental impacts after mitigation.
- 21. Petitioners Tiara Group 2 and CFASE submitted timely written comments disputing the EIR's analysis and conclusions and objecting to the Project.
- 22. In May, 2016 the City released a final EIR that purported to respond the these and other comments received from the public and sister agencies.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 23. In June, 2016, public hearings on the Project were held before the City's Board of Public Works and the City Council's Public Works and Gang Reduction Committee on the EIR and Project. All Petitioners appeared and objected further to the EIR and Project at these hearings.
- 24. On July 1, 2016, the City Council held a final public hearing on the EIR and Project. Petitioners appeared at this hearing as well, presenting additional oral and written testimony in opposition to the Project and disputing the conclusions in the EIR. After closing the public hearing, the City Council voted to certify the final EIR and approve the Project.
- Petitioners are informed and believe that the City posted a Notice of Determination in accordance with Public Resources Code section 21152 on July 1, 2016.

#### **CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

# (Violations of CEQA)

- 26. Petitioners here incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs in their entirety.
- 27. At all times relevant to this action the City was the "Lead Agency" responsible for the review and approval of the Project under Public Resources Code section 21067.
- 28. CEQA requires public agencies to first identify the environmental effects of its project or program, and then to mitigate those adverse environmental effects through the imposition of feasible mitigation measures or the analysis and selection of feasible alternatives. Public Resources Code, § 21002. CEQA requires a lead agency to establish that either: (1) impacts will not have a significant effect on the environment or (2) the agency has adopted findings that all significant environmental effects have been avoided or mitigated to the extent feasible, and any remaining effects found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to specific overriding economic, social, technological, or other benefits.
- 29. An EIR must include a finite, stable, accurate and meaningful project description. 14 C.C.R., § 15124. An EIR must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they existed at the time the notice of preparation is published, with particular focus on the regional setting. 14 C.C.R., § 15125. An EIR must identify and evaluate the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts of all phases of a project. 14

11 12

13 . 14

1516

17

18 19

2021

23 24

22

25 26

(27) M. R. Wolfe & Associates, PC 555 Surrer Street, Suite 405 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 369-9400 C.C.R., § 15126. The discussion must include relevant specifics of the area, the resources involved, physical changes, alterations to ecological systems, and changes induced in population distribution, population concentration, the human use of the land (including commercial and residential development), health and safety problems caused by the physical changes, and other aspects of the resource base such as water, historical resources, scenic quality, and public services. 14 C.C.R., § 15126.2.

- 30. A lead agency must describe and evaluate feasible measures for minimizing or avoiding a project's direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the environment. Public Resources Code, § 21100(b)(3); 14 C.C.R., § 15126.4. A lead agency may not improperly defer the formulation of mitigation measures until a future time. 14 C.C.R., § 15126.4.
- A lead agency must identify all significant effects on the environment caused by a proposed project that cannot be avoided. Public Resources Code, § 21100(b)(2)(A). A lead agency must also provide information in the record to justify rejecting mitigation measures as infeasible based on economic, social, or housing reasons. 14 C.C.R., § 15131(c).
- 32. An EIR must describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and must evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. 14 C.C.R., § 15126.6. An EIR must also include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. *Id.*
- 33. An EIR is required to contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons for determining that various effects on the environment were not significant and consequently were not discussed in detail in the EIR. Public Resources Code, § 21100(c).
- 34. A lead agency must provide good faith, reasoned analysis in response to comments on a draft EIR. 14 C.C.R., § 15088(c). The Final EIR must address recommendations and objections raised in comments in detail, giving reasons why they were not accepted. *Id.* Specific responses are required to comments raising specific questions about significant issues.

1

6

7

5

10 11

13

14

12

15 16

17 18

20 21

19

22 23

24

25

26 20 CEP 27 Per 28 Per 29 Per 29

555 Surter Street, Suite 405 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 369-9400

35. A lead agency may not approve a project for which an EIR identifies a significant environmental impact unless the impact has been mitigated or avoided by changes in the project, or unless the agency specifically finds that overriding benefits outweigh the significant effects on the environment. Public Resources Code, § 21081.

# Inadequate Analysis and Mitigation of Significant Impacts

- 36. The EIR for this Project fails to evaluate adequately all of the Project's significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, including impacts on: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, human health, global climate change, biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, utilities, and urban decay.
- 37. The City therefore prejudicially abused its discretion in certifying the EIR by failing to proceed in the manner required by CEQA, and by adopting findings that are not supported by the evidence.

# Failure To Require All Feasible Mitigation Measures

- 38. An EIR must describe, evaluate, and require feasible measures for minimizing or avoiding a project's direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the environment. 14 C.C.R. 15126.4.
- 39. The EIR for this Project fails to describe, evaluate, and require all reasonable, feasible mitigation measures for the Project's direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, including impacts on aesthetics, air quality, human health, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, transportation and traffic. It also improperly defers formulation of mitigation measures until future studies are completed.
- The City therefore prejudicially abused its discretion in certifying the EIR by failing to proceed in the manner required by CEQA, and by adopting findings that are not supported by the evidence.

# Inadequate Discussion Of Project Alternatives

- 41. An EIR must describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. 14 C.C.R. § 15126.6. An EIR must include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. *Id.*
- 42. The EIR for this Project fails to identify and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project, including alternative site designs, layouts, facilities placements, and configurations that would avoid or minimize significant impacts while attaining most project objectives. The EIR further fails to include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the City's chosen alternative.
- 43. The City therefore prejudicially abused its discretion in certifying the EIR by failing to proceed in the manner required by CEQA, and by adopting findings that are not supported by the evidence.

# Failure To Respond Adequately To Comments On Draft EIR

- 44. A lead agency must evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed a draft EIR during the public comment period, and must prepare a written response. 14 C.C.R. § 15088(a). The written response must describe the disposition of significant environmental issues raised. *Id.* at subd. (c). In particular, the major environmental issues raised when the lead agency's position is at variance with recommendations and objections raised in the comments must be addressed in detail, giving reasons why specific comments and suggestions were not accepted. *Id.* There must be good faith, reasoned analysis in response; conclusory statements unsupported by factual information will not suffice. *Id.*; see Berkeley Keep Jets Over The Bay Committee v. Board of Port Commissioners (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 1344.
- 45. The City here failed to provide a detailed, written, good faith, reasoned analysis in response to comments received on the draft EIR during the public comment period from individuals and responsible agencies, and failed to give adequate reasons why specific comments

---

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

and suggestions were not accepted. Instead, the City merely gave conclusory statements unsupported by factual information.

The City therefore prejudicially abused its discretion in certifying the EIR by failing 46. to proceed in the manner required by CEQA.

## **EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES**

- 47. This action is brought consistent with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21177 and Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5. Petitioners objected to the City's approval of the Project orally or in writing during the public comment period provided by CEOA, and/or prior to the close of the public hearing on the project before the issuance of the Notice of Determination. Petitioners, their members, and/or other agencies, organizations and individuals raised or affirmed each of the legal deficiencies asserted in this petition orally or in writing during the public comment provided by CEQA, or prior to the close of the public hearing on the project before the issuance of the Notice of Determination.
- Petitioners have performed all conditions precedent to filing this action by complying with the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21167.5 in serving notice of the commencement of this action July 29, 2016.

## **INADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW**

49. Petitioners declare that they have no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law for the improper action of the City.

#### NEWLY PRODUCED EVIDENCE

50. In accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5(e), Petitioners may, prior to or during the hearing on this petition, offer additional relevant evidence that could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have been produced at the administrative hearing.

#### ATTORNEYS FEES

51. Petitioners are entitled to recover attorneys' fees as provided under Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 if they prevail in this action and the Court finds that a significant benefit has been conferred on the general public or a large class of persons, and that the necessity and burden of private enforcement is such as to make an award of fees appropriate.

1 2 3 1. 4 (a) 5 Project under CEQA; 6 (b) 7 (c) 8 the Project. 9 2. 10 proceeding. 11 3. 12 13 14 4. For costs of suit. 15 5. 6. 16 17 18 Dated: July 28, 2016 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

### PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray for entry of judgment as follows:

- For a peremptory writ of mandate directing the City:
- to set aside its action taken on or about July 1, 2016 certifying an EIR for the
  - to set aside its action taken on or about July 1, 2016 approving the Project; and
- to comply fully with CEQA in any subsequent action or actions taken to approve
- For an order staying the effect of the City's actions pending the outcome of this
- For a preliminary and permanent injunction directing the City to cease and refrain from engaging in any action in reliance upon the approval actions challenged herein until the City takes any necessary action to bring its actions into compliance with.
  - For an award of attorneys' fees.
  - For other legal or equitable relief that the court deems just and proper.

M. R. WOLFE AND ASSOCIATES, P.C.

Mark R. Wolfe

Attorney for Petitioners

27 はおとうなどで 28

M. R. Wolfe & Associates, PC 555 Surter Street, Suite 405 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 369-9400

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE Tiara Group 2, et al. v. City of Los Angeles Case No.

#### VERIFICATION

I, Jeffrey Lynn, declare:

1

2

3

.4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

I am a principal member of THE TIARA GROUP 2, a Petitioner in the above-captioned action. I am authorized to make this verification on its behalf.

I have read the foregoing PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE and know its contents. The statements made therein are true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.

I affirm, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: July 27, 2014

: Jeff

27 (5) 28

(D)

(52) 15. M. Walfe & Macclaus, P.C. 155 Samer Street, Saite 405 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 369-9400

		CM-010			
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bail Mark R. Wolfe, CSB 176753	number, and address).	FOR COURT USE ONLY			
M. R. WOLFE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.					
555 Sutter Street, Suite 405		= ""			
San Francisco, CA 94102	415 260 0405	FILED			
TELEPHONE NO. 415-369-9400 ATTORNEY FOR (Name) Petitioners Tiara Gro	FAX NO.: 415-369-9405	Superior Court of California			
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF L		Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles			
STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill St.	OS Aligeies				
MAILING ADDRESS. 111 N. Hill St.	JUL 2 8 2016				
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, CA 90	012				
BRANCH NAME Central District - Sta	nley Mosk Courthouse	Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk			
CASE NAME:		1 10 10 1 7			
Tiara Group 2, et al. v. City of Los A	Angeles	Moses Soto Deputy			
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation	CASE NUMBER 1 6 3 7 6 3			
✓ Untimited		BS 1 6 3 7 6 3			
(Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder				
demanded demanded is	Filed with first appearance by defer				
exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402	<u> </u>			
	low must be completed (see instructions	: оп раде 2).			
1. Check one box below for the case type the		*			
Auto Tort	Contract	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3,400–3,403)			
Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (06)				
Uninsured motorist (46)	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)			
Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09)	Construction defect (10)			
Asbestos (04)	Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)			
Product liability (24)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)			
Medical malpractice (45)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)			
	Eminent domain/Inverse condemnation (14)	Insurance coverage claims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case			
Other PI/PD/WD (23) Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)			
	Other and arrant (OC)	Enforcement of Judgment			
Business tort/unfair business practice (07 Civil rights (08)	Uniawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)			
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)				
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint			
	Drugs (38)	RICO (27)			
Intellectual property (19) Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)			
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Miscellaneous Civil Petition			
Employment (35)	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)			
Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)			
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)	*			
		ules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the			
factors requiring exceptional judicial mana	dement:	dies of Court. If the case is complex, mark the			
a. Large number of separately repre		er of witnesses			
b. Extensive motion practice raising		with related actions pending in one or more courts			
issues that will be time-consuming		ities, states, or countries, or in a federal court			
c. Substantial amount of documenta		postjudgment judicial supervision			
		iosijooginent joutelat supervision			
<ol><li>Remedies sought (check all that apply): a.</li></ol>	monetary b. v nonmonetary;	declaratory or injunctive relief c. punitive			
4. Number of causes of action (specify):					
	s action suit.				
<ol><li>If there are any known related cases, file a</li></ol>	nd serve a notice of related case. (You	may use form CM-015.)			
Date: July 28, 2016		1/1/ 100			
Mark R. Wolfe	- M	11/4/6/			
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)		SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)			
D Distance of the second	NOTICE				
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the f	irst paper filed in the action or proceeding	ng (except small claims cases or cases filed			
in sanctions.	venare and institutions code), (Cal. Rul	les of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result			
	• File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.				
•, • If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et		u must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all			
other parties to the action or proceeding.					
Unless this is a collections case under rule 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.					

CASE NUMBER

BS 163763

# CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.3 in all new civil case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.

- **Step 1:** After completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet (Judicial Council form CM-010), find the exact case type in Column A that corresponds to the case type indicated in the Civil Case Cover Sheet.
- Step 2: In Column B, check the box for the type of action that best describes the nature of the case.
- **Step 3:** In Column C, circle the number which explains the reason for the court filing location you have chosen.

#### Applicable Reasons for Choosing Court Filing Location (Column C)

- 1. Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Central District.
- 2. Permissive filing in central district.
- 3. Location where cause of action arose.
- 4. Mandatory personal injury filing in North District.
- 5. Location where performance required or defendant resides.
- 6. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle.

- 7. Location where petitioner resides.
- 8. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly.
- 9. Location where one or more of the parties reside.
- 10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office.
- 11. Mandatory filing location (Hub Cases unlawful detainer, limited non-collection, limited collection, or personal injury).

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	<b>B</b> Type of Action (Check only one).	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
Auto	Auto (22)	☐ A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1, 4, 11
	Uninsured Motorist (46)	☐ A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1, 4, 11
المال Property ( كانتران) Property المالية المالية المالية المالية المالية المالية المالية المالية المالية الم	Asbestos (04)	☐ A6070 Asbestos Property Darnage ☐ A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	1, 11 1, 11
	Product Liability (24)	☐ A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1, 4, 11
	Medical Malpractice (45)	☐ A7210 Medical Matpractice - Physicians & Surgeons ☐ A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1, 4, 11 1, 4, 11
	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	<ul> <li>□ A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall)</li> <li>□ A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.)</li> <li>□ A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress</li> <li>□ A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death</li> </ul>	1, 4, 11 1, 4, 11 1, 4, 11 1, 4, 11

写例表するです Zの Other Personal Injury/ Property

> LACIV 109 (Rev 2/16) LASC Approved 03-04

SHORT TITLE TIARA GROUP 2, et. al. v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES

	Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
	Business Tort (07)	☐ A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1, 2, 3
Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort	Civil Rights (08)	□ A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1, 2, 3
	Defamation (13)	☐ A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1, 2, 3
al Injui ongfu	Fraud (16)	□ A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1, 2, 3
n-Persona image/ Wro	Professional Negligence (25)	□ A6017 Legal Malpractice □ A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1, 2, 3
žÖ	Other (35)	☐ A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	1, 2, 3
tent	Wrongful Termination (36)	☐ A6037 Wrongful Termination	1, 2, 3
Employment	Other Employment (15)	☐ A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case ☐ A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1, 2, 3
Contract	Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	<ul> <li>□ A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction)</li> <li>□ A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach - Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence)</li> <li>□ A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud)</li> <li>□ A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)</li> </ul>	2, 5 2, 5 1, 2, 5 1, 2, 5
	Collections (09)	<ul> <li>□ A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff</li> <li>□ A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case</li> <li>□ A6034 Collections Case-Purchased Debt (Charged Off Consumer Debt Purchased on or after January 1, 2014)</li> </ul>	5, 6, 11 5, 11 5, 6, 11
	Insurance Coverage (18)	☐ A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1, 2, 5, 8
	Other Contract (37)	<ul> <li>□ A6009 Contractual Fraud</li> <li>□ A6031 Tortious Interference</li> <li>□ A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)</li> </ul>	1, 2, 3, 5 1, 2, 3, 5 1, 2, 3, 8, 9
	Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	□ A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2, 6
operty	Wrongful Eviction (33)	☐ A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2, 6
er Real Property	Other Real Property (26)	<ul> <li>□ A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure</li> <li>□ A6032 Quiet Title</li> <li>□ A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)</li> </ul>	2, 6 2, 6 2, 6
	Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	☐ A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	6, 11
Unlawful Detainer	Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	6, 11
awful	Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	□ A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2, 6, 11
n n	Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	□ A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2, 6, 11

SHORT TITLE. TIARA GROUP 2, et. al. v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CASE NUMBER

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
	Asset Forfeiture (05)	□ A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2, 3, 6
M	Pelition re Arbitration (11)	□ A6115 Petition to Compet/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2, 5
Judicial Review	Writ of Mandale (02)	<ul> <li>☑ A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus</li> <li>☐ A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter</li> <li>☐ A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review</li> </ul>	2 2
	Other Judicial Review (39)	□ A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2, 8
	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	☐ A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1, 2, 8
itigatio	Construction Defect (10)	□ A6007 Construction Defect	1, 2, 3
plex L	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	☐ A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1, 2, 8
y Com	Securities Litigation (28)	☐ A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1, 2, 8
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	☐ A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1, 2, 3, 8
Provi	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	☐ A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1, 2, 5, 8
	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	□ A6141 Sister State Judgment	2, 5, 11
# #		☐ A6160 Abstract of Judgment	2, 6
Enforcement of Judgment		☐ A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations)	2, 9
orce		☐ A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes)	2, 8
ef,		☐ A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax	2, 8
		☐ A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2, 8, 9
ू इ <u>र</u>	RICO (27)	☐ A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1, 2, 8
scellaneous il Complaints	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	☐ A6030 Declaratory Relief Only	1, 2, 8
omp		☐ A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment)	2, 8
is ce		☐ A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex)	1, 2, 8
Civi		A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1, 2, 8
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2, 8
		☐ A6121 Civil Harassment	2, 3, 9
SUS		☐ A6123 Workplace Harassment	2, 3, 9
Miscellaneous Civil Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	☐ A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case	2, 3, 9
cell:		A6190 Election Contest	2
	43	A6110 Pelition for Change of Name/Change of Gender	2, 7
.行 数		☐ A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law	2, 3, 8
:×2		☐ A6100 Other Civil Petition	2, 9
(4) (4) (4)	38		-, -

SHORT TITLE	*	CASE NUMBER
0.1011	TIABA OBOLIDA -A -I OITY OF LOS ANOFLES	GAGE HOMOEK
1 .	TIARA GROUP 2, et. al. v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES	1 .
		(

**Step 4: Statement of Reason and Address:** Check the appropriate boxes for the numbers shown under Column C for the type of action that you have selected. Enter the address which is the basis for the filing location, including zip code. (No address required for class action cases).

REASON: . 1. \( 2. \) 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. \( \sigma \)	8. 9.		ADDRESS- City of Los Angeles 200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles	STATE:	ZIP CODE: 90012	

Step 5: Certification of Assignment: I certify that this case is properly filed in the CENTRAL District of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles [Code Civ. Proc., §392 et seq., and Local Rule 2.3(a)(1)(E)].

Dated: July 28, 2016

# PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 02/16).
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless there is court order for waiver, partial or scheduled payments.
- 6. A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
- 7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.

ALTORNEY/FILING PARTY)

Mark R. Wolfe, CSB No. 176753 M. R. WOLFE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles 555 Sutter Street, Suite 405 San Francisco, CA 94102 3 JUL 2 8 2016 Telephone: (415) 369-9400 Fax: (415) 369-9405 mrw@mrwolfeassociates.com 5 6 Attorney for Petitioner 7 THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 8 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT 10 11 BS 163763 THE TIARA GROUP 2, COALITION FOR Case No.: 12 A SAFE ENVIRONMENT, CALIFORNIA 13 KIDS IAQ, COMMUNITY DREAMS; NOTICE OF COMMENCEMENT OF 14 Petitioner, **ACTION UNDER CALIFORNIA** 15 VS. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT 16 CITY OF LOS ANGELES, [Pub. Resources Code § 21167.5] 17 Respondent; 18 19 DOES 1 through 25, inclusive, By Fax 20 Real Parties in Interest. 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 NOTICE OF COMMENCEMENT OF ACTION 555 Sutter Street, Suire 405 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 369-9400 Tiara Group 2, et al. v. City of Los Angeles

のなってのというは

(ji)

Case No.

01.01.00

---

Notice is hereby given to Respondent CITY OF LOS ANGELES of commencement of this lawsuit challenging its July 1, 2016 actions certifying an environmental impact report and approving the construction and operation of Van Nuys Fire Station No. 39 (W.O. E170094B), located on the 14600 block of Oxnard Street in the community of Van Nuys within the City.

The action is brought by Petitioners THE TIARA GROUP 2, COALITION FOR A SAFE ENVIRONMENT, CALIFORNIA KIDS IAQ, and COMMUNITY DREAMS pursuant to the judicial review provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Public Resources Code sections 21167 and 21168, and the writ of mandate provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5.

Dated: July 28, 2016

M. R. WOLFE AND ASSOCIATES, P.C.

By:\_

Mark R. Wolfe Attorney for Petitioner

Case No.

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby declare that I am employed in the City San Francisco, County of San Francisco, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to this action. My business address is 555 Sutter Street, Suite 405, San Francisco, CA 94102. I am familiar with this firm's practice for the collection and processing of mail sent via U.S. Mail, which provides that mail be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the same day in the ordinary court of business.

On July 28, 2016 I served the attached NOTICE OF COMMENCEMENT OF **ACTION** in this action via the U.S. Mail by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid addressed to:

> City of Los Angeles Attn: City Clerk 200 N. Spring Street, Room 360 Los Angeles, CA 90012

for collection and deposit with the U.S. mail on this date according to ordinary business practices.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed at San Francisco, California on July 28, 2016.

Alexis Mackenzie

C=2 26d 27 16d 27 16d 27 16d 27 16d 28 1

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Mark R. Wolfe, CSB No. 176753 Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles M. R. WOLFE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 2 555 Sutter Street, Suite 405 San Francisco, CA 94102 JUL 2 8 2016 3 Telephone: (415) 369-9400 Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk 4 Fax: (415) 369-9405 mrw@mrwolfeassociates.com 5 6 Attorney for Petitioner 7 THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 8 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT 10 11 Case No.: **BS 1 6 3 7 6 3** THE TIARA GROUP 2, COALITION FOR 12 A SAFE ENVIRONMENT, CALIFORNIA 13 KIDS IAQ, COMMUNITY DREAMS; REQUEST TO PREPARE RECORD OF 14 Petitioner, PROCEEDINGS (COST ESTIMATE); 15 CONDITIONAL NOTICE OF VS. ELECTION OF PREPARATION BY 16 CITY OF LOS ANGELES, PETITIONER 17 Respondent; (California Environmental Quality Act, Public 18 Res. Code § 21167.6.) 19 DOES 1 through 25, inclusive, 20 Real Parties in Interest. 21 22 By Fax 23 24 25 26 27 M. R. Wolfe & Associates, PC S55 Sutter Street, Suite 405 San Francisco, CA 94102 REQUEST TO PREPARE RECORD

7/20:201

(415) 369-9400

Tiara Group 2, et al. v. City of Los Angeles

Case No.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21167.6, and Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5(a), Petitioners THE TIARA GROUP 2, COALITION FOR A SAFE ENVIRONMENT, CALIFORNIA KIDS IAQ, and COMMUNITY DREAMS hereby request that Respondent CITY OF LOS ANGELES provide Petitioners with a cost estimate for preparing the administrative record in the above-captioned matter, including indexing, pagenumbering, and photocopying.

Petitioners request that Respondent designate in the record all documents, including all transcripts, minutes of meetings, notices, correspondence, reports, studies, proposed decisions, final decisions, findings, and any and all other documents relating to its actions made July 1, 2016 through its City Council certifying an environmental impact report ("EIR") and approving the construction and operation of Van Nuys Fire Station No. 39 (W.O. E170094B), located on the 14600 block of Oxnard Street in the community of Van Nuys within the City ("Project"). Please refer to Public Resources Code section 21167.6(e) for a list of materials required to be included in the administrative record.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21167.6(b)(2), Petitioners hereby reserve the right to elect to prepare the record itself after receiving Respondent's cost estimate, subject to future discussion and any alternative arrangement to which the parties to this action may agree

Dated: July 28, 2016

M. R. WOLFE AND ASSOCIATES, P.C.

By:\_

Mark R. Wolfe

Attorney for Petitioner

9 28 (주)

M. R. Wolfe & Associates, PC
555 Sutter Street, Suite 405
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 369-9400
Core No.