IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

TOWN OF ATHERTON, a Municipal Corporation, PLANNING AND CONSERVATION LEAGUE, a California nonprofit corporation, CITY OF MENLO PARK, a Municipal Corporation, TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS DEFENSE AND EDUCATION FUND, a California nonprofit corporation, CALIFORNIA RAIL FOUNDATION, a California nonprofit corporation, and BAYRAIL ALLIANCE, a California nonprofit corporation, and other similarly situated entities, Petitioners and Plaintiffs

V.

No. 34-2008-80000022

PEREMPTORY WRIT OF MANDATE

CALIFORNIA HIGH SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY, a public entity, and DOES 1-20, Respondents and Defendants

To Respondent CALIFORNIA HIGH SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY:

Judgment has been entered in this proceeding ordering that a peremptory writ of mandate issue under seal of this Court.

THEREFORE you are commanded, immediately upon receipt of this Writ:

1) To rescind and set aside your Resolution No. 08-01 certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Study ("EIR/EIS") for the Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train Project, approving the Pacheco Pass Network Alternative Serving San Francisco and San Jose Termini, and approving preferred alignment alternatives and station location options. This resolution is

Dated

remanded to Respondent for reconsideration after completing compliance with this writ;

- 2) To rescind and set aside your Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") in support of the aforesaid resolution No. 08-01. These findings are remanded to Respondent for reconsideration after completing compliance with this writ; and
- 3) To revise the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement for the Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train Project in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the Final Judgment entered in this case prior to reconsidering certification of that EIR/EIS.

Under Public Resources Code §21168.9(c), this Court does not direct Respondent to exercise its lawful discretion in any particular way.

YOU ARE FURTHER commanded to serve and file a written return to this Writ on or before the seventieth day following service of this writ, showing your compliance.

- 11		
5	0.590	
6	Dated: NOV 3 - 2009	DENNIS B.JONES
7		Clerk of the Superior Court
8		By: A. Fel, Clark
9	Approved:	S. LEE
20	Dated Oct. 19, 2009	Remine To a
	Dated	The Mr. Theben
21	Dated_Conv.,	Stuart Flashman
	Dated Conviger	Stuart Flashman Attorney for Petitioners and Plaintiffs
21	Dated	Stuart Flashman Attorney for Petitioners and
21	Approved:	Stuart Flashman Attorney for Petitioners and

Deputy Attorney General

Attorney for Respondent