MARC D. JOSEPH (State Bar No. 135595) ENDORSED RICHARD T. DRURY (State Bar No. 163559) FILED San Francisco County Superior Court ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO 2 601 Gateway Blvd., Suite 1000 JUL 1 6 2007 3 South San Francisco, CA 94080 Telephone: (650) 589-1660 GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk BY BERNADETTE THOMPSON Facsimile: (650) 589-5062 Deputy Clork 5 [Additional Counsel Listed on Next Page] 6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs ENVIRONMENTAL LAW FOUNDATION, OUR CHILDREN'S EARTH FOUNDATION, and COMMUNITIES FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT 8 9 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 11 12 ENVIRONMENTAL LAW FOUNDATION; OUR CASE NO.: CGC-06-451832 13 CHILDREN'S EARTH FOUNDATION, and SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT COMMUNITIES FOR A BETTER 14 ENVIRONMENT, On Behalf of the General Public FOR CIVIL PENALTIES, STATUTORY, EQUITABLE AND Plaintiffs. 15 INJUNCTIVE RELIEF BASED 16 **UPON:** V. 17 (1) Violation of Cal. Health & Safety LAIDLAW TRANSIT INC. dba LAIDLAW Code § 25249.6 et seq. EDUCATION SERVICES; LAIDLAW TRANSIT 18 SERVICES, INC.; DURHAM SCHOOL SERVICES, L.P.; and DOES 1 through 100, 19 Complaint filed: May 2, 2006 inclusive Respondents, 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR STATUTORY, EQUITABLE AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

JAMES R. WHEATON (State Bar No. 115230) LYNNE R. SAXTON (State Bar No. 226210) ENVIRONMENTAL LAW FOUNDATION 1736 Franklin, 9th Floor 3 Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 208-4555 Facsimile: (510) 208-4562 5 MICHAEL COSTA (State Bar No. 219416) 6 OUR CHILDREN'S EARTH FOUNDATION 100 First Street, Suite 100-367 San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 896-5289 8 Facsimile: (815) 642-9181 ADRIENNE L. BLOCH (State Bar No. 215471) SHANA LAZEROW (State Bar No. 195491) 10 COMMUNITIES FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT 11 1440 Broadway, Suite 701 Oakland, CA 94612 12 Telephone: (510) 302-0430 Facsimile: (510) 302-0438 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 - 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR STATUTORY, EQUITABLE AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

23· 

Н

Plaintiffs, by and through their attorneys, bring this action on behalf of the general public on information and belief, except those allegations that pertain to the named plaintiffs or to their attorneys (which are alleged on personal knowledge), and hereby allege as follows:

#### INTRODUCTION

## (The Hazards of Diesel Engine Exhaust)

- 1. This action seeks, among other remedies, civil penalties and injunctive relief to redress the actions of defendants that cause widespread exposure of children and school bus drivers to diesel engine exhaust, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer in humans. Specifically, plaintiffs challenge defendants' operation of school buses for public and private schools and school districts throughout the State of California that emit diesel engine exhaust, in the process exposing drivers and passengers to diesel engine exhaust from the buses without adequate prior warning. Defendants' actions, including but not limited to their failure to provide warnings, violate California Health & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 et seq.
- 2. Diesel engine exhaust poses a significant health threat, particularly to children and bus drivers. Diesel exhaust and the many chemicals, gases and particulates that it contains have been linked to decreases in lung function, cancer, asthma exacerbations, and premature death. The scientific evidence associating diesel exhaust and human health problems is quite extensive. In fact, the excess cancer risk in California from diesel particles is higher than any other Toxic Air Contaminant identified by California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment ("OEHHA").
- 3. Proposition 65 requires that consumers be warned before they are exposed to substances that cause cancer. (The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act, California Health and Safety Code § 25249.6, et seq., also known as "Proposition 65"). On October 1, 1990, diesel engine exhaust was declared to be a carcinogen subject to Proposition 65. On October 1, 1991, the warning requirements under Proposition 65 became effective for diesel engine exhaust. See Health and Safety Code § 25249.10(b).
  - 4. By exposing school children and bus drivers to diesel engine exhaust without

providing any warning, defendants have violated and will continue to violate Proposition 65.

Plaintiffs are therefore entitled to civil penalties. Additionally, by committing the acts set forth herein, defendants have violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, Proposition 65.

Therefore, plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief to compel defendants to comply with Proposition 65 in the operation of their diesel buses, including its requirement that the drivers and passengers of defendants' buses be provided with a clear and reasonable warning that defendants' diesel buses emit a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.

## **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff ENVIRONMENTAL LAW FOUNDATION ("ELF") is a California nonprofit organization founded on Earth Day in 1991. ELF has a longstanding interest in reducing health hazards to the public posed by diesel engine exhaust, and particularly to protect those with the least choice and greatest vulnerability to toxic risks: children and inner city dwellers. ELF is dedicated to the preservation and enhancement of human health and the environment. ELF brings this action pursuant to California Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d) in the interest of the general public.
- 6. Plaintiff OUR CHILDREN'S EARTH FOUNDATION ("OCE") is a California nonprofit organization dedicated to protecting the public, especially children, from the harmful effects of air and water pollution. OCE has an interest in reducing the harmful effects of toxic air pollution. OCE brings this action pursuant to California Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d) in the interest of the general public.
- 7. Plaintiff COMMUNITIES FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT ("CBE") is an environmental health and justice non-profit organization dedicated to promoting clean air, clean water and the development of toxin-free communities. CBE has a long-standing interest in reducing health hazards to the public posed by toxic chemicals. Founded in 1978, CBE combines grassroots organizing and education with scientific research and legal action in the service of environmental health and justice. CBE brings this action pursuant to California Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(d) in the interest of the general public.

- 8. ELF, OCE and CBE (collectively, "Plaintiffs") bring this action in the public interest as allowed under California law, as approved by the voters, in Health and Safety Code section 25249.7(d). Plaintiffs do not allege, nor have they suffered, an injury cognizable under Article III of the United States Constitution.
- 9. Defendant LAIDLAW TRANSIT INC., doing business as LAIDLAW EDUCATION SERVICES ("Laidlaw"), is a Delaware corporation and a "person in the course of doing business" within the meaning of Health and Safety 25249.11 with its principal place of business located at 55 Shuman Boulevard, #400, Naperville, Illinois 60563. Laidlaw operates diesel school buses for schools throughout the State of California that expose riders and drivers to diesel engine exhaust.
- 10. Defendant LAIDLAW TRANSIT SERVICES, INC. ("Laidlaw Transit Services") is a "person in the course of doing business" within the meaning of Health and Safety 25249.11 with its principal place of business located at 55 Shuman Boulevard, #400, Naperville, Illinois 60563. Laidlaw Transit Services operates diesel school buses for schools throughout the State of California that expose riders and drivers to diesel engine exhaust. LAIDLAW TRANSIT INC., doing business as LAIDLAW EDUCATION SERVICES; LAIDLAW TRANSIT SERVICES, INC. are collectively referred to as "Laidlaw".
- 11. Defendant DURHAM SCHOOL SERVICES, L.P. ("Durham") is a "person in the course of doing business" within the meaning of Health and Safety 25249.11 with its principal place of business at 9011 Mountain Ridge Drive, Suite 200, Austin, Texas 78759. Durham operates diesel school buses for schools throughout the State of California that expose riders and drivers to diesel engine exhaust.
- 12. The true names and capacities of defendants sued herein under California Code of Civil Procedure § 474 as DOE defendants 1 through 100, inclusive, are presently unknown to Plaintiffs, who therefore sue these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will seek to amend this Complaint and include these Doe defendants' true names and capacities when they are ascertained. Each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the

conduct alleged herein and for the injuries suffered by the general public.

13. Laidlaw, Durham and defendants DOES 1 through 100 (collectively, "Defendants") each have employed ten (10) or more persons at all times relevant to this action.

14. In doing the things alleged in the cause of action into which this paragraph is incorporated by reference, each and every Laidlaw Defendant was acting within the course and scope of his agency or employment, and was acting with the consent, permission, and authorization of each of the remaining Laidlaw Defendants. All actions of each Laidlaw Defendant alleged in the causes of action into which this paragraph is incorporated by reference were ratified and approved by every other Laidlaw Defendant or their officers or managing agents, and by agreeing to actively conceal the true facts as alleged herein. Alternatively, Laidlaw Defendants aided, conspired with and/or facilitated the wrongful conduct of other Laidlaw Defendants.

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 15. This Court has jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, because this case is a cause not given by statute to other trial courts.
- 16. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants named herein because Defendants either are located in this State or are foreign corporations authorized to do business in California and registered with the California Secretary of State, or who do sufficient business in California, have sufficient minimum contacts with California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the markets within California through the operation of their diesel buses and the promotion, sale and marketing of their diesel buses for use in California to render the exercise of jurisdiction by the California courts permissible under traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 17. Venue is proper in this Court because the exposure occurred in this County, a substantial portion of the activities complained of herein occurred here, contracts relating to the operation of vehicles causing the exposure were entered into, made and were to be performed in this County, and Defendants have received substantial compensation from the operation of the

vehicles causing the exposure at issue in this County by doing business here and exposing San Francisco school children and bus drivers in San Francisco to a known carcinogen which had an effect in this County.

- 18. With respect to violations of Health and Safety Code § 25249.6, et seq., on May 16, 2005, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7, Plaintiffs ELF and OCE mailed notices of Laidlaw's violations of section 25249.6 of Proposition 65, as alleged herein. On June 30, 2006 Plaintiff CBE mailed notices of violations of section 25249.6 of Proposition 65 by each of the Defendants, as alleged herein. On June 30, 2006 Plaintiffs ELF, OCE and CBE mailed notices of Durham's violations of section 25249.6 of Proposition 65, as alleged herein.
- 19. On April 23, 2007 Plaintiffs ELF, OCE and CBE mailed notices of violations by Durham and Laidlaw of section 25249.6 of Proposition 65 specifically with respect to bus drivers, as alleged herein. Because the April 23, 2007 notices of violation concerned occupational exposure, the notices also complied with the regulations that harmonize state and federal occupational health requirements. See 8 Cal. Code Regulations 338.
- 20. The "Notices of Violation of Proposition 65" were mailed to each of the Defendants, as well as to the California Attorney General, the District Attorney of every county in California, and the City Attorneys of any cities with populations according to the most recent decennial census of over 750,000. Each notice included a certificate of merit executed by Plaintiffs' attorneys stating that the person executing the certificate had consulted with one or more persons with relevant and appropriate experience or expertise who has reviewed the facts, studies or other data regarding exposure to the listed chemical that is the subject of the notice, and that, based on that information, the person executing the certificate believes there is a reasonable and meritorious case for this private action. Factual information sufficient to establish the bases of the certificates of merit has been attached to the certificates of merit served on the California Attorney General.
- 21. None of these public prosecutors has commenced and is diligently prosecuting an action against the violations at issue herein, although the notice period provided in § 25249.7 has

ŀ

## STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND

- 22. The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 is an initiative statute passed as Proposition 65 by a vote of the People in 1986.
- 23. Proposition 65 provides the circumstances under which persons must be warned before they are exposed to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm. Health and Safety Code § 25249.6 states the warning requirement:

No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual, except as provided in section 25249.10.

- 24. Proposition 65 establishes a procedure by which the Governor lists chemicals known to the state to cause cancer. Health and Safety Code § 25249.8. Pursuant to this authority, on October 1, 1990 diesel engine exhaust was placed on the list of carcinogens.
- 25. The warning requirements under Proposition 65 for a given chemical go into effect one year after the Governor places that chemical on the list. Health and Safety Code § 25249.10(b). Therefore, diesel engine exhaust became subject to a Proposition 65 warning on October 1, 1991.

#### **FACTS**

#### What is Diesel Engine Exhaust?

26. Diesel engine exhaust is a complex mixture of gases and fine particles formed by the combustion of diesel fuel. Many known and potential cancer-causing substances such as arsenic, benzene, formaldehyde, nickel and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons are present in the exhaust gases, some of which are bound to the surfaces of the diesel-exhaust particles. The exhaust contains more than 40 substances that California Air Resources Board ("ARB") has identified as Toxic Air Contaminants.

- 27. Diesel exhaust particles are small enough (less than 10 microns in diameter, about one-seventh of the width of a human hair) to be inhaled deep into the lungs, where they can affect lung performance and cause damage over time.
- 28. The small size of the particles in diesel exhaust and the large number of toxic chemicals it contains make diesel exhaust a particularly potent threat to the human body.
- 29. Up to 85% of fine particles remain in the lungs 24 hours after initial exposure. This means that diesel exhaust has easy, long-lasting access to the most sensitive parts of the lungs.

#### What are the Health Effects of Diesel Engine Exhaust?

- 30. Numerous human epidemiological studies have demonstrated that diesel exhaust increases cancer risk. In fact, long-term exposure to diesel exhaust particles poses the highest cancer risk of any toxic air contaminant evaluated by OEHHA.
- 31. The ARB estimates that about seventy percent (70%) of the cancer risk that the average Californian faces from breathing toxic air pollutants stems from diesel exhaust particles.
- 32. Diesel exhaust is associated with a wide range of health effects beyond cancer, including neurological effects, a weakened immune system, respiratory disease and cardiovascular disease.
- 33. Short-term exposure to diesel exhaust causes inflammation in the bloodstream and thickening of the blood, symptoms which are associated with cardiovascular disease and heart attacks. Short-term exposure can even have immediate effects like dizziness, headaches, light-headedness, and nausea. People who inhale diesel exhaust can experience nasal irritation, breathing difficulties, coughing and chest tightness.
- 34. Long-term exposure to diesel exhaust has been associated with other respiratory effects including chronic inflammation of lung tissue. Several studies have also linked diesel exhaust particles to asthma, suggesting that these particles can increase the severity of respiratory symptoms in individuals with pre-existing conditions like asthma.
- 35. Children, the elderly, individuals with asthma, cardiopulmonary disease and other lung diseases, and individuals with chronic heart diseases are particularly susceptible to the

effects of diesel exhaust. Evidence continues to mount that children, especially those with asthma, are exceptionally sensitive to the effects of fine particle pollution, such as diesel exhaust.

- 36. Diesel exhaust affects children more than adults because children inhale more pollutants per pound of body weight than adults and children have faster rate of respiration, narrower airways, and a less mature ability to metabolize, detoxify, and excrete toxins.

  Exposures that occur in childhood are of special concern because children's developmental processes can easily be disrupted and the resulting dysfunctions may be irreversible. In addition, exposures that occur earlier in life appear more likely to lead to disease than do exposures later in life.
- 37. There is no known safe level of exposure to diesel exhaust for children, especially those with respiratory illness.

# How are Children and Bus Drivers Exposed to Diesel Engine Exhaust?

- 38. Out of the six million school children in California, approximately one million are transported by school buses.
- 39. A recent study concluded that the average school bus is nine years old and emits nearly two times more pollution per mile than a big rig truck.
- 40. Studies by the ARB and others have established that much of a bus' own diesel exhaust enters the cabin and exposes passengers and drivers through a phenomenon called "self-pollution."
- 41. A child or driver in a diesel school bus may be exposed to as much as four times the level of toxic diesel exhaust as someone riding in a car traveling the same route immediately ahead of it.
- 42. A recent study conducted in the Los Angeles area found that children riding on diesel school buses inhale roughly one million times more school bus exhaust (by mass) than non-riders in the general population.
- 43. Children and drivers on school buses are exposed to levels of diesel exhaust that are five to ten times higher than background levels.

44. Closing the bus' windows simply makes the situation worse. Concentrations of diesel vehicle-related pollutants are significantly higher on board a conventional diesel bus when the windows are closed due to the intrusion of the bus' own exhaust.

#### **Additional Facts**

- 45. Defendants operate their diesel buses across the State of California and promote, sell and market their diesel buses for the transportation in California of school-age children.
- 46. The diesel buses at issue in this Complaint release diesel engine exhaust into the interior passenger area of the buses, which results in human exposure to the diesel engine exhaust without prior warning.
- 47. Defendants have not warned or informed the public that their buses expose passengers to diesel engine exhaust, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. Defendants have also promoted and marketed their diesel buses for use without any warning regarding the exposure to diesel engine exhaust. Further, Defendants have failed to provide adequate warnings to all of their employees who drive diesel buses that these buses expose the employees to diesel engine exhaust, a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. Thus, Defendants have, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposed individuals to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer without providing a clear and reasonable warning, as required by California Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f). As a direct result of Defendants' acts and omissions, Defendants' employees and the general public in California are being regularly, unlawfully, and involuntarily exposed to diesel engine exhaust, a known carcinogen, without a clear and reasonable warning.

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(California Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 et seq.

Exposure of Bus Riders to Diesel Engine Exhaust Without Adequate Warning.

By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants)

48. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the above paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

49. The people of the State of California have declared in Proposition 65 their right "[t]o be informed about exposure to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm." Cal. Health & Saf. Code §25249.5, (Proposition 65), Note § 1(b).

- 50. To carry out those statutory purposes, Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be given by persons who, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.
- 51. On October 1, 1990, diesel engine exhaust was listed as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. No warning needs to be given concerning a chemical so listed until one year after the chemical first appears on the list. Cal. Health & Saf. Code § 25249.10(b). Therefore, on October 1, 1991, diesel engine exhaust became subject to the warning requirements of Proposition 65.
- 52. Proposition 65 provides that any person "violating or threatening to violate" the statute may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. *Id.*, § 25249.7. In addition, violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day per violation, recoverable in a civil action. *Id.*, § 25249.7(b).
- 53. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in conduct that violates Health and Safety Code § 25249.6. This conduct includes the operation of their diesel buses and the promotion, sale and marketing of their diesel buses for use in California, the foreseeable use of which results in exposing the riding public to diesel engine exhaust, known to the State of California to cause cancer, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning pursuant to Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f). Defendants have, therefore, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposed individuals to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer without first providing a clear and reasonable warning.
- 54. By the above-described acts, Defendants are liable for a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per day per individual exposure to diesel engine exhaust through the use of Defendants' school buses, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(California Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 et seq.; 22 Cal.Code Regs. §12601(c)

Exposure of Employees to Diesel Engine Exhaust Without Adequate Warning.

By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants)

- 55. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the above paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 56. The people of the State of California have declared in Proposition 65 their right "[t]o be informed about exposure to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm." Cal. Health & Saf. Code §25249.5, (Proposition 65), Note § 1(b).
- 57. To carry out those statutory purposes, Proposition 65 requires that a clear and reasonable warning be given by persons who, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.
- 58. Proposition 65's requirements for warnings in the occupational setting have been incorporated into California's occupational safety and health plan established pursuant to the Occupational Safety and Health Act. 8 Cal.Code Regs. §5194.
- 59. The regulations promulgated under Proposition 65 define "occupational exposure" as "an exposure in the work place of the employer causing the exposure to any employee." 22 Cal.Code Regs. §12601(c).
- 60. When such an exposure is likely to occur, the employer must provide a clear and adequate warning to the employees. *Id*.
- 61. On October 1, 1990, diesel engine exhaust was listed as a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer. No warning needs to be given concerning a chemical so listed until one year after the chemical first appears on the list. Cal. Health & Saf. Code § 25249.10(b). Therefore, on October 1, 1991, diesel engine exhaust became subject to the warning requirements of Proposition 65.

62. Proposition 65 provides that any person "violating or threatening to violate" the statute may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. *Id.*, § 25249.7. In addition, violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day per violation, recoverable in a civil action. *Id.*, § 25249.7(b).

63. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in conduct that violates Health and Safety Code § 25249.6. This conduct includes the operation of their diesel buses and the promotion, sale and marketing of their diesel buses for use in California, the foreseeable use of which results in exposing their employees to diesel engine exhaust, known to the State of California to cause cancer, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning pursuant to Health and Safety Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f). Defendants have, therefore, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposed individuals to a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer without first providing a clear and reasonable warning.

64. By the above-described acts, Defendants are liable for a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per day per individual exposure to diesel engine exhaust through the use of Defendants' school buses, pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 25249.7(b).

#### THE NEED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

65. By committing the acts alleged herein, Defendants have caused irreparable harm for which there is no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law. In the absence of equitable relief, the general public will continue to be unwarned and involuntarily exposed to diesel engine exhaust by riding and/or driving Defendants' diesel school buses, which creates a substantial risk of irreparable physical injury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants as set forth below.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for the following relief:

- A. A temporary restraining order, preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, their agents, employees, assigns, and all persons acting in concert or participating with them from:
  - (1) operating their diesel school buses that expose employees and passengers to diesel engine exhaust in California, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning that the operation of these buses results in exposure to diesel engine exhaust, a chemical known to the State of California to be a carcinogen;
- B. An award of statutory penalties of \$2,500 for each violation of Proposition 65 throughout the State of California;
  - C. Reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;
- D. Such other and further relief as this court may deem necessary and proper.

  Respectfully submitted,

ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO MARC D. JOSEPH RICHARD T. DRURY

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW FOUNDATION JAMES R. WHEATON LYNNE R. SAXTON

OUR CHILDREN'S EARTH FOUNDATION MICHAEL COSTA

COMMUNITIES FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT SHANA LAZEROW ADRIENNE BLOCH

DATED: July 11, 2007

RICHARD TOSHIYUKI DRURY

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Environmental Law Foundation,

Our Children's Earth Foundation and

Communities for a Better Environment

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR STATUTORY, EQUITABLE AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF Page 15