

1 JULIE GUTMAN DICKINSON (SBN 148267)  
jgutmandickinson@bushgottlieb.com  
2 HECTOR DE HARO (SBN 300048)  
hdeharo@bushgottlieb.com  
3 VANESSA C. WRIGHT (SBN 328674)  
vwright@bushgottlieb.com  
4 BUSH GOTTLIEB  
A Law Corporation  
5 801 North Brand Boulevard, Suite 950  
Glendale, California 91203-1260  
6 Telephone: (818) 973-3200  
Facsimile: (818) 973-3201  
7

Attorneys for TEAMSTERS CALIFORNIA

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

9 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

10 TEAMSTERS CALIFORNIA,

11 Petitioner,

12 vs.

13 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
14 MOTOR VEHICLES, a state agency;  
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
15 FINANCE, a state agency;  
CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF  
16 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, a state  
agency;  
17 CALIFORNIA STATE  
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY, a state  
18 agency;  
TOKS OMISHAKIN, in his official  
19 capacity as Secretary of the California  
State Transportation Agency;  
20 JAMES HACKER, in his official capacity  
as Undersecretary of the California State  
21 Transportation Agency;  
ALICIA FOWLER, in her official capacity  
22 as General Counsel at the California State  
Transportation Agency;  
23 STEVE GORDON, in his official capacity  
as Director of the Department of Motor  
24 Vehicles;  
JOE STEPHENSHAW, in his official  
25 capacity as Director of the Department of  
Finance;  
26 KENNETH J. POGUE, in his official  
capacity as Director of the Office of  
27 Administrative Law;  
LEE PIACENTINI SCOTT, in his official  
28 capacity as Chief Budget Officer at the

Case No.

**VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDATE, DECLARATORY RELIEF,  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

1 Department of Motor Vehicle;  
2 TERESA CALVERT, in her official  
3 capacity as Program Budget Manager at  
4 the California Department of Finance;  
5 SAM MICON, in his official capacity as  
6 Senior Attorney at the Office of  
7 Administrative Law;  
8 DOES 1-10,

9 Respondents.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Petitioner TEAMSTERS CALIFORNIA alleges as follows:

### **INTRODUCTION**

1. For more than a decade, California prohibited fully autonomous commercial vehicles weighing 10,001 pounds or more, including semi-trucks which typically weigh over 26,000 pounds and are used to move containerized cargo (“Self-Driving Trucks”), from being tested or deployed on California roads, recognizing both the immense safety concerns that would result from Self-Driving Trucks and other large commercial vehicles roaring down our roadways and the negative impact that the deployment of Self-Driving Trucks would have on the hundreds of thousands of truck drivers in California who have built a life around the middle-class, often unionized jobs they secured by investing in their commercial driver’s licenses. These highly trained and safety-focused drivers<sup>1</sup> form the backbone of the critical logistics and delivery networks that supply Californians with everyday sustenance including the foods we eat, the products we use, construction materials, electronics, and fuel. Self-Driving Trucks pose an existential threat to hundreds of thousands of people who rely on driving jobs across the state of California, and imperil the millions of California drivers who will end up sharing the road with these Self-Driving Trucks and other large, autonomous commercial vehicles.

2. That is why studies have found that “only 16% of consumers are comfortable sharing the road with fully automated self-driving semi-trucks and 43% of consumers

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas M. Corsi et al, *Safety performance differences between unionized and non-union motor carries*, TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PART E: LOGISTICS AND TRANSPORTATION REVIEW, Volume 48, Issue 4, 807, 815 (2012), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1366554512000129> (“union membership results in significantly fewer crashes, controlling for firm size, compared to crash frequency for non-union carriers”); see also Belzer, Michael & Rodriguez, Daniel & Sedo, Stanley, *Paying for Safety: An Economic Analysis of the Effect of Compensation on Truck Driver Safety*, FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION (2002), [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael-Belzer/publication/242737359\\_Paying\\_for\\_Safety\\_An\\_Economic\\_Analysis\\_of\\_the\\_Effect\\_of\\_Compensation\\_on\\_Truck\\_Driver\\_Safety/links/00463529405f001106000000/Paying-for-Safety-An-Economic-Analysis-of-the-Effect-of-Compensation-on-Truck-Driver-Safety.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael-Belzer/publication/242737359_Paying_for_Safety_An_Economic_Analysis_of_the_Effect_of_Compensation_on_Truck_Driver_Safety/links/00463529405f001106000000/Paying-for-Safety-An-Economic-Analysis-of-the-Effect-of-Compensation-on-Truck-Driver-Safety.pdf).

1 believe they are less safe than human-driven semi-trucks.”<sup>2</sup> These concerns over public  
2 safety and confidence and the displacement of workers explain why polls have found that  
3 four out of five California voters support a “legislative proposal requiring all self-driving  
4 trucks and delivery vehicles operating on California’s public roads and freeways to have a  
5 human safety operator present at all times.”<sup>3</sup>

6         3.       The CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES (the  
7 “DMV”), however, chose to eschew those concerns and ignore the California  
8 Administrative Procedure Act (the “California APA”) in order to enact regulations which  
9 *for the first time* allow commercial vehicles weighing 10,001 pounds or more to operate  
10 fully autonomously on public roads across the State of California, without the level of  
11 economic analysis required for a rule of this magnitude. *See* April 2026 amendments to  
12 CAL. CODE REGS. Tit. 13, Art. 3.7 & 3.8 (the “Amended AV Regulations”).

13         4.       The Amended AV Regulations—which also make incremental changes to  
14 existing regulations that have allowed the testing of light-duty<sup>4</sup> autonomous vehicles (e.g.  
15

---

16         <sup>2</sup> Press Release, JD Power, Confidence in Self-Driving Vehicles Remains Stalled as  
17 Safety Concerns and Trust Gaps Persist, JD Power Finds (Jun. 11, 2026),  
18 [https://www.jdpower.com/business/press-releases/2026-us-mobility-confidence-index-](https://www.jdpower.com/business/press-releases/2026-us-mobility-confidence-index-mci-study)  
19 [mci-study](https://www.jdpower.com/business/press-releases/2026-us-mobility-confidence-index-mci-study); *see also* Brittany Moye, AAA: Fear in Self-Driving Vehicles Persists, AAA  
20 NEWSROOM, Feb. 25, 2025, [https://newsroom.aaa.com/2025/02/aaa-fear-in-self-driving-](https://newsroom.aaa.com/2025/02/aaa-fear-in-self-driving-vehicles-persists/)  
21 [vehicles-persists/](https://newsroom.aaa.com/2025/02/aaa-fear-in-self-driving-vehicles-persists/).

22         <sup>3</sup> Memorandum from Tulchin Research regarding polling showing a strong majority  
23 of Californians support action to rein in Big Tech and protect jobs from AI and automation  
24 (Jun. 28, 2025), [https://tulchinresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/California-](https://tulchinresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/California-Statewide-Poll-on-AI-and-Self-driving-Vehicles-01-25-Final.pdf)  
25 [Statewide-Poll-on-AI-and-Self-driving-Vehicles-01-25-Final.pdf](https://tulchinresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/California-Statewide-Poll-on-AI-and-Self-driving-Vehicles-01-25-Final.pdf).

26         <sup>4</sup> For purposes of this writ, we will rely on the DMV’s definitions in the Amended  
27 AV regulations, which define a heavy-duty vehicle as a commercial vehicle 10,001 pounds  
28 or more, making all smaller commercial vehicles “light-duty.” CAL. CODE REGS. Tit. 13 §  
227.02(e). This is in contrast to the Federal regulations that define a “heavy-duty vehicle”  
as a commercial vehicle over 26,000 pounds. *See* 49 CFR § 523.6. Vehicles that weigh  
10,000 pounds or less include small passenger vehicles like cars, vans, SUVs, and standard  
pickup trucks. Vehicles between 10,001 and 25,999 pounds include flat-bed trucks, box  
trucks, cargo vans, delivery vans, buses, ambulance-sized vans, some RVs, dump trucks,  
and delivery trucks. Vehicles weighing over 26,000 pounds include semi-trucks, tractor  
trailers, and large delivery trucks. *See Federal Highway Administration GVWR Class*

1 autonomous cars such as robotaxis) since 2014, and their subsequent driverless  
2 deployment after 2018 through companies such as Waymo—will fundamentally change  
3 the heavy-duty commercial vehicle industry. These regulatory changes will result in Self-  
4 Driving Truck companies spending hundreds of millions of dollars to exploit and threaten  
5 the critical California market.

6         5.       The deployment of Self-Driving Trucks, authorized by the regulatory  
7 changes, has the potential to eventually wipe out the jobs of more than 200,000 employee  
8 semi-truck drivers working across California. A similarly large number of self-employed  
9 drivers operating commercial vehicles weighing between 10,001 pounds and 25,999  
10 pounds could also be impacted. Despite this, the DMV rushed to promulgate these rules  
11 under the guise of amending existing light-duty autonomous testing regulations—which  
12 had already covered smaller autonomous vehicles like robotaxis or Waymos—in order to  
13 serve corporate interests, with little regard for the health, safety, or economic stability of  
14 everyday Californians and California businesses.

15         6.       California law requires that the state must engage in extensive study of the  
16 economic and practical impact of these types of monumental regulations before they can  
17 be implemented and that the public must be apprised of that economic impact to give its  
18 members and stakeholders an opportunity to assess and comment on proposed regulations.  
19 This is why the California APA requires an agency to conduct a Standardized Regulatory  
20 Impact Assessment (“SRIA”) when a regulation is estimated to have an economic cost or  
21 benefit that exceeds \$50 million in the first 12 months after implementation. GOV’T CODE  
22 §§ 11342.548; 11346.3(a), (c), 11346.36(e); CAL. CODE REGS. Tit. 1, §§ 2000(g); 2002,  
23 2003; State Administrative Manual (“SAM”)<sup>5</sup> § 6602.

24         7.       The DMV incorrectly concluded that a SRIA was not required for the  
25

26 *Identification*, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SAFETY RESEARCH,  
27 [https://cmvid.nisrinc.com/CMV\\_ID/GVWRClass.asp](https://cmvid.nisrinc.com/CMV_ID/GVWRClass.asp) (last accessed Jul. 31, 2026)  
(describing the vehicles by weight classification).

28         <sup>5</sup> State Administrative Manual, (last visited Aug. 4, 2026),  
<https://www.dgs.ca.gov/Resources/SAM>.

1 Amended AV Regulations by taking the implausible position that these regulations will not  
2 meet that \$50 million threshold. Even focusing solely on the Self-Driving Truck aspect of  
3 the Amended AV Regulations, however, it is clear that this conclusion defies logic and  
4 ignores all available evidence regarding the cost of testing and deploying Self-Driving  
5 Trucks, and regarding the economic impact that such testing and deployment will have on  
6 existing commercial truck drivers. This is particularly true because California—which  
7 handles 40% of the nation’s containerized imports and 30% of all US exports—is an  
8 essential market for Self-Driving Truck companies that wish to quickly establish a strong  
9 market share, and these companies have long had California’s \$2.8 trillion trucking  
10 corridor in their sights as a crucial component of their autonomous trucking networks.

11       8.       For example, the DMV has taken the indefensible, insupportable, and  
12 arbitrary position that not a single job will be eliminated as a result of these regulations and  
13 that not a single existing business will close, ignoring the commercial trucking industry’s  
14 stated goal of disrupting the existing commercial trucking industry and replacing  
15 commercial truck drivers with Self-Driving Trucks. The DMV thus ignores not only the  
16 costs of those drivers themselves being displaced, but also the effect that this displacement  
17 will have on the industries and businesses that have developed to service and support these  
18 drivers—including commercial driving schools, truck stops, restaurants, and hotels.

19       9.       The DMV has also somehow concluded that the *only* costs resulting from the  
20 regulation will be the cost companies will incur to report data to the DMV, ignoring the  
21 underlying expenditures necessary to obtain that data in the first place, and ignoring any  
22 other costs or benefits that may result from the Amended AV Regulations.

23       10.      These omissions are merely the tip of the iceberg. The DMV’s rudimentary  
24 and unsubstantiated regulatory paper trail makes clear that the DMV severely  
25 underestimated the costs associated with the Amended AV Regulations, and that it has not  
26 even begun to conceive of the far-reaching economic impacts of the Self-Driving Truck  
27 portion of these amended regulations. Instead, the DMV’s cavalier and woefully  
28 insufficient “economic analysis” ignores even the most basic economic impacts of an

11. This state is at a critical juncture. Self-Driving Truck prospectors are rushing to strike it rich in California, and will soon spend hundreds of millions of dollars within the state to comply with the Amended AV Regulations, giving them the ability to operate fully in the state and achieve what they have long been wishing for—the elimination of the human driver and their attendant needs from their logistics networks. The DMV’s flawed and irredeemable “economic analysis” means that the DMV was able to bring this moment to bear without due thought to or consideration of how these profound changes will impact California businesses or individuals.

12. The DMV thus abused its discretion by failing to conduct a proper economic analysis prior to promulgating its amendments, and it failed to follow the prescribed California APA process when it skirted the requirement for a SRIA. The DMV's careless attempt to unlawfully fast track the regulatory process—while fudging the math to avoid built-in checks to such abuse—means that the public was kept in the dark about the actual economic and safety impacts of the Amended AV Regulations that opened the door to Self-Driving Trucks and other heavy-duty commercial vehicles within the state. This deprived the public of the opportunity to engage in a full and fair public comment process as required by the California APA. Whether or not California ultimately concludes that the benefits of this technology outweigh its costs, the public was entitled to—and the California APA demands—the more detailed analysis that the statutorily required SRIA would have provided. The April 28, 2026 regulatory amendments were thus unlawfully enacted and this Court must order the DMV to rescind the Amended AV Regulations.

23 **PARTIES**

24           13.     Petitioner Teamsters California is a statewide labor association representing  
25 more than 250,000 workers in dozens of industries across the State of California through  
26 its membership composed of all local unions and joint councils in California affiliated with  
27 the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, an international labor organization. Teamsters  
28 California serves as the advocacy voice for the combined interests of these labor

1 organizations and their members and families. Teamsters California has a vested interest in  
2 protecting the rights of its constituent joint councils and local unions, who represent  
3 members whose jobs will be first reduced and then rendered obsolete by the Self-Driving  
4 Trucks and other heavy-duty, autonomous commercial vehicles allowed in California for  
5 the first time under the Amended AV Regulations.

6 14. Respondent DMV is an agency of the State of California. The DMV is  
7 tasked by the state legislature with regulating car dealers, motor vehicle and driver  
8 licensing, commercial cargo carriers, private driving schools, and private traffic schools.  
9 The DMV is a sub-department of the CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION  
10 AGENCY (“CalSTA”).

11 15. Respondent CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE (the “DOF”) is  
12 an agency of the State of California. The DOF establishes appropriate fiscal policies  
13 necessary to carry out the State of California’s programs.

14 16. Respondent CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW (the  
15 “OAL”) is a California state agency that is responsible for reviewing administrative  
16 regulations proposed by state agencies for compliance with the California APA.

17 17. Respondent CalSTA is a state agency that develops and coordinates  
18 California’s transportation policies and programs. The agency oversees the state’s eight  
19 entities that deliver transportation-related programs and services and support the  
20 movement of people and goods throughout the state, including the DMV.

21 18. Respondent TOKS OMISHAKIN is the Secretary of CalSTA. CalSTA is the  
22 California Agency that oversees California departments related to transportation, including  
23 the DMV. He is responsible for carrying out the functions of CalSTA and is sued in his  
24 official capacity.

25 19. Respondent JAMES HACKER is the Undersecretary of CalSTA. He is  
26 responsible for carrying out the functions of CalSTA and is sued in his official capacity.

27 20. Respondent ALICIA FOWLER is the General Counsel at CalSTA and is  
28 sued in her official capacity.





## **BACKGROUND**

30. On or around April 15, 2025, the DMV announced its intention to amend its autonomous vehicle regulations as set forth in California Code of Regulations Title 13, sections 227.00 *et seq.* and 228.00 *et seq.* A true and correct copy of the DMV’s Notice of Proposed Regulatory Action is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. A true and correct copy of the DMV’s Initial Proposed Regulatory Text is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

31. Critically, along with making changes to the long-existing testing and regulatory process for light duty autonomous vehicles, the DMV noted its intent to “remove the current prohibition” on Self-Driving Trucks—and other heavy-duty, autonomous commercial vehicles—testing and deploying on California roads.

### **Self-Driving Truck History**

32. Understanding the full impact of the Amended AV Regulations on California and its existing commercial drivers requires understanding the history of Self-Driving Truck’s technological development. According to expert reports, the road to Self-Driving Trucks can be traced back to a 1983 federal Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (“DARPA”) initiative to build the first autonomous land vehicle, and even two decades later the technology was still in its infancy: At the 2004 DARPA Grand Challenge, the most successful vehicle traveled only approximately 7.4 miles. Investment and research into this technology began to grow exponentially, however, with much of that investment centered in California (Silicon Valley in particular).

33. As self-driving vehicles evolved from short-lived tests in the California desert to machines capable of traveling sustained distances—with billions of dollars in investment from companies that hoped to eventually profit from this investment—over a decade ago, California banned self-driving heavy-duty vehicles statewide. According to expert reports, in the wake of this prohibition, well-resourced Self-Driving Truck companies like Aurora Innovation Inc. (“Aurora”), valued at over \$13 billion,<sup>6</sup> and Kodiak

---

<sup>6</sup> *Aurora Innovation, Inc.*, YAHOO! FINANCE (last visited Jul. 6, 2026), <https://finance.yahoo.com/quote/AUR/key-statistics/>.

1 AI, Inc. (“Kodiak”), valued at over \$1 billion,<sup>7</sup> moved to places like Texas and Arizona  
2 where they could set up and scale operations in a more lax regulatory environment. Over  
3 the last decade the companies developing Self-Driving Trucks have raised around \$20  
4 billion nationwide, with an increasing share of that capital now dedicated to building a  
5 pipeline of Self-Driving Truck facilities along Interstate 10, across Texas and Arizona, and  
6 up to the California border. As a result, Self-Driving Trucks are becoming a fixture on  
7 highways in the southwest as Self-Driving Truck companies ramp up their operations.<sup>8</sup>

8 34. Since Aurora proved it could successfully complete its one thousand mile  
9 driverless operation between Fort Worth, Texas and Phoenix, Arizona in 2025, it is now  
10 ramping up the mapping of new routes and plans to add 200 Self-Driving Trucks in the  
11 next year, which will result in approximately \$80 million in revenue.<sup>9</sup>

12 35. The Amended AV Regulations allow Aurora to focus some or all of that  
13 expansion in California, which is a critical market for commercial trucking based on: the  
14 Ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Oakland; logistics facilities in the Inland Empire;  
15 and the California bread basket in the Central Valley.

16 36. As these companies built up their testing and capacity outside California, on  
17 information and belief, they also lobbied California to overturn its prohibition on Self-  
18 Driving Trucks, recognizing that extending the networks they were already building into  
19 California was an indispensable part of their growth and profitability plans.

20  
21 <sup>7</sup> Kodiak AI, Inc., YAHOO! FINANCE (last visited Jul. 6, 2026),  
<https://finance.yahoo.com/quote/KDK/key-statistics/>.

22 <sup>8</sup> Tum Balk, *Driverless Semi Trucks are Here, With Little Regulations and Big*  
23 *Promises*, N.Y. TIMES, May 27, 2025,  
24 [https://www.nytimes.com/2025/05/27/business/driverless-semi-trucks-aurora-](https://www.nytimes.com/2025/05/27/business/driverless-semi-trucks-aurora-innovation.html?unlocked_article_code=1.Kk8.rjwV.AFSR5-EII4fA&smid=url-share)  
[innovation.html?unlocked\\_article\\_code=1.Kk8.rjwV.AFSR5-EII4fA&smid=url-share](https://www.nytimes.com/2025/05/27/business/driverless-semi-trucks-aurora-innovation.html?unlocked_article_code=1.Kk8.rjwV.AFSR5-EII4fA&smid=url-share)  
(explaining that in 2025 Aurora had clocked more than one thousand driverless miles);

25 <sup>9</sup> Larry Avila, *Aurora focuses on Southwestern US driverless route growth*,  
26 *Trucking Dive*, Feb. 27, 2026, [https://www.truckingdive.com/news/aurora-innovation-q4-](https://www.truckingdive.com/news/aurora-innovation-q4-2025-earnings-expansion-routes/812161/)  
27 [2025-earnings-expansion-routes/812161/](https://www.truckingdive.com/news/aurora-innovation-q4-2025-earnings-expansion-routes/812161/); see also Press Release, Aurora: Aurora Triples  
28 *Driverless Network to 10 Routes and Prepares to Expand Across U.S. Sun Belt*, (Feb. 11,  
2026), [https://ir.aurora.tech/news-events/press-releases/detail/132/aurora-triples-driverless-](https://ir.aurora.tech/news-events/press-releases/detail/132/aurora-triples-driverless-network-to-10-routes-and-prepares-to-expand-across-u-s-sun-belt)  
[network-to-10-routes-and-prepares-to-expand-across-u-s-sun-belt](https://ir.aurora.tech/news-events/press-releases/detail/132/aurora-triples-driverless-network-to-10-routes-and-prepares-to-expand-across-u-s-sun-belt).

1           37.     The Amended AV Regulations opened these flood gates. Autonomous  
2 trucking companies that have been waiting to do so are now able to stake out their territory  
3 in California’s latest gold rush and can connect shipping-container routes from Asia and  
4 across the Pacific, or fresh produce from California’s Central Valley, to Arizona and Texas  
5 and the rest of the country.

6           38.     With the California jewel in its sight, the United States Self-Driving Truck  
7 market is projected to reach \$17.57 billion by 2026 (up from \$16.68 billion in 2025).<sup>10</sup>

8           39.     According to expert analysis, as a result of the Amended AV Regulations,  
9 companies will invest hundreds of millions of dollars in California within the first year  
10 after implementation to take advantage of this startup opportunity, including costs  
11 associated with mapping routes (known as “lanes”), building facilities, purchasing  
12 autonomous equipped trucks, hiring test drivers and service technicians, purchasing and  
13 installing the required remote-in technology for the driverless stage, fuel costs, and  
14 prescribed regulatory training costs.

15           40.     The DMV failed to consider these costs and investments in California from  
16 Self-Driving Truck companies entering the state when it conducted its economic analysis  
17 of the Amended AV Regulations.

18           41.     The failure to consider this economic impact denied the public the  
19 opportunity to intelligently assess and comment on the proposed regulations before they  
20 were adopted.

21           **THESE REGULATIONS ARE MAJOR REGULATIONS UNDER THE**  
22           **CALIFORNIA APA AND THEREFORE REQUIRED A SRIA**

23           42.     The California APA defines a major regulation as any regulatory action  
24 subject to OAL review that will have an estimated “economic impact,” including both  
25 costs and benefits, on California businesses and individuals that exceeds \$50 million  
26

27           <sup>10</sup> *Autonomous Truck Market Size, Share & Industry Analysis*, Fortune Business  
28 Insights, (last visited Jul. 9, 2026), <https://www.fortunebusinessinsights.com/autonomous-truck-market-103590>.

1 within any 12-month period between the filing of the regulation and 12 months after the  
2 date the regulation is fully implemented. GOV'T CODE § 11342.548; CAL. CODE REGS. Tit.  
3 1, § 2000(g).

4 43. The cost assessment is calculated without regard to any offsetting of benefits  
5 or cost that may result directly or indirectly from the adoption, amendment or repeal of the  
6 regulation. CAL. CODE REGS. Tit. 1, § 2000(e); (g).

7 44. The California APA also requires any state agency proposing to amend a  
8 regulation to “assess the potential adverse impact on California business enterprises and  
9 individuals[.]” GOV'T CODE § 11346.3(a).

10 45. The California APA and the SAM require a state agency, as part of its initial  
11 statement of reasons, to include an STD 399 Form with each proposed regulation  
12 transmitted to the OAL for publication. GOV'T CODE §§ 11346.3(a)(3); 11346.5(a); SAM  
13 § 6603.

14 46. The STD 399 Form requires the agency to answer basic questions regarding  
15 the economic impact of the regulations. If the agency determines that the regulation “will  
16 not have a significant, statewide adverse economic impact” the agency shall make a  
17 declaration to that effect and “provide in the record facts, evidence, documents, testimony,  
18 or other evidence upon which the agency relies to support its initial determination.” GOV'T  
19 CODE § 11346.5(a)(8); SAM §§ 6602, 6603. A true and correct copy of the Department of  
20 Finance Letter 13-30 regarding Economic and Fiscal Impact Assessments and Regulatory  
21 Review (STD 399, SRIA, and SAM) is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**. *See also* Exhibit C.

22 47. Each state agency proposing to adopt, amend, or repeal a major regulation  
23 must conduct a SRIA that must conform to the DOF's requirements. GOV'T CODE  
24 §§ 11342.548; 11346.3(a), (c), 11346.36(e); CAL. CODE REGS. Tit. 1, §§ 2000(g); 2002,  
25 2003; SAM § 6602.

26 48. The SRIA requires the agency to include a description of the agency's  
27 economic impact method, including its underlying assumptions and rationale, the specific  
28 categories of business and individuals who would be affected, the inputs and outputs

1 associated with the economic impact, and the agency's interpretation of the economic  
2 impact assessment. CAL. CODE REGS. Tit. 1, §§ 2002, 2003.

3       49. In addition, the SRIA must be accompanied by a form that includes the  
4 agency's name and contact information, a statement of the need for the regulation,  
5 categories of businesses and individuals impacted and the amount of economic impact for  
6 each category, identification and description of all costs and benefits of the proposed  
7 change calculated on an annual basis from the estimated date of filing with the Secretary of  
8 State through 12 months after the regulation is fully implemented, a description of the 12-  
9 month period within which the estimated impact will exceed \$50 million, a description of  
10 the baseline the agency used to compare regulatory alternatives, identification of each  
11 regulatory alternative, including those provided by the public or another agency, and all  
12 costs or benefits related to each alternative considered and the reason for rejecting the  
13 alternative. CAL. CODE REGS. Tit. 1, §§ 2002, 2003.

14       50. This analysis is "intended to provide agencies and the public with tools to  
15 determine whether the regulatory proposal is an efficient and effective means of  
16 implementing the policy decisions enacted in statute or by other provisions of law in the  
17 least burdensome manner." GOV'T CODE § 11346.3(e).

18       51. An incomplete or missing analysis deprives the public of this opportunity.

19       52. An agency's failure to follow this procedure shall result in the OAL's refusal  
20 to approve the regulation; instead it must return the regulation to the proposing agency.  
21 GOV'T CODE § 11349.1(d).

22       53. The Amended AV regulations will have an economic impact exceeding \$50  
23 million within the first year after full implementation and are therefore major regulations.

24       **THE DMV GROSSLY UNDERESTIMATED THE COSTS AND BENEFITS**  
25       **ASSOCIATED WITH ITS 2026 AMENDMENTS**

26       54. In its April 15, 2025 Notice of Proposed Action, the DMV speculated—  
27 without providing a basis or further explanation—that the costs to representative private  
28 persons or businesses would be only \$5.8 million in the first year after implementation,

1 that the DMV was “not aware of a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly  
2 affecting businesses,” and that the “proposed action is unlikely to eliminate jobs in  
3 California . . . .”

4 55. The DMV sought written comments through June 9, 2025, with a public  
5 hearing held on June 10, 2025.

6 56. The DMV’s April 4, 2025 STD 399 Form contains the DMV’s purported  
7 explanation of its \$5.8 million first-year-impact estimate. A true and correct copy of the  
8 DMV’s April 4, 2025 STD 399 Form is attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.

9 57. Lee Piacentini Scott, the Chief Budget Officer at the DMV signed the STD  
10 399 Form on April 4, 2025, attesting that he had completed the form in accordance with  
11 the instructions in the SAM sections 6601 to 66016. *See Exhibit D*.

12 58. As described below, the STD 399 Form does not comply with the applicable  
13 SAM sections or the California APA. *See Exhibit D*.

14 59. The STD 399 Form also requires the Agency Secretary or the highest  
15 ranking official in the organization to sign the form.

16 60. The DMV is a sub-department of CalSTA, therefore CalSTA Agency  
17 Secretary Toks Omishakin was required to sign the form.

18 61. Despite this requirement CalSTA General Counsel Alicia Fowler signed on  
19 the line designated for the Agency Secretary. *See SAM § 66014; Exhibit D*.

20 62. As the DMV’s STD 399 form makes clear, the entirety of the DMV’s  
21 roughly \$5.8 million estimate was the approximately \$158,000 the DMV determined each  
22 of its estimated 37 first-year permit holders would spend annually on the data reporting  
23 requirements contained in the proposed regulation. In other words, the DMV, without  
24 explanation, took the position that the *only* economic impact the Amended AV Regulations  
25 would have is the amount that companies would have to spend to report the data from their  
26 testing back to the DMV.

27 63. The DMV’s meager \$5.8 million economic impact underestimate means that  
28 in the DMV’s accounting, the Amended AV Regulations fell below the threshold of a

1 “major regulation,” allowing the DMV to avoid having to prepare a SRIA.

2 64. The DMV’s STD 399 Form, however, is woefully inadequate, opaque and  
3 unclear.

4 65. The STD 399 Form does not provide any details regarding the DMV’s  
5 estimate that 37 permit holders will have data reporting expenses in the first year. It does  
6 not provide a basis for how it reached the 37 permit holder estimate. It does not explain  
7 whether it expects those permit holders to be current light-duty permit holders or if it  
8 expects those to be new permit holders seeking to test and deploy Self-Driving Trucks or  
9 other heavy-duty commercial vehicles instead of light-duty vehicles.

10 66. The document is also internally inconsistent. While page 6 denotes 37  
11 estimated permit holders in the implementation year, page 8 appears to contemplate 96  
12 applications which would presumably lead to permits in the initial 12 months after  
13 implementation—34 drivered original or renewal applications, 6 driverless original or  
14 renewal applications, 1 deployment original application, 3 deployment amended  
15 applications, and 52 modifications for drivered or driverless permits. Once again, the  
16 DMV does not explain whether it expects these applications to be for new Self-Driving  
17 Trucks, or for existing light-duty autonomous vehicle companies.

18 67. The most likely reading of this data is that the majority of the 34 estimated  
19 drivered applications in the first year will come from Self-Driving Truck companies  
20 because they are able to apply for such permits for the first time under the Amended AV  
21 Regulations. Light-duty autonomous vehicle companies have been able to apply for  
22 drivered testing permits since 2014, so it is unlikely that the Amended AV Regulations  
23 will lead to a large influx in new light-duty drivered applications as they will for Self-  
24 Driving Truck companies who have not previously been able to apply.

25 68. The DMV’s decision to only count the data reporting costs associated with  
26 the Amended AV Regulations ignores that even light-duty autonomous vehicle companies  
27 will incur costs in setting up new testing or modifying their existing testing and  
28 deployment protocols to remain in line with the Amended AV Regulations.



69. The costs described in Paragraph 68 are costs that should have been included in a proper economic analysis by the DMV under the California APA.

70. The DMV also chose not to acknowledge that Self-Driving Truck companies and companies operating other autonomous, heavy-duty commercial vehicles have not previously been able to test in California, much less deploy in California, so the Amended AV Regulations will require them to start their operations in California from the ground up. The DMV's analysis thus ignores the extensive investments that will be made by these companies to establish the infrastructure to conduct the testing required by the Amended AV Regulations. Some of the economic impacts in California that the DMV did not consider include companies purchasing or leasing facilities along the California routes where companies will conduct testing, acquiring or upgrading fleets of testing vehicles with the required sensor technology, investing in sensor-reading and data-storing capabilities that will be necessary for testing, and issuing required training programs for local law enforcement and first responders.

71. The costs described in Paragraph 70 are costs that should have been included in a proper economic analysis by the DMV under the California APA.

72. The DMV's economic analysis also ignores the extensive costs that will be incurred by these companies to conduct the testing required by the Amended AV Regulations, from wages and benefits for safety drivers who will be in the vehicles during the first phase of testing, to the fuel and maintenance costs for the required miles for testing and validating routes, to hiring additional personnel in California who will be required to oversee the testing and collect and analyze the immense amount of data that will be generated.

73. The costs described in Paragraph 72 are costs that should have been included in a proper economic analysis by the DMV under the California APA.

74. The DMV's analysis similarly ignores the scale-up costs that will be incurred by these companies to ramp up operations as they get closer to obtaining the required permits to commercialize their services.

1           75.     The costs described in Paragraph 74 are costs that should have been included  
2 in a proper economic analysis by the DMV under the California APA.

3           76.     According to sound expert analysis, the \$50 million major regulation  
4 threshold *will* be exceeded within the first year of full implementation of the Amended AV  
5 Regulations.<sup>11</sup>

6           77.     According to this expert analysis, the \$50 million threshold could be  
7 exceeded by a *single* large-scale Self-Driving Truck operator working to set up an  
8 operation in California the size of their current operations in other states, with direct  
9 expenditures in California in the first year for such a company projected at \$43.4 million,  
10 plus the multiplier economic effect that will result from these direct expenditures, which  
11 essentially doubles the economic impact. Even for smaller companies that enter the  
12 California market at the smallest scale possible, direct expenditures in the state are  
13 projected to be \$3 million. This means that the major regulation threshold will quickly be  
14 exceeded by even a few Self-Driving Truck companies entering the California market,  
15 with those costs ballooning as more companies begin testing and eventually deploying  
16 under the Amended AV Regulations.

17           78.     This statistically sound expert analysis places the total estimated direct costs  
18 of the Self-Driving Truck portion of the Amended AV Regulations at approximately  
19 \$287.8 million in the first year, with additional indirect and induced costs raising that  
20 estimate to \$575.6 million, an order of magnitude above the SRIA threshold.

21           79.     The DMV arbitrarily and capriciously ignored all of these expenditures that  
22 will be made in California even though they are clearly part of the “economic impact” that  
23 the Amended AV Regulations will have in their first year after implementation.

24           80.     The DMV’s flawed STD 399 Form estimate also ignores other less direct—  
25

26           <sup>11</sup> This expert analysis only considers the costs of Self-Driving Trucks (those  
27 weighing 26,000 pounds or more) and does not consider the costs associated with light  
28 duty vehicles (passenger vehicles weighing less than 10,000 pounds), or heavy-duty  
vehicles between 10,001 pounds and 25,999 pounds which are also authorized for testing  
and deployment under the Amended AV Regulations.

1 but equally important—costs that will result from its enactment of the Amended AV  
2 Regulations.

3       81. While the STD 399 Form claims the reporting requirements contained in the  
4 regulations will improve safety to the public by giving the DMV more information before  
5 it approves autonomous vehicles for testing or deployment, the DMV does not grapple  
6 with increased accidents that will undoubtedly result from Self-Driving Trucks and other  
7 autonomous, heavy-duty vehicles *entering California roads for the first time*. A single fatal  
8 commercial trucking accident is estimated to have an economic impact of approximately  
9 \$15.2 million, which means that even a single additional accident resulting from nascent  
10 automated driving technology would supersede the DMV’s flawed estimated economic  
11 impact for the regulations as a whole. A non-fatal commercial trucking accident involving  
12 an injury has an estimated economic impact of over \$325,000, and a non-injury  
13 commercial trucking accident has an estimated cost of approximately \$50,000.<sup>12</sup>

14       82. The DMV did not take into consideration safety costs associated with testing  
15 new technology on the same roads as human drivers in passenger cars. Because even a  
16 small uptick in fatal crashes would create costs exceeding the \$50 million threshold, this  
17 watershed moment will no doubt have *some* accident and safety related economic impact,  
18 and the DMV’s failure to even posit such safety costs is inexcusable.

19       83. The costs described in Paragraph 82 are costs that should have been included  
20 in a proper economic analysis by the DMV under the California APA.

21       84. Even if the DMV believes that Self-Driving Trucks are safer and will lead to  
22 *fewer* fatal crashes—which is illogical in the short-term testing phase—the DMV had a  
23 duty under the California APA to consider the marginal *savings* from this result in its  
24 economic analysis, which it failed to do.

25       85. The DMV asserted that not a single job or business would be eliminated. Yet  
26

27       <sup>12</sup> *Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration Crash Cost Methodology 2025*,  
28 FMCSA, Feb. 3, 2026, <https://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/safety/data-and-statistics/federal-motor-carrier-safety-administration-crash-cost-methodology-2025>.

1 one stated goal of autonomous trucking companies has been to eliminate at least some of  
2 the need for commercial truck drivers in commercial trucking.<sup>13</sup>

3 86. Even accepting that there will be a ramp-up period before autonomous  
4 trucking companies have the capacity to achieve this goal, companies are aiming to begin  
5 commercial operations as soon as possible, which will have *some* impact on existing  
6 businesses and drivers in the state within the first year of implementation of the Amended  
7 Av Regulations.

8 87. To turn a blind eye to this reality and to fail to even attempt to determine  
9 how extensive this impact will be is irresponsible and out of compliance with the  
10 California APA.

11 88. The DMV never publicly disclosed its insupportable STD 399 Form.

12 89. According to the DOF’s Rulemaking under the APA Economic and Fiscal  
13 Analysis—Training for Finance Budget Analysts, one of the objectives of the STD 399  
14 Form is to “**Disclose** to the public how and why a [regulatory] option is chosen[.]”  
15 (emphasis in original).<sup>14</sup>

16 90. Teamsters California only received a copy of the April 2025 STD 399 Form  
17 through a California Public Records Act request in March 2026.

18 91. The DMV never completed a SRIA for the Amended AV Regulations.

19 92. In a June 6, 2025 public comment, Teamsters California opposed the  
20 Amended AV Regulations and explained that the regulations would exceed the \$50 million  
21 threshold in the first year of implementation and therefore the DMV was required to  
22 conduct a SRIA.

23 93. The initial public comment period closed on June 9, 2025. The DMV held a  
24

25 <sup>13</sup> Jonathan Small, *Self-Driving Semi Trucks Are Coming, and They’re About to*  
26 *Transform a \$900 Billion Industry*, ENTREPRENEUR, Mar. 17, 2026,  
<https://www.entrepreneur.com/business-news/self-driving-semi-trucks-are-coming>  
(Aurora, Kodiak, and Waabi are racing to eliminate drivers).

27 <sup>14</sup> On August 3, 2026, Teamsters California obtained a copy of the DOF’s  
28 Rulemaking under the APA Economic and Fiscal Analysis—Training for Finance Budget  
Analysts, in response to a an earlier California Public Records Act request.

1 public hearing on June 10, 2025.

2       94. On or about December 3, 2025, the DMV filed a Notice of Proposed  
3 Modified Regulatory Text proposing additional modifications to the proposed Amended  
4 AV Regulations. A true and correct copy of the DMV's Modified Regulatory Text is  
5 attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.

6       95. In response, in a December 18, 2025 public comment Teamsters California  
7 wrote a letter to the DMV again opposing the regulations.

8       96. The DMV did not hold a public hearing following the December 3, 2025,  
9 Notice of Proposed Modified Regulatory Text.

10       97. On or about January 21, 2026, the DMV filed a Notice of Second Modified  
11 Regulatory Text. A true and correct copy of the DMV's Second Modified Regulatory Text  
12 is attached hereto as **Exhibit F**.

13       98. The DMV did not hold a public hearing following the January 21, 2026,  
14 Notice of Second Modified Regulatory Text.

15       99. In a January 27, 2026 public comment, Teamsters California again objected  
16 to the regulation, including by explaining that the DMV had failed to conduct the  
17 necessary SRIA.

18       100. On February 4, 2026, Teamsters California—in conjunction with other labor  
19 unions across the state—submitted a public comment objecting to the DMV's Amended  
20 AV Regulations on a number of grounds, including based on the DMV's failure to conduct  
21 a SRIA.

22       101. Notwithstanding repeated notice of its error, the DMV made no changes to  
23 its economic cost estimate. Instead, on March 12, 2026, the DMV submitted an updated  
24 STD 399 Form which contained the same projected costs of \$5.8 million, as described in  
25 Paragraphs 68-87. A true and correct copy of the DMV's March 12, 2026 STD 399 Form  
26 is attached hereto as **Exhibit G**.

27       102. Based on the DMV's analysis in its March 2026 STD 399 Form, the DMV  
28 again determined that the regulations were not major regulations and therefore failed to

1 complete a SRIA.

2 103. The DMV's STD 399 Form failed to use the correct estimate methodology or  
3 include the data or calculations relied upon by the DMV as required by SAM sections  
4 6601 to 6616.

5 104. The DMV never disclosed the identically flawed March 2026 STD 399 Form  
6 to the public.

7 105. Teamsters California only received a copy of the March 2026 STD 399 Form  
8 through a California Public Records Act request.

9 106. Lee Piacentini Scott signed the STD 399 Form on March 12, 2026, again  
10 attesting that the form had been completed in accordance with the instructions outlined in  
11 SAM sections 6601 to 6616.

12 107. As described above, SAM and the STD 399 Form itself required the CalSTA  
13 Agency Secretary, Toks Omishakin, to sign the form. SAM § 6614.

14 108. CalSTA Agency Secretary, Toks Omishakin, did not sign the STD 399 form.

15 109. Instead, Undersecretary James Hacker signed the STD 399 Form.

16 110. The DOF, through Program Budget Manager Teresa Calvert, approved and  
17 signed the DMV's March 12, 2026 STD 399 Form on March 13, 2026, despite the still-  
18 existing deficiencies. *See Exhibit G.*

19 111. The DOF's Rulemaking under the APA Economic and Fiscal Analysis—  
20 Training for Finance Budget Analysts lists seven common errors agencies make in filling  
21 out the STD 399 Form including, the agency's failure to quantify the costs of the  
22 regulations, and the head of the agency's failure to sign the form.

23 112. The DOF approved the STD 399 Form within a day of receipt, despite the  
24 lack of a correct signature, the flawed economic analysis that did not use the required  
25 methodology, and the DMV's failure to include the data or calculations upon which it  
26 relied. *See Exhibit G.*

27 113. DOF's Program Budget Manager's "signature reflects a concurrence that the  
28 estimates provided on the STD 399 are an accurate statement of the fiscal impact of the

1 proposed regulations.” SAM § 6614.

2       114. The DMV’s final estimate of a \$5.8 million economic impact in the first year  
3 is a patently gross underestimate and fails to consider a plethora of expenditures in the  
4 state that will result from and are connected to the implementation of the Amended AV  
5 Regulations and the costs related to opening California to Self-Driving Trucks and other  
6 autonomous, heavy-duty commercial vehicles.

7       115. The DMV’s economic impact analysis outright and arbitrarily fails to  
8 consider the safety costs to businesses and individuals that will result from the Amended  
9 AV Regulations allowing Self-Driving Trucks on California Roads for the first time.

10       116. The DMV’s economic impact analysis arbitrarily fails to consider the job  
11 loss and other impacts that Self-Driving Trucks will have on existing commercial truck  
12 drivers in California.

13       117. Based on publicly available wage data, it is clear that displacement of as few  
14 as 910 entry-level drivers—out of more than 200,000 employees driving commercial semi-  
15 trucks in California<sup>15</sup>—would on its own exceed the \$50 million threshold. This does not  
16 even include the indirect economic impact this will have on the industries that have  
17 developed to support these long-haul drivers, from commercial driving schools, to truck  
18 stops, hotel, and restaurants along key trucking corridors.

19       118. The DMV’s economic impact analysis fails to consider the costs and  
20 expenses that will be incurred by Self-Driving Truck companies that will seek to begin  
21 testing and deploying Self-Driving Trucks in California. According to expert analysis,  
22 these costs will easily exceed the \$50 million threshold.

23       119. The APA required that the DMV consider the costs described in Paragraphs  
24 114-118.

25       120. Had the DMV properly considered the costs described in Paragraphs 114-  
26

27       <sup>15</sup> This statistic only encompasses the 200,000 employees driving vehicles weighing  
28 over 26,000 pounds and does not account for the thousands of self-employed drivers, or  
those driving vehicles weighing 10,000 to 26,000 pounds.

1 118, it would have classified the Amended AV Regulations as major regulations.

2 121. The DMV's economic impact analysis was therefore irreparably flawed and  
3 arbitrarily failed to consider the true costs of the Amended AV Regulations.

4 **THE DMV SOUGHT EXPEDITED IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE**  
5 **REGULATIONS WITHOUT NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC OR THE**  
6 **OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

7 122. On March 16, 2026, the DMV conveyed the complete regulatory record to  
8 the OAL for its review. This record included an STD 400 Form, signed by the DMV on  
9 March 9, 2026, requesting that the Amended AV Regulations become effective upon filing  
10 with the Secretary of State rather than following the typical California APA process  
11 wherein the regulation takes effect on the first day of the next quarter. *See* GOV'T CODE  
12 § 11343.4(b). A true and correct copy of the DMV's March 2026 STD 400 Form and the  
13 complete Amended AV Regulations are attached hereto as **Exhibit H**.

14 123. Alongside the STD 400 Form, the DMV submitted a good-cause statement  
15 explaining why it sought expedited implementation of portions of the regulations. A true  
16 and correct copy of the DMV's March 2026 good cause statement is attached hereto as  
17 **Exhibit I**.

18 124. Neither the STD 400 Form nor the good cause statement were made  
19 available to the public.

20 125. As a result, the public was never able to provide comment regarding the  
21 irregular implementation timing of the regulations.

22 126. Teamsters California only received copies of these documents when it  
23 requested them in a California Public Records Act request after a portion of the Amended  
24 AV Regulations went into effect prematurely on April 28, 2026.

25 **THE OAL IMPROPERLY APPROVED THE DMV'S AMENDED AV**  
26 **REGULATION DESPITE DMV'S FAILURE TO FOLLOW THE CALIFORNIA**  
27 **APA PROCEDURE**

28 127. On April 7, 2026, Teamsters California wrote to the OAL explaining that it



1 must disapprove of the DMV’s regulations because the DMV failed to analyze the direct  
2 and indirect costs associated with the regulations and therefore incorrectly determined that  
3 the amended rules were not major regulations requiring a SRIA.

4 128. Despite the April 7 Teamsters letter, and the four Teamsters California  
5 public comments contained in the regulatory record highlighting the DMV’s failure to  
6 comply with the APA, the OAL, through Senior Attorney Sam Micon on behalf of OAL  
7 Director Kenneth J. Pogue, approved the Amended AV Regulations on April 28, 2026. A  
8 true and correct copy of the Notice of Approval of Regulatory Action is attached hereto as  
9 **Exhibit J.**

10 129. Although much of the Amended AV Regulations went into effect on April  
11 28, 2026, full implementation of the Amended AV Regulations will not occur until August  
12 28, 2026.

13 130. The OAL’s approval, notwithstanding the errors, omissions and, deficiencies  
14 described herein, violated the California APA.

15 **THE REGULATIONS LACK CLARITY, PUTTING EVERYDAY**  
16 **CALIFORNIANS’ SAFETY AT RISK**

17 131. Regulations are reviewed to determine compliance with the standard of  
18 necessity, authority, clarity, consistency, reference, and nonduplication. *See* GOV’T CODE  
19 § 11349.1(a).

20 132. Regulations are presumed to not comply with the clarity standard if the  
21 regulations can on their face “be reasonably and logically interpreted to have more than  
22 one meaning[.]” CAL. CODE REGS. Tit. 1, § 16(a)(1).

23 133. The Amended AV Regulations limit Self-Driving Truck testing and  
24 deployment to a specific “operational design domain”. *See* CAL. CODE REGS. Tit. 13,  
25 §§ 227.18(c); 227.42.

26 134. The Amended AV Regulations define “operational design domain” as  
27 the operating conditions under which a given automated driving system or feature  
28 thereof is specifically designed to function, including but not limited to,  
environmental, geographic, and time-of-day restrictions; and/or the requisite

1 presence or absence of certain traffic or roadway characteristics  
2 CAL. CODE REGS. Tit. 13, § 227.02(mm).

3 135. But the regulations do not define the terms “geographic” or “environmental.”

4 136. The only guidance on those terms appears to be a prohibition against  
5 traveling on roads with posted speed limits of 25 miles per hour or less, unless those roads  
6 provide “a direct route between hubs, motor carriers and shipping facilities, distribution  
7 centers, fueling or charging stations, maintenance facilities or terminals.” CAL. CODE  
8 REGS. TIT. 13, § 227.02 (c).

9 137. In this context it is not clear what the words “geographic” and  
10 “environmental” refer to. Geographic could mean only specific highways, specific towns,  
11 counties, regions of the state, or indeed anywhere in the state. Likewise the term  
12 environmental could be used to refer to aspects as far reaching as weather conditions,  
13 specific conditions like forests or deserts, or ecosystems. Under one potential reading of  
14 the regulations, a manufacturer could seek and obtain a driverless permit for all roads in  
15 California with a 55 mile per hour speed limit during the day but only test vehicles in a  
16 flat, dry section of the Interstate 10 freeway in regions with strong cellular or satellite  
17 service. Once the manufacturer meets the mileage requirements for full deployment, it  
18 could send vehicles over the snowy Donner Pass on Interstate 80 where cellular and  
19 satellite service is less consistent. Whether the DMV can prevent this from occurring is not  
20 clear on the face of the regulations. This lack of clarity and precision will have real  
21 consequences for the safety of Californians on roads across the state.

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: PETITION FOR WRIT OF TRADITIONAL  
MANDAMUS (CODE CIV. P. § 1085) OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,  
ADMINISTRATIVE MANDAMUS (CODE CIV. P. § 1094.5)–FAILURE TO  
CONDUCT A SRIA, AGAINST RESPONDENTS CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT  
OF MOTOR VEHICLES, CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY,  
TOKS OMISHAKIN, LEE PIACENTINI SCOTT, JAMES HACKER, ALICIA  
FOWLER, AND STEVE GORDON**

138. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of all foregoing paragraphs.

139. Petitioner seeks a writ of traditional mandamus pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1085, or, alternatively, a writ of administrative mandamus pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5, directing the DMV to rescind the Amended AV Regulations because the agency has not complied with Government Code Section 11346.3 as a result of its failure to perform a SRIA. *See* GOV'T CODE §§ 11349.1(d)(2); 11346.5(a).

140. As described above the California APA requires agencies to conduct a SRIA if the estimated costs or benefits to California businesses or individuals will exceed \$50 million in the first 12 months of implementation of the regulations.

141. The DMV's conclusion that the Amended AV Regulations do not constitute a major regulation is arbitrary, capricious, and/or an abuse of discretion. The DMV's \$5.8 million first-year economic impact estimate is woefully inadequate, unsupported, deficient, and unreasonably low.

a. The DMV's estimate fails to account for or consider the costs to light-duty autonomous vehicle companies that will have to modify their testing and deployment in response to the Amended AV Regulations.

b. The DMV's estimate fails to account for or consider the safety costs that will result to the public from the Self-Driving Trucks and other heavy-duty, autonomous commercial vehicles that will be allowed on California roads for the first time ever.

1           c.       The DMV’s estimate fails to account for or consider the costs to  
2 existing commercial truck drivers, to commercial trucking businesses, and to commercial  
3 driver license training and licensing companies from Self-Driving Truck companies  
4 beginning to operate in the state for the first time ever.

5           d.       The DMV’s estimate fails to account for the costs that will be  
6 expended by Self-Driving Truck companies that will seek to begin testing and operating in  
7 the state under the Amended AV Regulations. Direct expenditures by Self-Driving Truck  
8 companies on their own will exceed \$50 million with just a few Self-Driving Truck  
9 companies entering the California market as a result of the Amended AV Regulations. A  
10 conservative estimate of the most likely number of entrants into the state places the total  
11 direct expenditures by these Self-Driving Truck companies at \$287.8 million—without  
12 even taking into account a standard economic multiplier effect that estimates further  
13 impacts on communities resulting from increased expenditures in those communities,  
14 which doubles that economic impact.

15           142.   The costs and expenditures that will result from the Amended AV  
16 Regulations—but which the DMV arbitrarily chose to ignore—will easily exceed \$50  
17 million under any applicable metric. Therefore, the Amended AV Regulations are major  
18 regulations under the California APA and the DMV was required to conduct a SRIA.

19           143.   The DMV’s failure to conduct the required SRIA and its otherwise  
20 incomplete and deficient first-year economic estimate deprived the public of the  
21 opportunity to fully examine and analyze whether the Amended AV Regulations should  
22 have been implemented.

23           144.   Petitioner Teamsters California has a beneficial interest in ensuring that its  
24 members and the public obtain a full and complete picture regarding the economic effects  
25 of regulations that will directly affect members’ jobs and their livelihoods and families,  
26 and in ensuring that no regulations that affect its members are passed without the  
27 appropriate scrutiny required under California law. Petitioner also has a public interest in  
28 ensuring that the DMV complies with the legislative directives contained in the California

1 APA.

2 145. Because the DMV did not prepare a SRIA, the Amended AV Regulations  
3 must be rescinded. *See In re Board of Equalization, Regulatory Action Title 18, California*  
4 *Code of Regulations*, OAL Matter Number 2016-0104-01 (2016) (disapproving of a  
5 rulemaking action when an agency failed to comply with the major regulation procedures).

6 146. Because Respondents' actions are quasi-legislative in nature and not  
7 adjudicatory, Petitioners bring this action under California Code of Civil Procedure section  
8 1085. In the alternative, Petitioners seek a writ of mandamus under California Code of  
9 Civil Procedure section 1094.5 to the extent, if any, that the Court concludes section  
10 1094.5 is applicable.

11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: PETITION FOR WRIT OF TRADITIONAL**  
12 **MANDAMUS (CODE CIV. P. § 1085) OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,**  
13 **ADMINISTRATIVE MANDAMUS (CODE CIV. P. § 1094.5)– FAILURE TO**  
14 **INCLUDE DATA AND CALCULATIONS IN ITS RULEMAKING PAPERWORK.**  
15 **AGAINST RESPONDENTS CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR**  
16 **VEHICLES, CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY, TOKS**  
17 **OMISHAKIN, LEE PIACENTINI SCOTT, JAMES HACKER, ALICIA FOWLER,**  
18 **AND STEVE GORDON**

19 147. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of all  
20 foregoing paragraphs.

21 148. Petitioner seeks a writ of traditional mandamus pursuant to California Code  
22 of Civil Procedure section 1085, or, alternatively, a writ of administrative mandamus  
23 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5, directing the DMV to rescind the  
24 Amended AV Regulations because the agency has not provided the data used and  
25 calculations made in the rulemaking file, as is required by the California APA. *See* GOV'T  
26 CODE § 11349.1(d)(1).

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: PETITION FOR WRIT OF TRADITIONAL  
MANDAMUS (CODE CIV. P. § 1085) OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,  
ADMINISTRATIVE MANDAMUS (CODE CIV. P. § 1094.5) – LACK OF  
CLARITY, AGAINST RESPONDENTS CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
MOTOR VEHICLES AND STEVE GORDON**

149. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of all foregoing paragraphs.

150. Petitioner seeks a writ of traditional mandamus pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1085, or, alternatively, a writ of administrative mandamus pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.5, directing the DMV to rescind the Amended AV Regulations because the regulations lack clarity, which is required by the California APA. *See* GOV'T CODE § 11349.1(a).

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: DECLARATORY RELIEF (CODE CIV. P. § 1086)  
– THE AMENDED AV REGULATIONS ARE MAJOR REGULATIONS  
REQUIRING A SRIA ANALYSIS, AGAINST ALL RESPONDENTS**

151. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of all foregoing paragraphs.

152. Petitioner seeks a declaration from this Court stating that the instant regulations are major regulations under the California APA and therefore the DMV's failure to conduct a SRIA means the regulation is invalid, void, and without effect.

153. Judicial resolution of this dispute and a declaration by this Court is necessary to resolve the legality of the DMV's actions.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION: DECLARATORY RELIEF (CODE CIV. P. § 1086)—  
THE AMENDED AV REGULATIONS LACK CLARITY, AGAINST ALL  
RESPONDENTS**

154. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of all foregoing paragraphs.

155. Petitioner seeks a declaration from this Court stating that the Amended AV

1 Regulations lack clarity and are therefore invalid under the California APA.

2 156. Judicial resolution of this dispute and a declaration by this Court is necessary  
3 to resolve the legality of the DMV's actions.

4 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION: DECLARATORY RELIEF (CODE CIV. P. § 1086)—**  
5 **THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE ERRED IN AUTHORIZING THE MARCH**  
6 **2026 STD 399 FORM, AGAINST RESPONDENTS CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT**  
7 **OF FINANCE, JOE STEPHENSHAW, AND TERESA CALVERT**

8 157. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of all  
9 foregoing paragraphs.

10 158. Petitioner seeks a declaration from this Court stating that the DOF erred in  
11 approving the DMV's April 2025 and March 2026 STD 399 Forms because the forms  
12 failed to consider all direct, indirect, and induced costs to California businesses and  
13 individuals as a result of the Amended AV Regulations.

14 159. Judicial resolution of this dispute and a declaration by this Court is necessary  
15 to resolve the legality of the DOF's actions.

16 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION: DECLARATORY RELIEF (CODE CIV. P.**  
17 **§ 1086)—THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ERRED IN AUTHORIZING**  
18 **THE AMENDED AV REGULATIONS, AGAINST RESPONDENTS CALIFORNIA**  
19 **OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, KENNETH J. POGUE, AND SAM**  
20 **MICON**

21 160. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of all  
22 foregoing paragraphs.

23 161. Petitioner seeks a declaration from this Court stating that the OAL erred in  
24 approving the Amended AV Regulations because the DMV's amendments lack clarity and  
25 amounted to a major regulation and the DMV failed to conduct a SRIA.

26 162. Judicial resolution of this dispute and a declaration by this Court is necessary  
27 to resolve the legality of the OAL's actions.

**EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION: DECLARATORY RELIEF (CODE CIV. P.  
§ 1086)—THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW’S APPROVAL OF AN  
EARLY IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD VIOLATED STATE DUE PROCESS  
RIGHTS, AGAINST RESPONDENTS CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, KENNETH J. POGUE, AND SAM MICON**

163. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of all foregoing paragraphs.

164. Petitioner seeks a declaration from this Court stating that the OAL erred in approving the early implementation of the Amended AV Regulations because the DMV never furnished its request for early adoption or its good cause statement to the public. As a result, the public was denied adequate process in the rulemaking procedure.

165. Judicial resolution of this dispute and a declaration by this Court is therefore necessary to resolve the legality of the OAL’s actions.

**PRAYER**

166. WHEREFOR, Petitioner prays for a judgment as follows:

A. For a writ or writs mandamus directing the DMV and its agents to vacate and set aside its Amended AV Regulations;

B. For a declaration that the Amended AV Regulations are major regulations under the California APA and therefore required a SRIA;

C. For a declaration that the Amended AV Regulations lack clarity within the meaning of the California APA;

D. For a declaration that the DOF and its agents erred in authorizing and approving the DMV’s STD 399 Forms in April 2025 and/or March 2026;

E. For a declaration stating that the OAL and its agents erred in authorizing the Amended AV Regulations;

F. For permanent injunctive relief prohibiting the DMV and its agents from enforcing its Amended AV Regulations;

G. For costs of the suit according to proof;



1 H. For attorneys' fees according to proof pursuant to California Code of  
2 Civil Procedure §1021.5 and other applicable law; and

3 I. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.  
4

5 DATED: August 5, 2026

JULIE GUTMAN DICKINSON  
HECTOR DE HARO  
VANESSA C. WRIGHT  
BUSH GOTTLIEB, A Law Corporation

6  
7  
8  
9 By: 

10 JULIE GUTMAN DICKINSON  
11 Attorneys for Petitioner TEAMSTERS  
12 CALIFORNIA  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**VERIFICATION**

I have read the foregoing VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE, DECLARATORY RELIEF, AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF and know its contents.

I am an agent of a party to this action. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.

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

Executed on August 3, 2026, at Covina, California.



---

Victor Mineros  
Co-Chair Teamsters California