Case 1:06-cv-01502-AWI-DLB Document 96-5 Filed 10/18/10 Page 1 of 10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF INYO, Plaintiff,) Case No. VS.)1:06-CV-01502-AWI-DLB DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, DIRK KEMPTHORNE, in his as Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, MARY A. BOMAR, in her capacity as Director, National Park Service, JAMES T. REYNOLDS, in his capacity as Superintendent, Death Valley National Park, Defendants, and SIERRA CLUB, et al., Defendant-Intervenors.

DEPOSITION OF RON CHEGWIDDEN

Independence, California
March 5, 2008

NICCOLE M. ROSSY

Certified Shorthand Reporter #10698 Post Office Box 1675 Bishop, California 93515 (760) 872-4718



```
Case 1:06-cv-01502-AWI-DLB Document 96-5 Filed 10/18/10 Page 2 of 10
 1
                IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
               FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
 3
 4
     COUNTY OF INYO,
 5
               Plaintiff,
 6
                                         ) Case No.
          VS.
                                         )1:06-CV-01502-AWI-DLB
     DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
     DIRK KEMPTHORNE, in his
 8
     as Secretary of the United
     States Department of the
 9
     Interior, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
     MARY A. BOMAR, in her capacity
10
     as Director, National Park
     Service, JAMES T. REYNOLDS, in
     his capacity as Superintendent,
11
     Death Valley National Park,
12
               Defendants, and
13
     SIERRA CLUB, et al.,
14
               Defendant-Intervenors.
15
16
              Deposition of RON CHEGWIDDEN, taken on behalf
17
18
     of Defendant, at the Inyo County Administration offices,
19
     224 North Edwards Street, Independence, California,
20
     commencing at 1:43 p.m., Wednesday, March 5, 2008,
     before Niccole M. Rossy, CSR #10698, pursuant to notice.
21
22
23
24
25
```

Case	1:06-cv-01502-AWI-DLB Document 96-5 Filed 10/18/10 Page 3 of 10
1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	FOR PLAINTIFF: COUNTY OF INYO
4	OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL BY: RANDY KELLER, ASSISTANT COUNTY COUNSEL
5	P.O. Box M Independence, California 93526
6	(760) 878-0229
7	FOR DEFENDANTS:
8	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BY: BRUCE D. BERNARD, TRIAL ATTORNEY
9	1961 Stout Street, 8th Floor Denver, Colorado 80294
10	(303) 844-1361
11	FOR DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS:
12	EARTHJUSTICE BY: EDWARD B. ZUKOSKI, STAFF ATTORNEY
13	1631 Glenarm Place, Suite 300 Denver, Colorado 80202-4303
14	(303) 623-9466
15	ALSO PRESENT:
16	AINSLEY HOLESO, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Case 1:06-cv-01502-AWI-DLB Document 96-5 Filed 10/18/10 Page 4 of 10

- 1 because they were secondary to the state highway system,
- 2 if you will, but that's been since abolished, and at
- that time I don't know what the difference between the 3
- primary and the secondary was. 4
- Okay. In the same disclosures there's also a 5 resolution under 48-9 which states that, "The Board of 6 Supervisors of Inyo County did heretofore cause a map to be prepared showing each road proposed to be included in 8
- 9 the primary system of county roads," and it indicates
- it's attached as Exhibit A. 10
- Do you have any idea if that map still exists? 11
- No, I do not. We've tried to find it, and I'm 12 Α.
- not aware of it existing in any of the records that 13
- we've looked for -- looked through. 14
- 15 The same resolution references that there's a
- set of route descriptions marked Exhibit B that are 16
- 17 attached to the resolution and which are adopted as the
- official route descriptions for the roads included in 18
- the system of primary county roads. Do you know if 19
- 20 that -- if those route descriptions exist?
- No, I don't. 21 Α.
- 22 So is it your understanding that it's at
- 23 least -- well, let me back up.
- 24 The way in which a road becomes a county road
- 25 is for the county to adopt the road into its system of

Case 1:06-cv-01502-AWI-DLB Document 96-5 Filed 10/18/10 Page 5 of 10

- 1 Okay. And the county has been unable to find 2 the 1948 map. Is there a more current map that the county does have? 3
 - We have more current maps, yes.
 - There are portions of maps attached to this Q. initial disclosure again. Can you tell if these are copies that are taken from portions of the state map of county maintained mileage?
 - Α. Yes. That would appear to be an excerpt, if you will, from a maintained mileage map prepared by the state.

(A discussion was held off the record.)

- 12 MR. BERNARD: Let's go off for one second.
 - BY MR. BERNARD: All right. We're looking at Ο. four map sheets that Mr. Keller has provided us, which are labeled "State of California Department of Transportation, " and they're dated 1993, and they are sheets 2, 10, 12, and 18 of 23. Do those appear to be the state maps you were referring to?
 - Α. That's a part of the set, yes.
 - Is there any way of knowing whether these maps correspond to the maps that were attached to the 1948 resolution?
- 24 Α. No.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25 Q. So there's really no way of knowing what was

Case 1:06-cv-01502-AWI-DLB Document 96-5 Filed 10/18/10 Page 6 of 10

- 1 intended to be included in the 1948 resolution at this 2 point?
 - A. Not without having those attachments, no.
 - Q. Looking at sheet 2 of 23, which seems to show part of Last Chance Road, it shows a little piece, perhaps a half mile, on the north end coming south of Willow Creek Road. Do you see that?
 - A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And then beyond that it says, "County right-of-way only, no road." This is a map dated 1993. So would that indicate that's not part of the county maintained road system?
- A. I don't know what that's intended to represent quite honestly.
 - Do you have any idea of what right-of-way would be referred to there or how that right-of-way might have been obtained?
 - I would presume that would be the right-of-way that was claimed under the adoption of the roadway in 1948.
 - So that would tell us then that adoption of a resolution like the one done in 1948 doesn't necessarily confirm that there is a road on the ground for any of the described roads; is that right?
- 25 Α. I don't know if I could say that is indicative

Case 1:06-cv-01502-AWI-DLB Document 96-5 Filed 10/18/10 Page 7 of 10

- 1 BY MR. BERNARD: Mr. Chegwidden, what is the,
- if you know, what is the factual basis for the county's 2
- claim that it owns each of these four roads? 3
- That they were adopted by the Board of 4
- 5 Supervisors.
- 6 Q. That they were adopted into the county
- maintained system?
 - Α. Yes.

8

- 9 Ο. By the 1948 resolution, I believe in the case
- of three of them and then a 19 -- I think it's 57 10
- resolution for Padre Point; is that right? 11
- 12 I believe so, yes. Α.
- But you've indicated earlier we don't have 13
- either Exhibit A or B to that 1948 resolution, either 14
- 15 the map or the listing of roads; is that correct?
- Not to my knowledge. 16 Α.
- 17 So there's really no basis for knowing what
- roads were being adopted into the system at that point; 18
- is that not correct? 19
- 20 I guess there's no clear-cut definition of what
- the roads that were adopted look like, I guess. 21
- And you've confirmed that the '93 state map we 22 Q.
- 23 were looking at, that those descriptions don't --
- 24 there's no way of knowing if those correspond to what
- 25 might have been attached to the '48 resolution or not,

Case 1:06-cv-01502-AWI-DLB Document 96-5 Filed 10/18/10 Page 8 of 10

- Okay. And you don't know if the roads that are included in this register conform to those shown on Exhibits A and B to the 1948 resolution; is that correct?
 - A. No, I can't confirm that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. All right. This form goes on to say that, "At the time of this writing, " and this is 2006, "there is no evidence that a road was ever constructed on Last Chance Road Easement. If no road was actually constructed, even through use, it would be difficult to make a positive finding for finding one, under federal or California law."

Do you know if something changed after 2006 that affected that conclusion?

- It changed in terms of --Α.
- Well, it says that there's no evidence a road Q. was ever constructed, even through use, and without that it would be difficult to sustain a claim. Do you know if the county eventually turned up something that reflected construction or something that encouraged it to make the claim?
- I believe there are maps that showed that the road existed. I don't know what the basis of the statement that no road was actually constructed was based upon.

Case 1:06-cv-01502-AWI-DLB Document 96-5 Filed 10/18/10 Page 9 of 10 1 maintain a road and in general when. MR. KELLER: That's all I have. 2 3 MR. BERNARD: I'm afraid I'm confused now. 4 5 EXAMINATION BY MR. BERNARD: 6 Q. For a road to become a county road it takes an action by the county supervisors; is that right? 8 9 I believe so, yes. Α. 10 Q. Accepting the road into the county system? A. Uh-huh. 11 12 Q. Okay. And with respect to these four roads subject to this lawsuit, the resolution that the county 13 points to as the basis for that would be the 1948 14 15 resolution number 48-9, is that correct, with respect to at least three of the roads? 16 17 A. I don't recall the exact number, but, yeah, I believe that's it. 18 19 Q. Okay. And the 1957 resolution with respect to Padre Point Road? 20 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. Okay. But you've earlier testified that the 23 county can't find Exhibits A and B to resolution 48-9, 24 so we really don't know for sure what was included in 25 that, right?

Case 1:06-cv-01502-AWI-DLB Document 96-5 Filed 10/18/10 Page 10 of 10 1 CASE: COUNTY OF INYO V. DEPT. OF INTERIOR DEPOSITION OF: RON CHEGWIDDEN 2 DATE OF DEPOSITION: MARCH 5, 2008 3 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 4 5 I, NICCOLE M. ROSSY, CSR No. 10698, Certified 6 Shorthand Reporter, certify: 7 That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place therein set forth, at 8 9 which time the witness was put under oath by me; That the testimony of the witness and all 10 objections made at the time of the examination were 11 12 recorded stenographically by me and were thereafter transcribed; 13 14 That the foregoing is a true and correct 15 transcript of my shorthand notes so taken. I further certify that I am not a relative or 16 17 employee of any attorney or of any of the parties, nor financially interested in the action. 18 I declare under penalty of perjury under the 19 20 laws of the state of California that the foregoing is true and correct. 21 22 Dated this 17th day of March, 2008. 23 24 NICCOLE M. ROSSY, CSR #10698 25