

1  
2  
3  
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
5 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
6  
7

8 WILDEARTH GUARDIANS,

9 Plaintiff,

10 vs.

11  
12 LISA P. JACKSON, in her official capacity as  
13 Administrator of the United States  
14 Environmental Protection Agency,

15 Defendant.  
16

**Case No.: 11-CV-5651 YGR  
and Consolidated Case No.: 11-CV-05694  
YGR**

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART PLAINTIFFS’  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT;  
GRANTING DEFENDANT’S CROSS-MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; VACATING CASE  
MANAGEMENT AND OTHER HEARING DATES**

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

17 Plaintiffs WildEarth Guardians, Midwest Environmental Defense Center, and Sierra Club  
18 (“Plaintiffs”) moved for summary judgment on all claims in both of these consolidated cases.<sup>1</sup>

19 Defendant Lisa Jackson, in her official capacity as Administrator of the United States  
20 Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) filed a cross-motion for summary judgment, seeking  
21 dismissal of Plaintiffs’ claims as they relate to states that have since complied with statutory  
22 requirements to submit a state implementation plan.  
23

24 After consideration of the evidence and arguments submitted by the parties, and in light of  
25

26 <sup>1</sup> On May 7, 2012, the Court granted EPA’s Motion to Dismiss Mandatory Duty Claims as  
27 to Claim Two of MidWest Environmental Defense Center and Sierra Club’s Second Amended  
28 Complaint and Claim One of WildEarth Guardians’ Complaint. (Dkt. No. 40.) Partial judgment  
was issued on these claims on July 12, 2012. (Dkt. No. 51.) As a result, Plaintiffs’ Motion for  
Summary Judgment is moot with respect to these claims.

1 the parties' substantial agreement as to the findings herein, the Court finds that there is no triable  
2 issue of material fact and that Plaintiffs are entitled to judgment as a matter of law for the reasons  
3 stated herein.

4 **Mandatory Duty to Make Findings Of Failure to Submit Infrastructure SIPs**

5 1. EPA promulgated a National Ambient Air Quality Standard ("NAAQS") for ozone on  
6 March 12, 2008. 73 Fed. Reg. 16436 (Mar. 27, 2008).

7  
8 2. All States, as that term is defined in 42 U.S.C. § 7602(d), are required to submit the  
9 listed elements of State Implementation Plans ("SIPs") pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2), or  
10 Infrastructure SIPs, for the 2008 ozone NAAQS by March 12, 2011. 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(1).

11 3. None of the 40 States<sup>2</sup> listed below have submitted Infrastructure SIPs for the 2008  
12 ozone NAAQS:

- 13 a. Arizona, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.' Stmt. Mat. Facts Supp.  
14 Summ. J. ["Pls.' Fact"], Dkt. No. 37, Fact 3.)
- 15 b. Arkansas, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.' Fact 4.)
- 16 c. California, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.' Fact 5.)
- 17 d. Colorado, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.' Fact 6.)
- 18 e. Connecticut, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.' Fact 7.)
- 19 f. District of Columbia, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.' Fact 9.)
- 20 g. Hawaii, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.' Fact 10.)
- 21 h. Illinois, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.' Fact 12.)
- 22 i. Iowa, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.' Fact 14.)
- 23 j. Kansas, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.' Fact 15.)

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 <sup>2</sup> The Clean Air Act defines "State" to include the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. *See See* 42 U.S.C. § 7602(d).

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  
28

- k. Louisiana, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 16.)
- l. Maine, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 17.)
- m. Maryland, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 18.)
- n. Massachusetts, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 19.)
- o. Michigan, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 20.)
- p. Minnesota, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 21.)
- q. Missouri, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 22.)
- r. Montana, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 23.)
- s. Nebraska, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 24.)
- t. Nevada, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 25.)
- u. New Hampshire, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 26.)
- v. New Jersey, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 27.)
- w. New Mexico, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 28.)
- x. New York, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 29.)
- y. North Carolina, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 30.)
- z. North Dakota, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 31.)
- aa. Ohio, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 32.)
- bb. Oklahoma, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 33.)
- cc. Pennsylvania, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 35.)
- dd. Puerto Rico, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 36.)
- ee. Rhode Island, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 37.)
- ff. South Dakota, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 38.)
- gg. Texas, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 39.)

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  
28

hh. Utah, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 40.)

ii. Vermont, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 41.)

jj. Virginia, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 42.)

kk. Washington, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 43.)

ll. West Virginia, Sections 110(a)(2)(D)(i). (Pls.’ Fact 44.)

mm. Wisconsin, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 45.)

nn. Wyoming, Sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(H), (J)-(M). (Pls.’ Fact 46.)

4. EPA did not issue findings of failure to submit for these states by the September 12, 2011 deadline in violation of its mandatory duty. (Pls.’ Fact 47.)

5. Subsequent to the filing of this litigation, Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, and Oregon submitted Infrastructure SIPs to EPA intended to meet the infrastructure requirements for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. (Def.’s Stmt. Mat. Facts Supp. Summ. J. [“Def.’s Fact”] 1-4, Dkt. No. 44-3.)

6. Subsequent to the filing of this litigation, West Virginia submitted to EPA a SIP intended to meet the infrastructure requirements addressing CAA sections 110(a)(2)(A)-(C), (D)(i)(II), (D)(ii), (E)-(H), and (K)-(M) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. (Def.’s Fact 5.)

**Failure to Take Final Action on Infrastructure SIPs Submitted by Kentucky and Tennessee**

7. Kentucky submitted an Infrastructure SIP for the 2008 ozone NAAQS on September 8, 2009. (Pls.’ Fact 74.)

8. Kentucky’s submittal was deemed administratively complete on March 8, 2010. (Pls.’ Fact 75.)

9. EPA was required to take final action on Kentucky’s submittal no later than March 8, 2011, by approving in full, disapproving in full, or approving in part and disapproving in part. 42 U.S.C. § 7410(k)(2) and (3).



1 2008 ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard, by **no later than January 4, 2013**. Defendant  
2 shall forward the final signed rule or rules **within three working days** of signing to the Office of  
3 the Federal Register for review and publication.

4 D. Defendant shall sign a final rule or rules taking final action on the 2008 ozone NAAQS  
5 Infrastructure SIP submittals listed below by approving in full, disapproving in full, or approving in  
6 part and disapproving in part, by **no later than January 4, 2013**. Defendant shall forward the final  
7 signed rule or rules **within three working days** of signing to the Office of the Federal Register for  
8 review and publication.

9  
10 i. Kentucky submittal dated September 8, 2009.

11 ii. Tennessee submittal dated October 19, 2009.

12  
13 E. Defendant's cross-motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiffs' claims  
14 regarding failure to submit an Infrastructure SIP for the 2008 ozone NAAQS with respect to the  
15 states identified in paragraphs 5 and 6. Because those states have submitted Infrastructure SIPs  
16 subsequent to the filing of these actions, Plaintiffs' claims as to these states are **DISMISSED** as moot.


17  
18 The parties shall prepare a proposed form of judgment on the claims herein and submit it to  
19 the Court **within three days** of entry of this Order.

20 All other dates, including the Case Management Conference currently set for October 22,  
21 2012, are **VACATED**.

22 This Order terminates Docket Nos. 36 and 44.

23  
24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 **10/17/12**

26   
27 YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS  
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE