1	SAM HIRSCH		
2	Acting Assistant Attorney General		
2	Environment & Natural Resources Division		
3	United States Department of Justice		
4	LESLIE M. HILL (D.C. Bar No. 476008) Leslie.Hill@usdoj.gov		
7	Environmental Defense Section		
5	601 D Street N.W., Suite 8000		
6	Washington D.C. 20004		
	Telephone (202) 514-0375		
7	Facsimile (202) 514-8865		
8	Attorneys for Defendant		
9	POREDT LIKELLEY Admitted Dro Hac Vice		
10	ROBERT UKEILEY, Admitted Pro Hac Vice Law Office of Robert Ukeiley		
11	255 Mountain Meadows Road		
11	Boulder, CO 80302		
12	Telephone: 303-442-4033		
13	rukeiley@igc.org		
14	[additional attorney for Plaintiff included in signature block]		
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
16	IN THE UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT	
17	FOR THE NORTHERN DIS	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
18	OAKLAND DIVISION		
19			
1)			
20	CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL		
21	DIVERSITY,	Case No. 4:13-cv-5142-SBA	
22		CONSENT DECREE	
23	Plaintiff,		
24	V.		
	GINA McCARTHY, in her official capacity		
25	as the Administrator of the United States		
26	Environmental Protection Agency,		
27	Defendant		
	Defendant.		
28			

WHEREAS, on November 5, 2013, Plaintiff Center for Biological Diversity ("Plaintiff" or "CBD") filed the above-captioned matter against Gina McCarthy, in her official capacity as Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (hereinafter "EPA" or "Defendant");

WHEREAS, Plaintiff filed its first amended complaint (Dkt. No. 20) on January 28, 2014, and its second amended complaint (Dkt. No.22) on January 30, 2014;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff alleges that EPA has failed to undertake certain non-discretionary duties under the Clean Air Act ("CAA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401-7671q, and that such alleged failure is actionable under section 304(a)(2) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7604(a)(2);

WHEREAS, in Claim 1, Plaintiff alleges that EPA has failed to perform a duty mandated by CAA section 110(k)(1)(B), 42 U.S.C. § 7410(k)(1)(B), to find that certain states failed to submit nonattainment state implementation plans ("SIPs") for the following areas designated nonattainment for the 2006 fine particulate matter, or PM<sub>2.5</sub>, National Ambient Air Quality Standard ("NAAQS"), *see* 2nd Am. Compl. ¶ 1 (Dkt. No. 22):

AREA	STATE
Imperial County	California
Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley except nonattainment New	Pennsylvania
Source Review element	
Milwaukee-Racine except nonattainment New Source	Wisconsin
Review and emission inventories elements	
Tacoma Nonattainment New Source Review element	Washington

WHEREAS, EPA finalized a rule, *Identification of Nonattainment Classification* and Deadlines for Submission of State Implementation Plan (SIP) Provisions for the 1997 Fine Particle (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS, 79 Fed. Reg. 31,566 (June 2, 2014), which establishes a deadline of December

31, 2014, by which states must submit SIPs complying with Subpart 4 of Part D, title I of the CAA requirements;

WHEREAS, EPA believes issuance of the above-mentioned final rule renders Claim 1 therefore moot;

WHEREAS, EPA also promulgated a final rule redesignating the Milwaukee-Racine nonattainment area to attainment for the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS, rendering Claim 1 moot as to the Milwaukee-Racine area, *Redesignation of the Milwaukee-Racine 2006 24-Hour Fine Particle Nonattainment Area to Attainment*, 79 Fed. Reg. 22,415 (Apr. 22, 2014);

WHEREAS, in Claim 2, Plaintiff alleges that EPA has failed to perform a duty mandated by CAA sections 110(k)(2)-(4), 42 U.S.C. §§ 7410(k)(2)-(4), to take final action to approve or disapprove, in whole or in part, certain 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS nonattainment SIP submissions addressing nonattainment new source review from states for the five areas listed below, *see* 2nd Am. Compl. ¶ 1 (Dkt. No. 22):

AREA/STATE	ELEMENT
Los Angeles – South Coast, California	Non-Attainment
	New Source Review
Charleston, West Virginia	Non-Attainment
	New Source Review
Steubenville, Ohio-Weirton, West Virginia	Non-Attainment
	New Source Review
San Joaquin Valley, California	Non-Attainment
	New Source Review
Fairbanks, Alaska	Non-Attainment
	New Source Review;

WHEREAS, on August 11, 2014, EPA took final action approving California's SIP revision addressing nonattainment new source review for 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS for the

1		S
2		C
3		R
4		a
5		
6		a
7		N
8		2
9		((
10		P
11		a
12		2
13		
14		a
15		re
16		re
17		
18		(4
19		p
20		
21		a
22		n
23		
	П	

San Joaquin Valley, Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans, State of
California, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, New Source
Review, 79 Fed. Reg. 55,637 (Sept. 17, 2014), and therefore Claim 2 is moot as to that
area.

WHEREAS, EPA took final action to redesignate two of the five nonattainment areas to attainment, Approval of the Redesignation Requests and the Associated Maintenance Plans of the Charleston Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual and the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards, 79 Fed. Reg. 17,884 (Mar. 31, 2014) (Charleston, West Virginia); Approval of Redesignation Requests of the West Virginia Portion of the Steubenville-Weirton, OH-WV Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards, 79 Fed. Reg. 15,019 (Mar. 18, 2014) (Stuebenville, Ohio-Weirton, West Virginia);

WHERAS, as a result of the redesignation of the Charleston, West Virginia area and the Steubenville, Ohio-Weirton, West Virginia area, West Virginia is no longer required to submit nonattainment SIPs addressing nonattainment new source review with respect to these areas;

WHEREAS, EPA has not taken final action pursuant to CAA sections 110(k)(2)-(4), 42 U.S.C. §§ 7410(k)(2)-(4), to approve or disapprove, in whole or in part, certain plan submissions, with respect to the remaining two nonattainment areas;

WHEREAS, the relief requested in the Second Amended Complaint includes, among other things, an order from this Court to establish a date certain by which EPA must fulfill its obligations for both Claims 1 and 2;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff and EPA have agreed to a settlement of this action without admission of any issue of fact or law, except as expressly provided herein;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff and EPA, by entering into this Consent Decree, do not waive or limit any claim, remedy, or defense, on any grounds, related to any final EPA action;

28

24

25

26

27

WHEREAS, Plaintiff and EPA consider this Consent Decree to be an adequate and equitable resolution of all the claims in this matter and therefore wish to effectuate a settlement;

WHEREAS, it is in the interest of the public, Plaintiff Center for Biological Diversity, Defendant EPA, and judicial economy to resolve this matter without protracted litigation;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff and EPA agree that this Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to the citizen suit provision in CAA section 304(a)(2), 42 U.S.C. § 7604(a)(2), and that venue is proper in the Northern District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) and N.D. Cal. Civ. Local Rule 3-2(c)-(d);

WHEREAS, the Court, by entering this Consent Decree, finds that the Consent Decree is fair, reasonable, in the public interest, and consistent with the Clean Air Act;

NOW THEREFORE, before the taking of testimony, without trial or determination of any issues of fact or law, and upon the consent of Plaintiff Center for Biological Diversity and Defendant EPA, it is hereby ordered, adjudged and decreed that:

- 1. The appropriate EPA official shall sign a notice of final rulemaking to approve, disapprove, or approve in part and disapprove in part, certain plans pursuant to sections 110(k)(2)-(4) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7410(k)(2)-(4), no later than the date indicated below for the following areas designated nonattainment for the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS:
  - a. Los Angeles South Coast, California area by April 15, 2015; and
  - b. Fairbanks, Alaska area by December 31, 2014.
- 2. If either California or Alaska withdraws its above-listed submittal, then EPA's obligation to take the action required by Paragraph 1 is automatically terminated.
- 3. EPA shall, within 15 days of signature, deliver notice of each action taken pursuant to paragraph 1 of this Consent Decree to the Office of the Federal Register for review and publication.

- 4. After EPA has completed the actions set forth in Paragraph 1 of this Consent Decree and after notice of each final action required by paragraph 1 has been published in the Federal Register and the issue of costs of litigation, including attorneys fees has been resolved, EPA may move to have this Decree terminated and the action dismissed. Plaintiff shall have fourteen (14) days in which to respond to such a motion, unless the parties stipulate to a longer time for Plaintiff to respond.
- 5. The deadlines established by this Consent Decree may be extended (a) by written stipulation of Plaintiff and EPA with notice to the Court, or (b) by the Court upon motion of EPA for good cause shown pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and upon consideration of any response by Plaintiff and any reply by EPA.
- 6. If a lapse in appropriations occurs within one hundred and twenty (120) days prior to the deadline in Paragraph 1 in this Decree, that deadline shall be extended automatically one day for each day of the lapse in appropriations.
- 7. Plaintiff and EPA agree that this Consent Decree shall constitute a complete and final settlement of all claims that Plaintiff has asserted against the United States, including EPA, under any provision of law in connection with *Center for Biological Diversity v. McCarthy*, Case No. 4:13-cv-5142-SBA (N.D. Cal.). The Center for Biological Diversity therefore discharges and covenants not to sue the United States, including EPA, for any such claims.
- 8. In the event of a dispute between Plaintiff and EPA concerning the interpretation or implementation of any aspect of this Consent Decree, the disputing party shall provide the other party with a written notice outlining the nature of the dispute and requesting informal negotiations. These parties shall meet and confer in order to attempt to resolve the dispute. If these parties are unable to resolve the dispute within ten (10) business days after receipt of the notice, either party may petition the Court to resolve the dispute.
- 9. No motion seeking to enforce this Consent Decree or for contempt of Court shall be properly filed unless the procedure set forth in Paragraph 8 has been followed,

and the non-moving party has been provided with written notice at least ten (10) business days before the filing of such motion.

- 10. The deadline for filing a motion for costs of litigation (including attorney fees) for activities performed prior to entry of the Consent Decree is hereby extended until ninety (90) days after this Consent Decree is entered by the Court. During this period, the Parties shall seek to resolve informally any claim for costs of litigation (including attorney fees), and if they cannot, the Center for Biological Diversity will file a motion for costs of litigation (including attorney fees) or a stipulation or motion to extend the deadline to file such a motion. EPA reserves the right to oppose any such request.
- 11. This Court shall retain jurisdiction over this matter to enforce the terms of this Consent Decree and to consider any requests for costs of litigation, including attorney fees.
- 12. Nothing in the terms of this Consent Decree shall be construed (a) to confer upon this Court jurisdiction to review any issues that are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States Courts of Appeals under CAA section 307(b)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 7607(b)(1), including final action take pursuant to section 110(k) of the CAA, 42 U.S.C. § 7410(k), approving, disapproving, or approving in part and disapproving in part a SIP submittal or (b) to waive any claims, remedies, or defenses that the parties may have under CAA section 307(b)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 7607(b)(1).
- 13. Nothing in this Consent Decree shall be construed to limit or modify any discretion accorded EPA by the Clean Air Act or by general principles of administrative law in taking the actions which are the subject of this Consent Decree, including the discretion to alter, amend, or revise any final actions promulgated pursuant to this Consent Decree. EPA's obligation to perform each action specified in this Consent Decree does not constitute a limitation or modification of EPA's discretion within the meaning of this paragraph.

- 14. Except as expressly provided herein, nothing in this Consent Decree shall be construed as an admission of any issue of fact or law nor to waive or limit any claim, remedy, or defense, on any grounds, related to any final action EPA takes with respect to the actions addressed in this Consent Decree.
- 15. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek additional costs of litigation, including reasonable attorney fees, incurred subsequent to entry of this Consent Decree and arising from Plaintiff's need to enforce or defend against efforts to modify its terms or the underlying schedule outlined herein, or for any other unforeseen continuation of this action. EPA reserves the right to oppose any such request for additional costs of litigation, including reasonable attorney fees.
- 16. It is hereby expressly understood and agreed that this Consent Decree was jointly drafted by Plaintiff and EPA. Accordingly, the parties hereby agree that any and all rules of construction to the effect that ambiguity is construed against the drafting party shall be inapplicable in any dispute concerning the terms, meaning, or interpretation of this Consent Decree.
- 17. The parties agree and acknowledge that before this Consent Decree can be finalized and entered by the Court, EPA must provide notice of this Consent Decree in the Federal Register and an opportunity for public comment pursuant to CAA section 113(g), 42 U.S.C. § 7413(g). After this Consent Decree has undergone notice and comment, the Administrator and/or the Attorney General, as appropriate, shall promptly consider any written comments in determining whether to withdraw or withhold their consent to the Consent Decree, in accordance with CAA section 113(g). If the Administrator and/or the Attorney General do not elect to withdraw or withhold consent, EPA shall promptly file a motion that requests that the Court enter this Consent Decree.
- 18. Any notices required or provided for by this Consent Decree shall be in writing, via electronic mail or other means, and sent to the following (or to any new address of counsel as filed and listed in the docket of the above-captioned matter, at a future date):

1	1 For Plaintiff Center for Biological I	Diversity:	
2	2 Rober	rt Ukeiley	
3	J 11	Office of Robert Ukeiley Iountain Meadows Road	
4	4   Bould	ler, CO 80302	
5	5 II	03-442-4033 l: rukeiley@igc.org	
6	6		
7	11	han Evans (Cal. Bar #247376) r for Biological Diversity	
8	Q II	California St., Suite 600 Francisco, CA 94104	
9	9    Tel. 4	15-436-9682 x318	
10		: jevans@biologicaldiversity.org	
11	1 For Defendant EPA: Leslie	e M. Hill	
12	3 II	Department of Justice onment & Natural Resources Division	
13	Envir	onmental Defense Section	
14	11	O Street N.W., Suite 8000 ington D.C. 20004	
15	£ 11	202) 514-0375 l: Leslie.Hill@usdoj.gov	
16		Lesne.Time usuoj.gov	
17	19. EPA and Plaintiff recognize an	d acknowledge that the obligations imposed	
18	8 upon EPA under this Consent Decree can o	upon EPA under this Consent Decree can only be undertaken using appropriated funds	
19	legally available for such purpose. No prov	legally available for such purpose. No provision of this Consent Decree shall be	
20	interpreted as or constitute a commitment of	interpreted as or constitute a commitment or requirement that the United States obligate	
21	or pay funds in contravention of the Anti-Deficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. § 1341, or any other		
22	applicable provision of law.		
23	20. If for any reason the Court show	ald decline to approve this Consent Decree in	
24	the form presented, this agreement is voida	the form presented, this agreement is voidable at the sole discretion of either party and	
25	the terms of the proposed Consent Decree 1	the terms of the proposed Consent Decree may not be used as evidence in any litigation	
26	between the parties.		
27			
28			

## Case4:13-cv-05142-SBA Document40 Filed10/14/14 Page10 of 11

1	21. The undersigned representatives of Plaintiff Center for Biological Diversity	
2	and Defendant EPA certify that they are fully authorized by the party they represent to	
3	consent to the Court's entry of the terms and conditions of this Decree.	
4		
5	SO ORDERED on this 14th day of October, 2014.	
6	SO ORDERED on this 14th day of October, 2014.	
7		
8	SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

## Case4:13-cv-05142-SBA Document40 Filed10/14/14 Page11 of 11

1	COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF:	
2		
3		/s/ Robert Ukeiley (email authorization 9/26/14)
		Robert Ukeiley, Admitted Pro Hac Vice
4		Law Office of Robert Ukeiley
5		255 Mountain Meadows Road
3		Boulder, CO 80302
6		Tel: 303-442-4033
7		Email: rukeiley@igc.org
		Jonathan Evans (Cal. Bar #247376)
8		Center for Biological Diversity
9		351 California St., Suite 600
		San Francisco, CA 94104
10		Phone: 415-436-9682 x318
		Fax: 415-436-9683
11		email: jevans@biologicaldiversity.org
12		eman. jevans@biologicalarversity.org
13		Attorneys for Plaintiff Center for Biological
		Diversity
14		
15	COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT:	SAM HIRSCH
16		Acting Assistant Attorney General
17		Environment & Natural Resources Division
18		/s/ Leslie M. Hill
19		LESLIE M. HILL (D.C. Bar No. 476008)
1)		Environmental Defense Section
20		601 D Street N.W., Suite 8000
21		Washington D.C. 20004
_1		Tel. (202) 514-0375
22		Email: Leslie.Hill@usdoj.gov
23		Attorneys for Defendant EPA
24	Of counsel:	
25	Caralania II	
26	Stephanie Hogan Karen Bennett Bianco	
27	Office of General Counsel	
	U.S. Environmental Protection Age	ency
28		