

## ORAL ARGUMENT NOT YET SCHEDULED

**No. 20-1145**

Consolidated with Nos. 20-1167, 20-1168, 20-1169, 20-1173,  
20-1174, 20-1176, 20-1177, and 20-1230

---

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

---

COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE, et al.,  
*Petitioners,*

v.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, et al.,  
*Respondents.*

---

**STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT PETITIONERS'  
OPPOSITION TO RESPONDENTS' MOTION FOR ABEYANCE**

---

XAVIER BECERRA  
Attorney General of California  
ROBERT W. BYRNE  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
DAVID A. ZONANA  
Acting Senior Assistant Attorney General  
GARY E. TAVETIAN  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

JESSICA BARCLAY-STROBEL  
JULIA K. FORGIE  
MEREDITH HANKINS  
MICAELA M. HARMS  
JENNIFER KALNINS TEMPLE  
CAROLYN NELSON ROWAN  
ROBERT D. SWANSON  
JONATHAN A. WIENER  
DAVID ZAFT  
M. ELAINE MECKENSTOCK  
Deputy Attorneys General  
1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612-0550  
Telephone: (510) 879-0299  
Elaine.Meckenstock@doj.ca.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of California, by and through its Governor Gavin Newsom,  
Attorney General Xavier Becerra, and the California Air Resources Board*

*Additional counsel listed in signature block*

## INTRODUCTION

State and Local Government Petitioners welcome Executive Order 13990, which directs the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to review and potentially revise the standards challenged in these consolidated cases. However, the harms resulting from these unlawfully lax standards grow larger and larger with each passing model year of vehicle sales. The sheer magnitude of these accumulating harms, which include greenhouse gas emission increases greater than the *total* emissions of many States, warrants continued judicial oversight to ensure an opportunity for resolution if Respondents' review is delayed or leaves some of these harmful standards in place. State and Local Government Petitioners therefore oppose Respondents' request for an indefinite abeyance.

State and Local Government Petitioners would not, however, oppose a six-month extension to the existing briefing schedule. Under that approach, Respondents' brief would not be due until October 15, 2021, two and a half months after Respondents anticipate completing their review. *See* ECF Doc. No. 1866329 ("Respondents' Mot.") at 5 (review to be complete by the end of July, pursuant to the Executive Order). Respondents would not need to file a brief while they are reviewing the challenged standards, thereby safeguarding the important interests in conserving Respondents' and judicial resources. And,

by keeping a briefing schedule in place, this approach would facilitate timely judicial action, if such action is necessary, thereby protecting State and Local Government Petitioners' and the public's interests in avoiding increased pollution and oil consumption. All parties would remain free to bring future motions regarding alternative procedural paths forward (including indefinite abeyance) after Respondents complete their review and issue a notice of proposed rulemaking (if they do so). Consideration of any such motions would thus be informed by critical factual information that is unavailable now, including the extent to which any proposed rulemaking addresses all the standards and harms at issue in this litigation.

## **ARGUMENT**

### **I. INDEFINITE ABEYANCE IS NOT APPROPRIATE IN THIS MATTER**

State and Local Government Petitioners recognize that abeyance is common where a change in presidential Administrations prompts reconsideration of administrative positions. But this is not a typical case.

*First*, even small delays matter here because of the magnitude of the harms involved. The national greenhouse gas emission and fuel-economy standards at issue here address vehicles, which are the largest sources of greenhouse gas pollution and the largest consumers of oil in the nation. The challenged standards substantially weakened prior law for six model years of light-duty

vehicles, resulting, among other things, in dramatically increased emissions of harmful pollutants. These harms have already begun, and they grow larger with each vehicle model year as the gap widens between the pre-existing standards (which increased in stringency by 5% each model year) and the current standards (which increase by only 1.5% each model year). *See* 85 Fed. Reg. 24,174, 24,175, 25,106 (April 30, 2020). And the vehicles sold under the current, weaker standards will continue to emit these higher levels of pollution as long as they remain in use—for periods that run years, and often decades, into the future.

Executive Order 13990, titled “Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science to Tackle the Climate Crisis,” was adopted on the first day of the new Administration in recognition of the urgency of the climate crisis. State and Local Government Petitioners fully share that sense of urgency and wholeheartedly welcome the Administration’s plans to review the current, unlawfully weak standards. But these standards will remain in place unless and until they are stayed or vacated by this Court or are replaced administratively through final agency actions. Despite State and Local Government Petitioners’ efforts to advance this litigation more quickly, one or more model years of vehicles will likely be sold under the lax current

standards.<sup>1</sup> State and Local Government Petitioners therefore oppose any motion that would unnecessarily increase the potential for further delay, and they do so for the same reason they have consistently sought to resolve this case efficiently: to limit the number of model years during which more polluting vehicle fleets can be sold. Indefinite abeyance is inappropriate in the face of long-term impacts that increase in severity with each passing model year.

*Second*, because no rulemaking proposal has issued, it is unknown which model years might be covered by any future administrative action, let alone how stringent future standards might be. As a result, it is also unknown whether a future rulemaking can adequately and timely resolve Petitioners' challenges concerning all of the model-year standards at stake here. If it does not, and judicial review remains necessary, that review should occur without further delay. *See Teledesic LLC v. FCC*, 275 F.3d 75, 82-83 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (resolving "remaining challenges" to agency action after reconsideration where Court denied abeyance during that reconsideration). State and Local

---

<sup>1</sup> Under the prior Administration, Respondents filed incomplete certified indices of their administrative records, and the efforts to identify and address the omissions delayed further progress in the case by months. *See* ECF Doc. No. 1862650 at 7-8. Respondents also requested, and the Court granted, a more extended briefing schedule than the one Petitioners sought, which was designed to allow for oral argument during this Term. ECF Doc. Nos. 1861390 at 18; 1860054 at 11867064 at 3.

Government Petitioners should not bear the burdens and attendant delays of moving to bring this matter out of abeyance, obtaining a new briefing schedule, and then finally obtaining judicial relief, should that be necessary.

The examples cited in Respondents' motion do not support a contrary conclusion. *See* Respondents' Mot. at 8-9. None of the cited cases involved multiple national standards that cause more severe harms with each passing model year where any future rulemaking may not encompass all the model-year standards at issue.<sup>2</sup> Thus, none of Respondents' cases presents circumstances analogous to those of this case: where the Agencies' reconsideration may not moot the issues presented by the litigation, even if it results in some new standards for some model years. *Cf. Am. Petroleum Inst. v. EPA*, 683 F.3d 382, 388 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (granting abeyance where "an already published proposed rule, if enacted, would dispense with the need for" judicial review). Here, the Agencies have not yet initiated new rulemakings or informed Petitioners or the public of the scope of standards they may seek to change. *See Util. Solid Waste Activities Grp. v. EPA*, 901 F.3d 414, 426 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (rejecting agency's

---

<sup>2</sup> *Union of Concerned Scientists v. NHTSA*, D.C. Cir. No. 19-1230, is also distinguishable because there the Agencies are on a tighter schedule to complete their review (by the end of April), because any resulting administrative proceedings are unlikely to involve highly technical and time-consuming rulemakings of the kind at issue here, and because that case is fully briefed, which means it can proceed to argument without further delay should it be appropriate to lift the abeyance in the future.

request for abeyance to “consider[] potential regulatory changes” where the scope of agency reconsideration might not encompass the challenged rules).

## **II. A SIX-MONTH EXTENSION TO THE BRIEFING SCHEDULE WOULD ADEQUATELY SAFEGUARD RESPONDENTS’ INTERESTS**

State and Local Government Petitioners recognize Respondents’ understandable concerns about continuing with briefing while they are reviewing the challenged standards. But those concerns can be addressed by a six-month extension to the current briefing schedule.

A six-month extension would “afford [the Agencies] the opportunity to respond to the Executive Order by reviewing the Rule in accordance with the new policies set forth in the Order,” Respondents’ Mot. at 5; “ensure due respect for the prerogative of the executive branch to reconsider the policy decisions of a prior Administration,” *id.* at 5-6; and “avoid [any risk of] filing briefs and holding oral argument in the midst of the new Administration’s review,” *id.* at 7. There would likewise be no need for the Court to engage in “unnecessary adjudication” while Respondents conduct their review. *See id.* at 5. Respondents nonetheless express concern that a six-month extension “could pose significant complications” if Respondents had to brief this case in the middle of a new rulemaking. *Id.* at 8 n.2. But, if a new rulemaking is underway by July 31, 2021, Respondents would have adequate time to seek a further

extension or an indefinite abeyance for all, or appropriate parts, of this litigation before any brief would be due.

Indeed, if a rulemaking proposal issues by the end of July, *all parties* would have sufficient time to assess that proposal and its relationship to this litigation, and seek appropriate relief from the Court, before any briefs would be due. For example, all parties would know which model years the Agencies have included in their rulemaking proposal and would also know how stringent the Agencies propose to make those revised standards. That information is highly relevant to State and Local Government Petitioners' assessment of whether they can and should pursue additional relief in this litigation, such as a stay or vacatur of the standards applicable to any model years not covered (or insufficiently covered) by the proposal. And in the event a proposal has not issued by the end of July, that information would also be highly relevant to whether and how this case should proceed to resolution. A continuance of the briefing schedule would also have the advantage over an abeyance—including one with motions to govern due in six months—of leaving a briefing schedule in place.

In sum, a six-month extension would address Respondents' concerns and minimize the risk of further delays, without transforming *Respondents'* burden to establish that this Court should forgo its obligation to adjudicate these cases into *Petitioners'* burden to lift abeyance.

## CONCLUSION

State and Local Government Petitioners respectfully request that the Court deny Respondents' motion for indefinite abeyance but would not oppose a six-month extension of the current briefing schedule.

Dated: March 1, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

XAVIER BECERRA  
Attorney General of California  
ROBERT W. BYRNE  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
DAVID A. ZONANA  
Acting Senior Assistant Attorney General  
GARY E. TAVETIAN  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

*/s/ M. Elaine Meckenstock*  
M. ELAINE MECKENSTOCK  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Attorneys for Petitioner State of California, by and  
through its Governor Gavin Newsom, Attorney  
General Xavier Becerra, and California Air  
Resources Board*

FOR THE STATE OF COLORADO

PHIL WEISER  
Colorado Attorney General

/s/ Eric R. Olson

ERIC R. OLSON  
Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General  
1300 Broadway, 10th Floor  
Denver, CO 80203  
Telephone: (720) 508-6548  
eric.olson@coag.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Colorado*

FOR THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

WILLIAM TONG  
Attorney General of Connecticut  
MATTHEW I. LEVINE  
Deputy Associate Attorney General

/s/ Scott N. Koschwitz

SCOTT N. KOSCHWITZ  
Assistant Attorney General  
165 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, CT 06106  
Telephone: (860) 808-5250  
Fax: (860) 808-5386  
Scott.Koschwitz@ct.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Connecticut*

FOR THE STATE OF DELAWARE

KATHLEEN JENNINGS  
Attorney General of the State of  
Delaware

/s/ Kayli H. Spialter

KAYLI H. SPIALTER  
CHRISTIAN WRIGHT  
Deputy Attorneys General  
Delaware Department of Justice  
820 N. French Street, 6th Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
Telephone: (302) 395-2604  
Kayli.Spialter@delaware.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Delaware*

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

KARL A. RACINE  
Attorney General for the District of  
Columbia

/s/ Loren L. AliKhan

LOREN L. ALIKHAN  
Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General for the  
District of Columbia  
400 6th Street, NW, Suite 8100  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 727-6287  
Fax: (202) 730-1864  
Loren.AliKhan@dc.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner District of Columbia*

FOR THE STATE OF HAWAII

CLARE E. CONNORS  
Attorney General

/s/ Diane K. Taira\*

DIANE K. TAIRA  
KIMBERLY T. GUIDRY  
Deputy Attorneys General  
State of Hawaii Office of the Attorney  
General  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
Telephone: (808) 587-3050  
Diane.K.Taira@Hawaii.gov

*\*Application for admission pending*

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Hawaii*

FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

KWAME RAOUL  
Attorney General of Illinois  
MATTHEW J. DUNN  
Chief, Environmental Enforcement/  
Asbestos Litigation Division  
JASON E. JAMES  
Assistant Attorney General

/s/ Daniel I. Rottenberg

DANIEL I. ROTTENBERG  
Assistant Attorney General  
69 W. Washington St., 18th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60602  
Telephone: (312) 814-3816  
DRottenberg@atg.state.il.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Illinois*

FOR THE STATE OF MAINE

AARON M. FREY  
Attorney General of Maine

/s/ Laura E. Jensen

LAURA E. JENSEN  
Assistant Attorney General  
6 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333  
Telephone: (207) 626-8868  
Fax: (207) 626-8812  
Laura.Jensen@maine.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Maine*

FOR THE STATE OF MARYLAND

BRIAN E. FROSH  
Attorney General of Maryland

/s/ Cynthia M. Weisz

CYNTHIA M. WEISZ  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
Maryland Department of the  
Environment  
1800 Washington Blvd.  
Baltimore, MD 21230  
Telephone: (410) 537-3014  
cynthia.weisz2@maryland.gov

JOHN B. HOWARD, JR.  
JOSHUA M. SEGAL  
STEVEN J. GOLDSTEIN  
Special Assistant Attorneys General  
Office of the Attorney General  
200 St. Paul Place  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
Telephone: (410) 576-6300  
jbhoward@oag.state.md.us  
jsegal@oag.state.md.us  
sgoldstein@oag.state.md.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Maryland*

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
MASSACHUSETTS

MAURA HEALEY  
Attorney General  
CHRISTOPHE COURCHESNE  
Assistant Attorney General and  
Deputy Chief  
CAROL IANCU  
Assistant Attorney General  
MEGAN M. HERZOG  
DAVID S. FRANKEL  
Special Assistant Attorneys General

*/s/ Matthew Ireland*  
MATTHEW IRELAND  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
Environmental Protection Division  
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor  
Boston, MA 02108  
Telephone: (617) 727-2200  
matthew.ireland@mass.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner Commonwealth of  
Massachusetts*

FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF  
MICHIGAN

DANA NESSEL  
Attorney General of Michigan  
*/s/ Neil D. Gordon*  
NEIL D. GORDON  
GILLIAN E. WENER  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Michigan Department of Attorney  
General  
Environment, Natural Resources  
and Agriculture Division  
P.O. Box 30755  
Lansing, MI 48909  
Telephone: (517) 335-7664  
gordonn1@michigan.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner People of the State of  
Michigan*

FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

KEITH ELLISON  
Attorney General of Minnesota

/s/ Peter N. Surdo

PETER N. SURDO  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 900  
St. Paul, MN, 55101  
Telephone: (651) 757-1061  
Peter.Surdo@ag.state.mn.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Minnesota*

FOR THE STATE OF NEVADA

AARON D. FORD  
Attorney General of Nevada

/s/ Heidi Parry Stern

HEIDI PARRY STERN  
Solicitor General  
DANIEL P. NUBEL  
Deputy Attorney General  
Office of the Nevada Attorney General  
100 N. Carson Street  
Carson City, NV 89701  
HStern@ag.nv.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Nevada*

FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

GURBIR S. GREWAL  
Attorney General of New Jersey

/s/ Lisa Morelli

LISA MORELLI  
Deputy Attorney General  
25 Market St., PO Box 093  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0093  
Telephone: (609) 376-2745  
Fax: (609) 341-5031  
lisa.morelli@law.njoag.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New Jersey*

FOR THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

HECTOR BALDERAS  
Attorney General of New Mexico

/s/ William Grantham

WILLIAM GRANTHAM  
Assistant Attorney General  
State of New Mexico Office of the  
Attorney General  
Consumer & Environmental Protection  
Division  
201 Third Street NW, Suite 300  
Albuquerque, NM 87102  
Telephone: (505) 717-3520  
wgrantham@nmag.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New Mexico*

## FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK

LETTIA JAMES

Attorney General of New York

STEVEN C. WU

Deputy Solicitor General

YUEH-RU CHU

Chief, Affirmative Litigation Section

Environmental Protection Bureau

AUSTIN THOMPSON

Assistant Attorney General

/s/ Gavin G. McCabe

GAVIN G. MCCABE

Assistant Attorney General

28 Liberty Street, 19th Floor

New York, NY 10005

Telephone: (212) 416-8469

gavin.mccabe@ag.ny.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New York*

## FOR THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

JOSHUA H. STEIN

Attorney General

DANIEL S. HIRSCHMAN

Senior Deputy Attorney General

FRANCISCO BENZONI

Special Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Asher P. Spiller

ASHER P. SPILLER

TAYLOR CRABTREE

Assistant Attorneys General

North Carolina Department of Justice

P.O. Box 629

Raleigh, NC 27602

Telephone: (919) 716-6400

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of North Carolina*

FOR THE STATE OF OREGON

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM  
Attorney General of Oregon

/s/ Paul Garrahan

PAUL GARRAHAN  
Attorney-in-Charge  
STEVE NOVICK  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
Natural Resources Section  
Oregon Department of Justice  
1162 Court Street NE  
Salem, OR 97301-4096  
Telephone: (503) 947-4593  
Paul.Garrahan@doj.state.or.us  
Steve.Novick@doj.state.or.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Oregon*

FOR THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

PETER F. NERONHA  
Attorney General of Rhode Island

/s/ Gregory S. Schultz

GREGORY S. SCHULTZ  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
Office of Attorney General  
150 South Main Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
Telephone: (401) 274-4400  
gschultz@riag.ri.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Rhode Island*

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

JOSH SHAPIRO  
Attorney General of Pennsylvania  
MICHAEL J. FISCHER  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
JACOB B. BOYER  
Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Ann R. Johnston

ANN R. JOHNSTON  
Senior Deputy Attorney General  
Office of Attorney General  
1600 Arch St. Suite 300  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 560-2171  
ajohnston@attorneygeneral.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner Commonwealth of  
Pennsylvania*

FOR THE STATE OF VERMONT

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.  
Attorney General

/s/ Nicholas F. Persampieri

NICHOLAS F. PERSAMPIERI  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609  
Telephone: (802) 828-3171  
nick.persampieri@vermont.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Vermont*

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

MARK R. HERRING

Attorney General

PAUL KUGELMAN, JR.

Senior Assistant Attorney General

Chief, Environmental Section

/s/ Caitlin C. G. O'Dwyer

CAITLIN C. G. O'DWYER

Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General

Commonwealth of Virginia

202 North 9th Street

Richmond, VA 23219

Telephone: (804) 786-1780

godwyer@oag.state.va.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner Commonwealth of  
Virginia*

FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

ROBERT W. FERGUSON

Attorney General

/s/ Emily C. Nelson

EMILY C. NELSON

Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General

P.O. Box 40117

Olympia, WA 98504

Telephone: (360) 586-4607

emily.nelson@atg.wa.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Washington*

FOR THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

JOSHUA L. KAUL  
Attorney General of Wisconsin

/s/ Jennifer L. Vandermeuse

JENNIFER L. VANDERMEUSE  
GABE JOHNSON-KARP  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
Post Office Box 7857  
Madison, WI 53702-7857  
Telephone: (608) 266-7741 (JLV)  
(608) 267-8904 (GJK)  
Fax: (608) 267-2223  
vandermeusejl@doj.state.wi.us  
johnsonkarp@doj.state.wi.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Wisconsin*

FOR THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

MICHAEL N. FEUER  
Los Angeles City Attorney  
MICHAEL J. BOSTROM  
Assistant City Attorney

/s/ Michael J. Bostrom

MICHAEL J. BOSTROM  
Assistant City Attorney  
200 N. Spring Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Telephone: (213) 978-1867  
Fax: (213) 978-2286  
Michael.Bostrom@lacity.org

*Attorneys for Petitioner City of Los Angeles*

FOR THE CITY OF NEW YORK

JAMES E. JOHNSON  
New York City Corporation Counsel  
CHRISTOPHER G. KING  
ALICE R. BAKER  
Senior Counsel  
SHIVA PRAKASH  
Assistant Corporation Counsel

/s/ Christopher G. King  
CHRISTOPHER G. KING  
Senior Counsel  
New York City Law Department  
100 Church Street  
New York, New York  
Telephone: (212) 356-2074  
Fax: (212) 356-2084  
cking@law.nyc.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner City of New York*

FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER

KRISTIN M. BRONSON  
City Attorney  
EDWARD J. GORMAN  
LINDSAY S. CARDER  
Assistant City Attorneys

/s/ Edward J. Gorman  
EDWARD J. GORMAN  
Assistant City Attorney  
Denver City Attorney's Office  
201 W. Colfax Avenue, Dept. 1207  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Telephone: (720) 913-3275  
Edward.Gorman@denvergov.org

*Attorneys for Petitioner City and County of  
Denver*

FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
FRANCISCO

DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney  
ROBB W. KAPLA  
Deputy City Attorney

/s/ Robb W. Kapla

ROBB W. KAPLA  
Deputy City Attorney  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, California 94102-4602  
Telephone: (415) 554-4746  
Fax: (415) 554-4715  
Robb.Kapla@sfcityatty.org

*Attorneys for Petitioner City and County of San  
Francisco*

FOR THE BAY AREA AIR QUALITY  
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

/s/ Brian C. Bungler

BRIAN C. BUNGER, District Counsel  
RANDI LEIGH WALLACH  
Bay Area Air Quality Mgmt. District  
375 Beale Street, Suite 600  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 749-4920  
Fax: (415) 749-5103  
BBunger@baaqmd.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner Bay Area Air Quality  
Management District*

FOR THE SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN  
AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

*/s/ Kathrine Pittard*

KATHRINE PITTARD, District  
Counsel

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality  
Mgmt. District

777 12th Street

Sacramento, CA 95819

Telephone: (916) 874-4907

Fax: (916) 874-4899

KPittard@airquality.org

*Attorney for Petitioner Sacramento Metropolitan  
Air Quality Management District*

FOR THE SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY  
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

BARBARA BAIRD

Chief Deputy Counsel

*/s/ Brian Tomasovic*

BRIAN TOMASOVIC

KATHRYN ROBERTS

South Coast Air Quality Mgmt. District

21865 Copley Dr., Diamond Bar, CA  
91765

Telephone: (909) 396-3400

Fax: (909) 396-2961

BTomasovic@aqmd.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner South Coast Air Quality  
Management District*

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that the foregoing opposition complies with the type-volume limitations of the applicable rules. According to Microsoft Word, the non-exempt portions of the opposition contain 1,631 words. I further certify that this brief complies with the typeface requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(a)(6) because this document has been prepared in a proportionally spaced, 14-point typeface (Garamond).

*/s/ M. Elaine Meckenstock*

M. ELAINE MECKENSTOCK

Deputy Attorney General

1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor

Oakland, CA 94612

Telephone: (510) 879-0299

Fax: (510) 622-2270

[Elaine.Meckenstock@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Elaine.Meckenstock@doj.ca.gov)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on March 1, 2021, I electronically filed the foregoing opposition with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit via the CM/ECF system. All parties that are represented by counsel registered as CM/ECF users will be served by that system. I further certify that service will be accomplished via email for the following participant:

Diane K. Taira  
State of Hawaii  
Dept. of the Attorney General  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
[Diane.K.Taira@hawaii.gov](mailto:Diane.K.Taira@hawaii.gov)

*/s/ M. Elaine Meckenstock*  
M. ELAINE MECKENSTOCK  
Deputy Attorney General  
1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (510) 879-0299  
Fax: (510) 622-2270  
[Elaine.Meckenstock@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Elaine.Meckenstock@doj.ca.gov)