

Case No. 18-1192,
consolidated with No. **18-1190**

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

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, by and through XAVIER BECERRA,
ATTORNEY GENERAL and CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD,
STATE OF CONNECTICUT, STATE OF DELAWARE, STATE OF
ILLINOIS, STATE OF MAINE, STATE OF MARYLAND, by and
through BRIAN FROSH, ATTORNEY GENERAL and MARYLAND
DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT, COMMONWEALTH OF
MASSACHUSETTS, STATE OF MINNESOTA, by and through
MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY, STATE OF NEW
JERSEY, STATE OF NEW MEXICO, STATE OF NEW YORK, STATE
OF NORTH CAROLINA, STATE OF OREGON, COMMONWEALTH
OF PENNSYLVANIA, by and through JOSH SHAPIRO, ATTORNEY
GENERAL and PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,
STATE OF VERMONT, STATE OF WASHINGTON, and DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA

Petitioners,

v.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, and
ANDREW K. WHEELER, Acting Administrator, United States
Environmental Protection Agency,

Respondents.

**STATE PETITIONERS' OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS
AND REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUMMARY DISPOSITION**

(Counsel listed on Signature Pages)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--------------------|-------------|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| ARGUMENT | 2 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 4 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| CASES | |
| <i>Action on Smoking & Health v. Civil Aeronautics Bd.</i> , 713 F.2d 795 (D.C. Cir. 1983)..... | 3 |
| <i>Alaska v. USDA</i> , 772 F.3d 899 (D.C. Cir. 2014)..... | 4 |
| <i>Friends of the Earth v. Laidlaw Envtl. Servs.</i> , 528 U.S. 167 (2000)..... | 3 |
| <i>Heckler v. Chaney</i> , 470 U.S. 821 (1985)..... | 2, 3 |
| <i>OSG Bulk Ships, Inc. v. United States</i> , 132 F.3d 808 (D.C. Cir. 1998)..... | 2 |
| STATUTES | |
| 42 U.S.C. § 7607(b)(1) | 4 |

INTRODUCTION

This Court now has pending before it: State Petitioners' Emergency Motion for Summary Vacatur, or in the Alternative, for Stay Pending Judicial Review of EPA's "Conditional No Action Assurance Regarding Small Manufacturers of Glider Vehicles" ("EPA's Action" or "the EPA Memo"); and EPA's motion to dismiss this case as moot based on its withdrawal of the EPA Memo. EPA has offered no substantive opposition to State Petitioners' request for summary disposition of the merits of this case and the Court can, and should, grant State Petitioners' request.¹

As to EPA's motion, EPA has not carried its heavy burden to demonstrate that this case should be dismissed as moot. Unless the EPA memo is invalidated, there is a possibility it could be reinstated, temporarily or permanently, in the context of a challenge to EPA's notice withdrawing the EPA Memo. An order from this Court declaring EPA's Action invalid would eliminate this possibility and would confirm that EPA cannot disregard legislative direction or abdicate its statutory responsibilities.

¹ In light of the withdrawal of the EPA Memo, there is no longer a need for this Court to extend its administrative stay of EPA's Action into a stay pending judicial review. Accordingly, State Petitioners withdraw their alternative motion for a stay.

ARGUMENT

State Petitioners' request for summary disposition of the merits is substantively unopposed, and should be granted. As State Petitioners argued in their moving papers, summary disposition is warranted because EPA's Action constitutes an unlawful suspension of the regulatory limitations on glider vehicle production, which EPA attempted to accomplish without undertaking the required notice and comment process, and without the evaluation of the Action's substantial public-health and air-quality impacts that would be necessary to any reasoned decision-making process. As State Petitioners also argued, EPA's Action is subject to review as an unlawful modification of a duly promulgated regulation and as an "abdication of [EPA's] statutory responsibilities." *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 833 n. 4 (1985); *OSG Bulk Ships, Inc. v. United States*, 132 F.3d 808, 812 (D.C. Cir. 1998).

In its response to State Petitioners' motion, EPA does not dispute that its Action is reviewable, that its Action is unlawful, or that its Action would cause tremendous harms to the public and the environment, in contravention of the Clean Air Act. Although EPA's withdrawal notice did not go so far as to acknowledge the illegality of EPA's Action, EPA now has conceded for purposes of this litigation that it is not "free to disregard legislative

direction in the statutory scheme that [EPA] administers,” simply because the Clean Air Act affords it some enforcement discretion. *Heckler*, 470 U.S. at 833. EPA’s errors are clear and undisputed, and summary disposition of this case is proper.

Instead of defending its Action, EPA argues that this case is moot and moves to dismiss it on that basis. *See* EPA Mot. 6-8. But EPA has not carried the “heavy burden” of demonstrating mootness. *Friends of the Earth v. Laidlaw Envtl. Servs.*, 528 U.S. 167, 189 (2000). In its motion, EPA points only to its withdrawal of the Memo, made in response to the present litigation, and to its pledge, made in connection with that withdrawal, not to reinstate the Memo. *See* EPA Mot. at 6-8; ECF No. 1743093 at 12-13 (withdrawal notice). While State Petitioners welcome these developments, there remains a risk that, absent invalidation by this Court, the Memo could go back into effect. Specifically, the glider manufacturers—who have so determinedly advocated against regulatory production limits—may challenge EPA’s withdrawal of the Memo and argue that, if their challenge is successful, EPA’s Memo should come back into effect. *Cf. Action on Smoking & Health v. Civil Aeronautics Bd.*, 713 F.2d 795, 797 (D.C. Cir. 1983) (“by vacating or rescinding the rescissions proposed by [CAB’s rule], the judgment of this court had the effect of reinstating the rules previously in

force”); *Alaska v. USDA*, 772 F.3d 899 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (district court’s invalidation of agency action withdrawing rule had legal effect of reinstating it). State Petitioners believe that any such challenge would be meritless. Nevertheless, there is reason to doubt that EPA would vigorously oppose an industry challenge to the withdrawal notice, or a request for a judicial stay of the withdrawal notice. Indeed, EPA’s ongoing concern about the purported effects of production caps on the glider industry is evinced in its commitment, in the withdrawal notice, to “move as expeditiously as possible” to conclude the efforts to revise or repeal those caps that EPA already has underway. ECF No. 1743093 at 13; *see* ECF No. 1740848 at 53-61 (proposed repeal of production caps). Accordingly, State Petitioners’ petition and request for summary disposition are not moot, and will not become moot at least until 60 days have elapsed since EPA provided public notice of the withdrawal (*see* 42 U.S.C. § 7607(b)(1)), without any challenge to the withdrawal notice having been filed.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, State Petitioners respectfully request that this Court issue an order declaring EPA’s Action invalid. State Petitioners respectfully submit that EPA’s motion to dismiss this case should be denied, or that at minimum, the Court should postpone ruling on that motion until

after September 24, 2018, when 60 days will have passed from the date EPA provided the public notice of the withdrawal.

Dated: August 2, 2018

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of the
State of California
DAVID A. ZONANA
Supervising Deputy Attorney
General

By: /s/ Melinda Pilling
MELINDA PILLING
MEGAN K. HEY
M. ELAINE MECKENSTOCK
Deputy Attorneys General
California Department of Justice
1515 Clay Street, Suite 2000
Oakland, CA 94612
Tel.: (510) 879-1248
Email: David.Zonana@doj.ca.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of
California, by and through
Xavier Becerra, Attorney General
and California Air Resources Board*

Respectfully submitted,

GURBIR S. GREWAL
Attorney General of the
State of New Jersey
DAVID C. APY
Assistant Attorney General

By: /s/ Jung W. Kim
JUNG W. KIM
Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
R.J. Hughes Justice Complex
25 Market Street, P.O. Box 093
Trenton, NJ 08625-0093
Tel.: (609) 376-2804
Email: Jung.Kim@law.njoag.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New
Jersey*

GEORGE JEPSEN
Attorney General of the
State of Connecticut

By: /s/ Scott N. Koschwitz
SCOTT N. KOSCHWITZ
MATTHEW I. LEVINE
Assistant Attorneys General
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 120, 55 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06141-0120
Tel.: (860) 808-5250
Email: Scott.Koschwitz@ct.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner the State of
Connecticut*

LISA MADIGAN
Attorney General of the
State of Illinois
MATTHEW J. DUNN
Chief, Environmental Enforcement/
Asbestos Litigation Division

By: /s/ Daniel I. Rottenberg
DANIEL I. ROTTENBERG
Assistant Attorney General
Illinois Attorney General's Office
69 W. Washington Street, 18th Floor
Chicago, IL 60602
Tel.: (312) 814-3816
Email: DRottenberg@atg.state.il.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of
Illinois*

MATTHEW P. DENN
Attorney General of the
State of Delaware

By: /s/ Valerie S. Edge
VALERIE SATTERFIELD EDGE
Deputy Attorney General
Delaware Department of Justice
102 W. Water Street
Dover, DE 19904
Tel.: (302) 257-3219
Email: Valerie.Edge@state.de.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of
Delaware*

JANET T. MILLS
Attorney General of the
State of Maine

By: /s/ Gerald D. Reid
GERALD D. REID
Assistant Attorney General
Chief, Natural Resources Division
6 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0006
Tel.: (207) 626-8545
Email: Jerry.Reid@maine.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of
Maine*

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General of the
State of Maryland

By: /s/ Roberta R. James
ROBERTA R. JAMES
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
Maryland Department of the
Environment
1800 Washington Blvd.
Baltimore, MD 21230-1719
Tel.: (410) 537-3748
Email: Roberta.James@maryland.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of
Maryland by and through Brian Frosh,
Attorney General and the Maryland
Department of the Environment*

LORI SWANSON
Attorney General of the
State of Minnesota

By: /s/ Max Kieley
MAX KIELEY
Assistant Attorney General
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 900
Saint Paul, MN 55101-2127
Tel.: (651) 757-1244
Email: Max.Kieley@ag.state.mn.us

*Attorneys for the State of Minnesota,
by and through the Minnesota
Pollution Control Agency*

MAURA HEALEY
Attorney General of the
Commonwealth of Massachusetts

By: /s/ Carol Iancu
CAROL IANCU
Assistant Attorney General
Environmental Protection Division
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor
Boston, MA 02108
Tel: (617) 963-2428
Email: Carol.Iancu@state.ma.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner
Commonwealth of Massachusetts*

HECTOR H. BALDERAS
Attorney General of the
State of New Mexico

By: /s/ William Grantham
WILLIAM GRANTHAM
BRIAN E. MCMATH
Assistant Attorneys General
201 Third Street NW, Suite 300
Albuquerque, NM 87102
Tel.: (505) 717-3531
Email: wgrantham@nmag.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New
Mexico*

BARBARA D. UNDERWOOD
Attorney General of the
State of New York

By: /s/ Danielle C. Fidler
DANIELLE C. FIDLER
Assistant Attorney General
Environmental Protection Bureau
28 Liberty Street, 19th Floor
New York, NY 10005
Tel.: (212) 416-8441
Email: Danielle.Fidler@ag.ny.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New
York*

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
Attorney General of the
State of Oregon

By: /s/ Paul Garrahan
PAUL GARRAHAN
Attorney-in-Charge
Natural Resources Section
Oregon Department of Justice
1162 Court Street NE
Salem, OR 97301-4096
Tel.: (503) 947-4593
Email: Paul.Garrahan@doj.state.or.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of
Oregon*

JOSHUA H. STEIN
Attorney General of the
State of North Carolina

By: /s/ Asher P. Spiller
ASHER P. SPILLER
Assistant Attorney General
North Carolina Department of
Justice
P.O. Box 629
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602-0629
Tel.: (919) 716-6600
Email: اسپيللر@ncdoj.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of
North Carolina*

JOSH SHAPIRO
Attorney General of the
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

PETER F. KILMARTIN
Attorney General for the
State of Rhode Island

By: /s/ Michael J. Fischer
MICHAEL J. FISCHER
Chief Deputy Attorney General
KRISTEN M. FURLAN
Assistant Director
Bureau of Regulatory Counsel
Pennsylvania Department of
Environmental Protection
Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General
Strawberry Square
Harrisburg, PA 17120
Tel.: (215) 560-2171
Email: mfischer@attorneygeneral.gov
kfurlan@pa.gov

By: /s/ Gregory S. Schultz
GREGORY S. SCHULTZ
Special Assistant Attorney General
Rhode Island Department of
Attorney General
150 South Main Street
Providence, RI 02903
Tel: (401) 274 4400
Email: gschultz@riag.ri.gov

*Attorney for Petitioner State of
Rhode Island*

*Attorneys for Petitioner Commonwealth
of Pennsylvania by and through Josh
Shapiro, Attorney General and
Pennsylvania Department of
Environmental Protection*

ROBERT W. FERGUSON
Attorney General for the
State of Washington

By: /s/ Katharine G. Shirey
KATHARINE G. SHIREY
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 40117
Olympia, WA 98504-0117
Tel.: (360) 586-6769
Email: KayS1@atg.wa.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of
Washington*

KARL A. RACINE
Attorney General of the
District of Columbia

By: /s/ Loren L. AliKhan
LOREN L. ALIKHAN
Solicitor General
Office of the Attorney General for the
District of Columbia
441 4th Street, NW, Suite 600 South
Washington, D.C. 20001
Tel: (202) 727-6287
Email: Loren.AliKhan@dc.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner District of
Columbia*

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.
Attorney General for the
State of Vermont

By: /s/ Nicholas F. Persampieri
NICHOLAS F. PERSAMPIERI
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
109 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05609
Tel.: (802) 828-3186
Email:
Nick.Persampieri@vermont.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner the State of
Vermont*

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify that this Opposition to Motion to Dismiss and Reply in Support of Summary Disposition was prepared in a proportionally spaced, 14-point font and that, according to the word-count program in Microsoft Word, it contains 882 words. *See* D.C. Cir. R. 18(b).

Dated: August 3, 2018

By: /s/ Melinda Pilling
MELINDA PILLING
Deputy Attorney General

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 3, 2018, this Opposition to Motion to Dismiss and Reply in Support of Summary Disposition was electronically served on all parties through the appellate electronic case filing system.

Dated: August 3, 2018

By: /s/ Melinda Pilling
MELINDA PILLING
Deputy Attorney General