ORAL ARGUMENT NOT SCHEDULED

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

CLEAN AIR COUNCIL, EARTHWORKS, ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND, ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY PROJECT, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, AND SIERRA CLUB, Petitioners,	)	
v.	)	No. 17-1145
SCOTT PRUITT, Administrator, United States Environmental Protection Agency, and UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, Respondents.	)	

On Petition for Review of Final Action of the
United States Environmental Protection Agency

STATE PETITIONER-INTERVENORS' OPPOSITION TO EPA'S MOTION TO RECALL THE MANDATE

MAURA HEALEY
Attorney General of Massachusetts
MELISSA HOFFER
PETER C. MULCAHY
Assistant Attorneys General

Attorneys for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Additional counsel on signature pages

The Commonwealths of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington, the District of Columbia, and the City of Chicago (collectively, "State Petitioner-Intervenors") hereby oppose EPA's Motion to Recall the Mandate ("Mot.") filed on July 7, 2017.

On July 3, 2017, in response to Petitioners' Emergency Motion for a Stay, or In the Alternative, Summary Vacatur ("Emergency Motion"), this Court vacated Administrator Pruitt's stay ("Administrative Stay") of key provisions of EPA's 2016 New Source Performance Standards controlling methane and other pollutant emissions from new oil and gas sector sources ("2016 Rule"). *See* Opinion, ECF Doc. No. 1682465 (July 3, 2017) ("Slip Op."). The 2016 Rule had been in effect for nearly a year—since August 2, 2016, 81 Fed. Reg. 35,824 (June 3, 2016)—when Administrator Pruitt published a "[n]otice of reconsideration and partial stay" of the 2016 Rule for 90 days. 82 Fed. Reg. 25,730, 25,731 (June 5, 2017) (setting stay expiration date of August 31, 2017). This Court concluded that, because EPA's decision to grant reconsideration was arbitrary and capricious, EPA "lacked authority under the Clean Air Act to stay the rule." Slip Op. at 2. At the time of the decision, the Administrative Stay had already been in effect for a month; accordingly, the Court instructed the Clerk to issue the mandate forthwith. *See* Order, ECF Doc. No. 1682468 (July 3, 2017).

The Court was well within its discretion to direct issuance of the mandate concurrently with its decision vacating the Administrative Stay. Indeed, the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure plainly permitted the Court to issue its mandate immediately. Rule 41(b) expressly provides that "*[t]he court may shorten or extend the time*" in which to issue its mandate. Fed. R. App. P. 41(b) (emphasis added); *see also* Fed R. App. P. 40(a) (time for filing rehearing petition may be shortened or extended by order).

Here, the circumstances warranted the immediate issuance of the mandate. One-third of the 90-day Stay period had already elapsed as of July 3. Directing the simultaneous issuance of the mandate—rather than allowing the unlawful Stay to remain in effect even longer—was therefore necessary to avoid frustrating the Court's decision to vacate the Administrative Stay.

The Court's immediate issuance of its mandate is therefore not a "departure from . . . norms" that "deprived EPA and the Intervenor-Respondents of the standard relief from immediate compliance" with the mandate—let alone "an extraordinary circumstance" justifying recall of the mandate. Pet. at 2; *see Calderon v. Thompson*, 523 U.S. 538, 550 (1998) (stating that recall of mandate "can be exercised only in extraordinary circumstances") (citing 16 C. Wright, A. Miller, & E. Cooper, Federal Practice & Procedure § 3938 (2d ed. 1996)). The Court's ordinary application of the Rules of Appellate Procedure, tailored to the

circumstances of this particular case, is not a "grave, unforeseen contingenc[y]," overriding "'the profound interests in repose' attaching to the mandate of a court of appeals." *Calderon*, 523 U.S. at 549-550.

Under the law of this Circuit, the Court may recall its mandate "for good cause shown," in order "to avoid injustice." *Greater Boston Television Corp. v. F.C.C.*, 463 F.2d 268, 277 (D.C. Cir. 1971). The Court has identified circumstances constituting such grounds, including mistakes or inconsistencies between the judgment and mandate; mandates "procured by effecting fraud on the court," such that "enforcement of the mandate is 'manifestly unconscionable'"; inconsistencies between cases pending at the same time; and instructions of the appellate court "that would operate, unless changed, to require the district court to issue an unjust order." *Id.* at 277-79. None of these circumstances is present here.

In stark contrast, the Court's decision here to issue the mandate immediately was a common-sense approach to remedy the immediate harms occurring as a result of the Administrative Stay. Recall of the Court's mandate in this case would indeed work a further injustice, by rewarding EPA for "its decision to impose a stay [which] was 'arbitrary, capricious, [and] . . . in excess of [its] . . . statutory . . . authority.'" Slip Op. at 23 (citing 42 U.S.C. § 7607(d)(9)(A), (C)). As set forth in Petitioners' Emergency Motion, at 25-29, and State Petitioner-Intervenors' Motion to Intervene, at ¶¶ 12-17, excess emissions of methane, volatile organic

compounds, and hazardous air pollutants occurred as a result of the unlawful Administrative Stay and would have continued had the Stay remained in place. Issuance of the mandate—following a decision on a motion for emergency relief—therefore had to occur immediately to meaningfully remedy EPA's unauthorized action.

To withhold the mandate, as EPA suggests, for fifty-two days "or longer," Mot. at 2, would effectively nullify the Court's decision by allowing EPA to run out the clock, maintaining the unauthorized Administrative Stay in place until at least August 24, one week before it currently is set to expire.

And, as the Court observed, its decision in no way deprives EPA of the ability to "re-examine policy." Mot. at 3. Rather, the decision concludes unremarkably that, should EPA elect to do so, it must conform its decision-making processes to the well-established requirements of administrative law. Slip Op. at 11-12, 23. Nor does the Court's decision unreasonably alter the expectations of the "regulated community." For example, June 3, 2017, was the *deadline* by which regulated entities were to have completed fugitive emissions monitoring, 40 C.F.R. § 60.5397a(f), (h)—the first step in the 2016 Rule's leak detection and repair program that was frozen by the Administrative Stay. Regulated entities therefore had nearly a year—since August 2, 2016—to comply with that obligation before the Administrative Stay went into effect. The Court's decision merely reinstates

the 2016 Rule, and returns to the *status quo*, prior to the issuance of EPA's unauthorized Administrative Stay.

For the foregoing reasons, State Petitioner-Intervenors respectfully request that the Court deny EPA's Motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 11, 2017

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MAURA HEALEY
ATTORNEY GENERAL

/s/ Peter C. Mulcahy

MELISSA HOFFER
Chief, Energy and Environment Bureau
PETER C. MULCAHY
Assistant Attorney General,
Environmental Protection Division
Office of the Attorney General
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 727-2200
melissa.hoffer@state.ma.us
peter.mulcahy@state.ma.us

FOR THE CITY OF CHICAGO

EDWARD N. SISKEL
CORPORATION COUNSEL

BENNA RUTH SOLOMON
Deputy Corporation Counsel
30 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 800
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 744-7764

FOR THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

GEORGE JEPSEN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

MATTHEW I. LEVINE
SCOTT N. KOSCHWITZ
Assistant Attorneys General
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 120, 55 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06141-00120
(860) 808-5250

FOR THE STATE OF DELAWARE

MATTHEW P. DENN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Department of Justice
Carvel State Building, 6th Floor
820 North French Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 577-8400

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

KARL A. RACINE
ATTORNEY GENERAL

ROBYN BENDER
Deputy Attorney General, Public Advocacy Division
BRYAN CALDWELL
Assistant Attorney General, Public Integrity Unit
Office of the Attorney General of the District of Columbia
441 Fourth Street NW, Suite 600-S
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 724-6610
(202) 727-6211
robyn.bender@dc.gov
brian.caldwell@dc.gov

FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

LISA MADIGAN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

MATTHEW J. DUNN
GERALD T. KARR
JAMES P. GIGNAC
Assistant Attorneys General
Illinois Attorney General's Office
69 W. Washington St., 18th Floor
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 814-0660

FOR THE STATE OF IOWA

TOM MILLER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

JACOB LARSON
Assistant Attorney General
Environmental Law Division
Hoover State Office Building
1305 E. Walnut St., 2nd Floor
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
(515) 281-5341

FOR THE STATE OF MARYLAND

BRIAN E. FROSH
ATTORNEY GENERAL

ROBERTA R. JAMES
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Maryland Department of the Environment
1800 Washington Boulevard
Suite 6048
Baltimore, MD 21230-1719
(410) 537-3748

FOR THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

HECTOR H. BALDERAS
ATTORNEY GENERAL

WILLIAM GRANTHAM
BRIAN E. MCMATH
Consumer & Environmental Protection Division
New Mexico Office of the Attorney General
201 Third St. NW, Suite 300
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 717-3500
wgrantham@nmag.gov
bmcmath@nmag.gov

FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

BARBARA D. UNDERWOOD
Solicitor General
STEVEN C. WU
Deputy Solicitor General
DAVID S. FRANKEL
Assistant Solicitor General
MICHAEL J. MYERS
Senior Counsel
MORGAN A. COSTELLO
Chief, Affirmative Litigation Section
Environmental Protection Bureau
The Capitol
Albany, NY 12224
(518) 776-2382
michael.myers@ag.ny.gov

FOR THE STATE OF OREGON

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
ATTORNEY GENERAL

PAUL GARRAHAN
Attorney-in-Charge
Natural Resources Section
Oregon Department of Justice
1162 Court Street NE
Salem, OR 97301-4096
(503) 947-4593

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

JOSH SHAPIRO
ATTORNEY GENERAL

JONATHAN SCOTT GOLDMAN
Executive Deputy Attorney General
Office of Attorney General
Civil Law Division
15th Floor, Strawberry Square
Harrisburg, PA 17120
(717) 783-1471
jgoldman@attorneygeneral.gov

FOR THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

PETER F. KILMARTIN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

GREGORY S. SCHULTZ
Special Assistant Attorney General
Rhode Island Department of Attorney General
150 South Main Street
Providence, RI 02903
(401) 274-4400

FOR THE STATE OF VERMONT

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.
ATTORNEY GENERAL

NICHOLAS F. PERSAMPIERI
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
109 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05609
(802) 828-6902

FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

ROBERT W. FERGUSON
ATTORNEY GENERAL

KATHARINE G. SHIREY
Assistant Attorney General
P.O. Box 40117
Olympia, WA 98504
(360) 586-6769

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(g)(1) that the foregoing was printed in a proportionally spaced font of 14 points and that, according to the word-count program in Microsoft Word, it contains 984 words, in accordance with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(1) and (2).

Dated: July 11, 2017

/s/ Peter C. Mulcahy
Peter C. Mulcahy

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 25(d) that a copy of the foregoing Opposition to EPA's Motion to Recall the Mandate was filed on July 11, 2017, using this Court's ECF system, which serves copies on all registered counsel, and that paper copies were delivered to the Court by hand, pursuant to the Court's July 10, 2017, Order.

Dated: July 11, 2017

/s/ Peter C. Mulcahy
Peter C. Mulcahy