1	JOHN C. CRUDEN			
	Assistant Attorney General			
2	Environment & Natural Resources Division			
3	United States Department of Justice			
	LESLIE M. HILL (D.C. Bar No. 476008)			
4	Leslie.Hill@usdoj.gov			
5	Environmental Defense Section			
	601 D Street N.W., Suite 8000			
6	Washington D.C. 20004			
7	Telephone (202) 514-0375 Facsimile (202) 514-8865			
, l	1 acsimic (202) 314-0003			
8	Attorneys for Defendant			
9	The state of the s			
	ROBERT UKEILEY, Admitted Pro Hac Vice			
10	rukeiley@igc.org			
11	Law Office of Robert Ukeiley 255 Mountain Meadows Road Boulder, CO 80302			
11				
12				
12	Telephone (303) 442-4033			
13	[additional attorneys for Plaintiff included in signature block]			
14				
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff			
13	7 ttorneys for Frameni			
16	IN THE UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT		
17	EOD WHE NODWHEDN DI			
1 /	FOR THE NORTHERN DI	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
18	SAN FRANCIS	SCO DIVISION		
19				
1)				
20	CIEDD A CLUD			
21	SIERRA CLUB,	Case No. 3:15-cv-04328-JD		
41	Plaintiff,			
22	Tiamum,	[PROPOSED] PARTIAL CONSENT		
22	v.	DECREE		
23				
24	GINA McCARTHY, in her official capacity as			
	the Administrator of the United States			
25	Environmental Protection Agency,			
26				
	Defendant.			
27				
28				

part, each plan or revision, within 12 months of a determination of completeness by EPA or a determination deemed by operation of law to be complete;

WHEREAS, pursuant to CAA section 110(d)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 7410(d)(1), states were required to submit infrastructure SIPs within 3 years of promulgation of the 2008 ozone NAAQS, i.e., by March 12, 2011;

WHEREAS, in Claim 1, 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 2008 ozone NAAQS infrastructure SIP submissions addressing the following element or elements under 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2) from the states listed below, *see* Compl. ¶¶19-37 (Dkt. No. 39):

AREA/STATE	ELEMENT(S) (under CAA section 110)
Louisiana	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prongs 3 & 4)
New York	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prong 3 only)
Wisconsin	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prong 3 only)
Wyoming	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i) (prongs 1-4)
New Jersey	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prongs 3 & 4)

WHEREAS, on September 6, 2016, EPA partially approved and partially disapproved elements of a New Jersey SIP submission addressing the infrastructure requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prongs 3 and 4) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. *Final Rule*, 81 Fed. Reg. 64,070 (Sept. 19, 2016). Claim 1 is therefore moot as to New Jersey as to the requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prongs 3 and 4);

WHEREAS, on September 22, 2016, EPA approved Wyoming's SIP certification addressing the infrastructure requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prong 3) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. *Final Rule*, 81 Fed. Reg. 70,362 (Oct. 12, 2016). Claim 1 is therefore moot as to Wyoming as to the requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prong 3);

WHEREAS, on September 29, 2016, EPA partially approved and partially disapproved elements of Louisiana's SIP submission addressing the infrastructure requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prongs 3 and 4) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. *Final Rule*, 81 Fed. Reg. 68,322 (Oct. 4, 2016). Claim 1 is therefore moot as to Lousiana as to the requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prongs 3 and 4);

WHEREAS, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 7410(c)(1), EPA must "promulgate a Federal implementation plan [("FIP")] at any time within 2 years after the Administrator--

- (A) finds that a State has failed to make a required submission or finds that the plan or plan revision submitted by the State does not satisfy the minimum criteria established under subsection (k)(1)(A) of this section, or
- (B) disapproves a [SIP] submission in whole or in part, unless the State corrects the deficiency, and the Administrator approves the plan or plan revision, before the Administrator promulgates such [FIP];"

WHEREAS, on January 4, 2013, EPA found that California failed to submit a SIP addressing the requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(A)-(C), (D)(i)(II)-(H), & (J)-(M) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS, *Notice*, 78 Fed. Reg. 2882 (Jan. 15, 2013) (effective February 14, 2015);

WHEREAS, on November 24, 2015, EPA approved in part and disapproved in part California's SIP submission addressing certain requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(A)–(C), (D)(i)(II)–(H), & (J)-(M) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS, *Final Rule*, 81 Fed. Reg. 18,766 (Apr. 1, 2016);

WHEREAS, in Claim 2, Plaintiff alleges that EPA has failed to perform a duty mandated by CAA section 110(c)(1)(B), 42 U.S.C. § 7410(c)(1)(B), to promulgate a FIP addressing the requirements of 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(B)(with respect to the ambient air quality monitoring/data system for the Bakersfield Metropolitan Statistical Area ("MSA") in the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District ("APCD")) and 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2) (C), (D)(i)(II) (prong 3 only), & (J) (with respect to the Northern Sonoma, Mendocino, and

North Coast Air Districts) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS within 2 years after finding that California failed to make the required submission, Compl. ¶¶ 38-41;

WHEREAS, the relief requested in the Complaint includes, among other things, an order from this Court to establish a date certain by which EPA must fulfill its obligations;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff and EPA have agreed to a partial 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 partial Consent Decree (the "Consent Decree"), do not waive or limit any claim, remedy, or defense, on any grounds, related to any final EPA action;

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

WHEREAS, it is in the interest of the public, Plaintiff Sierra Club, Defendant EPA, and judicial economy to resolve a substantial portion of this matter without protracted litigation;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff and EPA agree that this Court has jurisdiction over the matters resolved in this Consent Decree 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 Civil L.R. 3-2(c)-(d); and

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 Sierra Club and Defendant EPA, it is hereby ordered, adjudged and decreed that:

- 1. The appropriate EPA official shall:
- a. sign a notice of final rulemaking to approve, disapprove, conditionally approve, or approve in part and conditionally approve or 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 states and elements of section 110(a)(2), 42 U.S.C. §§ 7410(a)(2) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS:

	STATE	SIP ELEMENT(S)	DATE
a.	New York	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i) (prong 3)	December 1, 2016
b.	Wisconsin	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(II) (prong 3 only)	December 16, 2016
c.	Wyoming	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(D)(i)(I)-(II) (prongs 1, 2, and 4)	January 17, 2017

b. sign a notice of final rulemaking to approve a revised SIP submission, promulgate a FIP, or partially approve a revised SIP submission and promulgate a partial FIP for California no later than the date indicated below for the following elements of section 110(a)(2), 42 U.S.C. §§ 7410(a)(2) for the 2008 ozone NAAQS:

	SIP ELEMENT(S)	DATE
1.	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(B)(with respect to the ambient air quality monitoring/data system for the Bakersfield MSA in the San Joaquin Valley APCD)	December 15, 2017
2.	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(C), (D)(i)(II) (prong 3 only), (J) (with respect to the Northern Sonoma Air District)	December 16, 2016
3.	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(C), (D)(i)(II) (prong 3 only), (J) (with respect to the Mendocino Air District) March 15, 2017	
4.	42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(C), (D)(i)(II) (prong 3 only), (J) (with respect to the North Coast Air District)	March 15, 2017

2. If any State withdraws a submittal listed above in Paragraph 1(a), then EPA's obligation to take the action required by Paragraph 1(a) with respect to that submittal is automatically terminated unless Plaintiff moves the Court to address EPA's obligation in light of the withdrawn submittal. If Plaintiff files such a motion, EPA's obligation to act on the submittal is stayed pending resolution of said motion. EPA shall notify Plaintiff within ten business days of receiving a written request from a state to withdraw any submittal listed in Paragraph 1(a). 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 EPA's obligation in the event that any State withdraws a submittal listed above in Paragraph 1(a) and Plaintiff files a motion pursuant to this Paragraph. If EPA signs a finding of failure to submit for the withdrawn submittal while such a motion is pending, Plaintiff shall withdraw its motion.

- 3. EPA shall, within 15 business days of signature, send the rulemaking package for 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, 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 reasonable attorney fees) has been resolved), EPA may move to have this Decree terminated. Plaintiff shall have fourteen (14) days in which to respond to such 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. Any other provision of this Consent Decree also may be modified by the Court following motion of an undersigned party for good cause shown pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and upon consideration of any response by a non-moving party and any reply.
- 6. If a lapse in EPA appropriations occurs within ninety (90) days prior to a deadline in Paragraph 1 in this Decree, that deadline shall be extended automatically one day for each day of the lapse in appropriations. Nothing in this Paragraph shall preclude EPA from seeking an additional extension of time through modification of this Consent Decree pursuant to Paragraph 5.
- 7. Plaintiff and EPA agree that this Consent Decree constitutes a complete settlement of Claim 1 as described in Paragraph 1 and Claim 2 as to California as described in Paragraph 1.

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, via electronic mail or other means, 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 or other proceeding 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 moving party has provided the other party with written notice received at least ten (10) business days before the filing of such motion or proceeding.
- 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 Claim 2 as to Kentucky, *see* Compl. ¶42-44, is resolved either by settlement or an order and judgment of 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 Sierra Club 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. The Court shall retain jurisdiction to resolve any requests for costs of litigation, including attorney fees.
- 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) related to Claim 1, *see* Compl. ¶¶20-37, and Claim 2 as to California, *see* Compl. ¶¶39-41, incurred subsequent to entry of this Consent Decree. EPA reserves the right to oppose any such request for additional costs of litigation (including 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

Case 3:15-cv-04328-JD Document 74 Filed 05/23/17 Page 11 of 12

1	20. If for any reason the Court should decline to approve this Consent Decree in the	
2	form presented, this agreement is voidable at the sole discretion of either party and the terms	
3	of the proposed Consent Decree may not be used as evidence in any litigation between the	
4	parties.	
5	21. The undersigned representatives of Plaintiff Sierra Club and Defendant EPA	
6	certify that they are fully authorized by the party they represent to consent to the Court's	
7	entry of the terms and conditions of this Decree.	
8		
9	SO ORDERED on this 23 day of May, 2019.	
10	(\mathcal{A})	
11		
12	IAMES TONATO	
13	JAMES PONATO UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
14	COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF:	
15		
16	/s/ Robert Ukeiley (email authorization 10/14/16)	
17	Robert Ukeiley, Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Law Office of Robert Ukeiley	
18	255 Mountain Meadows Road Boulder, CO 80302	
19	Tel. (303) 442-4033	
20	Email: rukeiley@igc.org	
21	KRISTIN HENRY (Cal. Bar. No. 220908) Sierra Club	
22	2101 Webster St., Suite 1300	
23	Oakland, CA 94612 Tel. (415) 977-5716	
24	kristin.henry@sierraclub.org	
25		
26		
27		
28		
	\mathbf{I}	

1				
2	COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT:	JOHN C. CRUDEN		
3		Assistant Attorney General Environment & Natural Resources Division		
4				
5		/s/ Leslie M. Hill		
6		LESLIE M. HILL (D.C. Bar No. 476008) Environmental Defense Section		
7		601 D Street N.W., Suite 8000		
8		Washington D.C. 20004 Tel. (202) 514-0375		
9		Email: Leslie.Hill@usdoj.gov		
10	Of counsel:			
11	 Stephanie Hogan			
12	Zach Pilchen Office of General Counsel			
13	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency			
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	i I			