

**EN BANC ORAL ARGUMENT HELD SEPTEMBER 27, 2016****IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA, *et al.*,

*Petitioners,*

v.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL  
PROTECTION AGENCY, *et al.*,

*Respondents.*

No. 15-1363 (and  
consolidated cases)

**PETITIONERS' AND PETITIONER-INTERVENORS' STATUS REPORT  
IN SUPPORT OF CONTINUED ABEYANCE**

Petitioners and Petitioner-Intervenors (collectively “Petitioners”) respectfully submit this status report to respond to the questions raised by Judges Tatel and Wilkins (which were joined by Judge Millett) regarding whether abeyance continues to be appropriate in these consolidated cases. *See* Order, ECF No. 1737735 at 2, 3 (June 26, 2018) (Tatel, J., statement; Wilkins, J., statement) (“June 26 Abeyance Order”). For the reasons described below, the Court should continue to hold these cases in abeyance. Any other course of action would waste judicial and party resources and could jeopardize Petitioners’ right to judicial review of the rule challenged in this litigation.

## ARGUMENT

### I. **Abeyance Continues To Be the Appropriate Course of Action in These Proceedings.**

For the reasons articulated in Petitioners' Supplemental Brief addressing the issue of whether to hold the case in abeyance or remand it to EPA, the Court should continue to hold these consolidated cases in abeyance pending completion of EPA's review of the Clean Power Plan. *See* Suppl. Br. of Pet'rs & Pet'r-Intervenors, ECF No. 1675250 (May 15, 2017) ("Supplemental Brief"). The considerations that supported the Court's initial grant of abeyance have not changed during that abeyance period.

*First*, holding these cases in abeyance protects Petitioners' rights to judicial review. Petitioners' challenge to the Clean Power Plan has not been mooted. As the Agency noted in its July 26, 2018 Status Report, EPA has published and taken comments on a proposed rule to repeal the Clean Power Plan and an advance notice of proposed rulemaking ("ANPR") soliciting input related to replacement of the Clean Power Plan. EPA Status Report at 3 ¶¶ 5-6, ECF No. 1742722 (July 26, 2018) ("EPA July Status Report"). As the Agency explained in its August 24, 2018 Status Report, the EPA Acting Administrator signed a proposed rule to replace the Clean Power Plan, called the Affordable Clean Energy Rule, on August 20, 2018. EPA Status Report at 4-5, ¶¶ 9-10, ECF No. 1747298 (Aug. 24, 2018) ("EPA August Status Report"). None of these *proposed* actions resolve the dispute between EPA and

Petitioners regarding the Clean Power Plan, as only a final agency action can change that rule, and there indisputably has been no such action yet. Until the Clean Power Plan is repealed and/or replaced in final form, Petitioners' challenges remain properly before this Court. Once EPA takes final action on one or both of its proposals, these cases could become moot depending on the content of the final repeal and/or replacement rule. For example, if EPA leaves in place portions of the Clean Power Plan, then this Court may need to resolve any challenges to those provisions of the rule.

The possibility that EPA could decide not to finalize its proposed rules also exists. As Petitioners noted in their Supplemental Brief, this happened in a previous analogous case involving a high-profile rule. There, this Court held in abeyance for several years a challenge to an EPA rule pending its reconsideration by the then-new presidential administration. Supplemental Brief at 3. Although EPA formally proposed to revise the rule (75 Fed. Reg. 2938 (Jan. 19, 2010)), it ultimately reversed course, decided to leave the rule unchanged (*see Mississippi v. EPA*, No. 08-1200, ECF No. 1327617 (D.C. Cir. Sept. 2, 2011)), and successfully defended it before this Court (*Mississippi v. EPA*, 744 F.3d 1334 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (per curiam)). The Court's decision to hold that case in abeyance and retain jurisdiction over the pending petitions for review for over two years, rather than remand the rule to EPA for reconsideration, allowed the Court to decide the merits of the legal challenges once EPA decided not to revise the rule.

By contrast, remanding to EPA notwithstanding the unresolved petitions for review raises questions about continued judicial review if EPA ultimately does not repeal or replace the Clean Power Plan, or repeals or replaces only portions of the Clean Power Plan. The Rules of this Court provide that if the Court remands the case, it “does not retain jurisdiction, and a new notice of appeal or petition for review will be necessary if a party seeks review of the proceedings conducted on remand.” D.C. Cir. R. 41(b). Thus, if the Court remands these consolidated cases without vacating the Clean Power Plan or otherwise retaining jurisdiction over the consolidated petitions, and if EPA ultimately keeps the rule or some portions of it in place, Petitioners could face jurisdictional challenges to subsequent review of the Clean Power Plan or elements of the Plan.

The Clean Air Act requires that a petition for review “shall be filed within sixty days from the date notice of such promulgation, approval, or action appears in the Federal Register,” unless it is “based solely on grounds arising after such sixtieth day.” 42 U.S.C. § 7607(b)(1). Any post-remand challenge to the Clean Power Plan or portions of the Plan would occur well after the expiration of the initial 60-day period, and the exception for cases filed on after-arising grounds has been narrowly construed by this Court. *See* Supplemental Brief at 5 n.2. As a result, even though Petitioners timely filed their petitions for review in these cases, they would face the argument that these statutory limitations shield the Clean Power Plan, or any retained portions thereof, from any renewed judicial review. Notably, even a dismissal “without

prejudice” would leave Petitioners potentially vulnerable to these statutory limitations. June 26 Abeyance Order at 3 (Wilkins, J., statement). Indeed, this Court recently confirmed this in a case involving a different EPA regulation that “[w]hen combined with [a] statutory provision requiring any challenge to be brought within [a specified period of time] of the Rule’s promulgation, the legal effect of remand without vacatur is simple: The Rule remains in force and . . . Petitioners cannot bring another challenge until and unless the EPA takes additional regulatory action.” *See Util. Solid Waste Activities Group v. EPA*, No. 15-1219, slip op. at 39-40 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 21, 2018). Although Petitioners would object to these arguments, the need to resolve these questions would be avoided by continuing to hold these cases in abeyance, with no prejudice to the parties or undue burden to the Court.

*Second*, it is the Court’s ordinary practice to hold cases in abeyance when an agency decides to review a challenged rule. This practice has extensive precedential support, both historically and in recent years, and has been followed in a wide variety of procedural circumstances. *See* Supplemental Brief at 5-6 (listing examples). As this Court has explained, it makes little sense to actively proceed with judicial review and expend the Court’s and parties’ resources when an agency has embarked on a review that could ultimately lead to a substantial revision to or rescission of the rule. *See Am. Petroleum Inst. v. EPA*, 683 F.3d 382, 388-89 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (holding case in abeyance where new proposal “would likely moot the analysis [the court] could undertake” in deciding the case); *see also U.S. Telecom Ass’n v. FCC*, 855 F.3d 381, 382 (D.C. Cir.

2017) (per curiam) (Srinivasan & Tatel, JJ., concurring in denial of rehearing en banc) (noting “[e]n banc review would be particularly unwarranted” where “agency will soon consider adopting a [proposal] that would replace the existing rule with a markedly different one”). This established practice recognizes that abeyance conserves judicial and party resources, and allows the Court to dismiss petitions for review if the challenges become moot—or to resolve those petitions if the underlying rule is not revised or rescinded.

*Third*, any issue concerning the stay issued by the Supreme Court can be addressed in that forum. In the June 26 Abeyance Order, Judge Tatel expressed the view that the Supreme Court should be “advised of circumstances as they stand today” to determine whether the stay should remain in effect while EPA pursues the repeal and replacement of the Clean Power Plan. June 26 Abeyance Order at 2 (Tatel, J., concurring). On July 27, 2018, the Public Health and Environmental Respondent-Intervenors in this case sent such a letter to Chief Justice Roberts and noted there that “the Court may wish to require the parties to explain why the stay should continue in effect.” Letter from Sean H. Donahue, Counsel of Record for Environmental Defense Fund, et al., to The Hon. John G. Roberts, Jr., Chief Justice of the United States & Circuit Justice for the D.C. Circuit, Supreme Court of the United States, at 3 (July 27, 2018), *West Virginia v. EPA*, No. 15A773 (S. Ct.). The letter, which is included here as Attachment 1, has been docketed. Docket, *West Virginia v. EPA*, No. 15A773 (S. Ct.).

## II. EPA Is Proceeding Expeditiously with Its Review of the Clean Power Plan.

Since this Court first granted a 60-day abeyance in these consolidated cases on August 8, 2017, ECF No. 1687838, EPA has proceeded diligently with its administrative review of the Clean Power Plan pursuant to Executive Order 13783, 82 Fed. Reg. 16,093 (Mar. 31, 2017). EPA's status reports have set forth the steps it has taken to reconsider the Clean Power Plan. As those reports indicate, the Agency announced its review of the Clean Power Plan on April 4, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 16,329), published its proposed repeal on October 16, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 48,035), solicited public comment on options to possibly replace the Clean Power Plan on December 28, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 61,507), and signed the proposed Affordable Clean Energy Rule to replace the Clean Power Plan on August 20, 2018 (*see* EPA August Status Report at 4, ¶ 9). Thus, EPA has been actively engaged in the rulemaking process for approximately 10 months and is expected to conclude in the next 5 or 6 months. *See* EPA July Status Report at 4, ¶ 8; EPA August Status Report at 5, ¶ 11.

The timetable for repeal and/or replacement of the Clean Power Plan is consistent with and in many cases is more expeditious than the time EPA has required to complete other rulemakings of similar scope and importance. For comparison, the Agency's rulemaking to promulgate new source performance standards for greenhouse gas emissions from new electric utility generating units under the prior Administration lasted over three and a half years: EPA's first proposal was published

in April 2012 and was then superseded by a new proposal in January 2014 before the rule was finalized in October 2015. *See* 77 Fed. Reg. 22,392 (Apr. 13, 2012); 79 Fed. Reg. 1430 (Jan. 8, 2014); 80 Fed. Reg. 64,510 (Oct. 23, 2015). Likewise, in the case of the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards Rule, EPA initiated its rulemaking proceedings with an information collection request (which, like the ANPR on replacement of the Clean Power Plan, sought information to assist in development of a proposed rule) in November 2009 and did not publish a final rule until February 2012, 27 months later. *See* 74 Fed. Reg. 58,012 (Nov. 10, 2009); 77 Fed. Reg. 9304 (Feb. 16, 2012).

Accordingly, viewed in the context of other similar rulemakings, the duration of EPA's proceedings on review of the Clean Power Plan is reasonable and reflects diligent efforts to complete that review as expeditiously as practicable.

### **CONCLUSION**

In sum, EPA is moving with all deliberate speed, consistent with the complex subject matter involved, to complete its review of the Clean Power Plan. That process will conclude soon. There is no need for the Court to depart from its longstanding policy of holding cases in abeyance where a new administration announces its intent to reconsider a prior rule. These consolidated cases should remain in abeyance pending EPA's finalization (or its abandonment) of its proposals to repeal and/or replace the Clean Power Plan.



Dated: August 24, 2018

/s/ Allison D. Wood

F. William Brownell  
Allison D. Wood  
Henry V. Nickel  
Tauna M. Szymanski  
HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
bbrownell@HuntonAK.com  
awood@HuntonAK.com  
hnickel@HuntonAK.com  
tszymanski@HuntonAK.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Utility Air Regulatory  
Group and American Public Power Association*

/s/ Peter S. Glaser

Peter S. Glaser  
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP  
401 Ninth Street N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 274-2998  
peter.glaser@troutmansanders.com

Carroll W. McGuffey III  
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP  
600 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 5200  
Atlanta, GA 30308  
Tel: (404) 885-3000  
mack.mcguffey@troutmansanders.com

*Counsel for Petitioner National Mining  
Association*

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lindsay S. See

Patrick Morrissey  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WEST  
VIRGINIA  
Lindsay S. See  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Paul Anthony Martin  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
State Capitol Building 1, Room 26-E  
Charleston, WV 25305  
Tel: (304) 558-2021  
Fax: (304) 558-0140  
lindsay.s.see@wvago.gov  
anthony.p.martin@wvago.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of West Virginia*

/s/ Scott A. Keller

Ken Paxton  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
Jeffrey C. Mateer  
First Assistant Attorney General  
Scott A. Keller  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 12548  
Austin, TX 78711-2548  
Tel: (512) 936-1700  
scott.keller@oag.texas.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Texas*

/s/ Peter D. Keisler

Peter D. Keisler  
C. Frederick Beckner III  
Ryan C. Morris  
SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 736-8027  
pkeisler@sidley.com  
rbeckner@sidley.com  
rmorris@sidley.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America; National Association of Manufacturers; American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers; National Federation of Independent Business; American Chemistry Council; American Coke and Coal Chemicals Institute; American Foundry Society; American Forest & Paper Association; American Iron & Steel Institute; American Wood Council; Brick Industry Association; Electricity Consumers Resource Council; Lignite Energy Council; National Lime Association; National Oilseed Processors Association; and Portland Cement Association*

/s/ Andrew Brasher

Steven T. Marshall  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ALABAMA  
Andrew Brasher  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
501 Washington Avenue  
Montgomery, AL 36130  
Tel: (334) 353-2609  
abrasher@ago.state.al.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Alabama*

/s/ Dominic E. Draye

Mark Brnovich  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ARIZONA  
Dominic E. Draye  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Keith J. Miller  
Assistant Solicitor General  
Arizona Attorney General's Office  
1275 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007-2997  
Tel: (602) 542-3333  
Fax: (602) 542-8308  
dominic.draye@azag.gov  
keith.miller@azag.gov  
SolicitorGeneral@azag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner Arizona Corporation Commission*

/s/ Thomas A. Lorenzen

Thomas A. Lorenzen  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 624-2500  
tlorenzen@crowell.com

*Counsel for Petitioners National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Big Rivers Electric Corporation; Brazos Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; Buckeye Power, Inc.; Central Montana Electric Power Cooperative; Central Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; Corn Belt Power Cooperative; Dairyland Power Cooperative; East River Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; Georgia Transmission Corporation; Kansas Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation; Northwest Iowa Power Cooperative; Oglethorpe Power Corporation; PowerSouth Energy Cooperative; Prairie Power, Inc.; Rushmore Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Southern Illinois Power Cooperative; Sunflower Electric Power Corporation; and Upper Missouri G. & T. Electric Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Lee Rudofsky

Leslie Rutledge  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ARKANSAS  
Lee Rudofsky  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Jamie L. Ewing  
Assistant Attorney General  
323 Center Street, Suite 400  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
Tel: (501) 682-5310  
lee.rudofsky@arkansasag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Arkansas*

/s/ Frederick Yarger

Cynthia H. Coffman  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF COLORADO  
Frederick Yarger  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
1300 Broadway, 10th Floor  
Denver, CO 80203  
Tel: (720) 508-6168  
fred.yarger@coag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Colorado*

Rae Cronmiller  
Environmental Counsel  
NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC  
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION  
4301 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Tel: (703) 907-5500  
rae.cronmiller@nreca.coop

*Counsel for Petitioner National Rural Electric  
Cooperative Association*

/s/ Eric L. Hiser

Eric L. Hiser  
JORDEN HISER & JOY, PLC  
5080 N. 40<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 245  
Phoenix, AZ 85018  
Tel: (480) 505-3927  
ehiser@JHJLawyers.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Arizona Electric Power  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Brian A. Prestwood

Brian A. Prestwood  
Senior Corporate and Compliance  
Counsel  
ASSOCIATED ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,  
INC.  
2814 S. Golden, P.O. Box 754  
Springfield, MO 65801  
Tel: (417) 885-9273  
bprestwood@aeci.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Associated Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Jonathan A. Glogau

Pamela Jo Bondi  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF FLORIDA  
Amit Agarwal  
Solicitor General  
Jonathan A. Glogau  
*Counsel of Record*  
Special Counsel  
Office of the Attorney General  
PL-01, The Capitol  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050  
Tel: (850) 414-3818  
Fax: (850) 410-2672  
amit.agarwal@myfloridalegal.com  
jonathan.glogau@myfloridalegal.com

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Florida*

/s/ Sarah Hawkins Warren

Christopher M. Carr  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF GEORGIA  
Sarah Hawkins Warren  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Office of the Attorney General  
40 Capitol Square S.W.  
Atlanta, GA 30334-1300  
Tel: (404) 463-0070  
Fax: (404) 657-8773  
swarren@law.ga.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Georgia*

/s/ David Crabtree  
David Crabtree  
Vice President, General Counsel  
DESERET GENERATION & TRANSMISSION  
CO-OPERATIVE  
10714 South Jordan Gateway  
South Jordan, UT 84095  
Tel: (801) 619-9500  
Crabtree@deseretpower.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Deseret Generation &  
Transmission Co-operative*

/s/ John M. Holloway III  
John M. Holloway III  
WILLIAMS MULLEN  
1666 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 293-8127  
Fax: (202) 293-5939  
jholloway@williamsmullen.com

*Counsel for Petitioners East Kentucky Power  
Cooperative, Inc.; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; Minnkota Power Cooperative,  
Inc.; and South Mississippi Electric Power  
Association*

Joshua L. Belcher  
EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (US) LLP  
1101 Fannin Street, Suite 3700  
Houston, TX 77002  
Tel: (713) 470-6118  
Fax: (713) 654-1301  
joshuabelcher@eversheds-sutherland.com

*Counsel for Petitioner East Kentucky Power  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Thomas M. Fisher  
Curtis T. Hill, Jr.  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF INDIANA  
Thomas M. Fisher  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Office of the Attorney General  
Indiana Government Ctr. South  
Fifth Floor  
302 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2770  
Tel: (317) 232-6255  
Fax: (317) 232-7979  
tom.fisher@atg.in.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Indiana*

/s/ Jeffrey A. Chanay  
Derek Schmidt  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF KANSAS  
Jeffrey A. Chanay  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Bryan C. Clark  
Assistant Solicitor General  
120 S.W. 10th Avenue, 3rd Floor  
Topeka, KS 66612  
Tel: (785) 368-8435  
Fax: (785) 291-3767  
jeff.chanay@ag.ks.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Kansas*

/s/ Patrick Burchette

Patrick Burchette  
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP  
800 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 469-5102  
Patrick.Burchette@hkllaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners East Texas Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; Northeast Texas Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; Sam Rayburn G&T Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; and Tex-La Electric  
Cooperative of Texas, Inc.*

/s/ Christopher L. Bell

Christopher L. Bell  
GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP  
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 1700  
Houston, TX 77002  
Tel: (713) 374-3556  
bellc@gtlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Golden Spread Electrical  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Mark Walters

Mark Walters  
Michael J. Nasi  
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.  
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100  
Austin, TX 78701  
Tel: (512) 236-2000  
Fax: (512) 236-2002  
mwalters@jw.com  
mnasi@jw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners San Miguel Electric  
Cooperative, Inc., South Texas Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Joe Newberg

Andy Beshear  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF KENTUCKY  
Joseph A. Newberg, II  
*Counsel of Record*  
Samuel R. Flynn  
Assistant Attorneys General  
700 Capital Avenue  
Suite 118  
Frankfort, KY 40601  
Tel: (502) 696-5611  
joe.newberg@ky.gov  
samuel.flynn@ky.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner Commonwealth of  
Kentucky*

/s/ Elizabeth B. Murrill

Jeff Landry  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF LOUISIANA  
Elizabeth B. Murrill  
*Counsel of Record*  
Harry J. Vorhoff  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Office of the Louisiana Attorney General  
Louisiana Department of Justice  
1885 N. Third Street  
Baton Rouge, LA 70802  
Tel: (225) 326-6085  
Fax: (225) 326-6099  
murrille@ag.louisiana.gov  
vorhoffh@ag.louisiana.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Louisiana*

/s/ Randolph G. Holt  
Randolph G. Holt  
Jeremy L. Fetty  
PARR RICHEY OBREMSKEY FRANSEN &  
PATTERSON LLP  
Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.  
722 N. High School Road  
P.O. Box 24700  
Indianapolis, IN 46224  
Tel: (317) 481-2815  
R\_holt@wvpa.com  
jfetty@parrlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Wabash Valley Power  
Association, Inc.*

/s/ Megan H. Berge  
Megan H. Berge  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Western Farmers Electric  
Cooperative*

/s/ Steven C. Kohl  
Steven C. Kohl  
Gaetan Gerville-Reache  
WARNER NORCROSS & JUDD LLP  
2000 Town Center, Suite 2700  
Southfield, MI 48075-1318  
Tel: (248) 784-5000  
skohl@wnj.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Wolverine Power Supply  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Donald Trahan  
Herman Robinson  
Executive Counsel  
Donald Trahan  
*Counsel of Record*  
Elliott Vega  
Spencer R. Bowman  
Charlotte Goudeau  
Courtney J. Burdette  
LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
Legal Division  
P.O. Box 4302  
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-4302  
Tel: (225) 219-3985  
Fax: (225) 219-4068  
donald.trahan@la.gov  
spencer.bowman@la.gov  
charlotte.goudeau@la.gov  
courtney.burdette@la.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Louisiana  
Department of Environmental Quality*

/s/ Lesley Foxhall Pietras  
Lesley Foxhall Pietras  
LISKOW & LEWIS, P.L.C.  
701 Poydras Street, Suite 5000  
New Orleans, LA 70139  
Tel: (504) 556-4125  
Fax: (504) 556-4108  
lfpietras@liskow.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Louisiana Public Service  
Commission*

/s/ Christina F. Gomez  
Christina F. Gomez  
Jill H. Van Noord  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3200  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 295-8000  
Fax: (303) 295-8261  
cgomez@hollandhart.com  
jhvan Noord@hollandhart.com

Patrick R. Day  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
2515 Warren Avenue, Suite 450  
Cheyenne, WY 82001  
Tel: (307) 778-4200  
Fax: (307) 778-8175  
pday@hollandhart.com

Emily C. Schilling  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
222 South Main Street, Suite 2200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101  
Tel: (801) 799-5800  
Fax: (801) 799-5700  
ecschilling@hollandhart.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Basin Electric Power  
Cooperative*

/s/ Aaron D. Lindstrom  
Bill Schuette  
ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE PEOPLE  
OF MICHIGAN  
Aaron D. Lindstrom  
Michigan Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 30212  
Lansing, MI 48909  
Tel: (515) 373-1124  
Fax: (517) 373-3042  
lindstroma@michigan.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner People of the State of  
Michigan*

/s/ Harold E. Pizzetta, III  
Jim Hood  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF  
MISSISSIPPI  
Harold E. Pizzetta  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Litigation Division  
Office of the Attorney General  
Post Office Box 220  
Jackson, MS 39205  
Tel: (601) 359-3816  
Fax: (601) 359-2003  
hpizz@ago.state.ms.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Mississippi*



/s/ Stacey Turner  
Stacey Turner  
SOUTHERN COMPANY SERVICES, INC.  
600 18th Street North  
BIN 14N-8195  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
Tel: (205) 257-2923  
staturner@southernco.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Alabama Power Company, Georgia Power Company, Gulf Power Company, and Mississippi Power Company*

/s/ C. Grady Moore, III  
C. Grady Moore, III  
BALCH & BINGHAM LLP  
1901 Sixth Avenue North, Suite 1500  
Birmingham, AL 35303-4642  
Tel: (205) 251-8100  
Fax: (205) 488-5704  
gmoore@balch.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Alabama Power Company*

/s/ Margaret Claiborne Campbell  
Margaret Claiborne Campbell  
Angela J. Levin  
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP  
600 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 5200  
Atlanta, GA 30308-2216  
Tel: (404) 885-3000  
margaret.campbell@troutmansanders.com  
angela.levin@troutmansanders.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Georgia Power Company*

/s/ Donna J. Hodges  
Donna J. Hodges  
Senior Counsel  
MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
P.O. Box 2261  
Jackson, MS 39225-2261  
Tel: (601) 961-5369  
Fax: (601) 961-5349  
dhodges@deq.state.ms.us

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality*

/s/ Todd E. Palmer  
Todd E. Palmer  
Valerie L. Green  
MICHAEL, BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP  
601 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2601  
Tel: (202) 747-9560  
Fax: (202) 347-1819  
tepalmer@michaelbest.com  
vlgreen@michaelbest.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Public Service Commission*

/s/ Terese T. Wyly

Terese T. Wyly  
Ben H. Stone  
BALCH & BINGHAM LLP  
1310 Twenty Fifth Avenue  
Gulfport, MS 39501-1931  
Tel: (228) 214-0413  
twyly@balch.com  
bstone@balch.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Power  
Company*

/s/ Jeffrey A. Stone

Jeffrey A. Stone  
BEGGS & LANE, RLLP  
501 Commendencia Street  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
Tel: (850) 432-2451  
JAS@beggslane.com

James S. Alves  
2110 Trescott Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Tel: (850) 566-7607  
jim.s.alves@outlook.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Gulf Power Company*

/s/ D. John Sauer

Josh Hawley  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MISSOURI  
D. John Sauer  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 899  
207 W. High Street  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
Tel: (573) 751-1800  
Fax: (573) 751-0774  
john.sauer@ago.mo.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Missouri*

/s/ Dale Schowengerdt

Timothy C. Fox  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MONTANA  
Dale Schowengerdt  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
215 North Sanders  
Helena, MT 59620-1401  
Tel: (406) 444-7008  
dales@mt.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Montana*

/s/ James S. Alves

James S. Alves  
2110 Trescott Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Tel: (850) 566-7607  
jim.s.alves@outlook.com

*Counsel for Petitioner CO<sub>2</sub> Task Force of the  
Florida Electric Power Coordinating Group, Inc.*

/s/ John J. McMackin

John J. McMackin  
WILLIAMS & JENSEN  
701 8th Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 659-8201  
jjmcmackin@wms-jen.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Energy-Intensive  
Manufacturers Working Group on Greenhouse  
Gas Regulation*

/s/ Megan H. Berge

Megan H. Berge  
William M. Bumpers  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Entergy Corporation*

/s/ Justin D. Lavene

Douglas J. Peterson  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEBRASKA  
Dave Bydlaek  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
Justin D. Lavene  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
2115 State Capitol  
Lincoln, NE 68509  
Tel: (402) 471-2834  
justin.lavene@nebraska.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Nebraska*

/s/ Eric E. Murphy

Michael DeWine  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OHIO  
Eric E. Murphy  
State Solicitor  
*Counsel of Record*  
30 E. Broad Street, 17th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Tel: (614) 466-8980  
eric.murphy@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Ohio*

/s/ Paul J. Zidlicky

Paul J. Zidlicky  
SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 736-8000  
pzidlicky@sidley.com

*Counsel for Petitioners GenOn Mid-Atlantic, LLC; Indian River Power LLC; Louisiana Generating LLC; Midwest Generation, LLC; NRG Chalk Point LLC; NRG Power Midwest LP; NRG Rema LLC; NRG Texas Power LLC; NRG Wholesale Generation LP; and Vienna Power LLC*

/s/ David M. Flannery

David M. Flannery  
Kathy G. Beckett  
Edward L. Kropp  
STEPTOE & JOHNSON, PLLC  
707 Virginia Street East  
Charleston, WV 25326  
Tel: (304) 353-8000  
dave.flannery@steptoe-johnson.com  
kathy.beckett@steptoe-johnson.com  
skipp.kropp@steptoe-johnson.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Indiana Utility Group*

/s/ David B. Rivkin, Jr.

Mike Hunter  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA  
P. Clayton Eubanks  
Deputy Solicitor General  
Oklahoma Office of the Attorney  
General  
313 NE 21st Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
Tel: (405) 522-8992  
Fax: (405) 522-0608  
clayton.eubanks@oag.ok.gov

David B. Rivkin, Jr.  
*Counsel of Record*  
Mark W. DeLaquil  
Andrew M. Grossman  
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP  
Washington Square, Suite 1100  
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 861-1731  
Fax: (202) 861-1783  
drivkin@bakerlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality*

/s/ F. William Brownell  
F. William Brownell  
Eric J. Murdock  
HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
bbrownell@HuntonAK.com  
emurdock@HuntonAK.com

Nash E. Long III  
HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP  
Bank of America Plaza, Suite 3500  
101 South Tryon Street  
Charlotte, NC 28280  
Tel: (704) 378-4700  
nlong@HuntonAK.com

*Counsel for Petitioner LG&E and KU Energy  
LLC*

/s/ James Emory Smith, Jr.  
Alan Wilson  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA  
Robert D. Cook  
Solicitor General  
James Emory Smith, Jr.  
Deputy Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
Tel: (803) 734-3680  
Fax: (803) 734-3677  
esmith@scag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of South Carolina*

/s/ Steven R. Blair  
Marty J. Jackley  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH  
DAKOTA  
Steven R. Blair  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
1302 E. Highway 14, Suite 1  
Pierre, SD 57501  
Tel: (605) 773-3215  
steven.blair@state.sd.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of South Dakota*

/s/ P. Stephen Gidiere III

P. Stephen Gidiere III  
Thomas L. Casey III  
Julia B. Barber  
BALCH & BINGHAM LLP  
1901 6th Ave. N., Suite 1500  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
Tel: (205) 251-8100  
sgidiere@balch.com

Stephanie Z. Moore  
Executive Vice President & General  
Counsel  
VISTRA ENERGY CORP.  
6555 Sierra Drive  
Irving, Texas 75039

Daniel J. Kelly  
Vice President & Associate General  
Counsel  
VISTRA ENERGY CORP.  
6555 Sierra Drive  
Irving, Texas 75039

*Counsel for Petitioners Luminant Generation  
Company LLC; Oak Grove Management  
Company LLC; Big Brown Power Company  
LLC; Sandow Power Company LLC; Big  
Brown Lignite Company LLC; Luminant  
Mining Company LLC; and Luminant Big  
Brown Mining Company LLC*

/s/ Tyler R. Green

Sean Reyes  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF UTAH  
Tyler R. Green  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Parker Douglas  
Federal Solicitor  
Utah State Capitol Complex  
350 North State Street, Suite 230  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-2320  
pdouglas@agutah.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Utah*

/s/ Misha Tseytlin

Brad D. Schimel  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WISCONSIN  
Misha Tseytlin  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Delanie M. Breuer  
Chief of Staff  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
17 West Main Street  
Madison, WI 53707  
Tel: (608) 267-9323  
tseytlinm@doj.state.wi.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Wisconsin*

/s/ Ronald J. Tenpas  
Ronald J. Tenpas  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 739-3000  
rtenpas@morganlewis.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Minnesota Power (an  
operating division of ALLETE, Inc.)*

/s/ Allison D. Wood  
Allison D. Wood  
Tauna M. Szymanski  
Andrew D. Knudsen  
HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
awood@HuntonAK.com  
tszymanski@HuntonAK.com  
aknudsen@HuntonAK.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Montana-Dakota Utilities  
Co., a Division of MDU Resources Group, Inc.*

/s/ James Kaste  
Peter K. Michael  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WYOMING  
James Kaste  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Erik Petersen  
Wyoming Attorney General's Office  
2320 Capitol Avenue  
Cheyenne, WY 82002  
Tel: (307) 777-6946  
Fax: (307) 777-3542  
james.kaste@wyo.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Wyoming*

/s/ Dennis Lane  
Dennis Lane  
STINSON LEONARD STREET LLP  
1775 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 785-9100  
Fax: (202) 785-9163  
dennis.lane@stinson.com

Parthenia B. Evans  
STINSON LEONARD STREET LLP  
1201 Walnut Street, Suite 2900  
Kansas City, MO 64106  
Tel: (816) 842-8600  
Fax: (816) 691-3495  
parthy.evans@stinson.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Kansas City Board of  
Public Utilities – Unified Government of  
Wyandotte County/ Kansas City, Kansas*

/s/ Megan H. Berge

Megan H. Berge  
William M. Bumpers  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner NorthWestern  
Corporation d/b/a NorthWestern Energy*

/s/ Joshua R. More

Joshua R. More  
Jane E. Montgomery  
Amy Antonioli  
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 7100  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: (312) 258-5500  
jmore@schiffhardin.com  
jmontgomery@schiffhardin.com  
aantonioli@schiffhardin.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Prairie State Generating  
Company, LLC*



/s/ Allison D. Wood  
Allison D. Wood  
Tauna M. Szymanski  
Andrew D. Knudsen  
HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
awood@HuntonAK.com  
tszymanski@HuntonAK.com  
aknudsen@HuntonAK.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Tri-State Generation and  
Transmission Association, Inc.*

/s/ Megan H. Berge  
Megan H. Berge  
William M. Bumpers  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Westar Energy, Inc.*

/s/ Jeffrey R. Holmstead  
Jeffrey R. Holmstead  
Brittany M. Pemberton  
BRACEWELL LLP  
2001 M Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 828-5852  
Fax: (202) 857-4812  
jeff.holmstead@bracewelllaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner American Coalition for  
Clean Coal Electricity*

/s/ John D. Lazzaretti

John D. Lazzaretti  
SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (US) LLP  
4900 Key Tower  
127 Public Square  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
Tel: (216) 479-8350  
john.lazzaretti@squirepb.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Murray Energy  
Corporation*

/s/ Andrew C. Emrich

Andrew C. Emrich  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
6380 South Fiddlers Green Circle  
Suite 500  
Greenwood Village, CO 80111  
Tel: (303) 290-1621  
Fax: (866) 711-8046  
acemrich@hollandhart.com

Emily C. Schilling  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
222 South Main Street, Suite 2200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101  
Tel: (801) 799-5753  
Fax: (202) 747-6574  
ecschilling@hollandhart.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Newmont Nevada  
Energy Investment, LLC and Newmont USA  
Limited*

/s/ Charles T. Wehland

Charles T. Wehland

JONES DAY

77 West Wacker Drive, Suite 3500

Chicago, IL 60601-1692

Tel: (312) 782-3939

Fax: (312) 782-8585

ctwehland@jonesday.com

*Counsel for Petitioners The North American Coal Corporation; The Coteau Properties Company; Coyote Creek Mining Company, L.L.C.; The Falkirk Mining Company; Mississippi Lignite Mining Company; North American Coal Royalty Company; NODAK Energy Services, LLC; Otter Creek Mining Company, LLC; and The Sabine Mining Company*

/s/ Robert G. McLusky

Robert G. McLusky

JACKSON KELLY, PLLC

1600 Laidley Tower

P.O. Box 553

Charleston, WV 25322

Tel: (304) 340-1000

rmclusky@jacksonkelly.com

*Counsel for Petitioner West Virginia Coal Association*

/s/ Eugene M. Trisko

Eugene M. Trisko

LAW OFFICES OF EUGENE M. TRISKO

P.O. Box 596

Berkeley Springs, WV 25411

Tel: (301) 639-5238

emtrisko7@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner International Brotherhood  
of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders,  
Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers*

/s/ Eugene M. Trisko

Eugene M. Trisko

LAW OFFICES OF EUGENE M. TRISKO

P.O. Box 596

Berkeley Springs, WV 25411

Tel: (301) 639-5238

emtrisko7@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner International Brotherhood  
of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO*

/s/ Eugene M. Trisko

Eugene M. Trisko  
LAW OFFICES OF EUGENE M. TRISKO  
P.O. Box 596  
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411  
Tel: (301) 639-5238  
emtrisko7@gmail.com

Grant F. Crandall  
General Counsel (Ret.)  
UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA  
18354 Quantico Gateway Drive  
Triangle, VA 22172  
Tel: (703) 291-2429  
gcrandall@umwa.org

Arthur Traynor, III  
Counsel  
UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA  
18354 Quantico Gateway Drive  
Triangle, VA 22172  
Tel: (571) 383-4013  
atraynor@umwa.org

*Counsel for Petitioner United Mine Workers of  
America*

/s/ Steven P. Lehotsky

Steven P. Lehotsky  
Michael B. Schon  
U.S. CHAMBER LITIGATION CENTER  
1615 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20062  
Tel: (202) 463-5337  
slehotsky@uschamber.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Chamber of Commerce of  
the United States of America*

/s/ Peter Tolsdorf

Peter Tolsdorf  
MANUFACTURERS' CENTER FOR LEGAL  
ACTION  
733 10th Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 637-3000  
ptolsdorf@nam.org

*Counsel for Petitioner National Association of  
Manufacturers*

/s/ Richard S. Moskowitz

Richard S. Moskowitz  
AMERICAN FUEL & PETROCHEMICAL  
MANUFACTURERS  
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 457-0480  
rmoskowitz@afpm.org

*Counsel for Petitioner American Fuel &  
Petrochemical Manufacturers*

/s/ Karen R. Harned

Karen R. Harned  
Executive Director  
Elizabeth A. Milito  
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF  
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS  
SMALL BUSINESS LEGAL CENTER  
1201 F Street, N.W., Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 314-2061  
karen.harned@nfib.org  
elizabeth.milito@nfib.org

*Counsel for Petitioner National Federation of  
Independent Business*

/s/ Megan H. Berge

Megan H. Berge  
William M. Bumpers  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner National Association of  
Home Builders*

/s/ Kathryn D. Kirmayer

Kathryn D. Kirmayer  
General Counsel  
Evelyn R. Nackman  
Associate General Counsel  
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS  
425 3rd Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20024  
Tel: (202) 639-2100  
kkirmayer@aar.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Association of American  
Railroads*

/s/ Chaim Mandelbaum

Chaim Mandelbaum  
Litigation Manager  
FREE MARKET ENVIRONMENTAL LAW  
CLINIC  
726 N. Nelson Street, Suite 9  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Tel: (703) 577-9973  
chaim12@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Energy and Environment  
Legal Institute*

/s/ Catherine E. Stetson

Catherine E. Stetson

Eugene A. Sokoloff

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP

555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004-1109

Tel: (202) 637-5600

Fax: (202) 637-5910

cate.stetson@hoganlovells.com

eugene.sokoloff@hoganlovells.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Denbury Onshore, LLC*



/s/ Adam R.F. Gustafson

C. Boyden Gray

Adam R.F. Gustafson

*Counsel of Record*

James R. Conde

BOYDEN GRAY & ASSOCIATES, PLLC

801 17th Street, N.W., Suite 350

Washington, D.C. 20006

Tel: (202) 955-0620

gustafson@boydengrayassociates.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Competitive Enterprise  
Institute; Buckeye Institute for Public Policy  
Solutions; Independence Institute; Rio Grande  
Foundation; Sutherland Institute; Klaus J.  
Christoph; Samuel R. Damewood; Catherine C.  
Dellin; Joseph W. Luquire; Lisa R. Markham;  
Patrick T. Peterson; and Kristi Rosenquist*

Sam Kazman

COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE

1310 L Street, N.W., 7th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20005

Tel: (202) 331-1010

*Counsel for Petitioner Competitive Enterprise  
Institute*

Robert Alt

BUCKEYE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

SOLUTIONS

88 E. Broad Street, Suite 1120

Columbus, OH 43215

Tel: (614) 224-4422

robert@buckeyeinstitute.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Buckeye Institute for  
Public Policy Solutions*

/s/ Tristan L. Duncan

Tristan L. Duncan  
SHOOK HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, MO 64018  
Tel: (816) 474-6550  
Fax: (816) 421-5547  
tlduncan@shb.com  
jxsmith@shb.com

Jonathan S. Massey  
MASSEY & GAIL, LLP  
1325 G Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 652-4511  
Fax: (312) 379-0467  
jmassey@masseygail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner-Intervenors Dixon Bros.,  
Inc., Nelson Brothers, Inc., Wesco International,  
Inc., Norfolk Southern Corp., Joy Global, Inc.,  
and Gulf Coast Lignite Coalition*

/s/ Jonathan S. Massey

Jonathan S. Massey  
MASSEY & GAIL, LLP  
1325 G Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 652-4511  
Fax: (312) 379-0467  
jmassey@masseygail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner-Intervenor Peabody Energy  
Corporation*

/s/ Mark Walters \_\_\_\_\_

Mark Walters

Michael Nasi

JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.

100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100

Austin, TX 78701

Tel: (512) 236-2000

mwalters@jw.com

mnasi@jw.com

Douglas Bryan Hughes

LAW OFFICES OF D. BRYAN HUGHES

701 N. Pacific Street

Mineola, TX 75773

Tel: (903) 569-8880

bryan@hughesfirm.com

*Counsel for Petitioner-Intervenor Gulf Coast  
Lignite Coalition*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that, on this 24th day of August 2018, a copy of the foregoing Petitioners' and Petitioner-Intervenors' Status Report in Support of Continued Abeyance was served electronically through the Court's CM/ECF system on all ECF-registered counsel.

/s/ Allison D. Wood

Allison D. Wood

# **ATTACHMENT 1**

July 27, 2018

Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr.  
Chief Justice of the United States and  
Circuit Justice for the D.C. Circuit  
Supreme Court of the United States  
1 First Street, NE  
Washington, D.C. 20543

Re: *West Virginia v. EPA*, No. 15A773  
*Basin Elec. Power Coop. v. EPA*, No. 15A776  
*Murray Energy Corp. v. EPA*, No. 15A778  
*Chamber of Commerce v. EPA*, No. 15A787  
*North Dakota v. EPA*, No. 15A793

\* \* \* \*

*West Virginia v. EPA*, No. 15-1363 (D.C. Cir.)

Dear Chief Justice Roberts:

On February 9, 2016, this Court stayed the Environmental Protection Agency's Clean Power Plan, 80 Fed. Reg. 64,662 (Oct. 23, 2015), pending disposition of petitions for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and of any petitions for certiorari in this Court.

The undersigned public health and environmental organizations, who are respondent-intervenors in the D.C. Circuit litigation, hereby notify the Court of developments in the underlying litigation, as suggested by D.C. Circuit judges who highlighted litigants' "continuing duty to inform th[is] Court of any development which may conceivably affect the outcome," *Bd. of License Comm'rs v. Pastore*, 469 U.S. 238, 240 (1985) (per curiam) (quoting *Fusari v. Steinberg*, 419 U.S. 379, 391 (1975) (Burger, C.J., concurring)).

Issued in October 2015 pursuant to section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d), the Clean Power Plan provides for limits on emissions of carbon dioxide from existing power plants. *See Am. Elec. Power v. Connecticut*, 564 U.S. 410, 424 (2011). A number of states and private entities petitioned for judicial review, and other states and private entities intervened to support the rule in *West Virginia v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. Nos. 15-1363, *et al.* After a D.C. Circuit panel denied stay motions and ordered expedited merits briefing, various parties filed stay applications with you as Circuit Justice. On February 9, 2016, this Court granted those applications. The stay orders provide that the Clean Power Plan

is stayed pending disposition of the applicants' petitions for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and disposition of the applicants' petition for a writ of certiorari, if such writ is sought. If a writ of certiorari is sought and the Court denies the petition, this order shall terminate

automatically. If the Court grants the petition for a writ of certiorari, this order shall terminate when the Court enters its judgment.

Order, *West Virginia v. EPA*, No. 15A773. The court of appeals subsequently decided to hear the case initially en banc, and the full D.C. Circuit (with Chief Judge Garland not participating) heard nearly seven hours of oral argument on September 27, 2016.


In March 2017, with the support of the petitioners challenging the Clean Power Plan, and over the opposition of the state, industry, and nongovernmental organization intervenors supporting the rule, EPA moved to put the litigation over the current regulation in abeyance while the agency undertook administrative proceedings to consider revising or repealing the Clean Power Plan. The D.C. Circuit placed the litigation in abeyance for 60 days and has granted a succession of additional 60-day abeyances since. In October 2017, EPA published a proposed regulation to repeal the Clean Power Plan, 82 Fed. Reg. 48,035 (Oct. 16, 2017), but the agency has not finalized that proposal nor proposed any other changes to the Clean Power Plan. *Cf.* 82 Fed. Reg. 61,507 (Dec. 28, 2017) (advance notice of proposed rulemaking, which “does not propose any regulatory requirements”). The agency is reported to be considering a new proposal to revise the Clean Power Plan rather than finalize the proposal to repeal it, but no such proposal has yet issued. EPA has not committed to a firm schedule for issuing the new proposed rule or any final rule, representing only its “intention and expectation is that the [proposed rule] will be published in the Federal Register by late summer or early fall so that the Agency will be in a position to take final action . . . by the first part of 2019.” Status Report, ECF No. 1742722 (July 26, 2018).

Approximately two and one-half years have elapsed since this Court issued a stay pending the D.C. Circuit’s disposition of the petitions for review and any appeal to this Court therefrom, and nearly two years have elapsed since the en banc oral argument. On June 26, 2018, the D.C. Circuit issued the latest 60-day extension of the abeyance. Three judges issued concurring statements noting that the merits review anticipated when this Court stayed the regulations has not materialized; two judges urged the parties to inform this Court of these circumstances. *See* Attachment A, Concurring Statement of Tatel, J., joined by Millett, J. (“[T]he Supreme Court is entitled to decide for itself whether the temporary stay it granted pending *judicial* assessment of the Clean Power Plan ought to continue now that it is being used to maintain the status quo pending *agency* action.”) (emphasis in original); *see also* Attachment B (statement of Judge Tatel and Judge Millett concurring in August 8, 2017 abeyance order). In a separate statement concurring in the June 26 order, Judge Wilkins, also joined by Judge Millett, stated that petitioners and respondent EPA “have hijacked the Court’s equitable power for their own purposes,” and urged that “[i]f EPA or the Petitioners wish to delay further the operation of the Clean Power Plan, then they should avail themselves of whatever authority Congress gave them to do so, rather than availing themselves of the Court’s authority under the guise of preserving jurisdiction over moribund petitions.” Concurring Statement of Wilkins, J., joined by Millett, J., Attachment A.

As the D.C. Circuit judges’ statements highlight, about two and one-half years after the stay *pendente lite* was granted, and contrary to the premise of the stay orders, the litigation has

come to a protracted standstill with the support of the parties that sought a stay in this Court. In light of these changed circumstances, the Court may wish to require the parties to explain why the stay should continue in effect.

Respectfully submitted,



Sean H. Donahue  
*Counsel of Record*  
Susannah L. Weaver  
Donahue, Goldberg & Weaver, LLP  
1111 14th Street, N.W., Suite 510A  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 277-7085  
sean@donahuegoldberg.com  
*Counsel for Environmental Defense Fund*

Tomás Carbonell  
Vickie L. Patton  
Martha Roberts  
Benjamin Levitan  
Environmental Defense Fund  
1875 Conn. Avenue, N.W. Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
(202) 572-3610  
*Counsel for Environmental Defense Fund*

Ann Brewster Weeks  
James P. Duffy  
Clean Air Task Force  
114 State Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Boston, MA 02109  
(617) 624-0234, ext. 156  
*Counsel for American Lung Association,  
Clean Air Council, Clean Wisconsin,  
Conservation Law Foundation, and The  
Ohio Environmental Council*

Vera P. Pardee  
Center for Biological Diversity  
1212 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94612  
(415) 632-5317  
*Counsel for Center for Biological Diversity*

David Doniger  
Benjamin Longstreth  
Melissa J. Lynch  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
1152 15th Street, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 513-6256  
*Counsel for Natural Resources  
Defense Council*

Joanne Spalding  
Andres Restrepo  
Alejandra Núñez  
Sierra Club  
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300  
Oakland, CA 94612  
(415) 977-5725  
*Counsel for Sierra Club*

Howard I. Fox  
Earthjustice  
1625 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 702  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 797-5241  
*Counsel for Sierra Club*

William V. DePaulo  
122 N Court Street, Suite 300  
Lewisburg, WV 24901  
(304) 342-5588  
*Counsel for West Virginia Highlands  
Conservancy, Ohio Valley Environmental  
Coalition, Coal River Mountain Watch,  
Kanawha Forest Coalition, Mon Valley  
Clean Air Coalition, and Keepers of the  
Mountains Foundation*



cc: Listed Counsel, by U.S. Mail and Electronic Mail Where Indicated

Noel J. Francisco  
Solicitor General of the United States  
United States Department of Justice  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Eric G. Hostetler  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Environment & Natural Resources Division  
Environmental Defense Section  
P.O. Box 7611  
Washington, DC 20044  
Email: eric.hostetler@usdoj.gov

*Counsel for the United States*

Lindsay S. See  
Solicitor General  
State of West Virginia  
State Capitol, Bldg. 1, Room 26-E  
Charleston, WV 25305

Scott A. Keller  
Solicitor General  
P.O. Box 12548  
Austin, TX 78741-2548  
Email: scott.keller@texasattorneygeneral.gov

*Counsel for Applicants in No. 15A773*

Christina F. Gomez  
Hollard & Hart LLP  
555 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3200  
Denver, CO 80202  
Email: cgomez@hollandhart.com

*Counsel for Applicants in No. 15A776*

Laurence H. Tribe  
420 Hauser Hall  
1575 Massachusetts Ave.  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
Email: tribe@law.harvard.edu

Geoffrey K. Barnes  
Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP  
127 Public Square, Suite 4900  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
Email: geoffrey.barnes@squirepb.com

*Counsel for Applicants in No. 15A778*

Peter D. Keisler  
Sidley Austin LLP  
1501 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
Email: pkeisler@sidley.com

*Counsel for Applicants in No. 15A787*

Paul M. Seby  
Special Assistant Attorney General State of North Dakota  
Greenberg Traurig LLP  
1200 17th Street, Suite 2400  
Denver, CO 80202  
Email: sebyp@gtlaw.com

*Counsel for Applicant in No. 15A793*

Steven C. Wu  
Deputy Solicitor General  
Michael J. Myers  
Assistant Attorney General  
120 Broadway, 25th Floor  
New York, NY 10271  
Email: steven.wu@ag.ny.gov

*Counsel for State Respondents*

Kevin Poloncarz  
Donald L. Ristow  
Paul Hastings LLP  
55 2nd Street #2400  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 856-7000  
Email: kevinpoloncarz@paulhastings.com

*Counsel for Industry Respondents Calpine, et al.*

## ATTACHMENT A

United States Court of Appeals  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 15-1363

September Term, 2017

EPA-80FR64662  
EPA-82FR4864

Filed On: June 26, 2018

State of West Virginia, et al.,

Petitioners

v.

Environmental Protection Agency and E. Scott  
Pruitt, Administrator, United States Environmental  
Protection Agency,

Respondents

-----  
American Wind Energy Association, et al.,  
Intervenors

-----  
Consolidated with 15-1364, 15-1365, 15-1366,  
15-1367, 15-1368, 15-1370, 15-1371, 15-1372,  
15-1373, 15-1374, 15-1375, 15-1376, 15-1377,  
15-1378, 15-1379, 15-1380, 15-1382, 15-1383,  
15-1386, 15-1393, 15-1398, 15-1409, 15-1410,  
15-1413, 15-1418, 15-1422, 15-1432, 15-1442,  
15-1451, 15-1459, 15-1464, 15-1470, 15-1472,  
15-1474, 15-1475, 15-1477, 15-1483, 15-1488

**BEFORE:** Garland\*, Chief Judge; Henderson, Rogers, Tatel,\*\* Griffith,  
Kavanaugh, Srinivasan, Millett, Pillard, Wilkins,\*\* and Katsas\*, Circuit  
Judges

**ORDER**

It is **ORDERED**, on the court's own motion, that these consolidated cases remain in  
abeyance for 60 days from the date of this order. EPA is directed to continue to file status  
reports at 30-day intervals beginning 30 days from the date of this order.

**Per Curiam**

**FOR THE COURT:**  
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/  
Michael C. McGrail  
Deputy Clerk

\* Chief Judge Garland and Circuit Judge Katsas did not participate in this matter.

\*\* A statement by Circuit Judge Tatel, joined by Circuit Judge Millett, concurring in the order  
granting further abeyance, is attached.

\*\* A statement by Circuit Judge Wilkins, joined by Circuit Judge Millett, is attached.

TATEL, *Circuit Judge*, joined by MILLETT, *Circuit Judge*, concurring in the order granting further abeyance:

Like Judge Wilkins, I have reluctantly voted to continue holding this case in abeyance for now. Although I might well join my colleagues in disapproving any future abeyance requests, I write separately only to reiterate what I said nearly a year ago: that the untenable status quo derives in large part from petitioners' and EPA's treatment of the Supreme Court's order staying implementation of the Clean Power Plan pending judicial resolution of petitioners' legal challenges as indefinite license for EPA to delay compliance with its obligation under the Clean Air Act to regulate greenhouse gases. *See Per Curiam Order, West Virginia v. EPA*, No. 15-1363 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 8, 2017) (Tatel and Millett, JJ., concurring in the order granting further abeyance).

In early 2016, petitioners represented to the Supreme Court that a stay was necessary to protect them from irreparable injury while the federal courts resolved their legal challenges to the Clean Power Plan. *See Application by 29 States and State Agencies for Immediate Stay of Final Agency Action During Pendency of Petitions for Review at 38–45, West Virginia v. EPA*, No. 15A773 (U.S. Jan. 26, 2016). Since then, however, EPA has proposed to repeal the Plan, *see Repeal of Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units*, 82 Fed. Reg. 48,035, 48,035 (proposed Oct. 16, 2017), and both petitioners and EPA itself have urged this court—successfully, so far—to refrain from conducting the very legal analysis the Supreme Court stay was designed to accommodate, *see Petitioners' and Petitioner-Intervenors' Response in Support of EPA's Motion to Hold Cases in Abeyance at 8, West Virginia v. EPA*, No. 15-1363 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 6, 2017) (explaining that because “the case could ultimately be mooted by EPA's forthcoming action,” any present effort to resolve the Rule's legality “would be wasted”).

The Supreme Court has reminded parties that they “have a ‘continuing duty to inform the Court of any development which may conceivably affect the outcome’ of [a] litigation.” *Board of License Commissioners v. Pastore*, 469 U.S. 238, 240 (1985) (per curiam) (quoting *Fusari v. Steinberg*, 419 U.S. 379, 391 (1975) (Burger, C.J., concurring)); *cf. Douglas v. Donovan*, 704 F.2d 1276, 1279 (D.C. Cir. 1983) (“As officers of this court, counsel have an obligation to ensure that the tribunal is aware of significant events that may bear directly on the outcome of litigation.”). Perhaps, if advised of circumstances as they stand today, the Supreme Court would extend the stay to give EPA additional time to consider its options for replacing the Clean Power Plan with greenhouse-gas regulations that better align with the agency's current views. Or perhaps, given EPA's own judicially upheld determination that greenhouse gases pose an ongoing threat to public health and welfare, *see Coalition for Responsible Regulation, Inc. v. EPA*, 684 F.3d 102 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (per curiam), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part on other grounds sub nom. Utility Air Regulatory Group v. EPA*, 134 S. Ct. 2427 (2014), and the Court's decade-old recognition in *Massachusetts v. EPA* that “[u]nder the clear terms of the Clean Air Act,” EPA must take regulatory action in the face of such a determination, 549 U.S. 497, 533 (2007), the Court would determine that the need for expeditious agency action does not permit the luxury of continued delay. Either way, and especially given that EPA has yet to present any concrete alternative for complying with *Massachusetts v. EPA*, the Supreme Court is entitled to decide for itself whether the temporary stay it granted pending *judicial* assessment of the Clean Power Plan ought to continue now that it is being used to maintain the status quo pending *agency* action.

WILKINS, *Circuit Judge*, joined by MILLETT, *Circuit Judge*:

Over a year has passed since we first held in abeyance our decision in this case – and nearly two years since oral argument. I will join in one further abeyance, but I am writing to apprise the parties that it is the last one that I am inclined to grant.

The Court’s ability to hold a case in abeyance – or to stay a rule – derives from the Court’s inherent equitable power to “preserv[e] rights” and “to save the public interest from injury or destruction while an appeal is being heard.” *See Scripps-Howard Radio v. F.C.C.*, 316 U.S. 4, 15 (1942). The Administrative Procedure Act codifies this in the rulemaking context by enabling courts, where “necessary to prevent irreparable injury,” “to postpone the effective date of an agency action or to preserve status or rights *pending conclusion of the review proceedings*.” 5 U.S.C. § 705 (emphasis added). Thus, the Court’s equitable power to maintain the status quo is inextricably tied to the Court’s authority to resolve disputes. *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 421 (2009) (power to stay an action or ruling “allow[s] an appellate court the time necessary to review it”); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) (All Writs Act empowers courts to “issue all writs necessary or appropriate *in aid of their respective jurisdictions*” (emphasis added)). Courts cannot simply issue stays without an active case pending. *See In re GTE Serv. Corp.*, 762 F.2d 1024, 1026 (D.C. Cir. 1985) (Absent a petition, “there was no ongoing proceeding in this court in which a motion for stay could have been filed and thus the court did not have jurisdiction to grant the motion for stay.”).

While this matter technically remains pending before us, in reality, the dispute appears to have dissipated. From the beginning of the abeyance proceedings, Petitioners and Petitioner-Intervenors have supported the request by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that the Court detain its decision, on the basis that the Clean Power Plan may be short-lived after agency review. *See* Doc. #1669984, Pet’rs’ and Pet’r-Intervenors’ Resp. in Supp. of EPA’s Mot. to Hold Cases in Abeyance. In other words, the parties who brought this controversy have joined their erstwhile adversary in seeking indefinite delay of the very result that their Petitions request – that is, this Court’s review of the Clean Power Plan – and Petitioners appear to have no current interest in prosecuting this action to disposition. Meanwhile, EPA has offered no indication of when it expects its review of the CPP to be complete, and instead simply asserts that “these cases should remain in abeyance pending the conclusion of [its] rulemaking [process].” Doc. #1733943, EPA Status Report (June 1, 2018). In this posture, our abeyance does not serve to maintain the status quo while the Court decides the disposition of the Petitions: instead, the result is the maintenance of the status quo while EPA decides the disposition of the rule that the Petitions challenge. The upshot is that the Petitioners and EPA have hijacked the Court’s equitable power for their own purposes. If EPA or the Petitioners wish to delay further the operation of the Clean Power Plan while the agency engages in rulemaking, then they should avail themselves of whatever authority Congress gave them to do so, rather than availing themselves of the Court’s authority under the guise of preserving jurisdiction over moribund petitions.

Unless Petitioners articulate a good reason to conclude otherwise, it would appear that the equities will no longer favor granting further abeyance in 60 days. At that time, I will urge the Court to dismiss the Petitions without prejudice and remand the case to EPA.

## ATTACHMENT B

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 15-1363

September Term, 2016

EPA-80FR64662

EPA-82FR4864

Filed On: August 8, 2017

State of West Virginia, et al.,

Petitioners

v.

Environmental Protection Agency and E. Scott
Pruitt, Administrator, United States Environmental
Protection Agency,

Respondents

American Wind Energy Association, et al.,
Intervenors

Consolidated with 15-1364, 15-1365, 15-1366,
15-1367, 15-1368, 15-1370, 15-1371, 15-1372,
15-1373, 15-1374, 15-1375, 15-1376, 15-1377,
15-1378, 15-1379, 15-1380, 15-1382, 15-1383,
15-1386, 15-1393, 15-1398, 15-1409, 15-1410,
15-1413, 15-1418, 15-1422, 15-1432, 15-1442,
15-1451, 15-1459, 15-1464, 15-1470, 15-1472,
15-1474, 15-1475, 15-1477, 15-1483, 15-1488

BEFORE: Garland\*, Chief Judge, and Henderson, Rogers, Tatel\*\*, Brown,
Griffith, Kavanaugh, Srinivasan, Millett\*\*, Pillard, and Wilkins,
Circuit Judges

ORDER

It is ORDERED, on the court's own motion, that these consolidated cases remain in
abeyance for 60 days from the date of this order. EPA is directed to continue to file status
reports at 30-day intervals beginning 30 days from the date of this order.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Ken Meadows
Deputy Clerk

\* Chief Judge Garland did not participate in this matter.

\*\* A statement by Circuit Judges Tatel and Millett, concurring in granting further abeyance is
attached.



**United States Court of Appeals**  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

**No. 15-1363**

**September Term, 2016**

TATEL, *Circuit Judge*, and MILLETT, *Circuit Judge*, concurring in the order granting further abeyance:

The Supreme Court stayed the Rule under review here “pending disposition of the . . . petitions for review” in this court and, if certiorari were granted, in the Supreme Court. *West Virginia v. EPA*, 136 S. Ct. 1000 (2016). As this court has held the case in abeyance, the Supreme Court’s stay now operates to postpone application of the Clean Power Plan indefinitely while the agency reconsiders and perhaps repeals the Rule. That in and of itself might not be a problem but for the fact that, in 2009, EPA promulgated an endangerment finding, which we have sustained. *Coalition for Responsible Regulation, Inc. v. EPA*, 684 F.3d 102 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (*per curiam*), *aff’d in part and rev’d in part on other grounds*, *Utility Air Regulatory Grp. v. EPA*, 134 S. Ct. 2427 (2014). That finding triggered an affirmative statutory obligation to regulate greenhouse gases. *See Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497, 533 (2007) (“Under the clear terms of the Clean Air Act, EPA can avoid taking further action only if it determines that greenhouse gases do not contribute to climate change or if it provides some reasonable explanation as to why it cannot or will not exercise its discretion to determine whether they do.”). Combined with this court’s abeyance, the stay has the effect of relieving EPA of its obligation to comply with that statutory duty for the indefinite future. Questions regarding the continuing scope and effect of the Supreme Court’s stay, however, must be addressed to that Court.