

ORAL ARGUMENT NOT YET SCHEDULED

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

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA, ET AL.,)	
)	
Petitioners,)	No. 15-1381 (and
)	consolidated cases)
v.)	
)	
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL)	
PROTECTION AGENCY,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

**RESPONDENTS' OPPOSITION TO PETITIONERS' MOTION TO
SUSPEND BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND CROSS-MOTION TO
ESTABLISH MODIFIED BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

Petitioners and Petitioner-Intervenors (collectively, “Petitioners”) moved on May 24, 2016, to suspend the briefing schedule previously established in this case for at least two and a half months, to allow for the consolidation of new anticipated petitions for review that will challenge a related action of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”). ECF No. 1614749. EPA and Respondent-Intervenors (collectively “Respondents”) do not agree that a suspension of briefing is necessary to accomplish the stated purpose of consolidation and, therefore, oppose Petitioners’ motion. Respondents request, instead, that the Court simply modify the schedule in a manner that will reasonably accommodate consolidation as well as the need for the parties’ briefs to address any new issues that

may arise from the new petitions. Respondents have identified the schedule modification they propose for these purposes in Paragraph 15 *infra*. The grounds for Respondents' opposition and cross-motion are further stated below:

BACKGROUND

A. Current Petitions for Review, Related Litigation, and Anticipated New Petitions

1. The current consolidated petitions on file with the Court seek review of EPA's "Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units; Final Rule" ("the 111(b) Rule"). 80 Fed. Reg. 64,510 (Oct. 23, 2015). The 111(b) Rule secures CO₂ emission reductions from new, modified, and reconstructed fossil-fuel-fired power plants by establishing standards of performance for two subcategories of plants: fossil fuel-fired electric utility steam generating units (chiefly utility boilers) and stationary combustion turbines (chiefly natural gas-fired units). See generally id.

2. Fifteen petitions for review of the 111(b) Rule, filed by state governmental entities, companies, trade organizations and labor groups, have been consolidated under lead case No. 15-1381.¹ A number of states and other governmental entities, industrial entities, and environmental groups have intervened as Respondents in support of EPA. See ECF No. 1600183 ¶ 9 (Respondents' Proposed

¹ A sixteenth petition, filed by Biogenic CO₂ Coalition (No. 15-1480), was severed and held in abeyance pending further order of the Court. ECF No. 1605581 (Order dated March 24, 2016).

Briefing Format and Schedule filed Feb. 22, 2016, describing more fully the entities that have intervened as Respondents).

3. A separate but related rule commonly known as the “Clean Power Plan,” which was promulgated on the same date as the 111(b) Rule, establishes emission guidelines for states to follow in developing plans to limit CO₂ emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired power plants. 80 Fed. Reg. 64,662 (Oct. 23, 2015); see generally 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d). Although the litigation challenging these two rules has not been consolidated into one action, the rules themselves are clearly related; indeed, the statute requires the establishment of standards for existing sources “to which a standard of performance under this section [111] would apply if such existing source were a new source.” 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d)(1). Petitions challenging the Clean Power Plan are consolidated under West Virginia v. EPA, No. 15-1363.

4. On May 6, 2016, EPA published a new final action denying five administrative petitions for reconsideration of the 111(b) Rule. See “Reconsideration of Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units; Notice of final action denying petitions for reconsideration,” 81 Fed. Reg. 27,442 (the “Reconsideration Denial”). The deadline under the Clean Air Act to file judicial petitions for review of this final action is July 5, 2016. See 42 U.S.C. § 7607(b)(1).

5. At least three of the five entities whose administrative reconsideration petitions were denied by EPA are expected to file judicial petitions for review—the

State of Wisconsin, the Energy & Environmental Legal Institute, and the Utility Air Regulatory Group. See Petitioners' Motion to Suspend Briefing Schedule ¶ 3. All three are already current Petitioners in the 111(b) Rule case. Id.; see Petitions Nos. 15-1399, 15-1397, and 15-1448. The remaining two entities whose administrative reconsideration petitions were denied by EPA are American Electric Power and Ameren Corporation, and at least one of them is a member of a current Petitioner (specifically, the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity, No. 15-1481).²

B. Current Litigation Schedules for Clean Power Plan and 111(b) Rule

6. In West Virginia, the Court ordered an expedited schedule for briefing the challenges to the Clean Power Plan, pursuant to which the parties submitted their final briefs on April 22, 2016. ECF No. 1595922. After originally scheduling oral argument in that case to be held before a three-judge panel on June 2, 2016, the Court issued an order on May 16, 2016, cancelling that argument and scheduling an *en banc* argument to be held September 27, 2016. ECF No. 1613489.

7. Although the Court has not ordered expedited briefing for the 111(b) Rule as it did for the Clean Power Plan, both Petitioners and Respondents have long made clear their interest in resolving challenges to the 111(b) Rule as promptly as is feasible without having to simultaneously prepare briefs or argument in both cases,

² See <http://www.americaspower.org/about-acce/bios/members/> (reviewed online on June 3, 2016).

given the extensive overlap of the parties in the two cases and the burden that simultaneous briefing or argument in the two cases would entail. See, e.g., ECF No. 1593420 ¶ 2 (Reply of North Dakota and Energy & Environment Legal Inst. to Response to Motion to Extend Time to File Briefing Schedule, noting that “petitioners in both cases desire expeditious proceedings, [b]ut have devoted their finite resources first to *West Virginia et al*”); ECF No. 1600183 ¶ 16 (Respondents’ Proposed Briefing Schedule and Format).

8. The scheduling order currently governing the 111(b) Rule case was entered on March 24, 2016. ECF No. 1605581. Under that order, Petitioners’ opening briefs are due July 15, 2016, approximately six weeks after the June 2 date when the parties until recently were preparing to present oral argument regarding the Clean Power Plan. EPA’s and Respondent-Intervenors’ briefs in the 111(b) Rule case are currently due on September 23 and 30, respectively, with replies to be filed on October 21 and final briefs on November 14, 2016. Id.

ARGUMENT

A. Respondents Do Not Oppose Consolidation, But Oppose Suspending the Schedule Because That Will Cause Needless Delay.

9. Petitioners’ new procedural motion in the 111(b) Rule case asks that the Court: (a) suspend the current schedule; (b) require that a motion to consolidate petitions challenging the Reconsideration Denial with the current case be filed by July

12, 2016; and (c) further require that a motion to amend the briefing schedule be filed by August 4, 2016. Petitioners' Motion to Suspend Schedule ¶¶ 5-7.

10. Respondents support consolidation in the particular circumstances of this case, and agree that the parties should be able to brief and argue at one time the merits of all issues raised by the 111(b) Rule and the related Reconsideration Denial. Id. ¶ 4. However, such consolidation should not come at the expense of unnecessarily delaying the final resolution of these issues. This is particularly the case given the relationship between the 111(b) Rule and the Clean Power Plan.³ The Court has expressly adopted measures to expedite its resolution of the challenges to the latter rule; an extended delay of the 111(b) Rule litigation should therefore be avoided to prevent lingering uncertainty regarding the judicial resolution of the challenges to *both* rules.

11. The Court can consolidate the 111(b) Rule case with the anticipated Reconsideration Denial challenges, while also preventing or at least minimizing delay of the current schedule, by entering a modified briefing schedule *now*. Petitioners suggest that waiting until August to consider a proposed schedule modification “will allow any new petitioners to the case to be known and to be consulted.” Petitioners’

³ See 42 USC § 7411 (d)(1)(A)(ii) (section 111 (d) applies to existing sources “to which a standard of performance under this section would apply if such existing source were a new source”); 80 Fed. Reg. 64,710 (Oct. 23, 2015) (“section 111 (d) applies only to air pollutants for which the existing source would be regulated under section 111 if it were a new source”).

Motion to Suspend Briefing Schedule ¶ 7. Such reasoning made sense at the outset of this litigation, when a few early petitions of the 111(b) Rule had been filed and a large number of additional entities were expected to potentially seek review of the rule.⁴ It does not make sense now because, as shown above, at least four of the five entities who are likely to challenge the Reconsideration Denial *already* are parties in the 111(b) Rule case, and the identity of the remaining entity, Ameren Corporation, is known.

Supra ¶ 5.

12. Moreover, Petitioners acknowledge that when they finally submit their anticipated briefing schedule modification in August, they envision merely “a uniform shifting of the deadlines by a fixed number of days” and “proposing appropriate additions to the word allocations for the briefs to accommodate the new issues arising from the Reconsideration Denial,” with no other change needed to the existing briefing format. Petitioners’ Motion to Suspend Briefing Schedule ¶ 7.

As discussed further below, EPA’s proposal would establish the envisioned shift of the briefing deadlines *now*, in a fashion that will not prejudice the current Petitioners or Ameren, while allowing the parties an opportunity prior to the opening brief deadline to seek additions to the word allocations if necessary.

⁴ See ECF No. 1585345 (Respondent EPA’s Motion to Extend Time for Establishing a Briefing Schedule, filed Nov. 24, 2015). At the time of this motion, four petitions for review of the 111(b) Rule had been filed, and many more were expected, with the identity of the additional filers impossible to ascertain. Id. ¶¶ 2, 5. Ultimately, a total of sixteen petitions were filed, including one that was later severed from the rest and held in abeyance. Supra ¶ 2 & n.1.

13. Finally, modifying the schedule now rather than waiting until August to propose an unspecified “uniform shifting of the deadlines” will enable the parties to prevent needless inconvenience by setting filing deadlines on dates that will avoid schedule and staff disruptions in periods overlapping with major holidays. A sixty-day shift of the current filing deadlines, for example, would make EPA’s brief due Tuesday, November 22, 2016—two days before Thanksgiving—while the joint appendix would become due Tuesday, January 3, 2017. See ECF No. 1605581 at 2-3. Respondents’ proposal, which is set forth in Paragraph 15 below, avoids such problems.

14. Because consolidation may be accomplished without the additional delay and other potential complications that would result from Petitioners’ suggested approach, Respondents oppose Petitioners’ request to suspend the briefing schedule.

B. Respondents’ Proposed Modification of the Schedule Reasonably Accommodates Consolidation and May Be Adopted Now.

15. In order to allow time for consolidation of Reconsideration Denial challenges with the current 111(b) Rule case, and to brief any additional issues arising from such challenges, Respondents propose that the following new or revised deadlines be adopted as a modification to the March 24, 2016 briefing schedule order:

- Motion to consolidate petitions to be filed no later than Tuesday, July 12, 2016;

- EPA to file the certified index to the administrative record for the Reconsideration Denial within five business days after the first petition for judicial review of that action is filed, and no later than July 12, 2016;
- Motion/s to modify the current word allocations to be filed no later than July 12, 2016, with responses due by Friday, July 15, 2016;
- Petitioners' opening briefs and Petitioner-Intervenor's brief due Friday, August 12, 2016;
- EPA's brief due Friday, October 7, 2016;
- Respondent-Intervenors' briefs due Wednesday, October 12, 2016;
- Petitioners' reply briefs due Wednesday, November 2, 2016;
- Joint appendix due Wednesday, November 9, 2016; and
- Final briefs due Monday, November 14, 2016.

16. EPA's schedule will not cause any prejudice to Petitioners or to Ameren Corporation if that entity elects to seek review of the Reconsideration Denial. EPA proposes the same deadline for a consolidation motion that Petitioners have suggested; and it proposes to give Petitioners until August 12, 2016, to file their opening briefs—effectively, a four-week extension of the current opening brief deadline. EPA posted its denial of the reconsideration petitions and the key

document explaining its decision on May 2, 2016.⁵ In addition, all documents relating to the Reconsideration Denial were docketed and publically available from the date of promulgation of the denial, as required by the Clean Air Act. See 42 USC § 7607(d)(4)(B)(ii). Consequently, petitioners will have had access to all of the documents comprising EPA’s administrative record for the Reconsideration Denial for more than three months by the date Respondents propose that their opening briefs be due (i.e., August 12).

17. Under Respondents’ proposal, Petitioners also will have at least four weeks after EPA files the certified index to the record for the Reconsideration Denial to complete preparation of their briefs. Although 40 days is the standard interval for filing opening briefs after the certified index is submitted, Fed. R. App. P. 31(a), the record for the Reconsideration Denial adds only a relatively small number of documents to the original record for the 111(b) Rule, and, as noted above, Petitioners have had access to all of those documents since early May. Accordingly, four weeks is a reasonable period by which to submit briefs taking these additional record documents into account. Moreover, the certified index for the original record will have been on file for some eight months by the time EPA proposes that opening

⁵ See https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-04/documents/111b_recondocument_april2016.pdf.

briefs be due, far longer than in a typical petition case. See ECF No. 1588089 (EPA's Notice of Filing of Certified Index, submitted Dec. 14, 2015).

18. Respondents also propose that Petitioners retain the same filing interval they have now for their reply briefs—i.e., such briefs would be 21 days after the Respondent-Intervenors' briefs. Compare supra ¶ 15 with ECF No. 1605581 at 2 (March 24, 2016 scheduling order).

19. Moreover, Respondents' proposal allows Petitioners to avoid any overlap of their obligation to prepare briefs in the 111(b) Rule case with their presentation of oral argument concerning the Clean Power Plan, as Respondents' proposed deadline for Petitioners' opening briefs (August 12, 2016) is nearly seven weeks prior to the oral argument (September 27, 2016), while the proposed reply date is five weeks afterward. Respondents' proposal thus meets Petitioners' stated preference to avoid substantial overlap in their litigation deadlines in the two cases. See supra ¶ 7.

20. Respondents further propose that any motions to modify word allocation be due by July 12, 2016, and that responses be filed within three business days—by Friday, July 15, 2016—to facilitate the Court's entry of a final word allocation order reasonably well in advance of when the opening briefs would be due.

21. The only changes Respondents propose to the existing schedule that would modestly shorten any filing dates involving Petitioners are as follows: (a) Respondents propose that the joint appendix be submitted seven days after the reply

briefs, rather than fourteen; and (b) Respondents propose that final briefs be submitted five days after the joint appendix, rather than ten. Compare supra ¶ 15 with ECF No. 1605581 at 2-3. These intervals, though shortened, are still consistent with schedules the Court routinely orders in other petition cases, and are more generous than the comparable filing intervals that the Court ordered in the Clean Power Plan case. See ECF No. 1595922 at 2 (January 28, 2016 scheduling order in West Virginia, allowing three days to submit the joint appendix and four to submit final briefs).

22. Respondents' proposal avoids any delay in the filing of final briefs, which currently are due on November 14, 2016 and would remain so under this proposal. Compare supra ¶ 15 with ECF No. 1605581 at 3. Respondents propose to achieve this result primarily by shortening the filing interval for EPA's brief from 70 days to 49, and by shortening the filing interval for Respondent-Intervenors' briefs from seven days after EPA's brief to five. Compare supra ¶ 15 with ECF No. 1605581 at 2. All of the signatories to this Opposition and Cross-Motion agree that any inconvenience to Respondents occasioned by this alteration of their briefing interval intervals is reasonable and acceptable given the public interest in avoiding a delay of the final resolution of this case.

CONCLUSION

23. For the foregoing reasons, the undersigned Respondents respectfully request that the Court deny Petitioners' Motion to Suspend Briefing Schedule and instead enter an order adopting the modified schedule described in Paragraph 15 above.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN C. CRUDEN
Assistant Attorney General
Environment & Natural Resources Division

June 6, 2016

/s/ Brian H. Lynk
BRIAN H. LYNK, D.C. Bar No. 459525
U.S. Department of Justice
Environmental Defense Section
P.O. Box 7611
Washington, D.C. 20044
Phone: (202) 514-6187
Email: brian.lynk@usdoj.gov

For Respondent EPA

Of Counsel:

Steven Silverman
Scott J. Jordan
United States Environmental
Protection Agency
Office of General Counsel
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

KAMALA D. HARRIS
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Robert W. Byrne

Sally Magnani

Senior Assistant Attorneys General

Gavin G. McCabe

David A. Zonana

Supervising Deputy Attorneys General

Timothy E. Sullivan

Elizabeth B. Rumsey

Jonathan Wiener

Deputy Attorneys General

1515 Clay Street

Oakland, CA 94612

(510) 622-2100

Attorneys for the State of California, by and through Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., the California Air Resources Board, and Attorney General Kamala D. Harris

FOR THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

GEORGE JEPSEN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Matthew I. Levine

Kirsten S. P. Rigney

Scott N. Koschwitz

Assistant Attorneys General

Office of the Attorney General

P.O. Box 120, 55 Elm Street

Hartford, CT 06141-0120

(860) 808-5250

FOR THE STATE OF DELAWARE

MATTHEW P. DENN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Valerie S. Edge

Deputy Attorney General
Delaware Department of Justice
102 West Water Street, 3d Floor
Dover, DE 19904
(302) 739-4636

FOR THE STATE OF HAWAII

DOUGLAS S. CHIN
ATTORNEY GENERAL
William F. Cooper
Deputy Attorney General
425 Queen Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 586-1500

FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

LISA MADIGAN
ATTORNEY GENERAL
Matthew J. Dunn
Gerald T. Karr
James P. Gignac
Assistant Attorneys General
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
Lucas State Office Building
321 E. 12th St., Room 18
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
(515) 281-5351

FOR THE STATE OF MAINE

JANET T. MILLS
ATTORNEY GENERAL
Gerald D. Reid
Natural Resources Division Chief
6 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
(207) 626-8800

FOR THE STATE OF MARYLAND

BRIAN E. FROSH
ATTORNEY GENERAL
Thiruvendran Vignarajah
Deputy Attorney General
200 St. Paul Place, 20th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202
(410) 576-6328

Attorneys for State of Maryland,
By and through Attorney General
Brian E. Frosh

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MAURA HEALEY
ATTORNEY GENERAL
Melissa A. Hoffer
Christophe Courchesne
Assistant Attorneys General
Environmental Protection Division
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 963-2423

FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

LORI SWANSON
ATTORNEY GENERAL
Karen D. Olson
Deputy Attorney General
Max Kieley
Assistant Attorney General
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 900
St. Paul, MN 55101-2127
(651) 757-1244

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

FOR THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

JOSEPH A. FOSTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL
K. Allen Brooks
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Chief, Environmental Bureau
33 Capitol Street
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 271-3679

FOR THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

HECTOR BALDERAS
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Tannis Fox

Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General

408 Galisteo Street

Villagra Building

Santa Fe, NM 87501

(505) 827-6000

FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Barbara Underwood

Solicitor General

Steven C. Wu

Deputy Solicitor General

Bethany A Davis Noll

Karen W. Lin

Assistants Solicitor General

Michael J. Myers

Andrew G. Frank

Assistant Attorneys General

Environmental Protection Bureau

The Capitol

Albany, NY 12224

(518) 776-2392

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

(503-497-4593)

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

WILLIAM H. SORRELL
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Nick Persampieri

Assistant Attorneys General

Office of the Attorney General

109 State Street

Montpelier, VT 05609-1001

(802) 828-2359

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

MARK HERRING
ATTORNEY GENERAL

John W. Daniel, II

Deputy Attorney General

Lynne Rhode

Senior Assistant Attorney General and Chief

Matthew L. Gooch

Assistant Attorney General

Environmental Section

Office of the Attorney General

900 East Main Street

Richmond, VA 23219

(804) 225-3193

FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

ROBERT W. FERGUSON

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Katharine G. Shirey

Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General

P.O. Box 40117

Olympia, WA 98504-0117

(360) 586-4613

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

KARL A. RACINE

ATTORNEY GENERAL

James C. McKay, Jr.

Senior Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General

441 Fourth Street, NW

Suite 630 South

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 724-5690

FOR THE CITY OF NEW YORK

ZACHARY W. CARTER

CORPORATION COUNSEL

Carrie Noteboom

Senior Counsel

New York City Law Department

100 Church Street

New York, NY 10007

(212) 356-2319

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

Sean H. Donahue
Donahue & Goldberg, LLP
1130 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 950
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 277-7085
sean@donahuegoldberg.com
Counsel for Environmental Defense Fund

Tomás Carbonell
Vickie Patton
Martha Roberts
Peter Zalzal
Environmental Defense Fund
1875 Connecticut Avenue NW
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 572-3610
tcarbonell@edf.org
Counsel for Environmental Defense Fund

Joanne Spalding
Andres Restrepo
Alejandra Núñez
Sierra Club
85 Second Street, Second Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 977-5725
joanne.spalding@sierraclub.org
Counsel for Sierra Club

Howard I. Fox
David S. Baron
Timothy D. Ballo
Earthjustice
1625 Mass. Ave., NW, Suite 702
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 667-4500
hfox@earthjustice.org
Counsel for Sierra Club

Ann Brewster Weeks
James P. Duffy
Clean Air Task Force
18 Tremont Street, Suite 530
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 624-0234, ext. 156
aweeks@catf.us
Counsel for American Lung Association, Clean Air Council, Clean Wisconsin, Conservation Law Foundation, and The Ohio Environmental Council

Vera P. Pardee
Kevin P. Bundy
Center for Biological Diversity
1212 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612
(415) 632-5317
vpardee@biologicaldiversity.org
Counsel for Center for Biological Diversity

William V. DePaulo
122 N Court Street, Suite 300
Lewisburg, WV 24901
Tel: 304-342-5588
william.depaulo@gmail.com
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

Kevin Poloncarz
Donald L. Ristow
Paul Hastings LLP
55 2nd Street #2400
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 856-7000
kevinpoloncarz@paulhastings.com
*Counsel for Calpine Corporation, the
City of Austin d/ b/ a Austin Energy,
the City of Los Angeles, by and through its
Department of Water and Power, the City of Seattle,
by and through its City Light Department,
National Grid Generation, LLC, New York Power Authority,
Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and Sacramento Municipal Utility District*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing Respondents' Opposition to Petitioners' Motion to Suspend Briefing Schedule and Cross-Motion to Establish Modified Briefing Schedule has been served through the Court's CM/ECF system on all registered counsel this 6th day of June 2016. I further certify that an additional copy was sent by electronic mail on the same date to the following counsel for

Ameren Corporation:

Raghav Murali, Esq.
Schiff Hardin LLP
2333 South Wacker Drive
Suite 6600
Chicago, IL 60606
rmurali@schiffhardin.com

/s/ Brian H. Lynk
Counsel for Respondent