

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

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

---

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

Petitioners,

v.

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

Respondents.

---

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

(Counsel listed on Signature Pages)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	2
CONCLUSION.....	4

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

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

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

---

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

## ARGUMENT

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

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

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

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

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

### **CONCLUSION**

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

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

Dated: August 2, 2018

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

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

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New  
Jersey*



GEORGE JEPSEN  
Attorney General of the  
State of Connecticut

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner the State of  
Connecticut*

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

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of  
Illinois*

MATTHEW P. DENN  
Attorney General of the  
State of Delaware

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of  
Delaware*

JANET T. MILLS  
Attorney General of the  
State of Maine

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of  
Maine*

BRIAN E. FROSH  
Attorney General of the  
State of Maryland

MAURA HEALEY  
Attorney General of the  
Commonwealth of Massachusetts

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

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner  
Commonwealth of Massachusetts*

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

LORI SWANSON  
Attorney General of the  
State of Minnesota

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

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

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

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New  
Mexico*

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

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New  
York*

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM  
Attorney General of the  
State of Oregon

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of  
Oregon*

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

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of  
North Carolina*

JOSH SHAPIRO  
Attorney General of the  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

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

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

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

*Attorney for Petitioner State of  
Rhode Island*

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

ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
Attorney General for the  
State of Washington

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of  
Washington*

KARL A. RACINE  
Attorney General of the  
District of Columbia

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner District of  
Columbia*

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

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

*Attorneys for Petitioner the State of  
Vermont*

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

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

Dated: August 3, 2018

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

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

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

Dated: August 3, 2018

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