

## ORAL ARGUMENT NOT YET SCHEDULED

**No. 20-1145**

Consolidated with Cases No. 20-1167, -1168,  
-1169, -1173, -1174, -1176, -1177 & -1230

---

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

---

COMPETTIVE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE et al.,

*Petitioners,*

v.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION et al.,

*Respondents,*

---

**MOTION OF ALL PETITIONERS, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
INTERVENORS, AND PUBLIC INTEREST ORGANIZATION  
INTERVENORS TO ESTABLISH BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND FORMAT**

---

These petitions collectively seek review of final rules that Respondents National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (collectively, Agencies) published together as *The Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule for Model Years 2021–2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks*, 85 Fed. Reg. 24,174 (Apr. 30, 2020) (Final Rules); and a step toward EPA’s final rule that the agency published as *Mid-Term Evaluation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards for Model Year 2022–2025 Light-Duty Vehicles*, 83 Fed. Reg. 16,077 (Apr. 13, 2018) (Revised Determination). Movants respectfully request that the Court establish a briefing format and schedule in these cases that will allow for oral argument during the current Term.

Petitioners are a diverse group of public and private entities that will present a wide range of arguments for why one or more of the Agencies' actions are unlawful. Some Petitioners also have moved to intervene to defend the Agencies against claims made by other Petitioners. But all Petitioners share the goal that these cases be briefed in an orderly fashion and that the Court be able to hear argument during its current Term. Accordingly, for the reasons stated *infra*, pages 6–9, all movants request that the Court establish the briefing schedule below, which anticipates disposition of this motion no later than October 9, 2020.

Petitioners	November 10, 2020
Amici curiae supporting Petitioners and amici curiae supporting neither party	November 17, 2020
Respondents	January 19, 2021
Amici curiae supporting Respondents	January 26, 2021
Intervenors supporting Respondents	January 26, 2021
Petitioners (reply)	February 22, 2021
Deferred Appendix	February 26, 2021
Final briefs	March 5, 2021

With respect to briefing format, for the reasons stated *infra*, at 9–13, movants request that this Court permit Petitioners to file five separate principal briefs:

- 1 brief for Competitive Enterprise Institute et al. (CEI) in Case No. 20-1145
- 1 brief for Clean Fuels Development Coalition et al. (CFDC) in No. 20-1230
- 3 briefs divided among the following “Coordinating Petitioners”: State and Local Government Petitioners (Nos. 20-1167 and -1173), Public Interest Organization Petitioners (Nos. 20-1168 and -1169), and Advanced Energy and

Transportation Petitioners (Nos. 20-1174, -1176, and -1177). These three groups of Petitioners are described further on pages 11–13, *infra*.

In addition, for the reasons stated *infra*, at pages 14–22, CEI, CFDC, and Coordinating Petitioners each move on their own behalf, without the support of other movants, for the word allotments specified in the table below. Lastly, for the reasons stated *infra*, pages 22–23, those Petitioners that have moved to intervene in other petitions (hereinafter, Coordinating Intervenors) move on their own behalf for the word allotment specified below, to be divided between two intervenor briefs: one brief for State and Local Government Intervenors and one brief for Public Interest Organization Intervenors.

If the Court grants all relief requested in this motion by any party, the briefing format for Petitioners and Coordinating Intervenors will be as follows:

Briefs of Petitioners	CEI: 13,000 words CFDC: 13,000 words Coordinating Petitioners: 46,000 words split among 3 briefs
Briefs of Intervenors supporting Respondents	Coordinating Intervenors: 8,000 words split between 2 briefs
Reply briefs of Petitioners	CEI: 8,000 words CFDC: 7,000 words Coordinating Petitioners: 23,000 words split among 3 briefs

While this motion does not specify the number of briefs or word allotments for non-movants, movants respectfully request that the Court establish a briefing format for those parties that is consonant with the briefing format established for movants.

Respondents oppose this motion and will file a response. Ingevity Corporation does not oppose the motion and will file a response regarding briefing format. Alliance for Automotive Innovation; American Honda Motor Co., Inc.; BMW of North America, LLC; Ford Motor Company; Rolls-Royce Motor Cars NA, LLC; and Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. have not stated a position.

### **BACKGROUND**

The Clean Air Act directs EPA to “by regulation prescribe ... standards applicable to the emission of any air pollutant from any class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, which in [the EPA Administrator’s] judgment cause, or contribute to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.” 42 U.S.C. § 7521(a)(1). In 2012, EPA prescribed standards applicable to greenhouse gas emissions from light-duty vehicles (passenger cars and light trucks) of model years 2017–2025. 77 Fed. Reg. 62,624, 63,149–87 (Oct. 15, 2012). In the same Federal Register notice, NHTSA “prescribe[d] by regulation average fuel economy standards,” 49 U.S.C. § 32902(a), for light-duty vehicles of model years 2017–2021 under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, 77 Fed. Reg. at 63,187–99, and published “augural,” nonbinding standards for model year 2022–2025 vehicles, *id.* at 62,629 & n.8.

EPA committed to conduct a “mid-term evaluation” “[n]o later than April 1, 2018,” to “determine whether [its emission] standards ... for the 2022 through 2025 model years are [still] appropriate.” 40 C.F.R. § 86.1818-12(h). EPA issued that evaluation in 2017, determining that standards for those model years remained appropriate.

*See California v. EPA*, 940 F.3d 1342, 1347–48 (D.C. Cir. 2019). In 2018, EPA issued a Revised Determination, “‘withdrawing’ the [prior determination] and concluding that the standards were ‘not appropriate.’” *Id.* at 1348. Many Petitioners here filed petitions for review of the Revised Determination at that time. This Court dismissed the petitions as unripe because “the Revised Determination is not judicially reviewable final action.” *Id.* at 1353.

Earlier this year, EPA published a final rule revising its greenhouse gas standards for model year 2021–2025 light-duty vehicles and prescribing new standards for model year 2026 vehicles. Final Rules, 85 Fed. Reg. at 25,268–72. In the same 1,105-page Federal Register notice, NHTSA “prescribe[d] by regulation average fuel economy standards” for model year 2021–2026 light-duty vehicles under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975. 49 U.S.C. § 32902(a); *see* Final Rules, 85 Fed. Reg. at 25,272–78.

This Court has consolidated nine petitions for review of EPA’s rule, NHTSA’s rule, and/or EPA’s Revised Determination. Seven of the petitions were filed by the Coordinating Petitioners: State and Local Government Petitioners (Cases No. 20-1167 and -1173), Public Interest Organization Petitioners (20-1168 and -1169), and Advanced Energy and Transportation Petitioners (20-1174, -1176, -1177). The remaining petitions were filed by CEI (20-1145) and CFDC (20-1230). Some State and Local Government Petitioners and some Public Interest Organization Petitioners also moved to intervene in support of Respondents in CEI’s petition “and any other case in which . . . petitioners argue that the standards established in the [Final Rules] should be weakened further, or

seek to erode the ability of EPA and NHTSA to regulate the greenhouse gas emissions and fuel economy of cars and light trucks.” ECF No. 1844912; *see also* ECF No. 1845212; D.C. Cir. R. 15(b). Alliance for Automotive Innovation and Ingevity Corporation moved to intervene in support of Respondents in all petitions. ECF Nos. 1844089, 1848163. Five major automakers moved to intervene in all petitions in support of no party but to be heard on remedy issues. ECF No. 1849385. This Court has not ruled on any of the motions to intervene.

On July 6, 2020, the Agencies filed certified indexes of administrative record in this Court. ECF No. 1850358. State and Local Government Petitioners and Public Interest Organization Petitioners moved on August 25, 2020, that this Court order the Agencies to complete and supplement their administrative records with certain inter-agency-review materials prior to merits briefing. ECF No. 1858308. CEI moved on August 27, 2020, that this Court order the Agencies to complete their records with certain other documents. ECF No. 1858924. Briefing on both record motions is expected to conclude on or before September 25, 2020.

## **REASONS FOR PROPOSED BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND FORMAT**

### **I. Reasons for proposed schedule**

Petitioners seek review of actions by the Agencies that prescribe or revise federal standards for greenhouse gas emissions and corporate average fuel economy of light-duty vehicles of model years 2021 and later. Holding oral argument during the Court’s current Term will ensure the petitions are resolved expeditiously and thus provide all

parties with greater regulatory certainty. Model year 2021 is already underway for some vehicles and will conclude for all vehicles no later than January 1, 2022. If this Court does not hear argument on the petitions until its next Term, it is quite likely that the petitions will not be decided until after January 1, 2022. It is in the interest of all concerned to resolve the petitions in a way that minimizes the number of model years that are affected by the standards while they remain subject to dispute.

Movants propose a briefing schedule that provides adequate time to brief the petitions in an orderly fashion, commensurate with their complexity, while still enabling this Court to hear oral argument during this Term and issue a decision in Summer or Fall 2021, without the need for an order formally expediting consideration.

The proposed deadline for Petitioners' principal briefs (November 10, 2020) is justified for several reasons. Because movants have taken the initiative to propose a schedule without awaiting an order of this Court, their proposed schedule will advance the interest of the Court, the parties, and the public in the expeditious resolution of this important case. Indeed, movants propose what is at this point the earliest practicable due date for Petitioners' opening briefs consistent with this Court's ordinary procedures and the complexity of the petitions.

The proposed deadline for Petitioners' briefs reflects that this Court normally gives petitioners at least 30 days to file briefs after issuing a briefing order. The instant motion will not be fully briefed until late September, making issuance of a briefing order before early October unlikely. The typical minimum period between briefing order and

opening brief is appropriate here because Petitioners—in particular, Coordinating Petitioners—are limited in the degree to which they can prepare their briefs without confirmation of the allotted words. Moreover, the scope of the Agencies’ administrative records is the subject of two pending motions that are not yet fully briefed, and the Court’s resolution of those motions will substantially affect the content of Petitioners’ merits briefs. Further, nearly all Coordinating Petitioners are also petitioners in *Union of Concerned Scientists v. NHTSA*, D.C. Cir. No. 19-1230, which challenges actions of the Agencies arising from the same underlying notice of proposed rulemaking. *See* NHTSA & EPA, *The Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule Part One: One National Program*, 84 Fed. Reg. 51,310 (Sept. 27, 2019). In that case, this Court has ordered the Agencies to file an answering brief by September 9, 2020, to which petitioners must reply by October 13, 2020. ECF No. 1843712. The substantial overlap in counsel between the two proceedings will make it difficult for Coordinating Petitioners to prepare their principal briefs in this proceeding during that time interval.

The proposed deadline for Respondents’ brief (January 19, 2021), allows a briefing interval of 70 days and provides adequate time for Respondents to prepare a brief. This interval is comparable to that afforded the federal government in similarly complex cases, even accounting for the holidays within that interval. *E.g.*, Order of Jan. 31, 2020, *Am. Lung Ass’n v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. No. 19-1140, ECF No. 1826621; Order of July 30, 2018, *Mozilla Corp. v. FCC*, D.C. Cir. No. 18-1051, ECF No. 1743015. The proposed deadline for Intervenors’ briefs (January 26, 2021) is likewise reasonable. A briefing



interval of 77 days to respond to Petitioners' briefs is ample time, and 7 days is the standard length of time this Court uses to stagger the briefing for an intervenor. D.C. Circuit Handbook of Practice and Internal Procedures (Handbook) 37.

The proposed deadline for reply briefs (February 22, 2021), allowing 34 days between Respondents' brief and Petitioners' replies—and 27 days between Intervenors' briefs and Petitioners' replies—is comparable to intervals afforded petitioners in like cases. *E.g.*, Order of Jan. 31, 2020, *Am. Lung Ass'n, supra*; Order of July 30, 2018, *Mozilla Corp., supra*. Coordinating Petitioners would find it particularly difficult to prepare reply briefs in less time, given the need to coordinate a shared word allotment, complete internal review processes of numerous state and local governments, and respond to multiple Intervenor briefs in addition to Respondents' brief.

The proposed deadline for final briefs (March 5, 2021) provides adequate time for a merits panel to hear oral argument in April or May 2021. *See* Handbook 48 (“Typically, the argument date will be a minimum of 45 days after briefing is completed.”). For instance, this Court recently calendared an oral argument for 56 days after receipt of final briefs in a similar, non-expedited proceeding. Order of Aug. 3, 2020, *Am. Lung Ass'n, supra*, ECF No. 1854843.

## II. Reasons for separate briefs<sup>1</sup>

There are five distinct Petitioner groups (described further below), each with markedly different litigation perspectives. Coordinating Petitioners include three kinds of parties: State and Local Government Petitioners, Public Interest Organization Petitioners, and Advanced Energy and Transportation Petitioners. Coordinating Petitioners will work diligently to avoid unnecessary duplication of arguments and join parts of each other's briefs where possible but, as explained below, propose to share a common word allotment among three briefs. The fourth group, CEI, requires a separate brief to present unique arguments, some or all of which certain Coordinating Petitioners will oppose if granted intervention. The fifth group, CFDC, also requires a separate brief to present unique arguments, some or all of which certain Coordinating Petitioners may oppose if granted intervention. All movants request that this Court permit these five separate briefs.

Those State and Local Government Petitioners and Public Interest Organization Petitioners that have moved to intervene (Coordinating Intervenors) request two separate intervenor briefs to present their different perspectives.

### **CEI**

CEI is diametrically opposed to all of the other petitioners in these consolidated cases. In fact, a number of those petitioners have intervened in Case No. 20-1145 to

---

<sup>1</sup> CEI, CFDC, Coordinating Petitioners, and Coordinating Intervenors each make statements under their own names in this Part that are not attributable to other movants.

expressly oppose CEI. These petitioners believe that the SAFE rule is an unwarranted reduction of the standards promulgated under the Obama Administration; in CEI's view, on the other hand, the Agencies did not go far enough in reducing the stringency of those standards. For this reason, the issues raised by CEI are substantially different than those of the other petitioners and require a separate brief to deal with them.

### **CFDC**

The CFDC Petitioners include Clean Fuels Development Coalition, Environmental and Energy Study Institute, National Farmers Union, Farmers Union Enterprises, Inc., Glacial Lakes Energy, LLC, Governors' Biofuels Coalition, Montana Farmers Union, North Dakota Farmers Union, Siouxland Ethanol, LLC, South Dakota Farmers Union, and Urban Air Initiative, Inc. The CFDC Petitioners' challenge is uniquely focused on the consideration and treatment of renewable fuels in the SAFE rulemaking, the elimination of incentives for flex fuel vehicles, the failure to consider harms and cost associated with existing aromatic-laden fuels, and the Agencies' determinations with respect to the feasibility and effectiveness of higher-octane low-carbon fuels to improve fuel economy and achieve emission reductions beyond those adopted in the Final Rule. Given the lack of substantive overlap with the issues raised by other petitioner groups, the breadth and complexity of the Final Rule and the record supporting it, the standing statements contemplated for this diverse group of Petitioners, and the challenges associated with coordinating with the other petitioners within

the timeframes contemplated in the proposed briefing schedule, a separate brief for the CFDC Petitioners is justified.

### **Coordinating Petitioners**

*State and Local Government Petitioners* are 23 States; the District of Columbia; the cities of Denver, Los Angeles, and New York; the City and County of San Francisco; and California's South Coast, Bay Area, and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management Districts. These States, cities, and other governmental bodies develop, adopt, and implement plans and policies to reduce air pollution and protect public health and the environment. Only these Petitioners can adequately defend their interests in these objectives, which are undermined by the actions challenged here. Further, these Petitioners' decades of experience administering pollution-control laws give them a unique perspective on why the actions under review are unlawful. This Court ordinarily does not compel governmental petitioners to join in a single brief with other petitioners, *see* D.C. Cir. R. 28(d)(4), 29(d), and there is no reason to depart from that sound practice here.

*Public Interest Organization Petitioners* are 12 regional and national nonprofit organizations committed to protecting public health and the environment by reducing vehicular air pollution. Collectively, these Petitioners count millions of members throughout the country affected by the challenged agency actions. These Petitioners have broad expertise in the legal, administrative, technical, environmental, and public-health aspects

of controlling vehicular emissions; and they submitted extensive comments on the Agencies' proposed rules.

*Advanced Energy and Transportation Petitioners* are the National Coalition for Advanced Transportation (Case No. 20-1174), Advanced Energy Economy (20-1176), Calpine Corporation, Consolidated Edison, Inc., National Grid USA, New York Power Authority, and Power Companies Climate Coalition (20-1177). These Petitioners collectively have invested billions of dollars in electric vehicle manufacturing, technology and infrastructure and clean generation technologies. The challenged actions directly undermine incentives for manufacturing and adoption of electric vehicles and related infrastructure and technologies, threatening these investments. These Petitioners submitted extensive comments on the challenged actions, and they bring unique perspectives regarding costs and technical assumptions made by the Agencies and the benefits to both consumers and the electricity grid to be obtained from widespread adoption of electric vehicles.

This Court permitted state petitioners, public interest organization petitioners, and advanced energy and transportation petitioners to file separate merits briefs in prior litigation challenging EPA's Revised Determination. Order of Jan. 11, 2019, *California v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. No. 18-1114, ECF No. 1768141.

### **Coordinating Intervenors**

Coordinating Intervenors will endeavor to avoid duplication of arguments but seek to file separate briefs for the reasons stated above with respect to State and Local

Government Petitioners and Public Interest Organization Petitioners. *See also* D.C. Cir. R. 28(d)(4).

### **III. Reasons for word allotments<sup>2</sup>**

CEI, CFDC, Coordinating Petitioners, and Coordinating Intervenors request, each on their own behalf, the word allotments for their merits briefs that are set forth below and summarized on page 3, *supra*.

#### **CEI**

As noted above, CEI is opposed to the other petitioners, and many of them have intervened to oppose CEI. There is no overlap between the arguments raised by CEI and those of the other petitioners, and thus there is no commonality that warrants reducing the word count of CEI's brief, especially in a rulemaking this complex. For this reason, CEI requests the standard FRAP allotment of 13,000 words for our principal brief. For our reply brief, we seek 8,000 words. This is slightly larger than standard FRAP word limit, but we believe it is necessary as we will need to respond to both the Agencies' brief and to the arguments presented by the Coordinating Intervenors in the two briefs that they propose.

---

<sup>2</sup> CEI, CFDC, Coordinating Petitioners, and Coordinating Intervenors each make statements and word-allotment requests under their own names in this Part that are not attributable to other movants.

## **CFDC**

As noted above, the issues raised by CFDC Petitioners are wholly distinct from those raised by the other petitioner groups. This absence of commonality warrants allowing the CFDC Petitioners the standard FRAP allotment of 13,000 words for their principal brief and an allotment of 7,000 words for their reply brief.

## **Coordinating Petitioners**

Coordinating Petitioners filed seven petitions that collectively challenge three actions by two federal agencies under two distinct and intricate statutory regimes. Two of the actions—EPA and NHTSA rules revising and prescribing standards for vehicular greenhouse gas emissions and corporate average fuel economy, respectively—are exceedingly complex, as evidenced by the sheer size (roughly 660,000 words) of the Federal Register notice accompanying the rules. The Agencies’ “analysis supporting [these rules] spans a range of technical topics, uses a range of different types of data and estimates, and applies several different types of computer models.” Rollback, 85 Fed. Reg. at 24,271.<sup>3</sup> Petitioners require a large number of words to adequately present the many fatal errors they have identified in diverse aspects of the Agencies’ analysis. The technical nature of many of those errors means that this Court cannot fairly assess Petitioners’ arguments unless Petitioners provide detailed explanations of complex topics

---

<sup>3</sup> The White House described these final rules as “the largest deregulatory action of [the Trump] Presidency.” White House Press Statement (Mar. 31, 2020), <http://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-press-secretary-124>.

including automotive technologies and their costs and efficacies, as well as theories and techniques for modeling automaker and consumer behavior and environmental impacts of automobile regulation. The record material that these arguments must discuss is voluminous. The *indexes* of administrative record filed by the Agencies run more than 750 pages, and the Agencies have acknowledged to counsel that those indexes exclude hundreds of additional documents that are part of the record for judicial review.

In addition to presenting all their record-based and highly technical arguments, these Petitioners will argue that the Agencies' rules violate multiple provisions of their governing statutes, as well as the National Environmental Policy Act and Endangered Species Act. And the third agency action under review—EPA's Revised Determination, itself the subject of extensive briefing in a prior case—raises its own, novel legal and record-based arguments that require substantial additional words to present.

Each subgroup of Coordinating Petitioners has its own perspective and will present different arguments for why the Agencies' actions are invalid, while coordinating to avoid duplication of any common arguments. To support this request for words, Coordinating Petitioners have provided below nonbinding estimates of the number of words they collectively need to adequately present their arguments to the Court in principal briefs. A more detailed explanation of these arguments follows this summary.

- a. Standing (1,500 words)
- b. Background and other required sections of briefs (10,000 words)
  1. Statement of the case, presented principally in a single brief (6,000 words)



2. Summaries of each brief's particular arguments (3,000 words)
3. Statements of jurisdiction and issues, standards of review, conclusions (1,000 words)
- c. Argument: Arbitrary and capricious findings and conclusions (18,000 words)
  1. Technology costs (4,000 words)
  2. Consumer costs and preferences (3,500 words)
  3. Public and environmental health (3,500 words)
  4. Vehicle safety (3,000 words)
  5. Overall societal costs and benefits (4,000 words)
- d. Argument: Statutory violations (14,000 words total)
  1. EPA's violation of the Clean Air Act (4,500 words)
  2. NHTSA's violation of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (5,000 words)
  3. The Agencies' violation of the Clean Air Act's conformity provisions (1,500 words)
  4. NHTSA's violation of the National Environmental Policy Act (1,500 words)
  5. The Agencies' violation of the Endangered Species Act (1,500 words)
- e. Argument: EPA's Revised Determination (2,500 words total)

---

Arbitrary and capricious findings and conclusions

Coordinating Petitioners will argue that the Agencies made material errors in the analyses of their rules, including in their assumptions, modeling, and conclusions on technology costs, consumer costs and preferences, public and environmental health, vehicle safety, and overall social costs and benefits. Petitioners will argue that these

errors individually and collectively undermine the Agencies' justifications for their rules and inflate the rules' alleged benefits by tens of billions of dollars. Most of these arguments are technical and cannot be adequately presented without extended discussion.

For example:

1. *Technology costs.* Petitioners will contend that the Agencies' cost of compliance projections include numerous fundamental errors, such as mistakenly disallowing certain technologies in their modeling that the Agencies themselves state should have been allowed; disallowing certain technologies in their modeling that are already installed and proven on vehicles in the marketplace; failing to update their analysis with EPA's own state-of-the-art data regarding technological effectiveness and feasibility; assuming that automakers will achieve significant emissions and fuel economy improvements even without regulatory requirements to do so; including inaccurate counts of manufacturers' existing overcompliance credits; and imposing restrictions on future use of overcompliance credits that do not reflect the law.
2. *Consumer Costs and Preferences.* Petitioners will argue that, among other errors, the Agencies miscalculate consumer costs; misunderstand consumer preferences for certain vehicles and technologies; incorrectly model the degree to which consumers respond to changes in vehicle prices; fail to correctly account for consumer valuation of fuel economy; and improperly exclude from

- their analysis the effects of increased gasoline prices due to the large increase in demand for gasoline under the rules, based on a flawed modeling analysis.
3. *Public and Environmental Health.* Petitioners will argue that the Agencies significantly underestimate the public and environmental health costs of their rules, by, for example, using erroneous emissions factors; undervaluing the estimated benefits of certain emissions reductions; using an arbitrary and unjustified estimate of the social cost of carbon emissions; and unjustifiably assuming that the increased fuel consumption under the rules will be met predominantly by increased oil production and refining abroad, rather than domestically, thus excluding increased domestic emissions from the Agencies' analysis.
  4. *Vehicle Safety.* Petitioners will argue that the Agencies' assessment of impact of the standards on safety is without merit because, for example, the Agencies adopt an unjustifiable estimate of the amount driving may increase due to fuel economy improvements reducing the cost of driving; the Agencies misunderstand how mass reduction of vehicles under the standards affects safety; and the Agencies' modeling of mass reduction contains technical errors.
  5. *Overall Social Costs and Benefits.* Petitioners will contend that the Agencies' calculation of total social costs and benefits is unreliable because, for example, the Agencies' extrapolation of traffic congestion costs from a 1997 study suffers from several clear errors, including failing to account for inflation and mischaracterizing data; and the Agencies' improper adjustment of the fuel

economy standard for domestically manufactured passenger automobiles undermines key fleet composition projections in the Agencies' modeling.

### Statutory arguments

Coordinating Petitioners will contend that EPA violated Section 202 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7521, by, among other things, failing to properly consider the central statutory factors and environmental-protection purpose undergirding Section 202; improperly reinterpreting statutory factors; and impermissibly assigning non-statutory factors determinative weight. Petitioners also will argue that EPA unlawfully abdicated to NHTSA the duty to independently judge what level of emission standards is appropriate, and that EPA did not apply its own technical expertise to answer that question.

Petitioners will contend that NHTSA violated Section 502 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, 49 U.S.C. § 32902, in several respects. Petitioners will argue, among other things, that Section 502 bars NHTSA from elevating other factors (including non-statutory factors) over petroleum conservation and other congressionally mandated objectives when setting "maximum feasible" standards. Petitioners also will argue that NHTSA's finding that a more fuel-efficient vehicle fleet would be "economically impracticable" cannot be squared with NHTSA's own analysis, which shows that the fleet could be expected to be more fuel efficient even if the standards were flatlined at model year 2020 levels. Petitioners will further argue that NHTSA violated Section 502's bar on consideration of the fuel economy of alternative-fuel vehicles or credits

when determining maximum feasible average fuel economy. Petitioners also will argue that NHTSA's minimum domestic passenger-car standard violates Section 502.

Petitioners will contend that both Agencies' actions violate the Clean Air Act's conformity provisions. Petitioners will explain that the final rules cause indirect emissions from increased gasoline use and, absent an exemption, the Clean Air Act required the Agencies to consider whether their actions conform to state implementation plans.

Petitioners will argue that NHTSA issued its final rule without considering a reasonable range of alternatives as required by the National Environmental Policy Act, and that the consideration of cumulative environmental impacts in NHTSA's Environmental Impact Statement is deficient.

Petitioners will argue that the Endangered Species Act required the Agencies to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service on whether and how weakened greenhouse gas and corporate average fuel-economy standards may affect species listed as endangered or threatened under the Act or their designated critical habitats. Petitioners will further contend that the Agencies' rules do adversely affect many species by substantially increasing emissions of greenhouse gases and other air pollutants.

#### EPA's Revised Determination

Coordinating Petitioners will argue that the Revised Determination, which is now subject to review along with EPA's final rule, is arbitrary, capricious, and contrary to governing regulations. Petitioners will contend that EPA did not make findings needed

to support a determination that its greenhouse gas emission standards for model year 2022–2025 vehicles were no longer appropriate and that the Agency failed to consider extensive record evidence to the contrary. Petitioners require a substantial number of words to present these arguments. *See* Final Br. of State of California et al., *California v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. No. 18-1114, ECF No. 1789881 (May 28, 2019) (devoting 4,201 words to merits arguments respecting the Revised Determination); Final Br. of Center for Biological Diversity et al., *California, supra*, ECF No. 1789848 (May 28, 2019) (1,990 words for same); Final Br. of National Coalition for Advanced Transportation et al., *California, supra*, ECF No. 1789858 (May 28, 2019) (1,267 words for same); Final Br. of Respondents, *California, supra*, ECF No. 1789798 (May 28, 2019) (5,316 words for same).

### **Coordinating Intervenors**

Coordinating Intervenors' briefs will respond to arguments by certain Petitioners that would result in further weakened federal standards or erode the Agencies' abilities to regulate greenhouse gas emissions or fuel economy. In particular, CEI will argue that "the Agencies did not go far enough in reducing the stringency of [their] standards," and that they overestimated "vehicle emission health costs" and underestimated their standards' "effect in restricting vehicle size and weight, and in increasing vehicle prices." ECF No. 1848430, at 2 (statement of issues). Although Coordinating Intervenors will make contrary arguments in their principal briefs as petitioners, they require additional words as intervenors to respond to CEI's specific arguments on these points and any other arguments CEI may raise in its principal brief. Coordinating Intervenors also may

need words to respond to any arguments made by CFDC that, if accepted, would result in further weakened federal standards or erode the Agencies' abilities to regulate greenhouse gas emissions or fuel economy. *Cf. United States v. Pogue*, 19 F.3d 663, 666 & n.2 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (holding that an appellant's "non-binding preliminary statement of the issues" filed in this Court "does not irrevocably define the limits of the scope of an appeal" (emphasis omitted)).

This Court's rules permit a respondent-intervenor to file a 9,100-word brief in response to a single 13,000-word brief, such as the one CEI proposes to file. D.C. Cir. R. 32(e)(2)(B)(i). Coordinating Intervenors' request for only 8,000 words, to be divided between two briefs in response to CEI's brief (and, potentially, in response to CFDC's brief), is reasonable under the circumstances.

## CONCLUSION

All movants request that this Court adopt the briefing schedule set forth on page 2, *supra*, and permit the five petitioner briefs set forth on page 2, *supra*. Coordinating Intervenors request that the Court permit them to file two intervenor briefs as set forth on page 3, *supra*. CEI, CFDC, Coordinating Petitioners, and Coordinating Intervenors each request on their own behalf that the Court adopt their proposed word allotments set forth on page 3, *supra*.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matthew Littleton

Matthew Littleton

Sean H. Donahue

Donahue, Goldberg,

Weaver & Littleton

1008 Pennsylvania Avenue SE

Washington, DC 20003

(202) 683-6895

matt@donahuegoldberg.com

Vickie L. Patton

Peter M. Zalzal

Alice Henderson

Environmental Defense Fund

2060 Broadway, Suite 300

Boulder, CO 80302

(303) 447-7215

vpatton@edf.org

*Counsel for Environmental Defense Fund*



**Counsel for CEI et al.**

/s/ Devin Watkins

Devin Watkins

Sam Kazman

Competitive Enterprise Institute

1310 L Street NW, 7th Floor

Washington, DC 20005

(503) 753-8104

devin.watkins@cei.org

*Counsel for Competitive Enterprise Institute,*

*Anthony Kreucher, Walter M. Kreucher,*

*James Leedy, and Marc Scribner*

**Counsel for CFDC et al.**

/s/ Jonathan W. Cuneo

Jonathan W. Cuneo  
Victoria Sims  
4725 Wisconsin Ave. NW  
Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20016  
Telephone: (202) 789-3960  
Email: jonc@cuneolaw.com  
Email: vicky@cuneolaw.com

Angela B. Brandt\*  
Michael J. Steinlage\*  
LARSON KING, LLP  
30 East 7th Street  
Suite 2800  
Saint Paul, MN 55101  
Telephone: (651) 312-6500  
Email: abrandt@larsonking.com

*Counsel for Clean Fuels Development Coalition,  
Environmental and Energy Study Institute, The  
Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of  
America d/b/a National Farmers Union,  
Farmers Union Enterprises, Inc., Glacial Lakes  
Energy, LLC, Governors' Biofuels Coalition,  
Montana Farmers Union, North Dakota Farmers  
Union, Siouxland Ethanol, LLC, South Dakota  
Farmers Union, and Urban Air Initiative, Inc.*

---

\* Application for admission pro hac vice forthcoming.

**Counsel for State and Local Government Petitioners and Movant-Intervenors**

FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
BY AND THROUGH ITS GOVERNOR  
GAVIN NEWSOM, ATTORNEY GENERAL  
XAVIER BECERRA, AND THE CALIFORNIA  
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

XAVIER BECERRA  
Attorney General of California  
ROBERT BYRNE  
EDWARD H. OCHOA  
Senior Assistant Attorneys General  
GARY E. TAVETIAN  
DAVID A. ZONANA  
Supervising Deputy Attorneys General  
JESSICA BARCLAY-STROBEL  
JULIA K. FORGIE  
MEREDITH HANKINS  
MICAELA HARMS  
JENNIFER KALNINS TEMPLE  
KAVITA LESSER  
CAROLYN NELSON ROWAN  
ROBERT D. SWANSON  
DAVID ZAFT  
Deputy Attorneys General

*/s/ M. Elaine Meckenstock*  
Deputy Attorney General  
1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612-0550  
(510) 879-0299  
Elaine.Meckenstock@doj.ca.gov

FOR THE STATE OF COLORADO

PHIL WEISER  
Colorado Attorney General

/s/ Eric R. Olson

ERIC R. OLSON  
Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General  
1300 Broadway, 10th Floor  
Denver, CO 80203  
Telephone: (720) 508-6548  
eric.olson@coag.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Colorado*

FOR THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

WILLIAM TONG  
Attorney General of Connecticut  
MATTHEW I. LEVINE  
Assistant Attorney General

/s/ Scott N. Koschwitz

SCOTT N. KOSCHWITZ  
Assistant Attorney General  
165 Capitol Avenue

Hartford, CT 06106  
Telephone: (860) 808-5250  
Fax: (860) 808-5386  
Scott.Koschwitz@ct.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Connecticut*

FOR THE STATE OF DELAWARE

KATHLEEN JENNINGS  
Attorney General of the State of  
Delaware

/s/ Kayli H. Spialter

KAYLI H. SPIALTER  
CHRISTIAN WRIGHT  
Deputy Attorneys General  
Delaware Department of Justice  
820 N. French Street, 6th Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
Telephone: (302) 395-2604  
Kayli.Spialter@delaware.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Delaware*

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

KARL A. RACINE  
Attorney General for the District of  
Columbia

/s/ Loren L. AliKhan

LOREN L. ALIKHAN  
Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General for the  
District of Columbia  
400 6th Street, NW, Suite 8100  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 727-6287  
Fax: (202) 730-1864  
Loren.AliKhan@dc.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner District of Columbia*

FOR THE STATE OF HAWAII

CLARE E. CONNORS  
Attorney General

/s/ William F. Cooper

WILLIAM F. COOPER  
Deputy Attorney General  
State of Hawaii Office of the Attorney  
General

425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
Telephone: (808) 586-4070  
Bill.F.Cooper@Hawaii.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Hawaii*

FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

KWAME RAOUL  
Attorney General of Illinois  
MATTHEW J. DUNN  
Chief, Environmental Enforcement/  
Asbestos Litigation Division  
JASON E. JAMES  
Assistant Attorney General

/s/ Daniel I. Rottenberg

DANIEL I. ROTTENBERG  
Assistant Attorney General  
69 W. Washington St., 18th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60602  
Telephone: (312) 814-3816  
DRottenberg@atg.state.il.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Illinois*

FOR THE STATE OF MAINE

AARON M. FREY  
Attorney General of Maine

/s/ Laura E. Jensen

LAURA E. JENSEN  
Assistant Attorney General  
6 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333  
Telephone: (207) 626-8868  
Fax: (207) 626-8812  
Laura.Jensen@maine.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Maine*

FOR THE STATE OF MARYLAND

BRIAN E. FROSH  
Attorney General of Maryland

/s/ Cynthia M. Weisz

CYNTHIA M. WEISZ  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
Maryland Department of the  
Environment  
1800 Washington Blvd.  
Baltimore, MD 21230  
Telephone: (410) 537-3014  
cynthia.weisz2@maryland.gov

JOHN B. HOWARD, JR.  
JOSHUA M. SEGAL  
STEVEN J. GOLDSTEIN  
Special Assistant Attorneys General  
Office of the Attorney General  
200 St. Paul Place  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
Telephone: (410) 576-6300  
jbhoward@oag.state.md.us  
jsegal@oag.state.md.us  
sgoldstein@oag.state.md.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Maryland*

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
MASSACHUSETTS

MAURA HEALEY  
Attorney General  
CHRISTOPHE COURCHESNE  
Assistant Attorney General  
Chief, Environmental Protection  
Division  
CAROL IANCU  
Assistant Attorney General  
MEGAN M. HERZOG  
DAVID S. FRANKEL  
Special Assistant Attorneys General

/s/ Matthew Ireland  
MATTHEW IRELAND  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
Environmental Protection Division  
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor  
Boston, MA 02108  
Telephone: (617) 727-2200  
matthew.ireland@mass.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner Commonwealth of  
Massachusetts*

FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF  
MICHIGAN

DANA NESSEL  
Attorney General of Michigan  
/s/ Neil D. Gordon  
NEIL D. GORDON  
GILLIAN E. WENER  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Michigan Department of Attorney  
General  
Environment, Natural Resources  
and Agriculture Division  
P.O. Box 30755  
Lansing, MI 48909  
Telephone: (517) 335-7664  
gordonn1@michigan.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner People of the State of  
Michigan*

FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

KEITH ELLISON  
Attorney General of Minnesota

/s/ Peter N. Surdo

PETER N. SURDO  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 900  
St. Paul, MN, 55101  
Telephone: (651) 757-1061  
Peter.Surdo@ag.state.mn.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Minnesota*

FOR THE STATE OF NEVADA

AARON D. FORD  
Attorney General of Nevada

/s/ Heidi Parry Stern

HEIDI PARRY STERN  
Solicitor General  
DANIEL P. NUBEL  
Deputy Attorney General  
Office of the Nevada Attorney General  
100 N. Carson Street  
Carson City, NV 89701  
HStern@ag.nv.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Nevada*

FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

GURBIR S. GREWAL  
Attorney General of New Jersey

/s/ Lisa Morelli

LISA MORELLI  
Deputy Attorney General  
25 Market St., PO Box 093  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0093  
Telephone: (609) 376-2745  
Fax: (609) 341-5031  
lisa.morelli@law.njoag.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New Jersey*

FOR THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

HECTOR BALDERAS  
Attorney General of New Mexico

/s/ William Grantham

WILLIAM GRANTHAM  
Assistant Attorney General  
State of New Mexico Office of the  
Attorney General  
Consumer & Environmental Protection  
Division  
201 Third Street NW, Suite 300  
Albuquerque, NM 87102  
Telephone: (505) 717-3520  
wgrantham@nmag.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New Mexico*



FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK

LETTIA JAMES  
Attorney General of New York  
YUEH-RU CHU  
Chief, Affirmative Litigation Section  
Environmental Protection Bureau  
AUSTIN THOMPSON  
Assistant Attorney General

/s/ Gavin G. McCabe

GAVIN G. MCCABE  
Assistant Attorney General  
28 Liberty Street, 19th Floor  
New York, NY 10005  
Telephone: (212) 416-8469  
gavin.mccabe@ag.ny.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of New York*

FOR THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

JOSHUA H. STEIN  
Attorney General  
DANIEL S. HIRSCHMAN  
Senior Deputy Attorney General  
FRANCISCO BENZONI  
Special Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Asher P. Spiller

ASHER P. SPILLER  
TAYLOR CRABTREE  
Assistant Attorneys General  
North Carolina Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 629  
Raleigh, NC 27602  
Telephone: (919) 716-6400

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of North Carolina*

FOR THE STATE OF OREGON

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM  
Attorney General of Oregon

/s/ Paul Garrahan

PAUL GARRAHAN  
Attorney-in-Charge  
STEVE NOVICK  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
Natural Resources Section  
Oregon Department of Justice  
1162 Court Street NE  
Salem, OR 97301-4096  
Telephone: (503) 947-4593  
Paul.Garrahan@doj.state.or.us  
Steve.Novick@doj.state.or.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Oregon*

FOR THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

PETER F. NERONHA  
Attorney General of Rhode Island

/s/ Gregory S. Schultz

GREGORY S. SCHULTZ  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
Office of Attorney General  
150 South Main Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
Telephone: (401) 274-4400  
gschultz@riag.ri.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Rhode Island*

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

JOSH SHAPIRO  
Attorney General of Pennsylvania  
MICHAEL J. FISCHER  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
JACOB B. BOYER  
Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Ann R. Johnston

ANN R. JOHNSTON  
Senior Deputy Attorney General  
Office of Attorney General  
1600 Arch St. Suite 300  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 560-2171  
ajohnston@attorneygeneral.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner Commonwealth of  
Pennsylvania*

FOR THE STATE OF VERMONT

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.  
Attorney General

/s/ Nicholas F. Persampieri

NICHOLAS F. PERSAMPIERI  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609  
Telephone: (802) 828-3171  
nick.persampieri@vermont.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Vermont*

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

MARK R. HERRING

Attorney General

PAUL KUGELMAN, JR.

Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Chief, Environmental Section/s/ Caitlin C. G. O'Dwyer

CAITLIN C. G. O'DWYER

Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General

Commonwealth of Virginia

202 North 9th Street

Richmond, VA 23219

Telephone: (804) 786-1780

godwyer@oag.state.va.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner Commonwealth of  
Virginia*

FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

ROBERT W. FERGUSON

Attorney General

/s/ Emily C. Nelson

EMILY C. NELSON

Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General

P.O. Box 40117

Olympia, WA 98504

Telephone: (360) 586-4607

emily.nelson@atg.wa.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Washington*

FOR THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

JOSHUA L. KAUL  
Attorney General of Wisconsin

/s/ Gabe Johnson-Karp

JENNIFER L. VANDERMEUSE  
GABE JOHNSON-KARP  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
Post Office Box 7857  
Madison, WI 53702-7857  
Telephone: (608) 266-7741 (JLV)  
(608) 267-8904 (GJK)  
Fax: (608) 267-2223  
vandermeusejl@doj.state.wi.us  
johnsonkarp@doj.state.wi.us

*Attorneys for Petitioner State of Wisconsin*

FOR THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

MICHAEL N. FEUER  
Los Angeles City Attorney  
MICHAEL J. BOSTROM  
Assistant City Attorney

/s/ Michael J. Bostrom

MICHAEL J. BOSTROM  
Assistant City Attorney  
200 N. Spring Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Telephone: (213) 978-1867  
Fax: (213) 978-2286  
Michael.Bostrom@lacity.org

*Attorneys for Petitioner City of Los Angeles*

FOR THE CITY OF NEW YORK

JAMES E. JOHNSON  
New York City Corporation Counsel  
CHRISTOPHER G. KING  
ROBERT L. MARTIN  
Senior Counsel  
SHIVA PRAKASH  
Assistant Corporation Counsel

/s/ Christopher G. King  
CHRISTOPHER G. KING  
Senior Counsel  
New York City Law Department  
100 Church Street  
New York, New York  
Telephone: (212) 356-2074  
Fax: (212) 356-2084  
cking@law.nyc.gov

*Attorneys for Petitioner City of New York*

FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney  
ROBB W. KAPLA  
Deputy City Attorney

/s/ Robb W. Kapla  
ROBB W. KAPLA  
Deputy City Attorney  
City Hall, Room 234  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, California 94102-4602  
Telephone: (415) 554-4746  
Fax: (415) 554-4715  
Robb.Kapla@sfcityatty.org

*Attorneys for Petitioner City and County of San Francisco*

FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER

KRISTIN M. BRONSON

City Attorney

EDWARD J. GORMAN

LINDSAY S. CARDER

Assistant City Attorneys

*/s/ Edward J. Gorman*

EDWARD J. GORMAN

Assistant City Attorney

Denver City Attorney's Office

201 W. Colfax Avenue, Dept. 1207

Denver, Colorado 80202

Telephone: (720) 913-3275

Edward.Gorman@denvergov.org

*Attorneys for Petitioner City and County of  
Denver*

/s/ Brian Tomasovic

BARBARA BAIRD, Chief Deputy Counsel

BRIAN TOMASOVIC

KATHRYN ROBERTS

South Coast Air Quality Management District

21865 Copley Dr.

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Telephone: (909) 396-3400

Fax: (909) 396-2961

*Counsel for South Coast Air Quality*

*Management District*

/s/ Brian C. Bunger

BRIAN BUNGER, District Counsel

RANDI WALLACH

Bay Area Air Quality Management District

375 Beale Street, Suite 600

San Francisco, CA 94105

Telephone: (415) 749-4920

Fax: (415) 749-5103

*Counsel for Bay Area Air Quality Management*

*District*

/s/ Kathrine Pittard

KATHRINE PITTARD, District Counsel

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality

Management District

777 12th Street

Sacramento, CA 95814

Telephone: (916) 874-4807

*Counsel for Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality*

*Management District*

**Additional Counsel for Public Interest Organization Petitioners and Movant-Intervenors**

Maya Golden-Krasner  
Katherine Hoff  
Center For Biological Diversity  
660 South Figueroa Street, Suite 1000  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
(213) 785-5402  
mgoldenkrasner@biologicaldiversity.org

*Counsel for Center For Biological Diversity*

Ariel Solaski  
Jon A. Mueller  
Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Inc.  
6 Herndon Avenue  
Annapolis, MD 21403  
(443) 482-2171  
asolaski@cbf.org

*Counsel for Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Inc.*

Shana Lazerow  
Communities For A Better Environment  
6325 Pacific Boulevard, Suite 300  
Huntington Park, CA 90255  
(323) 826-9771  
slazerow@cbecal.org

*Counsel for Communities for A Better Environment*

Emily K. Green  
Conservation Law Foundation  
53 Exchange Street, Suite 200  
Portland, ME 04101  
(207) 210-6439  
egreen@clf.org

*Counsel for Conservation Law Foundation*

Michael Landis  
The Center For Public Interest Research  
1543 Wazee Street, Suite 400  
Denver, CO 80202  
(303) 573-5995 ext. 389  
mlandis@publicinterestnetwork.org

*Counsel for Environment America*

Robert Michaels  
Ann Jaworski  
Environmental Law & Policy Center  
35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1600  
Chicago, IL 60601  
(312) 795-3713  
rmichaels@elpc.org

*Counsel for Environmental Law & Policy Center*



Ian Fein  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
111 Sutter Street, 21st Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
(415) 875-6100  
ifein@nrdc.org

David D. Doniger  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
1152 15th Street NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 289-6868  
ddoniger@nrdc.org

*Counsel for Natural Resources Defense Council,  
Inc.*

Joanne Spalding  
Andrea Issod  
Sierra Club  
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300  
Oakland, CA 94612  
(415) 977-5725  
joanne.spalding@sierraclub.org

Paul Cort  
Regina Hsu  
Earthjustice  
50 California Street, Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 217-2077  
pcort@earthjustice.org

Vera Pardee  
726 Euclid Avenue  
Berkeley, CA 94708  
(858) 717-1448  
pardeelaw@gmail.com

*Counsel for Sierra Club*

Scott L. Nelson  
Public Citizen Litigation Group  
1600 20th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20009  
(202) 588-1000  
snelson@citizen.org

*Counsel for Public Citizen, Inc. and  
Consumer Federation of America*

Travis Annatoyn  
Democracy Forward Foundation  
1333 H Street NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 601-2483  
tannatoyn@democracyforward.org

*Counsel for Union Of Concerned Scientists*

**Counsel for Advanced Energy and Transportation Petitioners**

/s/ Stacey L. VanBellegem

Stacey L. VanBellegem  
Robert A. Wyman, Jr.  
Devin M. O'Connor  
Ethan Prall  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
555 Eleventh Street, NW  
Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 637-2200  
stacey.vanbellegem@lw.com

*Counsel for National Coalition for Advanced  
Transportation*

/s/ Kevin Poloncarz

Kevin Poloncarz  
Donald L. Ristow  
Jake Levine  
Covington & Burling LLP  
Salesforce Tower  
415 Mission Street, 54th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2533  
(415) 591-7070  
kpoloncarz@cov.com

/s/ Jeffery Scott Dennis

Jeffery S. Dennis  
General Counsel and Managing Director  
Advanced Energy Economy  
1000 Vermont Ave. NW Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202.383.1950  
jdennis@aee.net

*Counsel for Advanced Energy Economy*

/s/ Kevin Poloncarz

Kevin Poloncarz

Donald L. Ristow

Jake Levine

Covington & Burling LLP

Salesforce Tower

415 Mission Street, 54th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94105-2533

(415) 591-7070

kpoloncarz@cov.com

*Counsel for Calpine Corporation,  
Consolidated Edison, Inc., National  
Grid USA, New York Power Authority,  
and Power Companies Climate Coalition*

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

The foregoing motion was prepared in 14-point Garamond font using Microsoft Word 365 (July 2020 ed.), and it complies with the typeface and typestyle requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(1)(E). The motion contains 5,199 words and complies with the type-volume limitation of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(2)(A).

/s/ Matthew Littleton

Matthew Littleton

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

On September 4, 2020, I served a copy of the foregoing motion using this Court's CM/ECF system. All parties are represented by registered CM/ECF users that will be served by the CM/ECF system.

/s/ Matthew Littleton

Matthew Littleton