

1 XAVIER BECERRA  
 Attorney General of California  
 2 GAVIN G. MCCABE  
 Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
 3 MELINDA F. PILLING, SBN 274929  
 TIMOTHY E. SULLIVAN, SBN 197054  
 4 JONATHAN WIENER, SBN 265006  
 Deputy Attorneys General  
 5 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000  
 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004  
 6 Telephone: (415) 703-5969  
 Fax: (415) 703-5480  
 7 E-mail: Jonathan.Wiener@doj.ca.gov  
 Attorneys for Plaintiff State of California  
 8

9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 10 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 11

12 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, STATE OF NEW  
 YORK, STATE OF CONNECTICUT, STATE  
 13 OF ILLINOIS, STATE OF IOWA, STATE OF  
 MAINE, STATE OF MARYLAND,  
 14 COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,  
 STATE OF MINNESOTA, BY AND  
 15 THROUGH ITS MINNESOTA POLLUTION  
 CONTROL AGENCY, STATE OF OREGON,  
 16 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
 STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, STATE OF  
 17 VERMONT, STATE OF WASHINGTON, and  
 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20  
 21 SCOTT PRUITT, as Administrator of the  
 United States Environmental Protection  
 22 Agency, and the UNITED STATES  
 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
 23 AGENCY,

24 Defendants.  
 25

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
 AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

**(Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401 et seq.)**

26 Plaintiffs California, New York, Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland,  
 27 Massachusetts, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, and the District of  
 28 Columbia, by their respective Attorneys General, and Minnesota, by and through its Minnesota

1 Pollution Control Agency, (collectively, the “States”), allege as follows:

2 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

3 1. The States bring this action to compel E. Scott Pruitt, in his official capacity as  
4 Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, and the United States  
5 Environmental Protection Agency (together, “EPA”), to fulfill their mandatory duty under the  
6 Clean Air Act to designate all areas of the country as in or out of compliance with health and  
7 welfare standards, referred to as the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (“NAAQS”), for  
8 ozone. These designations trigger the steps necessary to protect the public from the various health  
9 effects—such as heart disease, bronchitis, and asthma—this pollution causes or exacerbates.  
10 Section 107(d)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(B), requires the Administrator  
11 to promulgate designations of “attainment,” “nonattainment,” or “unclassifiable” for the NAAQS  
12 for all areas of the country as expeditiously as practicable, but in no case later than two years  
13 from the date EPA promulgates a new NAAQS. EPA promulgated a new NAAQS for ozone on  
14 October 1, 2015, and, more than two years later, EPA has not promulgated designations for all  
15 areas. Indeed, EPA has not promulgated designations for *any* nonattainment areas, which are the  
16 areas with the highest concentrations of ozone and so most in need of the corrective plans that  
17 designation triggers. Therefore, the States seek both declaratory relief and an injunction requiring  
18 EPA to promptly promulgate all overdue designations by a date certain.

19 **JURISDICTION**

20 2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to section 304(a)(2) of the  
21 Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7604(a)(2), which authorizes any person, after duly giving notice, to  
22 commence a citizen suit in district court against the EPA Administrator for failing to perform a  
23 nondiscretionary duty under the Clean Air Act. The Court also has jurisdiction to hear this civil  
24 action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction) and 28 U.S.C. § 1361 (action  
25 to compel officer or agency to perform a duty owed to plaintiffs).

26 **VENUE**

27 3. Venue in this Court is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) because a substantial  
28 part of the events or omissions giving rise to the States’ claim occur in this judicial district. The

1 Administrator's failure to perform his nondiscretionary duty to designate areas as in or out of  
2 attainment with the ozone NAAQS is adversely impacting areas within this judicial district,  
3 which experiences elevated levels of ozone pollution. Indeed, California, as a result of its unique  
4 topography, contains some of the worst ozone pollution in the country, and is sorely in need of  
5 protection and planning.

6 4. In addition, EPA has failed to issue a designation for the San Francisco Bay Area.  
7 Despite the recommendation of the California Air Resources Board, EPA has not made a  
8 nonattainment designation for the San Francisco Bay Area (comprising the counties of Marin,  
9 Napa, Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, San Francisco, and San Mateo, and portions of the  
10 counties of Solano and Sonoma). The lack of a nonattainment designation for the Bay Area  
11 undermines the ability of state and local regulators to improve the region's air quality, by  
12 depriving them of crucial regulatory tools that are not readily available otherwise.

13 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

14 5. Intradistrict assignment of this matter to the San Francisco Division of the Court is  
15 appropriate pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2(e) because a substantial part of the events or  
16 omissions giving rise to the claims in this case occurred in the County of San Francisco.

17 **PARTIES**

18 6. Plaintiff State of California is a sovereign entity that brings this action on behalf of  
19 its citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own behalf to protect its  
20 interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as an employer, and its  
21 interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by the State.

22 7. Plaintiff State of New York is a sovereign entity that brings this action on behalf of  
23 its citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own behalf to protect its  
24 interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as an employer, and its  
25 interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by the State.

26 8. Plaintiff State of Connecticut is a sovereign entity that brings this action on behalf  
27 of its citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own behalf to protect  
28

1 its interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as an employer, and  
2 its interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by the State.

3 9. Plaintiff State of Illinois is a sovereign entity that brings this action on behalf of its  
4 citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own behalf to protect its  
5 interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as an employer, and its  
6 interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by the State.

7 10. Plaintiff State of Iowa is a sovereign entity that brings this action on behalf of its  
8 citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own behalf to protect its  
9 interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as an employer, and its  
10 interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by the State.

11 11. Plaintiff State of Maine is a sovereign entity that brings this action on behalf of its  
12 citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own behalf to protect its  
13 interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as an employer, and its  
14 interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by the State.

15 12. Plaintiff State of Maryland is a sovereign entity that brings this action on behalf of  
16 its citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own behalf to protect its  
17 interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as an employer, and its  
18 interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by the State.

19 13. Plaintiff Commonwealth of Massachusetts is a sovereign entity that brings this  
20 action on behalf of its citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own  
21 behalf to protect its interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as  
22 an employer, and its interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by  
23 the State.

24 14. Plaintiff State of Minnesota, by and through its Minnesota Pollution Control  
25 Agency (“MPCA”), brings this action to protect the health and well-being of its citizens and  
26 residents, and to preserve its interest in providing environmental protection to the State. The  
27 MPCA is Minnesota’s lead agency for enforcing environmental regulations and is responsible for  
28 reducing the amount of air pollution that is emitted in the State. Minn. Stat. § 116.07.

1           15. Plaintiff State of Oregon is a sovereign entity that brings this action on behalf of its  
2 citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own behalf to protect its  
3 interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as an employer, and its  
4 interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by the State.

5           16. Plaintiff Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is a sovereign entity that brings this  
6 action on behalf of its citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own  
7 behalf to protect its interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as  
8 an employer, and its interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by  
9 the State.

10           17. Plaintiff State of Rhode Island is a sovereign entity that brings this action on  
11 behalf of its citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own behalf to  
12 protect its interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as an  
13 employer, and its interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by the  
14 State.

15           18. Plaintiff State of Vermont is a sovereign entity that brings this action on behalf of  
16 its citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own behalf to protect its  
17 interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as an employer, and its  
18 interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by the State.

19           19. Plaintiff State of Washington is a sovereign entity that brings this action on behalf  
20 of its citizens and residents to protect their health and well-being, and on its own behalf to protect  
21 its interests as administrator of healthcare programs and schools, its interests as an employer, and  
22 its interests in protecting and preserving the natural resources held in trust by the State.

23           20. Plaintiff District of Columbia is a municipal corporation created by an act of  
24 Congress, and is the local government for the territory constituting the permanent seat of the  
25 government of the United States, and is empowered, through its Office of the Attorney General,  
26 to bring this action on behalf of its citizens and residents.

27           21. Each of the states is a “person” as defined in the applicable provision of the Clean  
28 Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7602(e).



1 § 7407(d)(1)(B)(i). EPA may extend its deadline to issue the designations by up to one year only  
2 in the event that it has “insufficient information” to issue them. *Id.* If EPA intends to modify a  
3 recommended designation for an area, it must give at least 120-day advance notice of the  
4 proposed change to the state. 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(B)(ii).

5 27. The Clean Air Act’s anti-backsliding provision locks in protections for  
6 nonattainment areas once they are designated as nonattainment, even if a NAAQS is later  
7 weakened. 42 U.S.C. § 7502(e).

8 28. A delay in any of the steps in this process delays when the public receives the air  
9 quality benefits of a stronger air-quality standard.

## 10 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

### 11 **A. Ozone Pollution**

12 29. Ozone—commonly referred to at ground level as “smog”—is a colorless, odorless  
13 gas that forms when other pollutants, emerging from tailpipes and smokestacks, such as nitrogen  
14 oxide and volatile organic compounds (known as ozone “precursors”) react in the presence of  
15 sunlight. EPA has found significant health effects associated with exposure to ozone, including  
16 aggravation of existing conditions like asthma, bronchitis, heart disease, and emphysema, as well  
17 as coughing, throat irritation, and lung tissue damage. Exposure to ozone also has been linked to  
18 early deaths. Children, the elderly, and people who already have lung diseases are particularly at  
19 risk from exposure to ozone pollution.

20 30. Ozone pollution is a particular problem in major metropolitan areas such as the  
21 San Francisco Bay Area, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and the New York City area, as well as in  
22 California’s Central Valley. Ozone is not only a result of local pollution; many northeastern states  
23 have high levels of ozone pollution because, in part, they are located downwind of numerous  
24 coal-fired power plants in the Midwest. Other stationary and mobile sources can also contribute to  
25 high ozone levels. Additionally, health effects can result from both long-term and short-term  
26 exposure to ozone pollution. Therefore, interstate or upwind ozone pollution can harm public  
27 health not only within nonattainment areas, but also in downwind areas within states that  
28 experience short-term elevated ozone levels.

1           31.     The pollution reductions EPA expects to result from attainment of the 2015 ozone  
2 NAAQS in California will—each year—save between 115 and 218 lives, prevent many hundreds  
3 of hospital visits for asthma and other respiratory problems, and enable children to attend 120,000  
4 days of school they would otherwise be forced to miss. EPA, Regulatory Impact Analysis of the  
5 Final Revisions to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ground-Level Ozone, ES-18,  
6 tbl. ES-10, *available at* [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/20151001ria.pdf)  
7 [02/documents/20151001ria.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/20151001ria.pdf). All told, EPA projects that attainment in California alone will  
8 lead to net annual health benefits of up to \$1.3 billion, a result of avoided health care costs, lost  
9 work days, and school absences. *Id.*, tbl. ES-9. Similar health and economic benefits are projected  
10 by EPA to result from attainment of the NAAQS throughout the rest of the country each year,  
11 including 316 to 660 lives saved, nearly 900 prevented hospital visits for asthma and other  
12 respiratory problems, and 160,000 avoided school absences, culminating in net annual health  
13 benefits of up to \$4.5 billion. *Id.*, ES-15 & 16, tbls. ES-5 & 6.

14     **B.     Failure of the Defendants to Promulgate Nonattainment Designations**

15           32.     Acting upon the advice of its objective scientific committee and on the basis of  
16 extensive studies showing that prior federal standards were set too high to protect public health  
17 and welfare, EPA promulgated revisions to the primary and secondary standards for ozone  
18 NAAQS on October 1, 2015, in a rule that was subsequently published in the Federal Register.  
19 *National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone*, 80 Fed. Reg. 65,292 (Oct. 26, 2015), *codified*  
20 *at* 40 C.F.R. § 50.15 (“2015 ozone NAAQS”). The 2015 ozone NAAQS lowered the primary and  
21 secondary standard to 0.070 parts per million (ppm), strengthening the previous standard of 0.075  
22 ppm set in 2008.

23           33.     Upon information and belief, as required under section 107(d)(1)(A) of the Clean  
24 Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(A), all states have submitted their recommended area  
25 designations to EPA.

26           34.     Under section 107(d)(1)(B), 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(B), EPA was required to issue  
27 designations for all areas pursuant to the new, more protective standard by no later than October  
28 1, 2017.



1           35.     On June 21, 2017, EPA announced without notice and comment that it was giving  
2     itself a one-year extension to issue the designations, extending the deadline to October 1, 2018.  
3     *Extensions of Deadline for Promulgating Designations for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air*  
4     *Quality Standards*, 82 Fed. Reg. 29,246 (June 21, 2017) (the “Deadline Extension”). Various  
5     states and non-profit organizations petitioned the United States Court of Appeals for the District  
6     of Columbia Circuit for review of the Deadline Extension. *See* D.C. Cir. Case Nos. 17-1172, 17-  
7     1185, 17-1187.

8           36.     After being sued, EPA purported to reverse course by issuing a notice withdrawing  
9     the Deadline Extension. *See Withdrawal of Extension of Deadline for Promulgating Designations*  
10    *for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards*, 82 Fed. Reg. 37,318 (Aug. 10,  
11    2017) (the “Withdrawal Notice”). EPA admitted in the Withdrawal Notice that the October 1,  
12    2017, deadline once again applied. *See id.* at 37,319 (“[T]he EPA is withdrawing its prior  
13    announced 1-year extension of the deadline for promulgating initial area designations for the  
14    2015 ozone NAAQS, and the 2-year deadline for promulgating designations provided in section  
15    107(d)(1)(B) of the CAA applies.”). Notwithstanding EPA’s withdrawal of the extension, the  
16    October 1, 2017 deadline passed without EPA’s having made any of the required designations.

17          37.     On November 6, 2017, EPA issued designations for some areas of the country. *See*  
18    *Air Quality Designations for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards*, 82 Fed.  
19    Reg. 54,232 (Nov. 16, 2017). Notably, EPA’s designations were all for “attainment” or  
20    “attainment/unclassifiable” areas. *Id.* at 54,232. EPA made no “nonattainment” designations.  
21    “Nonattainment” designations typically trigger state implementation planning to adopt ozone  
22    reduction measures to improve air quality and comply with new standards. Regarding the overdue  
23    designations, EPA stated “[f]or other areas not addressed in this final rule, the EPA is not  
24    extending the time provided under section 107(d)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act but is not yet  
25    prepared to issue designations. The agency intends to address these areas in a separate future  
26    action.” *Id.* EPA was silent as to how far in the “future” such action could be expected. The areas  
27    EPA failed to designate include many densely populated areas, in plaintiff States and elsewhere,  
28    that suffer from the highest levels of ozone. In fact, more than half of the U.S. population lives in

1 the undesignated areas. In some Plaintiff States, such as Connecticut, the entirety of the state  
2 remains undesignated. The Clean Air Act contains no provision authorizing EPA to selectively  
3 designate only areas that are in attainment with the ozone NAAQS, while indefinitely delaying  
4 issuance of other areas that may also be in attainment as well as the crucial nonattainment  
5 designations that necessitate remedial action.

6 38. EPA's failure to timely designate nonattainment areas delays the Clean Air Act's  
7 requirements for measures to reduce pollution in these areas, thus resulting in further harm to  
8 public health. Such delay leads to additional health care expenses, including for the States as  
9 administrators of healthcare programs for low-income people and seniors. Premature deaths and  
10 missed work and school days resulting from ozone-related health problems also harms the States'  
11 interests as administrators of schools and as employers.

12 39. EPA has still not issued all area designations for the 2015 ozone NAAQS. The  
13 agency's failure to issue the designations constitutes a violation of a nondiscretionary duty under  
14 section 107(d)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(B), to promulgate timely area  
15 designations for the 2015 ozone NAAQS, subjecting the agency to suit under section 304(a)(2) of  
16 the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7604(a)(2). The result is that planning to attain the new standards  
17 is not required to begin in nonattainment areas that are without a designation, anti-backsliding  
18 protections are not in place, and many millions of people continue to suffer from unhealthy air,  
19 contrary to the Clean Air Act's fundamental mandates.

20 **C. Notice of Violation**

21 40. On October 5 and 6, 2017, the States sent citizen-suit notice letters by certified  
22 mail to the EPA Administrator notifying him of the violation of section 107(d)(1)(B) and of the  
23 States' intention to commence a lawsuit if EPA did not correct the violation within 60 days  
24 (attached).

25 41. More than 60 days have passed since notice was provided and EPA has not issued  
26 all of the ozone NAAQS designations required under section 107(d)(1)(B).

27 \\\

28 \\\

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(Failure to Perform a Nondiscretionary Duty**  
**to Issue Area Designations for 2015 Ozone NAAQS)**

42. As set forth above, in light of the October 1, 2015 promulgation of the 2015 ozone NAAQS, EPA had a nondiscretionary duty, pursuant to section 107(d)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(B), to issue all area designations for the NAAQS by no later than October 1, 2017.

43. EPA's failure to issue all area designations for the 2015 ozone NAAQS is a violation of 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(B) that continues and is ongoing to this day.

44. This ongoing violation constitutes a "failure of the Administrator to perform any act or duty under this chapter which is not discretionary with the Administrator" under 42 U.S.C. § 7604(a)(2).

45. EPA's failure to perform its nondiscretionary duty has harmed and continues to harm the States by delaying the implementation of a more protective ozone standard that will lead to cleaner air in the States, benefitting the health and welfare of our citizens.

**REQUESTED RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, the States respectfully request that this Court enter judgment against defendants as follows:

- A. Declare that defendants are in violation of section 107(d)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7607(d)(1)(B), for failing to issue designations for all areas for the 2015 ozone NAAQS;
- B. Enjoin defendants to promptly perform their mandatory duty to promulgate all area designations for the 2015 ozone NAAQS by a date certain;
- C. Award the States the costs of the litigation, including reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 7604(d);
- D. Retain jurisdiction over this matter until such time as defendants have fully complied with their nondiscretionary duty to promulgate area designations for the 2015 ozone NAAQS by a date certain; and
- E. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

1 Dated: December 5, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

2 XAVIER BECERRA  
3 Attorney General of California  
4 GAVIN G. MCCABE  
5 Supervising Deputy Attorney General

6 /s/Jonathan Wiener  
7 JONATHAN WIENER  
8 MELINDA F. PILLING  
9 TIMOTHY E. SULLIVAN  
10 Deputy Attorneys General  
11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of California by*  
12 *and through Attorney General Xavier Becerra*  
13 *and the California Air Resources Board*

14 FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK

FOR THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

15 ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN  
16 ATTORNEY GENERAL

GEORGE JEPSEN  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

17 Morgan A. Costello\*  
18 Brian Lusignan\*  
19 Assistant Attorneys General  
20 Environmental Protection Bureau  
21 The Capitol  
22 Albany, NY 12224  
23 (518) 776-2399

Jill Lacedonia\*  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
P.O. Box 120, 55 Elm Street  
Hartford, CT 06141-0120  
(860) 808-5250

24 FOR THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

FOR THE STATE OF IOWA

25 LISA MADIGAN  
26 ATTORNEY GENERAL

THOMAS J. MILLER  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

27 Gerald T. Karr\*  
28 Assistant Attorney General  
69 W. Washington St., 18th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60602  
(312) 814-0660

Jacob Larson\*  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of Iowa Attorney General  
Hoover State Office Building  
1305 E. Walnut Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
(515) 281-5341

\* Application for admission *pro hac vice* to be  
filed shortly after filing complaint

1 FOR THE STATE OF MAINE

2 JANET T. MILLS  
3 ATTORNEY GENERAL

4 Gerald D. Reid\*  
5 Natural Resources Division Chief  
6 6 State House Station  
7 Augusta, ME 04333  
8 (207) 626-8800

9 FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
10 MASSACHUSETTS

11 MAURA HEALEY  
12 ATTORNEY GENERAL

13 Carol Iancu\*  
14 Assistant Attorney General  
15 Environmental Protection Division  
16 One Ashburton Place, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
17 Boston, MA 02108  
18 (617) 963-2428

19 FOR THE STATE OF OREGON

20 ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM  
21 ATTORNEY GENERAL

22 Paul Garrahan\*  
23 Attorney-in-Charge  
24 Natural Resources Section  
25 Oregon Department of Justice  
26 1162 Court Street NE  
27 Salem, OR 97301-4096  
28 (503) 947-4593

FOR THE STATE OF MARYLAND

BRIAN E. FROSH  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Leah Tulin\*  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Maryland Attorney General  
200 Saint Paul Place  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202  
(410) 576-6962

FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA, BY  
AND THROUGH ITS MINNESOTA  
POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
State of Minnesota

Max Kieley\*  
Assistant Attorney General  
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 900  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127  
(651) 757-1244

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

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

JOSH SHAPIRO  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Steven J. Santarsiero\*  
Michael J. Fischer\*  
Chief Deputy Attorneys General  
PA Office of the Attorney General  
21 South 12th Street, Third Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
(215) 560-2380

\* Application for admission *pro hac vice* to be  
filed shortly after filing complaint

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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 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) 586-6769

FOR THE STATE OF VERMONT

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Katherine Pohl (Bar No. 288288)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609-1001  
(802) 828-3186

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

KARL A. RACINE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL  
ROBYN M. BENDER  
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL  
PUBLIC ADVOCACY DIVISION

Catherine A. Jackson\*  
Chief, Public Integrity Section  
Office of the Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General  
441 4th Street, NW, Suite 630S  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 442-9864

\* Application for admission *pro hac vice* to be filed shortly after filing complaint

# **ATTACHMENT A**

**ATTORNEYS GENERAL OF NEW YORK, CALIFORNIA, CONNECTICUT,  
ILLINOIS, IOWA, MAINE, MASSACHUSETTS, MINNESOTA, BY AND THROUGH  
ITS MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY, OREGON, PENNSYLVANIA,  
RHODE ISLAND, VERMONT, WASHINGTON, AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

October 5, 2017

**Via Certified Mail**

E. Scott Pruitt, Administrator  
Office of the Administrator (1101A)  
Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20460

Re: Notice of Intent to Sue for Failure to Issue Designations for 2015 Ozone National  
Ambient Air Quality Standards

Dear Administrator Pruitt:

The States of New York, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, by and through its Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont and Washington, the Commonwealths of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia (collectively, “States”) hereby provide notice pursuant to Section 304(a)(2) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7604(a)(2), of our intent to commence litigation regarding EPA’s failure to timely issue nonattainment designations on the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ozone promulgated on October 1, 2015. See 65 Fed. Reg. 65,292 (Oct. 26, 2015).

As you are aware, EPA’s promulgation of NAAQS sets in motion a process under the statute that several years later results in air quality benefits. See 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(A), (B) (setting forth deadlines for state and EPA designation of nonattainment areas based on date the NAAQS was promulgated) and § 7410(a)(1) (deadline for states to submit implementation plan revisions tied to NAAQS promulgation date). Once EPA promulgates a NAAQS, states must propose designations of nonattainment areas within their borders within a year. 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(A). EPA must then promulgate the designations (after making any necessary changes) “as expeditiously as practicable, but in no case later than 2 years from the date of promulgation of the new or revised [NAAQS].” Id., § 7407(d)(1)(B). The agency may extend this deadline by up to one year in the event that it has “insufficient information” to promulgate the designations. Id. A delay in any of these steps in the process in turn delays when the public receives the air quality benefits of a stronger standard.

Here, EPA has failed to issue the designations for nonattainment areas for the 2015 ozone standards as required under 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(B). Under that statutory provision, the promulgation of the ozone NAAQS on October 1, 2015 started the clock ticking for EPA to issue the designations by October 1, 2017. On June 28, 2017, EPA promulgated a rule giving itself an extension of one year to issue the designations, stating that it had “insufficient information” to complete the designations. 82 Fed. Reg. 29,246 (June 28, 2017) (the “designations delay”).



After a collection of states\* and environmental organizations challenged EPA's designations delay in court, EPA abruptly reversed course and withdrew the designations delay. 82 Fed. Reg. 37,318 (Aug. 10, 2017). However, EPA was still equivocal on whether the 2015 ozone NAAQS designations would be made by the statutory deadline, noting that although there "may be areas of the United States for which designations could be promulgated" by the deadline, "[t]he Administrator may still determine that an extension of time to complete designations is necessary." 82 Fed. Reg. at 37,319.


As of today, EPA has failed to promulgate nationwide designations for the 2015 ozone NAAQS. The agency's failure to issue the designations constitutes a violation of a nondiscretionary duty under 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(B) to promulgate timely nonattainment designations for the 2015 ozone NAAQS, subjecting the agency to suit under Section 304(a)(2) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7604(a)(2). Accordingly, the States intend to file a lawsuit in federal district court to compel EPA to comply with its obligations under the statute.

If you would like to discuss this matter prior to expiration of the 60-day notice period, you may have your counsel contact us through New York Assistant Attorney General Brian Lusignan at the address below.

Very truly yours,

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN  
Attorney General of New York

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MORGAN COSTELLO  
BRIAN LUSIGNAN  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Environmental Protection Bureau  
The Capitol  
Albany, New York 12224  
(518) 776-2399  
Brian.Lusignan@ag.ny.gov  
For the State of New York

---

\*The governmental units challenging the designations delay consisted of the States of New York, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, by and through its Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington, the Commonwealths of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia.

FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

XAVIER BECERRA  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CALIFORNIA

Robert W. Byrne  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Gavin G. McCabe  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
Melinda Pilling  
Timothy E. Sullivan  
Deputy Attorneys General  
455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 703-5585

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

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 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 CONNECTICUT

GEORGE JEPSEN  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Matthew I. Levine  
Jill Lacedonia  
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 IOWA

THOMAS J. MILLER  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jacob Larson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of Iowa Attorney General  
Hoover State Office Building  
1305 E. Walnut Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
(515) 281-5341

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
MASSACHUSETTS

MAURA HEALEY  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Carol Iancu  
Assistant Attorney General  
Environmental Protection Division  
One Ashburton Place, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Boston, MA 02108  
(617) 963-2428

FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA, BY AND  
THROUGH ITS MINNESOTA POLLUTION  
CONTROL AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

State of Minnesota  
Max Kieley  
Assistant Attorney General  
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 900  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127  
(651) 757-1244

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

FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

JOSH SHAPIRO  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Steven J. Santarsiero  
Michael J. Fischer  
Chief Deputy Attorneys General  
PA Office of the Attorney General  
Strawberry Square  
Harrisburg, PA 17102  
(215) 560-2380

FOR THE STATE OF VERMONT

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Nicholas F. Persampieri  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609-1001  
(802) 828-3186

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) 947-4593

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 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) 586-6769

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

KARL A. RACINE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Loren L. Alikhan  
Deputy Solicitor General  
Office of the Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General  
441 4th Street, NW, Suite 600S  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 727-6287

# **ATTACHMENT B**

BRIAN E. FROSH  
*Attorney General*



ELIZABETH F. HARRIS  
*Chief Deputy Attorney General*

CAROLYN QUATTROCKI  
*Deputy Attorney General*

STATE OF MARYLAND  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

FACSIMILE NO. 410-576-7036

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NO. 410-576-6311

October 6, 2017

**VIA CERTIFIED MAIL**

E. Scott Pruitt, Administrator  
Office of the Administrator (1101A)  
Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20460

Re: Notice of Intent to Sue for Failure to Issue Designations for 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards

Dear Administrator Pruitt:

Maryland hereby provides notice pursuant to Section 304(a)(2) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7604(a)(2), of its intent to commence litigation regarding EPA's failure to timely issue nonattainment designations on the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ozone promulgated on October 1, 2015. See 65 Fed. Reg. 65,292 (Oct. 26, 2015).

As you are aware, EPA's promulgation of NAAQS sets in motion a process under the statute that several years later results in air quality benefits. See 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(A), (B) (setting forth deadlines for state and EPA designation of nonattainment areas based on date the NAAQS was promulgated) and § 7410(a)(1) (deadline for states to submit implementation plan revisions tied to NAAQS promulgation date). Once EPA promulgates a NAAQS, states must propose designations of nonattainment areas within their borders within a year. 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(A). EPA must then promulgate the designations (after making any necessary changes) "as expeditiously as practicable, but in no case later than 2 years from the date of promulgation of the new or revised [NAAQS]." Id., § 7407(d)(1)(B). The agency may extend this deadline by up to one year in the event that it has "insufficient information" to promulgate the designations. Id. A delay in any of these steps in the process in turn delays when the public receives the air quality benefits of a stronger standard.

Here, EPA has failed to issue the designations for nonattainment areas for the 2015 ozone standards as required under 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(B). Under that statutory provision, the promulgation of the ozone NAAQS on October 1, 2015 started the clock ticking for EPA to issue the designations by October 1, 2017. On June 28, 2017, EPA promulgated a rule giving itself an extension of one year to issue the designations, stating that it had "insufficient information" to complete the designations. 82 Fed. Reg. 29,246 (June 28, 2017) (the "designations delay").

Administrator E. Scott Pruitt  
October 6, 2017  
Page 2 of 2

---

complete the designations. 82 Fed. Reg. 29,246 (June 28, 2017) (the “designations delay”). After a collection of states and environmental organizations challenged EPA’s designations delay in court, EPA abruptly reversed course and withdrew the designations delay. 82 Fed. Reg. 37,318 (Aug. 10, 2017). However, EPA was still equivocal on whether the 2015 ozone NAAQS designations would be made by the statutory deadline, noting that although there “may be areas of the United States for which designations could be promulgated” by the deadline, “[t]he Administrator may still determine that an extension of time to complete designations is necessary.” 82 Fed. Reg. at 37,319.

As of today, EPA has failed to promulgate nationwide designations for the 2015 ozone NAAQS. The agency’s failure to issue the designations constitutes a violation of a nondiscretionary duty under 42 U.S.C. § 7407(d)(1)(B) to promulgate timely nonattainment designations for the 2015 ozone NAAQS, subjecting the agency to suit under Section 304(a)(2) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7604(a)(2). Accordingly, Maryland intends to file a lawsuit in federal district court to compel EPA to comply with its obligations under the statute.

If you would like to discuss this matter prior to expiration of the 60-day notice period, you may have your counsel contact us through Maryland Assistant Attorney General Leah Tulin at the address below.

Very truly yours,

BRIAN E. FROSH  
Attorney General of Maryland

By:



STEVEN SULLIVAN  
LEAH TULIN  
Assistant Attorneys General  
200 St. Paul Place, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Baltimore, Maryland  
(410) 576-6962  
ltulin@oag.state.md.us  
For the State of Maryland