```
Robert Ukeiley, (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
 1
   CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
   1536 Wynkoop St., Ste. 421
   Denver, CO 80202
 3
   Tel: 720-496-8568
   Email: rukeiley@biologicaldiversity.org
 4
   Jonathan Evans (Cal. Bar #247376)
   CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
 6
   1212 Broadway, Suite 800
   Oakland, CA 94612
   Phone: 510-844-7100
 8
   Fax: 510-844-7150
   email: jevans@biologicaldiversity.org
   MICHAEL N. LAZORCHAK (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
10
   CSE LAW
11
   107 STATE STREET
   Montpelier, VT 05601-1385
12
   (802)225-6495
   mnl@caroline-law.com
13
14
    Attorney for Plaintiffs Center for Biological Diversity,
    Center for Environmental Health, and Sierra Club
15
                           UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16
                   FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
17
18
   CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY.
   CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH,
19
    and SIERRA CLUB,
20
                                                  Civ. No. 18-cv-3544-YGR
          Plaintiffs,
21
                                                ) FIRST AMENDED
                                                ) COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE
22
    v.
                                                ) AND DECLARATORY RELIEF
23
   ANDREW R. WHEELER,
                                                  (Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401 et.
24
                                                    seq.)
25
   in his official capacity as Acting
    Administrator of the United States
26
   Environmental Protection Agency,
27
         Defendant.
28
```

INTRODUCTION

- 1. This is a Clean Air Act "deadline suit" against Andrew R. Wheeler for his failure to protect people, ecosystems and wildlife from dangerous exposure to sulfur oxides (SOx). SOx, in even very short exposure time periods—such as five minutes—has significant health impacts, including decrements in lung function, aggravation of asthma, and respiratory and cardiovascular morbidity. EPA has also determined that exposure to SO₂ pollution can aggravate existing heart disease, leading to increased hospitalizations and premature deaths.
- 2. SOx also contribute to the formation of acid rain, which damages trees, crops, historic buildings, and monuments and alters the acidity of both soils and water bodies. Acute and chronic exposures to SOx lead to foliar injury, decreased photosynthesis, and decreased growth of vegetation. EPA's draft Integrated Review Plan acknowledged that SOx have a potential to negatively affect endangered species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has already identified many federally protected species that are negatively affected by atmospheric pollution from SOx.
- 3. In addition, because SOx emissions may be transmitted long distances, they contribute to visibility impairment problems in many national parks and wilderness areas. EPA has previously found "that current levels of oxides of nitrogen and sulfur are sufficient to cause acidification of both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, nutrient enrichment of terrestrial ecosystems and contribute to nutrient enrichment effects in estuaries that could be considered adverse[.]" 77 Fed. Reg. 20,218, 20,241-42 (April 3, 2012).
- 4. SOx also facilitate mercury methylation. This creates the form of mercury which is especially dangerous to humans and wildlife.
- 5. To better protect the public from the damage caused by SOx, the United States

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) promulgated a SOx National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) in 1971 and again in 2010. The promulgation of these SOx NAAQS creates various mandatory duties which EPA must perform in order to effectively implement those SOx NAAQS. As detailed below, EPA is in violation of numerous Clean Air Act mandatory duties with regard to the SOx NAAQS.

6. Specifically, EPA has a mandatory duty to take final action on state implementation plan (SIP) submittals within 12 months of those SIP submittals becoming administratively complete.
42 U.S.C. § 7410(k)(2)-(4). EPA is in violation of this mandatory duty for the nonattainment areas and SIP elements listed in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1

ADEA O CEATE	ELEMENTO(C)	COMPLETION	TUNIAT
AREA & STATE	ELEMENT(S)	COMPLETION	FINAL
		DATE	ACTION DUE
			DATE
Indianapolis, IN	Attainment Demonstration,	2/25/2016	2/25/2017
Marion County	Contingency Measures,		
(part)	Emission inventory,		
	Nonattainment New Source		
	Review (NSR), Reasonably		
	Available Control		
	Measures/Reasonably		
	Available Control Technology		
	(RACM/RACT), Reasonable		
	Further Progress (RFP).		
Morgan County, IN	Attainment Demonstration,	2/25/2016	2/25/2017
Morgan County	Contingency Measures,		
(part)	Emission inventory,		
	Nonattainment NSR,		
	RACM/RACT, RFP.		
Southwest, IN	Attainment Demonstration,	2/25/2016	2/25/2017
Daviess County	Contingency Measures,		
(part)	Emission inventory,		
Pike County (part)	Nonattainment NSR,		
	RACM/RACT, RFP.		
Terre Haute, IN	Attainment Demonstration,	2/25/2016	2/25/2017
Vigo County (part)	Contingency Measures,		

	Emission inventory,		
	Nonattainment NSR,		
	RACM/RACT, RFP.		
Muscatine, IA	Attainment Demonstration,	11/26/2016	11/26/2017
Muscatine County	Contingency Measures,		
(part)	Emission inventory,		
	Nonattainment NSR,		
	RACM/RACT, RFP.		
Detroit, MI	Attainment Demonstration,	11/30/2016	11/30/2017
Wayne County	Contingency Measures,		
(part)	Emission inventory,		
	Nonattainment NSR,		
	RACM/RACT, RFP.		
Jackson County, MO	Emission inventory	2/25/2016	2/25/2017
Jackson County			
(part)			
Lake County, OH	Attainment Demonstration,	10/03/2015 for	10/3/2016 for
Lake County	Contingency Measures,	attainment	attainment
	Emission inventory,	demonstration.	demonstration
	Nonattainment NSR,	2/25/2016 for	2/25/2017 for
	RACM/RACT, RFP.	other elements.	other elements
Muskingum River,	Attainment Demonstration,	10/03/2015 for	10/3/2016 for
OH	Contingency Measures,	attainment	attainment
Morgan County	Emission inventory,	demonstration.	demonstration
(part)	Nonattainment NSR,	2/25/2016 for	2/25/2017 for
Washington County	RACM/RACT, RFP.	other elements.	other elements
(part)			
Steubenville, OH-	Attainment Demonstration,	10/03/2015 for	10/3/2016 for
WV, OH	Contingency Measures,	attainment	attainment
Jefferson County	Emission inventory,	demonstration.	demonstration
(part)	Nonattainment NSR,	2/25/2016 for	2/25/2017 for
	RACM/RACT, RFP.	other elements.	other elements
Steubenville, OH-	Attainment Demonstration,	10/2/2016	10/2/2017
WV, WV	Contingency Measures,		
Brooke County	Emission inventory,		
(part)	Nonattainment NSR,		
•	RACM/RACT, RFP.		
Rhinelander, WI	Attainment Demonstration,	2/25/2016	2/25/2017
Oneida County	Contingency Measures,		
(part)	Emission inventory,		
'	Nonattainment NSR, RFP.		
Hayden, AZ	Attainment Demonstration,	0/06/0017	0/06/0010
Gila County (part)	Contingency Measures,	9/26/2017	9/26/2018
Pinal County (part)	Emission Inventories,		
······································	Reasonably available control		
	measures/Reasonably available		

control technology

(RACM/RACT), Reasonable Further Progress (RFP).

Attainment Demonstration,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

Miami, AZ

Miami, AZ	Attainment Demonstration,	9/26/2017	9/26/2018
Gila County (part)	Contingency Measures,	J/20/2017	7/20/2010
	Emission Inventories,		
	RACM/RACT, RFP.		
Jefferson County,	Attainment Demonstration,	10/10/2017	10/10/2018
KY	Contingency Measures,	10/10/2017	10/10/2010
Jefferson County	Emission Inventories,		
(part)	Nonattainment NSR,		
	RACM/RACT, RFP.		
Allegheny, PA	heny, PA Attainment Demonstration, 10/6/2017		10/6/2018
Allegheny County	Contingency Measures,	10/0/2017	10/0/2018
(part)	Emission Inventories,		
	Nonattainment NSR,		
	RACM/RACT, RFP.		
Beaver, PA	Attainment Demonstration,	10/5/2017	10/5/2018
Beaver County	Contingency Measures,	10/3/2017	10/3/2016
(part)	Emission Inventories,		
	Nonattainment NSR,		
	RACM/RACT, RFP.		
Indiana, PA	Attainment Demonstration,	10/13/2017	10/13/208
Indiana County	Contingency Measures,	10/13/2017	10/13/208
Armstrong County	Emission Inventories,		
(part)	Nonattainment NSR,		
	RACM/RACT, RFP.		
Marshall, WV	Attainment Demonstration,	9/20/2017	9/20/2018
Marshall County	Contingency Measures,	3/20/2017	9/20/2016
(part)	Nonattainment NSR,		
	RACM/RACT, RFP.		

20

21

22

23

24

7. EPA also has a mandatory duty to make a finding that a state has failed to submit a required SIP submittal within six months of when that SIP submittal is due. 42 U.S.C. § 7410(k)(1)(B). EPA has violated this mandatory duty to make a finding of failure to submit nonattainment SIPs for the nonattainment areas listed in Table 2 below.

25 26

27

28

TABLE 2

AREA & ELEMENT(S)	SUBMITTAL
	DEADLINE
	(No later than)
New Jersey portion of the Northeast Pennsylvania-Upper Delaware Valley Interstate AQCR (part) 1971 primary SO ₂ SIP.	5/15/1992
Alton Township, IL, Madison County (part); Attainment Demonstration, Contingency Measures, Emission Inventories, Nonattainment New Source Review (NSR), Reasonably available	3/12/2018
control measures/Reasonably available control technology (RACM/RACT), Reasonable Further Progress (RFP).	
Williamson County, IL, Williamson County; Attainment Demonstration, Contingency Measures, Emission Inventories, Nonattainment NSR, RACM/RACT, RFP.	3/12/2018
Anne Arundel County and Baltimore County, MD, Anne Arundel County (part), Baltimore County (part); Attainment Demonstration, Contingency Measures, Emission Inventories, Nonattainment NSR, RACM/RACT, RFP.	3/12/2018
St. Clair, MI, St. Clair County (part): Attainment Demonstration, Contingency Measures, Emission Inventories, Nonattainment NSR, RACM/RACT, RFP.	3/12/2018

8. Accordingly, Plaintiffs CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH and SIERRA CLUB bring this action against Defendant ANDREW R. WHEELER, in his official capacity as Acting EPA Administrator, to compel him to perform his mandatory duties with respect to the SOx NAAQS.

JURISDICTION

- 9. This case is a Clean Air Act citizen suit. Therefore, the Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction) and 42 U.S.C. § 7604(a) (Clean Air Act citizen suits).
- 10. An actual controversy exists between the parties. This case does not concern federal taxes, is not a proceeding under 11 U.S.C. §§ 505 of 1146, and does not involve the Tariff Act of 1930. Thus, this Court has jurisdiction to order declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2201. If the Court orders declaratory relief, 28 U.S.C. § 2202 authorizes this Court to issue injunctive relief.

NOTICE

11. Plaintiffs mailed to EPA by certified mail, return receipt requested, written notice of intent to sue regarding the violations alleged in this Complaint. EPA received the notice letter regarding the claims in the original complaint by no later than March 19, 2018. Plaintiffs mailed the notice letter regarding the claims added in the First Amended Complaint on October 15, 2018. More than sixty days have passed since Plaintiffs mailed these notice letters. EPA has not remedied the violations alleged in this Complaint. Therefore, a present and actual controversy exists between the parties.

VENUE

12. Defendant EPA resides in this judicial district. This civil action is brought against an officer of the United States acting in her official capacity and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims in this case occurred in the Northern District of California.

One of the claims in this Complaint concerns EPA's failure to perform mandatory duties with First Amended Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief

regard to Arizona. EPA Region 9, which is responsible for Arizona, is headquartered in San Francisco. Thus several of the events and omissions at issue in this action occurred at EPA's Region 9 headquarters in San Francisco. In addition, Plaintiffs Center for Environmental Health and Sierra Club are headquartered in Oakland. Accordingly, venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e).

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

13. A substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to the claims in this case occurred in the County of San Francisco. Accordingly, assignment to the San Francisco Division or the Oakland Division is proper pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-2(c) and (d).

PARTIES

- 14. Plaintiff CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY is a non-profit 501(c)(3) corporation incorporated in California. The Center for Biological Diversity has approximately 68,000 members throughout the United States and the world. The Center for Biological Diversity's mission is to ensure the preservation, protection, and restoration of biodiversity, native species, ecosystems, public lands and waters, and public health through science, policy, and environmental law. Based on the understanding that the health and vigor of human societies and the integrity and wildness of the natural environment are closely linked, the Center for Biological Diversity is working to secure a future for animals and plants hovering on the brink of extinction, for the ecosystems they need to survive, and for a healthy, livable future for all of us.
- 15. The Center for Biological Diversity and its members include individuals with varying interests in wildlife species and their habitat ranging from scientific, professional, and

educational to recreational, aesthetic, moral, and spiritual. Further, the Center for Biological Diversity's members enjoy, on an ongoing basis, the biological, scientific, research, educational, conservation, recreational, and aesthetic values of the regions inhabited by these species, including the regions at issue in this action. The Center for Biological Diversity's members observe and study native species and their habitat, and derive professional, scientific, educational, recreational, aesthetic, inspirational, and other benefits from these activities and have an interest in preserving the possibility of such activities in the future. The Center for Biological Diversity and its members have participated in efforts to protect and preserve natural areas, including the habitat essential to the continued survival of native species, and to address threats to the continued existence of these species, including the threats posed by air pollution and other contaminants.

- 16. Plaintiff the CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH is an Oakland, California based non-profit organization that helps protect the public from toxic chemicals and promotes business products and practices that are safe for public health and the environment. The Center for Environmental Health works in pursuit of a world in which all people live, work, learn, and play in healthy environments.
- 17. Plaintiff SIERRA CLUB is the oldest and largest grassroots environmental organization in the United States, with more than 795,000 members nationally. Sierra Club's mission is to explore, enjoy, and protect the wild places of the Earth; to practice and promote the responsible use of the Earth's resources and ecosystems; to educate and enlist humanity to protect and restore the quality of the natural and human environment; and to use all lawful means to carry out these objectives. Sierra Club performs this mission through advocacy, litigation, and educational outreach to its members and state chapters. Sierra Club and its members are greatly concerned

about the effects of air pollution on human health and the environment and have a long history of involvement in activities related to air quality.

- 18. Plaintiffs' members live, work, recreate, travel and engage in other activities throughout the areas at issue in this complaint and will continue to do so on a regular basis. Pollution in the affected areas threatens and damages, and will continue to threaten and damage, the health and welfare of Plaintiffs' members as well as their ability to engage in and enjoy their other activities. Pollution diminishes Plaintiff's members' ability to enjoy the aesthetic qualities and recreational opportunities of the affected area.
- 19. EPA's failure to timely perform the mandatory duties described herein also adversely affects Plaintiffs, as well as their members, by depriving them of procedural protection and opportunities, as well as information that they are entitled to under the Clean Air Act. The failure of EPA to perform the mandatory duties also creates uncertainty for Plaintiffs' members as to whether they are exposed to excess air pollution.
- 20. The above injuries will continue until the Court grants the relief requested herein.
- 21. Defendant ANDREW R. WHEELER is the Acting Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency. In that role Acting Administrator Wheeler has been charged by Congress with the duty to administer the Clean Air Act, including the mandatory duties at issue in this case.

LEGAL BACKGROUND AND FACTS

22. Congress enacted the Clean Air Act to "speed up, expand, and intensify the war against air pollution in the United States with a view to assuring that the air we breathe throughout the Nation is wholesome once again." H.R.Rep. No. 1146, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 1,1, 1970 U.S.Code

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23 24

25

26 27

28

Cong. & Admin. News 5356, 5356. To promote this, the Act requires EPA to set National Ambient Air Quality Standards for certain pollutants, including SOx. National Ambient Air Ouality Standards establish maximum allowable concentrations in the air of these pollutants.

- 23. Each National Ambient Air Quality Standard must be stringent enough to protect public health and welfare. Effects on welfare include, but are not limited to, effects on soils, water, vegetation, manmade materials, wildlife, visibility (i.e., haze), climate, damage to property, economic impacts and effects on personal comfort and well-being.
- 24. EPA set a primary and secondary SOx in 1971. 36 Fed. Reg. 8,186 (Apr. 30, 1971). EPA set an additional primary SOx in 2010. 75 Fed. Reg. 35,520 (June 22, 2010).
- 25. Due to both the more stringent numerical limit and shorter averaging time as compared to the previous SOx NAAQS, the 2010 SOx NAAQS is far more protective of human health than the prior SOx NAAQS and promises huge health benefits. EPA estimated that 2,300 to 5,900 premature deaths and 54,000 asthma attacks a year will be prevented by the new standard.
- 26. Timely implementation of the new NAAQS is critical. Considering the scientific evidence, each year implementation of the one-hour SO2 NAAQS is delayed, up to 5,900 more people will die prematurely and 54,000 asthma attacks will occur unnecessarily. Further, EPA estimates that the net benefit of implementing the 75 ppb SO₂ NAAQS is up to \$36 billion dollars. Those individuals who suffer from health impacts caused by exposure to SOx levels above the NAAOS will have greater medical costs with each year implementation is delayed and, as a result, the monetized benefits of implementing the one-hour SOx NAAOS will go unrealized. Further, the ability of those individuals to enjoy everyday activities such as exercise, school, and work will continue to be negatively impacted.
- 27. The Clean Air Act requires EPA to determine whether any state implementation plan First Amended Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief 11

submittal is administratively complete. *See* 42 U.S.C. 7410(k)(1)(B). If a state fails to submit any required state implementation plan by the deadline for its submittal, there is no submittal that may be deemed administratively complete and EPA must make a determination stating that the state failed to submit the required state implementation plan. 42 U.S.C. § 7410(k)(1)(B). This is referred to as a "finding of failure to submit."

- 28. If a state does submit a SIP submittal, EPA has a mandatory duty to take final action on the submittal by approving it, disapproving it or approving it in part and disapproving it in part within 12 months of when the submittal is deemed administratively complete. 42 U.S.C. § 7410(k)(2)-(4).
- 29. If EPA disapproves a SIP submittal or makes a finding that a state has failed to submit a SIP submittal by the deadline for submittal, EPA has a mandatory duty to promulgate a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) no later than two years after disapproving a SIP submittal. 42 U.S.C. § 7410(c).

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

CLAIM ONE

(Failure to take final action on SIP submittals)

- 30. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all paragraphs listed above.
- 31. It has been more than 12 months since the states listed in Table 1 above have submitted and had determined or deemed administratively complete the 2010 SOx NAAQS nonattainment SIP elements listed in Table 1 above for the 2010 SOx NAAQS nontattainment areas listed in Table 1 above.
- 32. EPA has not taken final action, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 7410(k)(2)-(4), on the 2010 SOx

First Amended Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief

13

1	40.	Therefore, EPA is in violation of its mandatory duty to issue findings of failure to submit
2	pursua	nt to 42 U.S.C. § 7410(k)(1)(B) for the nonattainment areas and elements listed in Table 2
3	above.	
4		
5		REQUEST FOR RELIEF
6		WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court:
7	A.	Declare that the Administrator is in violation of the Clean Air Act with regard to his
8		failure to perform each mandatory duty listed above;
9 10	B.	Issue a mandatory injunction requiring the Administrator to perform his mandatory duties
11		by certain dates;
12	C.	Retain jurisdiction of this matter for purposes of enforcing and effectuating the Court's
13		order;
14	D.	Grant Plaintiffs their reasonable costs of litigation, including attorneys' and expert fees;
15		and
16		
17 18	E.	Grant such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.
19		
20		Respectfully submitted,
21		
22		/s/Robert Ukeiley
23		Robert Ukeiley, (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
		1536 Wynkoop St., Ste. 421
24		Denver, CO 80202 Tel: 720-496-8568
25		Email: rukeiley@biologicaldiversity.org
26		Jonathan Evans (Cal. Bar #247376)
27		CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY 1212 Broadway, Suite 800
28	First A	amended Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief 14
	Trust	inches Complaint for Decialatory and injunetive Renet

Case 4:18-cv-03544-YGR Document 25 Filed 12/17/18 Page 15 of 15

Oakland, CA 94612 Tel: 510-844-7100 Fax: 510-844-7150 email: jevans@biologicaldiversity.org MICHAEL N. LAZORCHAK (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) **CSE LAW** 107 STATE STREET Montpelier, VT 05601-1385 Tel: (802)225-6495 Email: mnl@caroline-law.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs Center for Biological Diversity, Center for Environmental Health and Sierra Club Dated: December 17, 2018