

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THE CALIFORNIA NATURAL
RESOURCES AGENCY, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WILBUR ROSS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 1:20-CV-00426-DAD-EPG

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

(Doc. No. 54)

PACIFIC COAST FEDERATION OF
FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WILBUR ROSS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 1:20-CV-00431-DAD-EPG

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART AS MOOT
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION AND HOLDING
CERTAIN ISSUES IN ABEYANCE

(Doc. No. 81.)

INTRODUCTION

This order addresses motions for preliminary injunction filed in two largely overlapping cases: *California Natural Resources Agency v. Ross*, No. 1:20-CV-00426-DAD-EPG (CNRA), and *Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations v. Ross*, 1:20-CV-00431-DAD-EPG

1 (PCFFA). In *CNRA*, plaintiffs are the People of the State of California, California’s Natural
2 Resources Agency, and California’s Environmental Protection Agency (collectively,
3 “California”). In *PCFFA*, plaintiffs are a coalition of six environmental organizations led by
4 PCFFA (collectively, “PCFFA”).

5 Both sets of plaintiffs bring claims against the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS),
6 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), and
7 various official representatives of those agencies. (*CNRA*, Doc. No. 51, First Amended
8 Complaint (FAC); *PCFFA*, Doc. No. 52, FAC.) California’s first and second claims for relief in
9 *CNRA* challenge the adoption by NMFS and FWS, respectively, of a pair of “biological opinions”
10 (BiOps) issued in 2019 pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (ESA), 16 U.S.C § 1531 *et seq.*,
11 regarding the impact on various ESA-listed species of implementing Reclamation’s updated Plan
12 for the long-term operation of the Central Valley Project (CVP) and the State Water Project
13 (SWP) (collectively, “Water Projects” “Plan” or “Proposed Action”). More specifically, in its
14 first and second claims for relief California alleges that NMFS and FWS violated the
15 Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. § 706, in various ways by concluding that the
16 Water Projects would not jeopardize the continued existence of the ESA-listed species addressed
17 in each biological opinion. California also brings claims against Reclamation under the ESA
18 (third claim for relief) for unlawfully relying on the 2019 BiOps in formally adopting and
19 implementing the Proposed Action, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42
20 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.*, (fourth claim for relief). Finally, California alleges in its fifth claim for
21 relief that Reclamation has violated the APA by failing to comply with the California Endangered
22 Species Act (CESA), which compliance California alleges is required by various provisions of
23 federal law. PCFFA’s claims are largely identical to California’s, although its complaint does not
24 include a CESA-based claim. (*PCFFA*, Doc. No. 52, First Amended Complaint.)

25 On March 25, 2020, these cases were transferred to this district from the U.S. District
26 Court for the Northern District of California in light of related cases already pending before the
27 undersigned. (*CNRA*, Doc. No. 26; *PCFFA*, Doc. No. 112.)

28 //

1 Now pending before the court are inter-related and overlapping motions for preliminary
2 injunction in both cases. (*PCFFA*, Doc. No. 81 (filed March 5, 2019); *CNRA*, Doc. No. 54 (filed
3 April 21, 2019).) The briefs, declarations, and attachments submitted in connection with these
4 pending motions make up a lengthy and complex record. *PCFFA* and California have urged the
5 court to act expeditiously before certain events take place in May. Accordingly, the court
6 accelerated the briefing schedule where necessary and set a hearing on the pending motions for
7 May 7, 2020. All parties made appearances through counsel at an all-day videoconference
8 hearing on that date, as stated on the record. (*See PCFFA*, Doc. No. 167; *CNRA*, Doc. No. 99).
9 Thereafter, the parties submitted a small number of additional documents referenced at the
10 hearing, which the court has also reviewed.

11 *PCFFA* requests that the court issue a broad preliminary injunction order “temporarily
12 setting aside” the 2019 BiOps and prohibiting Federal Defendants from implementing or taking
13 any actions in reliance on those BiOps, including prohibiting Reclamation from implementing the
14 Proposed Action in reliance on those BiOps. (*PCFFA*, Doc. No. 81-1 at 2–3.) *PCFFA* also has
15 requested that the court order Federal Defendants to instead adhere to the **previous** operational
16 regime for the Water Projects authorized pursuant to previously-controlling BiOps issued in 2008
17 and 2009 by FWS and NMFS, respectively, until this court can resolve the merits of *PCFFA*’s
18 claims asserted in the pending action. (*Id.* at 2.) *PCFFA*’s request was accompanied by extensive
19 and wide-ranging briefing challenging numerous aspects of the Proposed Action and the 2019
20 BiOps, focusing on issues related to operations at the Water Projects’ export pumping facilities in
21 the southern portion of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) as well as instream temperature
22 management planning and protocols for Shasta Dam on the Upper Sacramento River and New
23 Melones Reservoir on the Stanislaus River. (*See generally PCFFA*, Doc. No. 86.) The record
24 presented by *PCFFA*, Federal Defendants, and Defendant Intervenors in *PCFFA* in connection
25 with the pending motions also contains extensive information addressing how the planned
26 operations may, or may not, harm ESA-listed winter-run Chinook salmon (winter-run), spring-run
27 Chinook salmon (spring-run), California Central Valley steelhead (CCV steelhead), and Delta
28 smelt.

1 California's motion for preliminary injunction is more narrowly focused on the period
2 from now until May 31, 2020. It requests that the current operating regime (i.e., the Proposed
3 Action as approved by the 2019 BiOps) be enjoined from the date of this court's order through
4 and including May 31, 2020, "to the extent that operation is inconsistent with the requirement in
5 ***Reasonable and Prudent Alternative Action IV.2.1***," which was contained within NMFS's 2009
6 BiOp (2009 NMFS BiOp). (CNRA, Doc. No. 60 at 7–8.) (emphasis added). The emphasized text
7 requests imposition of one aspect of the 2009 NMFS BiOp that was not carried forward into the
8 2019 NMFS BiOp: a restriction on the amount of exports permitted at the CVP and SWP
9 pumping plants in the South Delta that operates by imposing an inflow to export ratio, with the
10 inflow numerator based upon flow in the San Joaquin River measured at Vernalis. California's
11 motion focuses on harm during this narrower period to ESA-listed Delta smelt and CCV
12 steelhead, as well as to CESA-listed Longfin smelt. (*See generally* CNRA, Doc. No. 54.)

13 These requests for preliminary injunctive relief are not mutually exclusive, since the
14 broader injunction sought by PCFFA's motion encompasses the relief requested by California.

15 Having considered the papers filed thus far and the parties' arguments, for the reasons
16 explained below, the court will: (a) grants plaintiffs' joint request to enjoin the Proposed
17 Action's export operations in the South Delta and reinstate RPA Action IV.2.1 from the 2009
18 NMFS BiOp from the date of this order up to and through May 31, 2020, on the specific ground
19 that operations carried out pursuant to the Proposed Action will irreparably harm threatened CCV
20 steelhead; (b) deny California's motion in all other respects as having been rendered moot by this
21 order; (c) deny PCFFA's request to enjoin operations on the Stanislaus River as moot; and
22 (d) hold all other aspects of PCFFA's motion in abeyance with the understanding that the court
23 intends to issue a separate order addressing those remaining requests for injunctive relief in the
24 near future.

25 STANDARD OF DECISION

26 "The proper legal standard for preliminary injunctive relief requires a party to demonstrate
27 'that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the
28 absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction

1 is in the public interest.” *Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky*, 586 F.3d 1109, 1127 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting
2 *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)); *see also* *Ctr. for Food Safety v.*
3 *Vilsack*, 636 F.3d 1166, 1172 (9th Cir. 2011) (“After *Winter*, ‘plaintiffs must establish that
4 irreparable harm is likely, not just possible, in order to obtain a preliminary injunction.”); *Am.*
5 *Trucking Ass’n, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009). The Ninth
6 Circuit has also held that an “injunction is appropriate when a plaintiff demonstrates . . . that
7 serious questions going to the merits were raised and the balance of hardships tips sharply in the
8 plaintiff’s favor.” *All. for Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1134–35 (9th Cir. 2011)
9 (internal quotation and citation omitted).¹ For the purposes of injunctive relief,

10 “serious questions” refers to questions which cannot be resolved one
11 way or the other at the hearing on the injunction and as to which the
12 court perceives a need to preserve the *status quo* lest one side prevent
13 resolution of the questions or execution of any judgment by altering
14 the status quo. Serious questions are substantial, difficult and
15 doubtful, as to make them a fair ground for litigation and thus for
16 more deliberative investigation.

17 *Republic of the Philippines v. Marcos*, 862 F.2d 1355, 1362 (9th Cir. 1988) (quotations marks and
18 citation omitted).

19 The party seeking an injunction bears the burden of proving these elements. *Klein v. City*
20 *of San Clemente*, 584 F.3d 1196, 1201 (9th Cir. 2009); *see also* *Caribbean Marine Servs. Co. v.*
21 *Baldrige*, 844 F.2d 668, 674 (9th Cir. 1988) (citation omitted) (“A plaintiff must do more than
22 merely allege imminent harm sufficient to establish standing; a plaintiff must demonstrate
23 immediate threatened injury as a prerequisite to preliminary injunctive relief.”). Finally, an
24 injunction is “an extraordinary remedy that may only be awarded upon a clear showing that the
25 plaintiff is entitled to such relief.” *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 22.

26 An injunction must be narrowly tailored to avoid the irreparable identified. *Nat’l Wildlife*
27 *Fed’n v. Nat’l Marine Fisheries Serv.*, 886 F.3d 803, 823 (9th Cir. 2018). “There must be a

28 _____
¹ The Ninth Circuit has found that this “serious question” version of the circuit’s sliding scale
approach survives “when applied as part of the four-element *Winter* test.” *All. for the Wild*
Rockies, 632 F.3d at 1134. “That is, ‘serious questions going to the merits’ and a balance of
hardships that tips sharply towards the plaintiff can support issuance of a preliminary injunction,
so long as the plaintiff also shows that there is a likelihood of irreparable injury and that the
injunction is in the public interest” *Id.* at 1135

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.