

Jonathan Evans (Cal. Bar # 247376)  
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY  
1212 Broadway, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Telephone: (510) 844-7100 x318  
Cellphone: (213) 598-1466  
Email: jevans@biologicaldiversity.org

*Attorney for Plaintiffs Center for Biological Diversity and  
Center for Environmental Health*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

and

CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL  
HEALTH

Plaintiffs,

vs.

MICHAEL S. REGAN, in his official  
capacity as Administrator of the United States  
Environmental Protection Agency,

Defendant.

Case No.

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

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

## INTRODUCTION

1. This action is brought under the federal Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401–7671q, and seeks to compel the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) to carry out his outstanding legal obligations to promulgate Federal Implementation Plans (“FIP”) to address requirements for the 2008 ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (“NAAQS”) that apply to nonattainment areas in California and New Hampshire.

2. Ozone air pollution has profound effects on human health. EPA found that ozone “posed multiple, serious threats to health” including: worsening respiratory and cardiovascular health, increased likelihood of early death, increased asthma-related hospital admissions, increased likelihood of children developing asthma as adolescents, and lower birthweights and decreased lung function in newborns.<sup>1</sup> Individuals particularly sensitive to ozone exposure include older adults, people with heart and lung disease, people who work and exercise outdoors, and children.<sup>2</sup>

3. Ozone is also harmful to vegetation and ecosystems.<sup>3</sup> Ozone can be especially harmful to sensitive vegetation—including trees such as the black cherry, quaking aspen, white pine, and ponderosa pine—during the growing season.<sup>4</sup> Ozone pollution can also indirectly harm soils, water, wildlife, and their associated ecosystems, leading to diminished clean air and water.<sup>5</sup>

4. Finally, ozone pollution also contributes to the climate crisis, as ozone is a greenhouse gas and ozone pollution also hinders plant growth throughout a plant’s lifecycle, thereby shrinking the carbon sequestration potential of plants.<sup>6</sup>

5. Accordingly, Plaintiffs CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY and

---

<sup>1</sup> American Lung Association, *Ozone*, <https://www.lung.org/clean-air/outdoors/what-makes-air-unhealthy/ozone> (last updated Apr. 20, 2020) (summarizing the results of Table 1-1 in EPA, *Integrated Science Assessment for Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants*, 1-5 (2013)), EPA/600/R-10/076F.

<sup>2</sup> 78 Fed. Reg. 3086, 3088 (Jan. 15, 2013); *see* 73 Fed. Reg. 16436, 16440 (Mar. 27, 2008).

<sup>3</sup> EPA, *Ecosystem Effects of Ozone Pollution*, <https://www.epa.gov/ground-level-ozone-pollution/ecosystem-effects-ozone-pollution> (last updated Mar. 8, 2022).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*, *see also* EPA, *Integrated Science Assessment for Ozone and Related Photochemical Oxidants*, 8-42 (Apr. 2020), EPA/600/R-20/012.

<sup>5</sup> 73 Fed. Reg. 16436, 16486 (Mar. 27, 2008).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*; *see generally* University California Davis, *Biological Carbon Sequestration*, <https://climatechange.ucdavis.edu/science/carbon-sequestration/biological/> (last updated Nov. 5, 2021).

1 CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH bring this action against Defendant MICHAEL  
2 S. REGAN, in his official capacity as Administrator for the United States EPA, to compel him to  
3 perform his mandatory duties to ensure health and public welfare protections promised under the  
4 Clean Air Act.

### 5 JURISDICTION

6 6. This case is a Clean Air Act “citizen suit.” Therefore, the Court has jurisdiction  
7 over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction) and 42 U.S.C. §  
8 7604(a) (Clean Air Act citizen suit).

9 7. An actual controversy exists between the parties. This case does not concern  
10 federal taxes, is not a proceeding under 11 U.S.C. § 505 or 11 U.S.C. § 1146, and the case does  
11 not involve the Tariff Act of 1930.

12 8. Thus, this Court has jurisdiction to order declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C. §  
13 2201. If the Court orders declaratory relief, 28 U.S.C. § 2202 authorizes this Court to issue  
14 injunctive relief.

### 15 NOTICE

16 9. Plaintiffs gave EPA written notice of intent to sue regarding the claims alleged in  
17 this Complaint on February 10, 2021, by certified mail.

18 10. More than sixty days have passed since Plaintiffs mailed the notice letter  
19 discussed above. EPA has not remedied the violations alleged in this Complaint. Therefore, a  
20 present and actual controversy exists between the parties.

### 21 VENUE

22 11. Defendant EPA resides in this judicial district. This civil action is brought against  
23 an officer of the United States acting in his official capacity. Some of the claims in this  
24 Complaint concern EPA’s failure to perform mandatory duties regarding California. EPA Region  
25 9, which is responsible for California, is headquartered in San Francisco. Thus, events and  
26 omissions at issue in this action occurred at EPA’s Region 9 headquarters in San Francisco.  
27 Additionally, Plaintiff CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH resides in Oakland.  
28

Accordingly, venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e).

### INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

12. 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 Oakland or San Francisco Division is proper pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-2(c) and (d).

### PARTIES

13. Plaintiff CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY is a non-profit 501(c)(3) corporation incorporated in California. 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 environmental are closely linked, the Center for Biological Diversity is working to secure a future for animals and plants hovering on the brink of extinction, to protect the ecosystems they need to survive, and for a healthy, livable future for all of us.

14. 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.

15. Plaintiffs' members live, work, recreate, travel, and engage in 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. Pollution diminishes Plaintiffs' members' ability to enjoy the aesthetic qualities and recreational opportunities of the affected areas.

16. Plaintiffs have a member whose work focuses on California deserts including the Mojave Desert. This member is adversely affected by EPA's failure to issue a FIP for the Los Angeles—San Bernardino Counties (West Mojave Desert), California area.

17. Plaintiffs have a member who has lived in Sacramento since the 1990's and will continue to do so. This member currently lives in the Sacramento Metro (Sacramento) area and he lived in the Sacramento (Yolo-Solano) area for five years. He currently bicycle rides through the greater Sacramento region including the Yolo County area every weekend. Additionally, this member rides his bicycle through Solano County once a year, and the next bicycle trip through Solano County is scheduled for October 1st, 2022. This member is adversely affected by EPA's failure to issue a FIP for Sacramento Metro (Sacramento) and Sacramento (Yolo-Solano), California areas.

18. Plaintiffs have a member who owns a condominium in New Hampshire and spends a significant portion of the year in the state and will continue to do so. He enjoys outdoor activities including hiking in New Hampshire. He is elderly and thus sensitive to ozone. This member is adversely affected by EPA's failure to issue a FIP for the New Hampshire 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. Furthermore, EPA's failure to perform its mandatory duties also creates uncertainty for Plaintiffs' members as to whether they are exposed to excess air pollution.

20. Defendant MICHAEL S. REGAN is sued in his official capacity as the Administrator of the United States EPA. In that role, EPA has been charged by Congress with the duty to administer the Clean Air Act, including the mandatory duties at issue in this case.

21. The above injuries will continue until the Court grants the relief requested herein.

## STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

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 the air we breathe through the Nation is wholesome once again.” H.R. Rep. No. 1146, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 1, 1 (1970).

23. Commensurate with this goal, Congress authorized the Administrator of the United States EPA to establish NAAQS for “criteria pollutants,” which are air pollutants that

# 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.