

Nos. 19-72109 & 19-72280

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY, et al.,
Petitioners,

v.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, et al.,
Respondents.

On Petition for Review of Final Agency Action of the
United States Environmental Protection Agency

BRIEF OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Of Counsel:
Amber Aranda
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency

JEAN E. WILLIAMS
Acting Assistant Attorney General
BRUCE GELBER
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Meghan E. Greenfield
Briena Strippoli
Attorneys
Environment and Natural Resources
Division
U.S. Department of Justice
150 M Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 514-2795
Meghan.Greenfield@usdoj.gov

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| GLOSSARY | viii |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES..... | 4 |
| PERTINENT STATUTES AND REGULATIONS | 4 |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE | 5 |
| 1. Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act | 5 |
| 2. Endangered Species Act..... | 7 |
| B. Procedural History | 11 |
| 1. 2013 Registration..... | 11 |
| 2. 2016 Registrations and 2019 Registration Amendments | 12 |
| 3. Record Supporting 2019 Registration Amendments | 14 |
| 4. Petitions for Review and Procedural History..... | 15 |
| SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT | 16 |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW..... | 19 |
| ARGUMENT | 20 |
| I. Remand Is Proper to Allow EPA to Remedy the ESA Defect and Further Explain Its FIFRA Rationale..... | 20 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| A. | EPA’s acknowledgment of error, along with the intervening decision in <i>National Family Farm Coalition v. EPA</i> , provides a proper basis to remand this action. | 20 |
| B. | EPA’s remand request is timely and made in good faith. | 23 |
| II. | Vacatur of the Registration Amendments Is Not Required or Appropriate During the Pendency of the Remand..... | 27 |
| A. | The ESA error and EPA’s intent to elucidate its FIFRA rationale are not such serious deficiencies that vacatur is required. | 29 |
| 1. | EPA took into account ecological impacts in the registration amendments, and so the ESA error does not weigh heavily in favor of vacatur..... | 29 |
| 2. | There is no serious deficiency in the FIFRA analysis..... | 34 |
| 3. | No procedural flaw warrants vacatur. | 36 |
| B. | Vacatur of the 2019 registration amendments would be inequitable because it would cause environmental and economic harm. | 40 |
| 1. | Vacatur could cause environmental harm. | 41 |
| a. | The FIFRA record supports the conclusion that sulfoxaflor is less toxic than the most widely used alternatives. | 41 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| b. | The claimed errors with the FIFRA analysis do not undermine EPA's analysis of the ecological effects of the pesticide..... | 48 |
| 2. | Vacatur would cause economic hardship..... | 57 |
| | CONCLUSION..... | 61 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Allied–Signal, Inc. v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm’n</i> , 988 F.2d 146 (D.C. Cir. 1993) | 19, 28, 32, 33, 34, 39, 40 |
| <i>ASARCO, Inc. v. Occupational Safety & Health Admin.</i> , 746 F.2d 483 (9th Cir. 1984) | 19 |
| <i>B.J. Alan Co. v. ICC</i> , 897 F.2d 561 (D.C. Cir. 1990) | 21 |
| <i>Cal. Cmty. Against Toxics v. EPA</i> , 688 F.3d 989 (9th Cir. 2012) | 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 32, 39, 40 |
| <i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. EPA</i> , 861 F.3d 174 (D.C. Cir. 2017) | 24, 28, 29, 30, 32, 47 |
| <i>Ethyl Corp. v. Browner</i> , 989 F.2d 522 (D.C. Cir. 1993) | 20, 21 |
| <i>Heartland Reg’l Med. Ctr. v. Sebelius</i> , 566 F.3d 193 (D.C. Cir. 2009) | 33 |
| <i>Idaho Farm Bureau Fed’n v. Babbitt</i> , 58 F.3d 1392 (9th Cir. 1995) | 39 |
| <i>Lands Council v. McNair</i> , 537 F.3d 981 (9th Cir. 2008), <i>rev’d on other grounds by</i> <i>Winter v. NRDC</i> , 555 U.S. 7 (2008) | 35 |
| <i>Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , 463 U.S. 29 (1983) | 20 |
| <i>Nat’l Family Farm Coal. v. EPA</i> , 960 F.3d 1120 (9th Cir. 2020) | 2, 24, 25, 33, 52 |

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.