

**XAVIER BECERRA**  
**Attorney General**

**State of California**  
**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**



1515 CLAY STREET, 20TH FLOOR  
P.O. BOX 70550  
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0550

Public: (510) 879-1300  
Telephone: (510) 879-0280  
Facsimile: (510) 622-2270  
E-Mail: [Jamie.Jefferson@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Jamie.Jefferson@doj.ca.gov)

The States of California, Washington, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Territory of Guam, District of Columbia, City of New York, and Harris County, Texas

September 22, 2020

*Via Electronic and Certified U.S. Mail: Return Receipt Requested*

Mary Neumayr, Chair  
Council on Environmental Quality  
730 Jackson Place, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20503  
[Mary.b.neumayr@ceq.eop.gov](mailto:Mary.b.neumayr@ceq.eop.gov)

Wilbur Ross, Secretary  
Department of Commerce  
1401 Constitution Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20230  
[WLRoss@doc.gov](mailto:WLRoss@doc.gov)

David Bernhardt, Secretary  
Department of the Interior  
1849 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20240  
[Ex\\_sec@ios.doi.gov](mailto:Ex_sec@ios.doi.gov)

Aurelia Skipwith, Director  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
1849 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20240  
[Aurelia\\_skipwith@fws.gov](mailto:Aurelia_skipwith@fws.gov)

Chris Oliver, Asst. Administrator for Fisheries  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
1315 East-West Highway  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
[Chris.w.oliver@noaa.gov](mailto:Chris.w.oliver@noaa.gov)

RE: 60-Day Notice of Intent to Sue the Council on Environmental Quality (“CEQ”) Under the Endangered Species Act regarding its *Update to Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act* (“NEPA”)

Dear Chairwoman Neumayr, *et al.*:

This letter provides notice that the CEQ has violated the Endangered Species Act (“ESA”) in issuing its July 16, 2020 final rule entitled *Update to the Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act*, 85 Fed. Reg. 43,304 (July 16, 2020) (hereinafter “Final Rule”). Prior to promulgating the Final Rule, CEQ failed to consult

under section 7 of the ESA with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service (together, “Services”) regarding the Final Rule’s likely impact to federally listed endangered and threatened species in the United States. We request that CEQ immediately comply with its consultation obligations under the section 7 of the ESA to ensure that the Final Rule will not “jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in the adverse modification” of critical habitat of any listed species.<sup>1</sup>

If CEQ fails to initiate consultation within 60 days, the undersigned entities, including the States of California, Washington, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, the Territory of Guam, the District of Columbia, the City of New York, and Harris County, Texas intend to file suit against CEQ, by amending our existing Complaint in *State of California et al v. Council on Environmental Quality*, 3:20-cv-06057-RS (N.D. Cal) to seek a court order requiring CEQ to fulfill its statutory consultation obligations under the ESA.<sup>2</sup>

## **I. BACKGROUND**

### **A. The Endangered Species Act**

The ESA was enacted by Congress in 1973 out of deep concern for the preservation of America’s imperiled plants and wildlife.<sup>3</sup> The Act aims “to provide a means whereby the ecosystems upon which endangered species and threatened species depend may be conserved, [and] to provide a program for the conservation of such endangered species and threatened species.”<sup>4</sup> As the U.S. Supreme Court has stated, Congress intended “to halt and reverse the trend toward species extinction, whatever the cost.”<sup>5</sup> Thus, “the language, history, and structure of the [ESA]” indicates beyond doubt that Congress intended endangered species to be afforded the highest of priorities.”<sup>6</sup>

There are presently 1,471 animal species and 946 plant species listed as threatened or endangered, respectively, in the United States.<sup>7</sup> The listing of a species under the ESA is a last resort to conserve endangered and threatened species and the ecosystems on which they depend. The Services manage listed species and their designated critical habitats.

As relevant here, section 7 of the ESA reflects “an explicit congressional decision to require agencies to afford first priority to the declared national policy of saving endangered

---

<sup>1</sup> 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* § 1540(g)(2)(A)(i).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* § 1531 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* § 1531(b).

<sup>5</sup> *Tenn. Valley Auth. v. Hill*, 437 U.S. 153, 174 (1978).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 174-75.

<sup>7</sup> *See* 50 C.F.R. § 17.11 (animals), § 17.12 (plants).

species,” elevating concern for species protection “over the ‘primary missions’ of federal agencies.”<sup>8</sup> Section 7 requires all federal agencies to “insure” that any action they propose to authorize, fund, or carry out “is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence” of any endangered or threatened species or “likely to result in the destruction or adverse modification of” any designated critical habitat.<sup>9</sup> Federal agency action subject to consultation is broadly defined and includes “the promulgation of regulations” as well as “actions which directly or indirectly cause[sic] modifications to the land, water, or air.”<sup>10</sup>

Under section 7, federal agencies, including CEQ, must engage in a consultation process with the appropriate Service before taking action that “may affect” listed species.<sup>11</sup> Typically, the Services will prepare a “biological opinion” evaluating the impacts of an agency’s intended action. If the Services determine that the action is likely to result in jeopardy or adverse modification of critical habitat, the Services will impose “reasonable and prudent alternatives” to avoid this result, and also will impose “reasonable and prudent measures” to minimize and mitigate the impacts of the proposed federal agency action.<sup>12</sup>

Finally, section 7(d) of the ESA prohibits any “irretrievable commitment of resources” pending the completion of consultation.<sup>13</sup> The purpose of section 7(d) is to maintain the environmental status quo pending the completion of consultation. Section 7(d)’s prohibition remains in effect throughout the consultation period and until the federal agency has satisfied its obligation under section 7(a)(2) to ensure that the action will not result in jeopardy to the species or adverse modification of its critical habitat.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> *Hill*, 437 U.S. at 185.

<sup>9</sup> 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2).

<sup>10</sup> 50 C.F.R. § 402.02; *Pacific Rivers Council v. Thomas*, 30 F.3d 1050, 1054-55 (9th Cir. 1994.)

<sup>11</sup> 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(a).

<sup>12</sup> 50 C.F.R. § 402.14; *Nat’l Ass’n of Home Builders v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 551 U.S. 644 (2007).

<sup>13</sup> 16 U.S.C. § 1536(d).

<sup>14</sup> *See, e.g., Pacific Rivers Council*, 30 F.3d 1050, 1056-57 (9th Cir. 1994); *Defs. of Wildlife v. Jackson*, 791 F. Supp. 2d 96, 113 (D.D.C. 2011).

## **B. NEPA Helps Protect Listed Species in Federal Planning**

NEPA was enacted in 1970 declaring a “national policy” to encourage “productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man.”<sup>15</sup> Consistent with this overarching policy, Congress directed federal agencies to implement NEPA “to the fullest extent possible” and to conduct a detailed environmental review for “major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” that analyzes an action’s environmental impacts, alternatives to the proposed action, the relationship between short-term uses and long-term productivity, and any irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources.<sup>16</sup>

In 1978, CEQ promulgated regulations that have guided federal, state, and local agencies’ compliance with NEPA for more than 40 years.<sup>17</sup> These 1978 implementing regulations helped to ensure that federal agencies fully comply with NEPA’s requirement that agencies take a “hard look” at the environmental impacts of their actions and provide an opportunity for meaningful public participation in the agency decision-making process.<sup>18</sup>

NEPA review ensures that federal agencies consider potential impacts to fish and wildlife, including federally listed species, when planning and undertaking projects. NEPA review may show the presence of a federally listed species in a project area or might reveal potential impacts on species that agencies might otherwise overlook. With this information in hand, federal agencies can alter the proposed action or implement mitigation measures to avoid or decrease adverse impacts to listed species. In addition, courts have held that the scope of NEPA’s cumulative impacts analysis under the 1978 regulations is broader than that required under the ESA itself.<sup>19</sup> Thus, by eliminating cumulative impacts analysis from NEPA, CEQ’s Final Rule is immediately likely to impact listed species. Environmental review under NEPA helps to ensure agency actions are “not likely to jeopardize the continued existence” of any endangered or threatened species.<sup>20</sup>

## **C. The 2020 Final Rule Threatens Harm to Listed Species**

CEQ’s Final Rule, which became effective on September 14, 2020, radically re-writes many fundamental provisions of the 1978 NEPA regulations. In particular, the Final Rule severely limits which federal actions require NEPA compliance; narrows the scope of federal agencies’ obligation to consider environmental impacts; threatens to render NEPA’s public participation process a meaningless paperwork exercise; and unlawfully seeks to restrict judicial

---

<sup>15</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 4321.

<sup>16</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C).

<sup>17</sup> See 40 C.F.R. Part 1500 (1978).

<sup>18</sup> *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 350 (1989).

<sup>19</sup> *Fund for Animals v. Hall*, 448 F. Supp.2d 127, 136 (D.D.C. 2006).

<sup>20</sup> 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2).

review of agency actions that violate NEPA. The Final Rule weakens federal agency NEPA review as described below and eliminates the concomitant benefits to listed species entirely.

The Final Rule narrows the universe of federal actions subject to environmental review under NEPA which will harm listed species. First, the Final Rule establishes a “threshold inquiry” carving out six situations from any environmental review whatsoever.<sup>21</sup> Second, the Final Rule authorizes federal agencies to determine that other statutes or directives conflict with NEPA and thus excuses agencies from NEPA review.<sup>22</sup> Third, the Final Rule expands the use of categorical exclusions by removing consideration of cumulative impacts and allowing use of categorical exclusions in situations that previously were considered extraordinary circumstances (i.e., circumstances where normally an action excluded from more rigorous review would have required a closer look).<sup>23</sup> And, importantly, the Final Rule removes the presence of endangered and threatened species from the list of extraordinary circumstances which would conclusively bar use of a categorical exclusion.<sup>24</sup> With fewer projects undergoing environmental review because of the changes in the Final Rule, it is inevitable that federal agencies will overlook and fail to mitigate harm to listed species.

For projects that are not entirely exempt from review, the Final Rule also severely limits the scope of environmental impacts agencies must consider. For example, the Final Rule instructs agencies not to consider “cumulative impacts”—that is, the environmental impacts of a proposed action combined with the anticipated impacts of other existing or future projects.<sup>25</sup> Cumulative impacts can be particularly devastating for listed species. For example, while one intrusion into a species’ habitat might cause minimal harm, multiple incursions into the same region may contract the species’ range or extirpate it from a geographic area entirely thus adversely modifying critical habitat.

Likewise, the Final Rule allows agencies to ignore the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change, which are, by definition, cumulative. Impacts related to climate change threaten many species throughout the United States both directly and through adverse modification of critical habitat.<sup>26</sup> If agencies are permitted to avoid consideration of cumulative

---

<sup>21</sup> 85 Fed. Reg. at 43,359 (to be codified at § 1501.1)

<sup>22</sup> 85 Fed. Reg. at 43, 359, 43,373-74 (to be codified at §§ 1501.1(a)(2), (a)(3), 1507.3(d)(2).

<sup>23</sup> 85 Fed. Reg. at 43,360 (to be codified at § 1501.4).

<sup>24</sup> Compare 40 C.F.R. § 1508.1(d) (2020), with *id.* § 1508.4 (1978).

<sup>25</sup> 85 Fed. Reg. at 43,360 (to be codified at 40 C.F.R. § 1501.3(b).)

<sup>26</sup> See, e.g., Céline Bellard, *et al.*, *Impacts of Climate Change on the Future of Biodiversity*, 15 ECOLOGY LETTERS 365, 375 (2012) (most climate change impact models “indicate alarming consequences for biodiversity, with the worst-case scenarios leading to extinction rates that would qualify as the sixth mass extinction in the history of the earth”), available at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01736.x>; Paul Leadley *et al.*, *Biodiversity Scenarios: Projections of 21st Century Change in Biodiversity and Associated Ecosystem Services*, CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY TECHNICAL

impacts, agencies will inevitably fail to address, mitigate, or avoid such impacts in approving major federal projects throughout the country.

In California, there are currently over 300 species listed as endangered or threatened under the ESA that reside wholly or partially within the State and its waters—more than any other mainland state. Examples include the southern sea otter (*Enhydra lutris nereis*) found along California's central coastline, the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) and its critical habitat in the Mojave Desert, the marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*) in north coast redwood forests, as well as two different runs of Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) and their spawning, rearing, and migration habitat in the Bay-Delta and Central Valley rivers and streams. These and other species are affected by federal projects throughout California. For example, Chinook salmon are threatened by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's proposal to raise the level of the Shasta Reservoir in northern California.

Washington State has 49 federally listed species. These listed species include chinook (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), chum (*Oncorhynchus keta*), and sockeye (*Oncorhynchus nerka*) salmon, steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), Southern Resident killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) and the pygmy rabbit (*Brachylagus idahoensis*), the smallest rabbit in North America.

There are dozens of federally endangered or threatened species that reside in whole or in part within the State of New York and its waters. Examples include four sea turtles that can be found in New York waters—the loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*), green (*Chelonia mydas*), leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*) and Kemp's Ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*). New York hosts ten National Wildlife Refuges, home to federally protected species like the Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*), and dozens of other federal sites. Other species of concern include the endangered shortnose sturgeon (*Acipenser brevirostrum*), Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus*), and the Northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*). Strong ESA protections both within its state borders and throughout each species' range are fundamental to New York's interests.

Guam has numerous species and habitats that are threatened or endangered. These species and habitats include the Mariana Fruit Bat (*Pteropus mariannus*), Hayun Lagu (*Serianthes nelsonii*), the largest native tree in the Mariana Islands, and the Guam Rail or the Ko'ko' bird (*Gallirallus owstoni*), which is native to Guam and found nowhere else in the world.

At least seventeen federally listed and protected endangered or threatened species are known to occur in Massachusetts, including, for example, the threatened piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), and the endangered shortnose sturgeon (*Acipenser brevirostrum*) and leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*).

---

SERIES NO. 50 (2010); see also U.S. Dep't of the Interior, *9 Animals That are Feeling the Impacts of Climate Change* (Nov. 16, 2015)(climate change threatens endangered and threatened species, including loggerhead and other sea turtles, polar bears, and piping plovers), available at <https://www.doi.gov/blog/9-animals-are-feeling-impacts-climate-change>.

Endangered species in Minnesota include the Rusty-Patched Bumble Bee, (*bombus affinis*), the Topeka Shiner (*nontropis topeka*), the Higgins Eye Pearlymussel (*lampsilis higininsi*), and the Winged Mapleleaf Mussel (*quadrula fragosa*). Of special concern are the Canada lynx (*lynx canadensis*) and the Western Prairie Fringed Orchid (*plantanthera praeclara*).

New Jersey has at least 14 federally listed species, including the threatened piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*), red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), and the recently designated New Jersey state reptile, the bog turtle (*Clemmys muhlenbergii*).

Pennsylvania has 19 federally listed and protected endangered or threatened species are known to occur in Pennsylvania, including the endangered rusty patched bumble bee (*Bombus affinis*) and Piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) and the threatened northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*).

In short, as described above, the Final Rule threatens severe and irreversible impacts to numerous endangered and threatened species throughout the United States, including species within the territories of the undersigned states and territories.

## **II. CEQ Failed to Comply with its Mandatory Duty to Consult with the Services on the Final Rule's Impact to Listed Species**

CEQ's revision of NEPA's implementing regulations is a discretionary action that required consultation under the ESA.<sup>27</sup> Despite the Final Rule's significant changes to NEPA's regulations, CEQ did not consult with the Services regarding the Final Rule's potential and, indeed, likely impacts to endangered and threatened species.<sup>28</sup> Instead, CEQ bypassed section 7's formal consultation process and concluded, without providing any meaningful analysis or supporting evidence, that the Final Rule will have "no effect" on listed species and critical habitat.<sup>29</sup>

CEQ's reasoning for not consulting under section 7 of the ESA is arbitrary and capricious and violates the ESA. In its Final Rule, CEQ asserts that it "determined that updating its regulations implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA has 'no effect' on listed species and critical habitat. Therefore, ESA section 7 consultation is not required."<sup>30</sup> CEQ stated it reviewed the rulemaking "to determine if it 'may affect' listed species or their designated critical habitat" and concluded that "[n]one of the changes to the 1978 regulations are anticipated to have environmental impacts, including potential effects to listed species and critical habitat."<sup>31</sup> In its response to comments, CEQ contends that consultation is not required because the Final Rule is "procedural in nature, and does not make any final determination regarding the level of

---

<sup>27</sup> 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2); 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(a).

<sup>28</sup> 85 Fed. Reg. at 43,354-55.

<sup>29</sup> *Id.* at 43,354-55.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.* at 43,354.

<sup>31</sup> *Id.* at 43,354-55.

NEPA analysis required for particular actions.”<sup>32</sup> These cursory explanations are wholly insufficient to avoid section 7 consultation.

First, “[t]he threshold for triggering the Endangered Species Act is relatively low: consultation is required whenever a federal action ‘*may affect* listed species or critical habitat.’”<sup>33</sup> As discussed, the Final Rule threatens significant harm to endangered and threatened species throughout the United States, and thus easily passes the low threshold required for triggering consultation. CEQ’s contrary finding is unsupported and contradicted by CEQ itself. For one thing, CEQ asserts that reducing delay in the NEPA process will “expedite[] a plethora of logging, mining, transportation, and other projects.”<sup>34</sup> CEQ fails to explain how expediting the approval process for federal projects which include ground-disturbing activities will have no effect whatsoever on listed species or critical habitat.

Second, CEQ’s assertion that it need not consult with the Services because the Final Rule does not authorize any activity at the present time also violates the ESA. ESA consultation is required for programmatic agency actions that, like the Final Rule, authorize activity that harms listed species.<sup>35</sup> For example, the Ninth Circuit has held that ESA consultation was required before the U.S. Forest Service could repeal the National Roadless Rule, which generally prohibits roadbuilding and logging in “inventoried roadless areas” in the national forests but does not by itself authorize or prohibit any specific on-the-ground activity.<sup>36</sup>

Although the Final Rule significantly weakens NEPA’s implementing regulations, CEQ did not identify, quantify, or consider the adverse impacts of this change on a programmatic level; nor did it consider the impacts to any specific threatened or endangered species prior to finalizing the rulemaking.<sup>37</sup> Instead, it arbitrarily asserts that there would be no impacts, categorically, to the approximately 1,800 listed species in the United States and hundreds of millions of acres of critical habitat, despite the diverse threats that each one faces. CEQ does not have the expertise or the statutory authority to determine that there will be no impacts to listed

---

<sup>32</sup> *Id.* at 43,354.

<sup>33</sup> *California ex rel. Lockyer v. U.S. Dep’t of Agric.*, 575 F.3d 999, 1018 (9th Cir. 2009) (emphasis in original)(quoting 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2).)

<sup>34</sup> 85 Fed. Reg. at 43,352 (claiming “there are no adverse environmental impacts” from the final rule.)

<sup>35</sup> See *Pac. Rivers Council v. Thomas*, 30 F.3d 1050, 1055 (9th Cir. 1994); see also *W. Watersheds Project v. Kraayenbrink*, 632 F.3d 472, 496-97 (9th Cir. 2011) (ESA consultation required before Bureau of Land Management could revise regulations governing the agency’s grazing program nationwide); *Citizens for Better Forestry v. U.S. Dep’t of Agric.*, 481 F. Supp. 2d 1059, 1097 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (consultation required before Forest Service could revise regulations governing development of forest management plans for the National Forests).

<sup>36</sup> *California ex rel. Lockyer*, 575 F.3d at 1019.

<sup>37</sup> 85 Fed. Reg. 43,354-55.



species from the Final Rule without seeking input from the Services. It is for precisely this reason that the consultation requirement exists.

By finalizing the Final Rule without first complying with the ESA's substantive and procedural requirements, CEQ has failed to ensure that its actions will not jeopardize the numerous listed species in the United States or adversely modify their critical habitat. This failure undermines the plain language and fundamental purposes of the ESA and violates the Act.<sup>38</sup>

If CEQ does not withdraw the Final Rule and begin consultation within 60 days, please be advised that we intend to commence litigation to compel CEQ to perform these duties. This letter provides the notice of intent to sue under section 11(g) of the ESA, to the extent such notice is required, and that parties other than the undersigned may join this litigation with respect to the claims covered by this notice.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> 16 U.S.C. § 1531(b).

<sup>39</sup> *Id.* § 1540(g)(2)(A)(i).

Sincerely,

XAVIER BECERRA  
Attorney General of California

/s/ Jamie Jefferson  
SARAH E. MORRISON  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
JAMIE B. JEFFERSON  
JOSHUA R. PURTLE  
JULIA K. FORGIE  
Deputy Attorneys General  
1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor  
P.O. Box 70550  
Oakland, CA 94612-0550  
(510) 879-1002  
Jamie.Jefferson@doj.ca.gov  
Joshua.Purtle@doj.ca.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of California*

PHILIP J. WEISER  
Attorney General of Colorado

/s/ Scott Steinbrecher  
SCOTT STEINBRECHER  
Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
Ralph C. Carr Colorado Judicial Center  
1300 Broadway, Seventh Floor  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
(720) 508-6287

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Colorado*

ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
Attorney General of Washington

/s/ Elizabeth Harris  
AURORA JANKE  
ELIZABETH HARRIS  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Washington Attorney General's Office  
Environmental Protection Division  
800 5th Ave Ste. 2000 TB-14  
Seattle, Washington 98104-3188  
(206) 233-3391  
Aurora.Janke@atg.wa.gov  
Elizabeth.Harris@atg.wa.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Washington*

WILLIAM TONG  
Attorney General of Connecticut

/s/ Robert Snook  
ROBERT SNOOK  
Assistant Attorney General  
Attorney General's Office  
165 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, Connecticut, 06106  
(860) 808-5250  
Robert.Snook@ct.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Connecticut*

KATHERINE S. DYKES  
Commissioner Connecticut Department  
of Energy and Environmental Protection

/s/ Kirsten S. P. Rigney  
KIRSTEN S. P. RIGNEY  
Director, Legal Office  
Department of Energy and  
Environmental Protection  
10 Franklin Square  
New Britain, CT 06051  
(860) 827-2984

/s/ Robert Snook  
ROBERT SNOOK  
Assistant Attorney General  
10 Franklin Square  
New Britain, CT 06051  
(860) 827-2620  
[Robert.Snook@ct.gov](mailto:Robert.Snook@ct.gov)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Connecticut  
Department of Energy and  
Environmental Protection*

KWAME RAOUL  
Attorney General of Illinois

/s/ Jason E. James  
JASON E. JAMES  
Assistant Attorney General  
MATTHEW J. DUNN  
Chief, Environmental  
Enforcement/Asbestos Litigation  
Division  
Office of the Attorney General  
Environmental Bureau  
69 West Washington St., 18th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60602  
(312) 814-0660  
jjames@atg.state.il.us

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Illinois*

KATHLEEN JENNINGS  
Attorney General of Delaware

/s/ Kayli H. Spialter  
KAYLI H. SPIALTER  
Deputy Attorney General  
Delaware Department of Justice  
820 N. French Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 577-8508  
kayli.spialter@delaware.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Delaware*

AARON FREY  
Maine Attorney General

/s/ Jillian R. O'Brien  
JILLIAN R. O'BRIEN, SBN 251311  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
6 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333-0006  
jill.obrien@maine.gov  
(207) 626-8582

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Maine*

DANA NESSEL  
Attorney General of Michigan

/s/ Elizabeth Morrisseau  
ELIZABETH MORRISSEAU  
Assistant Attorney General  
Environment, Natural Resources, and  
Agriculture Division  
6th Floor G. Mennen Williams Building  
525 W. Ottawa Street  
P.O. Box 30755  
Lansing, MI 48909  
(517) 335-7664  
MorrisseauE@michigan.gov

*Attorneys for the People of the State of  
Michigan*

BRIAN E. FROSH  
Attorney General of Maryland

/s/ Steven J. Goldstein  
STEVEN J. GOLDSTEIN  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
200 Saint Paul Place, 20th Floor  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202  
(410) 576-6414  
sgoldstein@oag.state.md.us

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Maryland*

KEITH ELLISON  
Attorney General of Minnesota

/s/ Peter N. Surdo  
PETER N. SURDO  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
445 Minnesota Street Suite 900  
Saint Paul, MN 55101  
(651) 757-1061

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State  
of Minnesota*

GURBIR S. GREWAL  
Attorney General of New Jersey

/s/ Lisa Morelli  
LISA MORELLI  
Deputy Attorney General  
Environmental Permitting and  
Counseling  
R.J. Hughes Justice Complex  
P.O. Box 093  
Trenton, NJ 08625  
(609) 376-2804

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New  
Jersey*

HECTOR BALDERAS  
Attorney General of New Mexico

/s/ William Grantham  
WILLIAM GRANTHAM  
Assistant Attorney General  
201 Third Street NW, Suite 300  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102  
(505) 717-3520  
wgrantham@nmag.gov

*Attorneys for the State of New Mexico*

JOSHUA H. STEIN  
Attorney General of North Carolina

DANIEL S. HIRSCHMAN  
Senior Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Asher P. Spiller  
ASHER P. SPILLER  
Assistant Attorney General  
North Carolina Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 629  
Raleigh, NC 27602  
(919) 716-6400  
aspiller@ncdoj.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of North  
Carolina*

LETITIA JAMES  
Attorney General of New York

/s/ Claiborne E. Walthall  
CLAIBORNE E. WALTHALL  
Assistant Attorney General  
New York State Office of  
the Attorney General  
State Capitol  
Albany, NY 12224  
(518) 776-2380  
claiborne.walthall@ag.ny.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New  
York and New York State Department  
of Environmental Conservation*

ELLEN ROSENBLUM  
Attorney General of Oregon

/s/ Paul Garrahan  
PAUL GARRAHAN  
Attorney-in-Charge  
STEVE NOVICK  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
Natural Resources Section  
Oregon Department of Justice  
1162 Court Street NE  
Salem, OR 97301-4096  
(503) 947-4593  
Paul.Garrahan@doj.state.or.us  
Steve.Novick@doj.state.or.us

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Oregon*

PETER F. NERONHA  
Attorney General of Rhode Island

/s/ Gregory S. Schultz  
GREGORY S. SCHULTZ  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
Rhode Island Office of Attorney General  
150 South Main Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
(401) 274-4400  
gschultz@riag.ri.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Rhode Island*

JOSHUA L. KAUL  
Attorney General of Wisconsin

/s/ Emily M. Ertel  
EMILY M. ERTEL  
Assistant Attorney General  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
Post Office Box 7857  
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857  
(608) 266-0432  
ertelem@doj.state.wi.us

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Wisconsin*

JOSH SHAPIRO  
Attorney General of Pennsylvania

MICHAEL J. FISCHER  
Chief Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Ann R. Johnston  
ANN R. JOHNSTON  
Senior Deputy Attorney General  
Office of Attorney General  
Strawberry Square, 14th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
(717) 705-6938

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Commonwealth of  
Pennsylvania*

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.  
Attorney General of Vermont

/s/ Nicholas F. Persampieri  
NICHOLAS F. PERSAMPIERI  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609  
(802) 828-3171  
nick.persampieri@vermont.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Vermont*

MAURA HEALEY  
Attorney General of Massachusetts

/s/ Turner Smith  
TURNER SMITH  
MATTHEW IRELAND  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Office of the Attorney General  
Environmental Protection Division  
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor  
Boston, MA 02108  
(617) 727-2200  
Turner.Smith@mass.gov  
Matthew.Ireland@mass.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Commonwealth  
of Massachusetts*

KARL A. RACINE  
Attorney General for the District of  
Columbia

KATHLEEN KONOPKA  
Deputy Attorney General  
Public Advocacy Division

/s/ Alacoque Hinga Nevitt  
ALACOQUE HINGA NEVITT  
WESLEY ROSENFELD  
Assistant Attorneys General  
District of Columbia Office of the Attorney  
General  
400 6th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 717-1368  
[alacoque.nevitt@dc.gov](mailto:alacoque.nevitt@dc.gov)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff District of Columbia*

JAMES E. JOHNSON  
Corporation Counsel of the  
City of New York

/s/ Nathan Taylor  
NATHAN TAYLOR  
New York City Law Department  
100 Church Street, Rm 6-144  
New York, NY 10007  
(646) 940-0736 (m)  
(212) 356-2315  
NTaylor@law.nyc.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of New York*

LEEVIN TAITANO CAMACHO  
Attorney General of Guam

/s/ Joseph A. Perez

JOSEPH A. PEREZ

Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection Division  
590 South Marine Corps Drive,  
Suite 901, ITC Building  
Tamuning, Guam 96913 ▪ USA  
Telephone: (671) 475-3324  
Facsimile: (671) 472-2493  
[jperez@oagguam.org](mailto:jperez@oagguam.org)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Territory  
of Guam*

VINCE RYAN  
Harris County Attorney

/s/ Sarah Jane Utley

SARAH JANE UTLEY

Managing Attorney  
Environmental Practice Group  
Harris County Attorney's Office  
1019 Congress, 15th Floor  
Houston, Texas 77057  
(713) 274-5124  
Sarah.Utley@cao.hctx.net

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Harris County,  
Texas*

OK2020303085  
91294966.docx