UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

STATE OF OHIO, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

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

Case No. 2:15-cv-02467 Chief Judge Sargus Magistrate Judge Jolson

Defendants.

UNOPPOSED MOTION OF THE STATES OF NEW YORK,
WASHINGTON, CALIFORNIA, MARYLAND, NEW JERSEY, OREGON,
RHODE ISLAND AND VERMONT, THE COMMONWEALTH OF
MASSACHUSETTS, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF
IN OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

The States of New York, Washington, California, Maryland, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island and Vermont, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia (the Amici States) hereby move for leave to file an amicus curiae brief in opposition to plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. This motion is unopposed.

ARGUMENT

Participation as amicus curiae is "a privilege within the sound discretion of the courts . . . depending upon a finding that the proffered information is timely, useful or otherwise necessary to the administration of justice." $Ball\ v$.

Kasich, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 116145, at *24 (S.D. Ohio, Sargus, C.J., July 25, 2017) (citations and internal quotations omitted). A non-party "may submit a brief as an amicus curiae in order to assist the court in reaching a proper decision." Rowland v. GGNSC Ripley, LLC, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 101733, at *10 (N.D. Miss. August 3, 2016) (citing Jin v. Ministry of State Sec., 557 F.Supp.2d 131, 136 (D.D.C. 2008)). "An amicus brief should normally be allowed" if the amicus "has unique information or perspective that can help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the parties are able to provide." Cmty. Ass'n for Restoration of Env't v. DeRuyter Bros. Dairy, 54 F. Supp.2d 974, 975 (E.D. Wash. 1999).

Here the Amici States have their own interests in this matter that are distinct from those of the parties. The Amici States are situated along the shores of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, the Great Lakes, and Lake Champlain and are downstream from, or otherwise hydrologically connected with many of the Nation's waters. As such, the Amici States are recipients of water pollution generated not only within their borders but also from sources outside their borders over which they lack jurisdiction. The Amici States require a protective, clear, practical, and science-based definition of "waters of the United States" under the Clean Water Act in order to maintain a strong federal foundation for water pollution control that preserves the integrity of their waters.

Enjoining the Clean Water Rule would implicate the environmental interests of the Amici States and their citizens, and affect the Amici States' proprietary interests. The Amici States own, operate, finance and manage property within their borders, including lands, roads, bridges, buildings, drinking water systems, sewage and stormwater treatment or conveyance systems, and other infrastructure and improvements. Inadequate or ineffective protection of waters under the Clean Water Act, such as floodplain waters which mitigate the damaging effects of floods, will cause harm to the States' properties and increase the costs of operating and managing them.

The Clean Water Rule that plaintiff States seek to enjoin would protect the Amici States' environmental and proprietary interests by strengthening and clarifying Clean Water Act protections of waters within the Amici States' jurisdictions, and by helping to ensure that polluted water from other states does not flow into the Amici States' waters. Granting the Amici States amicus status should not delay these proceedings nor prejudice the other parties who are unopposed to this motion.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Amici States respectfully request that this Court grant their motion for leave to file the attached amicus curiae brief.

DATED: July 24, 2018

BARBARA D. UNDERWOOD

Attorney General State of New York Environmental Protection Bureau 350 Main Street, Suite 300 A Buffalo, NY 14202 Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT W. FERGUSON

Attorney General State of Washington

s/ Jeffrey G. Rupert JEFFREY G. RUPERT (WA Bar No. 45037)

Trial Attorney

Washington Attorney General's Office

Division Chief

Complex Litigation Division 800 Fifth Ave., Suite 2000

Seattle, WA 98104

206-389-2116

JeffreyR2@atg.wa.gov

XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General State of California Office of the Attorney General 300 South Spring Street

Los Angeles, CA 90013

BRIAN E. FROSH Attorney General State of Maryland 200 Saint Paul Place Baltimore, Maryland 21202 ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM

Attorney General State of Oregon Natural Resources Section Oregon Department of Justice 1162 Court St. NE Salem, OR 97301-4096

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.

Attorney General State of Vermont Office of the Attorney General 109 State Street Montpelier, VT 05609-1001

MAURA HEALEY

Attorney General Commonwealth of Massachusetts One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor Boston, MA 02108 GURBIR S. GREWAL

Attorney General
State of New Jersey
Office of the Attorney General
Division of Law, Environmental
Practice Group
R.J. Hughes Justice Complex
25 Market Street, P.O. Box 093
Trenton, N.J. 08625

PETER F. KILMARTIN

Attorney General State of Rhode Island 150 South Main Street Providence, RI 02903

KARL A. RACINE

Attorney General
District of Columbia
Office of the Attorney General
of the District of Columbia
441 Fourth Street N.W., Ste # 600-S
Washington, D.C. 20001