

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,

NO. 2:01-cv-01520-MCE-GGH

v.

ORDER

EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA;
and CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE,
CALIFORNIA,

Defendants.

AND ALL RELATED ACTIONS.

-----oo0oo-----

On November 4, 2009, the United States filed the Motion now
before the Court: a request for approval of the government's
proposed Consent Decree with the South Tahoe Public Utility
District ("District").


///
///
///

1 The proposed Consent Decree was initially lodged with the
2 Court on September 17, 2009. Notice of Lodging was thereafter
3 published with the Federal Register on Wednesday, September 23,
4 2009, indicating that the United States would accept comments on
5 the proposed Consent Decree with the District for a period of
6 thirty (30) days. That comment period closed on October 23, 2009
7 and no comments were received. The instant Motion was thereafter
8 filed.

9 Given the terms of the Consent Decree negotiated between the
10 parties, the fact that no one posited any suggestion during the
11 aforementioned comment period that the Consent Decree was not
12 fair, reasonable, and consistent with the objectives of CERCLA,
13 the fact that no opposition to the present Motion was made, and
14 good cause appearing therefor, the United States' Motion to
15 Approve Consent Decree (Docket No. 354) is GRANTED.¹ The Court
16 will sign the Consent Decree itself concurrently with this Order.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: January 11, 2010

19
20 
21

MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

22
23
24
25
26
27 ¹ Because oral argument was not of material assistance, the
28 Court ordered this matter submitted on the briefs. E.D. Cal.
Local Rule 230(g).