

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
12 Plaintiff,

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

13 v.

ORDER

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

17 Defendants.
18

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

AND ALL RELATED ACTIONS.

-----oo0oo-----

On April 14, 2010, the United States filed the Motion now
before the Court: a request for approval of the government's
proposed Partial Consent Decree with the South Tahoe Refuse
Company, Inc. ("STR").

///

///

///

1 The proposed Consent Decree was initially lodged with the
2 Court on February 24, 2010. Notice of Lodging was thereafter
3 published with the Federal Register on March 3, 2010, indicating
4 that the United States would accept comments on the proposed
5 Consent Decree with the City for a period of thirty (30) days.
6 That comment period closed on or about April 2, 2010 and no
7 comments were received. The instant Motion was thereafter filed.

8 Given the terms of the Consent Decree negotiated between the
9 parties, the fact that no one posited any suggestion during the
10 aforementioned comment period that the Consent Decree was not
11 fair, reasonable, and consistent with the objectives of CERCLA,
12 the fact that no opposition to the present Motion was made, and
13 good cause appearing therefor, the United States' Motion to
14 Approve Consent Decree (Docket No. 376) is GRANTED.¹ The Court
15 will sign the Consent Decree itself, lodged on February 24, 2010,
16 concurrently with this Order.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: May 12, 2010

19
20
21 
22

MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23
24
25
26
27

¹ Because oral argument was not of material assistance, the
28 Court deems this matter suitable for submission on the briefs.
E.D. Cal. Local Rule 230(g).