

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

ROBERT G. DREHER  
Acting Assistant Attorney General

KEVIN W. McARDLE, Senior Attorney (D.C. Bar No. 454569)  
United States Department of Justice  
Environment & Natural Resources Division  
Wildlife & Marine Resources Section  
Benjamin Franklin Station, P.O. Box 7611  
Washington, D.C. 20044-7611  
Tele: (202) 305-0219/Fax: (202) 305-0275  
kevin.mcardle@usdoj.gov

AYAKO SATO, Trial Attorney  
United States Department of Justice  
Environment & Natural Resources Division  
Natural Resources Section  
Ben Franklin Station, P.O. Box 7611  
Washington, D.C. 20044-7611  
Tele: (202) 305-0239/Fax: (202) 305-0506  
Ayako.Sato@usdoj.gov

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, et al.,  
  
Plaintiffs,  
  
v.  
  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, et al.,  
  
Federal Defendants,  
  
and  
  
AMERICAN SAND ASSOCIATION, et al.,  
  
Defendant-Intervenors.

Case No. 3:03-cv-02509-SI  
  
**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~  
ORDER REGARDING  
FURTHER PROCEEDINGS**

1 To establish an orderly schedule for accelerated further proceedings in this matter, and to  
2 avoid a dispute over preliminary injunctive relief, the parties, through undersigned counsel, and  
3 subject to the Court’s approval, hereby state as follows pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-12:

4 WHEREAS, claims four through eight of Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint (ECF  
5 No. 147) challenged: (1) the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (“Service”) January 25, 2005  
6 Biological Opinion (“2005 BiOp”) regarding the U.S. Bureau of Land Management’s (“BLM”)  
7 management of the Imperial Sand Dunes Recreation Area under the 2003 Recreation Area  
8 Management Plan (“RAMP”); (2) BLM’s Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) for the  
9 RAMP; (3) BLM’s March 24, 2005 Record of Decision (“2005 ROD”) approving the RAMP;  
10 and (4) the Service’s August 4, 2004 final rule designating critical habitat for the Peirson’s milk-  
11 vetch (“Critical Habitat Rule”);

12 WHEREAS, the parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment on claims four  
13 through eight in Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint;

14 WHEREAS, on March 14, 2006, the Court issued an opinion and order granting in part  
15 and denying in part each party’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 174), and finding that  
16 Federal Defendants “have failed to comply with federal environmental statutes in a number of  
17 important respects,” ECF No. 174 at 3;

18 WHEREAS, the Court held that the Service’s 2005 BiOp violated the Endangered  
19 Species Act by: “permit[ing] significant declines in the population of the already-threatened  
20 Peirson’s milk-vetch before instituting any mitigating measures”; “fail[ing] to explain how  
21 continued and expanded habitat degradation of almost half of the designated critical habitat for  
22 the Peirson’s milk-vetch does not result in ‘adverse modification’”; and including an incidental  
23 take statement for the desert tortoise that “does not contain a meaningful standard by which  
24 incidental take can be measured” and “fail[ing] to include required ‘terms and conditions’  
25 regarding how to minimize the potential for incidental take,” ECF No. 174 at 3;

26 WHEREAS, the Court further held that the Service’s decision to exclude certain areas  
27 from the Critical Habitat Rule was inadequately supported and contrary to the ESA, ECF No.  
28 174 at 3;

1           WHEREAS, the Court also held that the EIS for the 2003 RAMP violated the National  
2 Environmental Policy Act by eliminating the interim closures that have been in place since  
3 November 2000 from the range of alternatives evaluated and by failing to take a hard look at the  
4 impact of the RAMP on endemic invertebrates, ECF No. 174 at 3-4;

5           WHEREAS, on September 26, 2006, the Court issued its Order and Injunction Regarding  
6 Final Relief (ECF No. 192) (“Remedy Order”);

7           WHEREAS, in relevant part, the Remedy Order: vacated and remanded the 2005 ROD  
8 and EIS; vacated and remanded portions of the 2005 BiOp and incidental take statement (with  
9 conditions); remanded the 2003 RAMP; remanded the Service’s exclusions from the Critical  
10 Habitat Rule (with conditions); and directed the Service to submit a new final critical habitat rule  
11 to the Federal Register for publication no later than February 1, 2008;

12           WHEREAS, paragraphs 5-7 of the Remedy Order provide, in relevant part, as follows:

13           5.       Notwithstanding any contrary provision of the 2005 ROD, 2003 RAMP, or  
14 the FEIS, BLM shall maintain the vehicle closures as identified in the “Temporary  
15 Closure of Approximately 49,300[] Acres to Motorized Vehicle Use of Five Selected  
16 Areas in the ISDRA,” 66 Fed. Reg. 53,431-02 (Oct. 22, 2001) (“Temporary  
17 Closure”)...

18           6.       All injunctive relief shall expire 90 days after [BLM]’s issuance of a new  
19 ROD approved after the completion of appropriate levels of land-use planning,  
20 environmental analysis, and consultation pursuant to NEPA, [the Federal Land Policy  
21 and Management Act], and the ESA...

22           7.       BLM and [the Service] shall provide plaintiffs and defendant-intervenors  
23 with copies of relevant final documents and file a Notice with this Court indicating that  
24 the documents have been issued. Within 90 days of the filing of the Notice, plaintiffs  
25 and defendant-intervenors may file a response, if any, to the Notice explaining why the  
26 terms of this Order should continue...

27           WHEREAS, on February 14, 2008, the Service’s new critical habitat designation for the  
28 Peirson’s milk-vetch was published in the Federal Register, 73 Fed. Reg. 8748 (Feb. 14, 2008);

          WHEREAS, the 2008 critical habitat designation was upheld in response to legal  
challenges brought by the Plaintiffs in this case and others, see Maddalena v. U.S. Fish &  
Wildlife Serv., No. 3:08-cv-02292-H-AJB (S.D. Cal. Aug. 5, 2010);

1           WHEREAS, in June 2013, BLM issued a new ROD and RAMP for the ISDRA (“2013  
2 ROD”), which was preceded by BLM’s preparation of a new EIS pursuant to NEPA and the  
3 completion of consultation with the Service pursuant to ESA Section 7(a)(2), which resulted in  
4 the Service’s issuance of a new Biological Opinion on November 2, 2012 (“2012 BiOp”);

5           WHEREAS, on June 17, 2013, Federal Defendants filed a Notice of the issuance of the  
6 ROD and supporting documents, including the new EIS and 2012 BiOp, and provided copies of  
7 the documents to the Plaintiffs and Defendant-Intervenors pursuant to paragraph 7 of the  
8 Remedy Order;

9           WHEREAS, Plaintiffs have indicated that they intend to file a new pleading challenging  
10 the new ROD and supporting documents;

11           WHEREAS, Plaintiffs have also indicated that they intend to file a response to the Notice  
12 explaining why the terms of the Remedy Order should continue and, in addition or in the  
13 alternative, seek preliminary injunctive relief pending a ruling on the merits of their challenge to  
14 the June 2013 ROD and supporting documents;

15           WHEREAS, the parties subsequently entered into negotiations for a procedure whereby  
16 paragraph 5 of the Remedy Order would remain in effect while Plaintiffs’ challenge to the June  
17 2013 ROD and supporting documents is resolved on an expeditious basis, thereby avoiding the  
18 need for emergency proceedings and conserving the resources of the parties and the Court;

19           WHEREAS, BLM desires to obtain a resolution of Plaintiffs’ challenge to the June 2013  
20 ROD and supporting documents as soon as possible, and in advance of April 15, 2014, to allow  
21 sufficient time for implementation of the ROD and public education prior to the periods of high  
22 use of the ISDRA commencing in the fall of 2014;

23           NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

24           1.       Plaintiffs shall file a new pleading challenging the June 2013 ROD and supporting  
25 documents on or before **September 16, 2013**.

26           2.       Federal Defendants shall file the administrative records for the June 2013 ROD  
27 and the 2012 BiOp on or before **September 20, 2013**

1           3.       Federal Defendants and Defendant-Intervenors shall file their answers or other  
2 responses to Plaintiffs' new pleading, if required under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on  
3 or before **October 15, 2013**.

4           4.       Plaintiffs shall file their motion for summary judgment on or before **October 18,**  
5 **2013**. Plaintiffs' supporting memorandum of points and authorities shall not exceed 25 pages.

6           5.       Federal Defendants shall file a combined cross-motion for summary judgment and  
7 opposition to Plaintiffs' motion, not to exceed 25 pages, on or before **November 15, 2013**.

8           6.       Intervenor-Defendants shall file a combined cross-motion for summary judgment  
9 and opposition to Plaintiffs' motion, not to exceed 25 pages, on or before **November 15, 2013**.

10          7.       Plaintiffs shall file a single combined opposition and reply to the summary  
11 judgment briefs described in paragraphs 5 and 6, not to exceed 20 pages, on or before **December**  
12 **6, 2013**.

13          8.       Federal Defendants shall file a reply brief, not to exceed 15 pages, on or before  
14 **December 20, 2013**.

15          9.       Intervenor-Defendants shall file a reply brief, not to exceed 15 pages, on or before  
16 **December 20, 2013**.

17          10.       Notwithstanding any contrary provision of the June 2013 ROD or supporting  
18 documents, paragraph 5 of the Remedy Order shall remain in effect until the Court issues a  
19 ruling on the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment or **April 15, 2014**, whichever occurs  
20 first. While Paragraph 5 of the Remedy Order remains in effect, BLM shall not be required to  
21 implement any provision of the June 2013 ROD or supporting documents. However, nothing in  
22 this Stipulation precludes BLM, in its sole discretion, from implementing any provision of the  
23 ROD or supporting documents that is not inconsistent with paragraph 5 of the Remedy Order.

24          11.       Plaintiffs shall not pursue any preliminary or provisional injunctive relief  
25 involving the ISDRA or the claims contained in the new pleading prior to the Court's ruling on  
26 cross-motions for summary judgment or April 15, 2014, whichever occurs first.

1           12.     The parties respectfully request that the Court issue a ruling on the parties' cross-  
2 motions for summary judgment as soon as possible after briefing is complete and in advance of  
3 April 15, 2014, if possible.

4 DATED:       August 2, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

5 /s/ Brendan R. Cummings  
6 (with permission by Kevin W. McArdle)

ROBERT G. DREHER  
Acting Assistant Attorney General

7 Brendan R. Cummings  
8 Center for Biological Diversity  
9 P.O. Box 549  
10 Joshua Tree, CA 92252  
11 760-366-2232  
12 Fax: 760-366-2669  
13 bcummings@biologicaldiversity.org

/s/ Kevin W. McArdle  
KEVIN W. McARDLE, Trial Attorney  
United States Department of Justice  
Environment & Natural Resources Division  
Wildlife & Marine Resources Section  
Benjamin Franklin Station, P.O. Box 7611  
Washington, D.C. 20044-7611  
Tele: (202) 305-0219/Fax: (202) 305-0275  
kevin.mcardle@usdoj.gov  
[Kevin.McArdle@usdoj.gov](mailto:Kevin.McArdle@usdoj.gov)

11 /s/ Lisa T. Belenky  
12 (with permission by Kevin W. McArdle)

/s/ Ayako Sato  
AYAKO SATO, Trial Attorney  
United States Department of Justice  
Environment & Natural Resources Division  
Natural Resources Section  
Ben Franklin Station, P.O. Box 7611  
Washington, D.C. 20044-7611  
Tele: (202) 305-0239/Fax: (202) 305-0506  
Ayako.Sato@usdoj.gov

13 Lisa T. Belenky  
14 Center for Biological Diversity  
15 351 California Street , Suite 600  
16 San Francisco, CA 94104  
17 415-436-9682 ext. 307  
18 Fax: 415-436-9683  
19 lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

Attorneys for Defendants

/s/ Paul A. Turcke  
(with permission by Kevin W. McArdle)

Paul A. Turcke  
Moore Smith Buxton & Turcke  
950 West Bannock Street, Suite 520  
Boise, ID 83702  
208/331-1807  
pat@msbtlaw.com

Attorney for Defendant-Intervenors Blue  
Ribbon Coalition, California Association of 4  
Wheel Drive Clubs, San Diego Off Road  
Coalition, Desert Vipers Motorcycle Club, and


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

High Desert Multiple Use Coalition

/s/ David P. Hubbard  
(with permission by Kevin W. McArdle)  
David P. Hubbard , Esq.  
Gatzke Dillon & Ballance LLP  
1525 Faraday Avenue, Suite 150  
Carlsbad, CA 92008  
(760) 431-9501  
dhubbard@gdandb.com

Attorney for Defendant-Intervenors Off-Road  
Business Association, California Off-Road  
Vehicle Association, and American Sand  
Association

Pursuant to Stipulation, **IT IS SO ORDERED** this 5<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. SUSAN ILLSON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

This matter has been scheduled for argument on Friday,  
January 31, 2014, at 9:00 a.m.

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