

1 David A. Bahr (Oregon Bar No. 90199)
 2 Bahr Law Offices, P.C.
 3 1035 ½ Monroe Street
 4 Eugene, OR 97402
 (541) 556-6439
davebahr@mindspring.com

5 Elena Saxonhouse (California Bar. No. 235139)
 6 Sierra Club Environmental Law Program
 7 85 Second St., 2nd Floor
 8 San Francisco, CA 94105
 (415) 977-5765
 (415) 977-5793 (facsimile)
Elena.Saxonhouse@Sierraclub.org

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

10
 11 MELINDA HAAG (CSBN 132612)
 12 United States Attorney
 13 ALEX TSE (CSBN 152348)
 Acting Chief, Civil Division
 14 ABRAHAM A. SIMMONS (CSBN 146400)
 Assistant United States Attorney
 15 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
 16 San Francisco, California 94102-3495
 Telephone: (415) 436-7264
 17 Facsimile: (415) 436-6748
 Email: abraham.simmons@usdoj.gov

18 Attorneys for Federal Defendant



19 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 20 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 21 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

22 **THE SIERRA CLUB and ENVIRONMENTAL**
 23 **INTEGRITY PROJECT,**

24 Plaintiffs,

25 vs.

26 **UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL**
 27 **PROTECTION AGENCY,**

28 Defendant.

Case No. C-11-0846-MEJ

**SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL JOINT CASE
MANAGEMENT REPORT**

1 This is an action brought by Plaintiffs pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. §
2 552, to compel production of documents. The information request upon which this suit is based, sought
3 information submitted to defendant relating to the operations of coal-fired power plants owned by the
4 Luminant Corporation.

5 After the parties completed briefing cross-motions for summary judgment, but before oral argu-
6 ment on same, on May 20, 2012, the Court vacated the scheduled hearing and ordered the parties to
7 meet and confer in her chambers on May 30, 2012. Dkt. No. 50. After fruitful discussion in chambers,
8 the parties agreed to continue with informal settlement discussions in an effort to resolve this matter
9 without further litigation. Accordingly, the parties engaged in a number of direct and informal settlement
10 conference calls and have exchanged a settlement proposal. Additionally, as the Parties informed the
11 Court, recent EPA enforcement activities involving Luminant have impacted EIP and Sierra Club's in-
12 terest in the documents at issue in this matter. Because the parties required additional time in which to
13 explore possible resolution of this case, when they reported back to the Court on September 20, 2012,
14 they requested that the case be stayed until November 21, 2012 by which time they would inform the
15 Court of the status of their settlement efforts. Dkt. No. 52. The Court so ordered. Dkt. No. 53.

16 The parties reported to the court on November 21, 2012, that they desired additional time to ex-
17 plore a possible settlement of this case. Dkt. No. 54. Accordingly, the Court set December 21, 2012 as a
18 deadline for the parties to report their progress in this regard. Dkt. No. 55.

19 The parties have continued their dialogue and are closer to a general consensus on how to settle
20 the case. However, the parties require additional time to negotiate the details of the settlement terms and
21 obtain approval for a final settlement from their respective organizations. They therefore desire addi-
22 tional time in which to explore a negotiated resolution to this dispute.
23
24
25
26
27
28

