

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6 OAKLAND DIVISION

7
8 RESOURCE RENEWAL INSTITUTE,
9 CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY,
10 and WESTERN WATERSHEDS PROJECT,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 vs.

13 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, a federal
14 agency, and CICELY MULDOON, in her
15 official capacity as Superintendent of Point
16 Reyes National Seashore,

17 Defendants.

Case No: C 16-0688 SBA

**ORDER RE REFERRAL FOR
EARLY MANDATORY
SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE**

18 Plaintiffs Resource Renewal Institute, Center for Biological Diversity and Western
19 Watersheds Project (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), bring the instant action under the
20 Administrative Procedures Act, 5 U.S.C. § 701, against the National Park Service and
21 Cicely Muldoon (collectively, “Defendants”). Plaintiffs contend that Defendants have
22 violated various federal laws by failing to revise the General Management Plan for the
23 Point Reyes National Seashore (“Seashore”) and continuing to authorize dairy farming and
24 cattle ranching activities at the Seashore without conducting the requisite environmental
25 review.

26 The Court recently denied Defendants’ motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, but
27 granted their alternative motion for a more definite statement regarding which particular
28 ranching authorizations are at issue in this action. Dkt. 49. In addition, the parties have
notified the Court of Plaintiffs’ intention to file a motion for preliminary injunction to
enjoin Defendants from issuing a Ranch Management Plan and/or new grazing

1 authorizations or leases before a revised General Management Plan/Environmental Impact
2 Study is completed. See Dkt. 27, 53.

3 Plaintiffs' anticipated motion for preliminary injunction—and the further litigation
4 of this action—are likely to consume a considerable amount of the parties and the Court's
5 time and resources. In addition, the Court's rulings may lead to the filing of one or more
6 appeals, engendering additional costs and further delaying the final resolution of the instant
7 dispute. As such, the Court finds that it is in the parties' best interest to engage in a good
8 faith attempt to resolve the action on terms that are mutually acceptable to them. To that
9 end, it is the Court's intention to refer this action to a magistrate judge for a mandatory
10 settlement conference, which will be scheduled on an *expedited* basis (i.e., within the next
11 30 to 60 days, depending on the assigned magistrate judge's availability). Accordingly,

12 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the parties shall meet and confer forthwith in an
13 effort to mutually identify three possible magistrate judges of this Court to conduct the
14 settlement conference. If the parties cannot reach such an agreement, they shall separately
15 list their preferences. The parties shall jointly file their list of proposed settlement judges
16 by no later than July 27, 2016.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: 7/22/16


SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
Senior United States District Judge

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28