Case 2:13-cv-02095-KJM-DB Document 277-2 Filed 05/26/17 Page 1 of 5

 1 2 3 4 5 	M. REED HOPPER (Bar No. 131291) ANTHONY L. FRANÇOIS (Bar No. 184100) Pacific Legal Foundation 930 G Street Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 419-7111 (p) (916) 419-7747 (f) mrh@pacificlegal.org alf@pacificlegal.org			
6	See next page for additional attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterclaim-Defendants			
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	DUARTE NURSERY, INC., a California Corporation; and JOHN DUARTE, an	No. 2:13-CV-02095-KJM-DB		
11	individual,	DUARTE'S M	DUARTE'S MOTION IN LIMINE # 5	
12	Plaintiffs,	TO PROHIBIT RELIANCE ON ILLEGAL 2008 RAPANOS GUIDANCE		
13	v.	ILLEGAL 200	60 KAI ANOS GUIDANCE	
14	UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS,	Date: Time:	June 16, 2017	
15	Defendant.	Courtroom: Judge:	10:00am 3 Hon. Kimberly J.	
16		Juage.	Mueller	
17				
18	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Counterclaim- Plaintiff,			
19	v.			
20	DUARTE NURSERY, INC., a California Corporation; and JOHN DUARTE, an			
21	individual,			
22	Counterclaim- Defendants.			
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

Case 2:13-cv-02095-KJM-DB Document 277-2 Filed 05/26/17 Page 2 of 5

1	Additional attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterclaim-Defendants
2	DAVID M. IVESTER (Bar No. 76863)
3	PETER PROWS (Bar No. 257819)
4	MAX ROLLENS (Bar No. 308984) Briscoe Ivester & Bazel LLP
5	155 Sansome Street, Seventh Floor San Francisco, CA 94104
6	(415) 402-2700 (p) (415) 398-5630 (f)
7	divester@briscoelaw.net pprows@briscoelaw.net
8	GERALD E. BRUNN (Bar No. 107004)
9	Law Offices of Brunn & Flynn 928 12th Street, Suite 200
10	Modesto, CA 95354 (209) 521-2133 (p)
11	(209) 521-7584 (f) gbrunn@brunn-flynn.com
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

CASE NO. 13-CV-2095

4845-8562-7976 v. 1

DUARTE'S MOTION IN LIMINE # 5

I. INTRODUCTION

One issue remaining for trial is the extent of the seasonal waters and wetlands on the property regulated under the Clean Water Act—often called "jurisdictional" waters or wetlands. To establish jurisdiction, the Government and its experts rely exclusively on an illegal guidance document. That guidance is illegal because it was not submitted to Congress as required by the Congressional Review Act, and that Act makes such guidance ineffective as a matter of law.

The Government's experts' reliance on that guidance document is also patently unreliable, because they obviously misapplied some of its most basic concepts.

The Government should be prohibited from basing evidence or argument on this illegal—and misapplied—guidance document.

II. EVIDENCE AT ISSUE

The memorandum, jointly published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and dated December 2, 2008, entitled "Clean Water Act Jurisdiction Following the U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in *Rapanos v. United States & Carabell v. United States*" ("2008 *Rapanos* Guidance", "*Rapanos* Guidance", or "Guidance"). The Guidance was not produced during discovery or otherwise disclosed by the Government in this matter, but the Government's main expert report relies heavily on the Guidance. (Dkt. #87-3 at 106-113.) The Guidance is available online, and a courtesy copy is attached as Exhibit 1 to the Prows declaration supporting this motion.

III. THE RAPANOS GUIDANCE IS INEFFECTIVE

The Congressional Review Act ("CRA"), 5 U.S.C. § 800 *et seq.*, prohibits any "rule" from "tak[ing] effect" until after a "report" on that rule is submitted to Congress and the Controller General. (5 U.S.C. § 801(a)(1)(A); *see also* para. (a)(4) ("a rule shall take effect as otherwise provided by law *after* submission", emphasis added).) The CRA defines "rule" by reference to the definition of "rule" in the Administrative Procedures Act ("APA"), with a few exceptions irrelevant to this case. (5 U.S.C. § 804(3).) The APA, in turn, defines "rule" broadly as "the whole or a part of

¹ https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/cwa_jurisdiction_following_rapanos120208.pdf 4845-8562-7976 v_1

Case 2:13-cv-02095-KJM-DB Document 277-2 Filed 05/26/17 Page 4 of 5

an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy". (5 U.S.C. § 551(4).) If an agency "bases enforcement actions on the policies or interpretations formulated in the document", then that document is a rule. (Appalachian Power Co. v. E.P.A., 208 F.3d 1015, 1021 (D.C. Cir. 2000).)

The Government Accountability Office maintains a database of rules that have been submitted in compliance with the CRA.²

The *Rapanos* Guidance is a rule, within the meaning of the CRA and APA. The Guidance prescribes those features over which the Government "will assert jurisdiction" and those over which it "will not assert jurisdiction" under the Clean Water Act. (Guidance at 1.) The Guidance is intended to ensure that the Government's assertions of jurisdiction are "consistent". (Guidance at 3.) The Government is basing this enforcement action on the policies or interpretations formulated in the Guidance. Because the Guidance is intended to prescribe generally applicable rules to guide the Government's application of law or policy in enforcement actions under the Clean Water Act, the Guidance is a rule.

A report on this rule has not been submitted to Congress or the Controller General. (Prows. Decl. ¶ 2.)

Because the Guidance is a rule, and a report on the rule has not been submitted as required, the Guidance is ineffective under the CRA. Evidence or argument based on an ineffective essentially illegal—rule should be barred.

IV. THE GOVERNMENT'S USE OF THE RAPANOS GUIDANCE IS PATENTLY UNRELIABLE

Evidence or arguments by the Government based on the Guidance should be excluded for the additional reason that the Government's application of the Guidance in this case is patently unreliable. (See FRE 702(d) (expert testimony inadmissible if expert has not "reliably applied the principles and methods to the facts of the case").) For example, the Government's experts assert that the mostly dry seasonal wetlands and swales on the Duarte property are all "tributaries that flow directly to the traditional navigable waters of the Sacramento River." (Dkt. #87-3 at 107, emphasis

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

² The GAO CRA database can be searched, at http://www.gao.gov/legal/congressional-reviewact/overview 4845-8562-7976 v. 1

Case 2:13-cv-02095-KJM-DB Document 277-2 Filed 05/26/17 Page 5 of 5

added.) The Guidance defines "tributaries" as "the entire reach of the stream that is of the same *order*". (Guidance at 6, 10 emphasis added.) But the Government's experts admit that the wetlands and swales on the Duarte property are of at least three different orders. (Dkt. #87-2 at 21 ("on the Duarte Site, there are first-, second-, and third-order streams").) Because the Guidance defines tributaries as being of the same order, and yet the Government's experts admit that the seasonal waters and wetlands on the Duarte property are of at least three different orders, those experts cannot have reliably applied the Guidance.

This unreliability is significant, because the Guidance draws a sharp distinction between "tributaries" of navigable waters and mere "swales" or other "low-volume" features, as the Government's experts acknowledge. (Guidance at 1; Dkt. #87-3 at 108 (quoting Guidance).) The Guidance takes the position that tributaries of navigable waters are always, or at least may be, jurisdictional. (*Id.*) But the Guidance takes the position that mere swales and other low-volume features are *never* jurisdictional. (*Id.*) The seasonal wetlands and swales on the Duarte property carry quite low volumes of water: a small fraction of one percent of the watershed. (Dkt. #150-3 at 15.) Those features are not jurisdictional under the Guidance, and the evidence and arguments the Government might offer otherwise, in conflict with the Guidance, should be excluded as patently unreliable.

V. CONCLUSION

Evidence or argument based on the Guidance should be excluded.

BRISCOE IVESTER & BAZEL LLP

By: /s/ Peter Prows

Peter S. Prows Attorneys for DUARTE NURSERY, INC. and JOHN DUARTE

4845-8562-7976 v. 1

DUARTE'S MOTION IN LIMINE # 5

CASE NO. 13-CV-2095