	Case 2:14-cv-00196-RSM Docu	ment 95 Filed 10/17/18 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
6		
7	NORTHWEST ENVIRONMENTAL	
8	ADVOCATES,)
9	Plaintiff,)
10	v.))
11	UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,) No. 2:14-cv-0196-RSM
12) ORDER GRANTING STAY PENDING
13	Defendant, and) VOLUNTARY RECONSIDERATION
14	NORTHWEST PULP & PAPER ASS'N,	ý)
15	et al.,)
16	Defendant-Intervenors)
17	The Count having considered the Jain	t Mation to Stay the Case Danding Veluntary
18	The Court, having considered the Joint Motion to Stay the Case Pending Voluntary Reconsideration of Certain Actions, in which the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) state	
19		
20	its intention to reconsider certain actions of either approving certain state water quality standards	
21	or determining that certain state provisions are not water quality standards subject to Clean	
22	Water Act section 303(c) review and approval, 33 U.S.C. § 1313(c), and for good cause shown,	
23	hereby GRANTS that Motion.	
24	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:	
25	1. This case shall be stayed pending EPA's administrative reconsideration of the	
26	 2. Once EPA completes its administrative reconsideration process of the referenced 	
	2. Once EPA completes its admir	insulative reconsideration process of the referenced
	ORDER GRANTING STAY PENDING RECONSIDERATION	

No. 2:14-cv-0196-RSM

agency actions, by making approval or disapproval decisions, or by making a final determination that such provisions are not water quality standards subject to section 303(c) review, the Parties shall file an appropriate motion or motions seeking dismissal of this case or otherwise explaining why such dismissal is not appropriate.

3. For any referenced action subject to reconsideration: (a) for which EPA has not completed its administrative reconsideration, by making approval or disapproval decisions, or by making a final determination that such provisions are not water quality standards subject to section 303(c) review, by October 16, 2021; or (b) for which EPA has by that date completed its administrative reconsideration but the claim in the Amended Complaint pertaining to that action has not been rendered moot, then Plaintiff may by motion request that the Court lift the stay of this case and establish a briefing schedule for the adjudication of the claim corresponding to that action in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (Dkt. 54) at Paragraphs 97(b), (c), (d) and (e) of Claim Three, Paragraph 104(a) of Claim Four related to WAC 173-201A-200(1)(c)(i) and WAC 173-201A-210(1)(c)(i), and Paragraphs 104(b), (c), (d) and (e) of Claim Four. Each Party reserves the right to argue that any such claim is or is not moot and to defend any such claim to be adjudicated.

4. Plaintiff reserves the right to petition the Court for its costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, associated with these claims. Defendant reserves the right to contest such a request.

5. Plaintiff and Defendant EPA shall file a periodic joint status report with this Court every 180 days, stating any relevant changes in the case and explaining whether the stay should continue. Dated this 17 day of October, 2018.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

ORDER GRANTING STAY PENDING RECONSIDERATION No. 2:14-cv-0196-RSM