

1 STACEY P. GEIS, CA Bar No. 181444  
EVE GARTNER, (*Pro Hac Vice Applicant*)  
2 A. YANA GARCIA, CA Bar No. 282959  
Earthjustice  
3 50 California Street, Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
4 T: 415.217.2000 • F: 415.217.2040  
E: [sgeis@earthjustice.org](mailto:sgeis@earthjustice.org)  
5 [egartner@earthjustice.org](mailto:egartner@earthjustice.org)  
[ygarci@earthjustice.org](mailto:ygarci@earthjustice.org)

6 VIRGINIA RUIZ, CA Bar No. 194986  
7 Farmworker Justice  
1126 16<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 270  
8 Washington, D.C. 20036  
T: 202.293.5420 • F: 202.293.5427  
9 E: [vrui@farmworkerjustice.org](mailto:vrui@farmworkerjustice.org)

10 *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 PINEROS Y CAMPESINOS UNIDOS DEL )  
14 NOROESTE, UNITED FARM WORKERS, )  
FARMWORKER ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA, )  
15 CALIFORNIA RURAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE )  
FOUNDATION, and PESTICIDE ACTION )  
16 NETWORK NORTH AMERICA, )

17 Plaintiffs, )

18 v. )

19 E. SCOTT PRUITT, in his official capacity as )  
Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection )  
20 Agency; and U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL )  
PROTECTION AGENCY, )

21 Defendants. )  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No:

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
RELIEF**

**INTRODUCTION**

1  
2 1. Plaintiffs PINEROS Y CAMPESINOS UNIDOS DEL NOROESTE, UNITED  
3 FARM WORKERS, FARMWORKER ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA, CALIFORNIA RURAL  
4 LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOUNDATION, and PESTICIDE ACTION NETWORK NORTH  
5 AMERICA (“Plaintiffs”) assert violations of the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”) and the  
6 Federal Insecticide Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (“FIFRA”) by defendants E. SCOTT PRUITT,  
7 Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, and the UNITED STATES  
8 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (collectively “EPA”) for EPA’s repeated and  
9 unlawful delays of the effective date of the Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule, 82 Fed. Reg.  
10 952 (Jan. 4, 2017) (“CPA Rule”).<sup>1</sup> The CPA Rule, as currently enacted, provides much needed and  
11 long overdue protections for those exposed to the most toxic pesticides, called restricted use  
12 pesticides (“RUPs”), by ensuring those who handle and apply these pesticides are properly trained  
13 and certified and thus know how, when, and where to apply the most dangerous pesticides on the  
14 market. The glaring need for the new CPA Rule is highlighted by the widespread, nationwide  
15 incidences of serious harm, including death, that have occurred over the years because of the  
16 improper application of RUPs in agricultural fields and in our homes.

17 2. EPA updated and finalized the CPA Rule after a multi-year process that included  
18 extensive stakeholder review and input from interested parties. The final rule, which updated a 40+-  
19 year-old regulation, was published in the Federal Register on January 4, 2017, with an effective date  
20 of March 6, 2017. Under the final rule, both States and other certifying authorities would have three  
21 years after the rule’s effective date to prepare and submit a compliance plan to EPA. EPA would  
22 then have up to two years to consider and approve the compliance plan.

23 3. On January 26, 2017, EPA issued a notice in the Federal Register stating that it was  
24 delaying the effective date of the CPA Rule for 60 days until March 22, 2017. EPA based this delay  
25 on a White House memorandum issued on January 20, 2017 and signed by the Assistant to the  
26 President and Chief of Staff, Reince Priebus, directing all federal agencies to, among other things,

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> A copy of the CPA Rule is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

1 temporarily postpone, for 60 days, all final rules whose effective date had not yet come to fruition.  
2 The memo asserted that the delays were to allow the new heads of federal agencies time to review  
3 the rules for possible revision. The memo stated that should an agency delay a rule pursuant to its  
4 direction, it should consider providing an opportunity for notice and public comment before issuing  
5 the delay, especially if the agency ended up delaying the rule after the initial 60 days.

6 4. The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (“FIFRA”), 7 U.S.C. § 136  
7 *et seq.*, requires EPA to ensure that the use of pesticides does not pose “unreasonable adverse  
8 effects” to human health or the environment. *See* 7 U.S.C. § 136a(a). When EPA adopted the CPA  
9 Rule less than six months ago, it found that the rule was needed to help ensure that RUPs “do not  
10 cause unreasonable adverse effects to applicators, workers, the public, or the environment.” 82 Fed.  
11 Reg. at 952, Ex. A.

12 5. Despite EPA’s finding that the CPA Rule is necessary to comply with its obligations  
13 under FIFRA, and despite allowing States, Tribes, and applicators several years to come into  
14 compliance with the CPA Rule’s requirements, EPA has now delayed the CPA Rule through five  
15 different rulemakings. First, EPA delayed the rule for 60 days with no notice or opportunity for  
16 public comment. EPA then enacted an additional 62-day delay, again providing no notice or  
17 opportunity for public comment. EPA then announced a one-year delay and provided the public  
18 only four days to comment on this lengthy delay. The APA generally requires a minimum comment  
19 period of thirty days. EPA then issued a rule moving the effective date to June 5, 2017 to give itself  
20 an additional two weeks to review the comments it received in the earlier 4-day comment period.  
21 Finally, EPA issued a rule delaying the effective date of the CPA Rule an entire year to May 22,  
22 2018.

23 6. With each delay rule, EPA failed to provide the reasoned decision making required  
24 for such agency action. In particular, EPA failed to provide any analysis of, or adequate justification  
25 for, the “unreasonable adverse effects to applicators, workers, the public, or the environment,” 82  
26 Fed. Reg. at 952, Ex. A, which EPA said the CPA Rule would help prevent, but that will now persist  
27 due to the 14-month delay of the rule.

1 7. Plaintiffs seek an order vacating EPA's rules delaying the effective date for  
2 implementation of the CPA Rule on the basis that each delay rule violated procedural rulemaking  
3 requirements, constituted arbitrary and capricious rulemaking, and was contrary to law.

4 **PARTIES**

5 8. Plaintiff PINEROS Y CAMPEÑINOS UNIDOS DEL NOROESTE ("PCUN") is a  
6 non-profit public interest organization and farmworkers' union with more than 6,000 registered  
7 members. PCUN is based in Woodburn, Oregon, and represents year-round and seasonal  
8 agricultural field workers; irrigators; nursery and reforestation workers; and cannery workers – many  
9 of whom are Mexican and Central American immigrants, and mono-lingual Spanish or indigenous  
10 language speakers. PCUN negotiates and implements union contracts with local farms on behalf of  
11 its members; works with the Oregon legislature to develop policies to better protect farmworkers  
12 from risks they face in the fields; and collaborates with public health partners to document pesticide  
13 exposures among farmworker communities throughout the state of Oregon and nationally. PCUN  
14 has established a service center for farmworkers to provide translation, immigration and other  
15 support services to its members. PCUN works to educate its members on safe pesticide handling  
16 practices and advocates for increased controls on pesticide use to protect farmworkers, their families  
17 and rural communities from the harms associated with pesticide exposures. PCUN works to protect  
18 the health and safety of its members and their families from the risk of harm from exposure to RUPs.

19 9. Plaintiff UNITED FARM WORKERS ("UFW") is the nation's oldest and largest  
20 farmworker membership organization. UFW is headquartered in California and serves farmworkers  
21 in offices all across the country including at its offices in Salinas and Santa Rosa, California. UFW  
22 has represented farm workers for more than 40 years and currently has more than 27,000 members,  
23 many of whom are migrant and seasonal farmworkers. UFW's mission is to protect and expand  
24 farmworkers' labor rights, including rights pertaining to health and safety issues. UFW works to  
25 protect the health and safety of its members and their families from the risk of harm from exposure  
26 to RUPs.

27 10. Plaintiff CALIFORNIA RURAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOUNDATION  
28 ("CRLAF") is a statewide non-profit legal aid organization, based in Sacramento, California, that

1 provides free legal services and policy advocacy for California's rural poor. CRLAF's mission is to  
2 achieve social justice and equity in partnership with farmworkers and all low-wage workers and their  
3 families in rural communities through community, legislative and legal advocacy. CRLAF engages  
4 in community education and outreach, impact litigation, legislative and administrative advocacy, and  
5 public policy leadership to address labor rights, housing, education equity, health care access,  
6 pesticide exposure, work safety, immigration, and environmental justice.

7 11. Plaintiff FARMWORKER ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA, INC. ("FWAF") is a non-  
8 profit organization, based in Florida. More than 8,000 families are members of FWAF, which has  
9 five locations throughout Central and South Florida. FWAF conducts programs and activities that  
10 build leadership and activist skills among low-income communities of color who are  
11 disproportionately affected by pesticide exposure and health problems as well as environmental  
12 contamination, racism, exploitation, and political under-representation. FWAF's long-standing  
13 mission is to build power among farmworker and rural low-income communities to respond to the  
14 myriad of workplace, economic, health, and environmental justice issues that impact their lives. In  
15 line with its mission, FWAF works to protect the health and safety of its members and their families  
16 from the risk of harm from exposure to RUPs.

17 12. Plaintiff PESTICIDE ACTION NETWORK NORTH AMERICA ("PANNA") is a  
18 non-profit organization that serves as an independent regional center for Pesticide Action Network  
19 International, a coalition of over 600 public interest organizations in more than 90 countries.  
20 PANNA provides scientific expertise, public education, access to pesticide data and analysis, policy  
21 development and other support to its 225 member organizations. PANNA works in coalition with  
22 farmworker groups in California and across the country, pushing for federal and state policy change  
23 to protect farmworkers and their families from pesticide exposure. For the past 30 years, PANNA  
24 has worked alongside groups serving, representing, and advocating for farmworkers to improve state  
25 and federal rules addressing workplace safety, pesticide regulation, immigration policy,  
26 and pesticide drift. PANNA submitted comments to EPA during its rulemaking process for the  
27 revised CPA Rule. PANNA's principal place of business is Oakland, California.

28

1           13.     Members of PCUN, UFW, CRLAF and FWAF use, purchase, work with, or are  
2 otherwise exposed to RUPs or products to which RUPs have been applied; they live in communities,  
3 have children that attend schools, and work in buildings and environments where RUPs are applied,  
4 and own or rent homes where RUPs could be improperly applied, causing serious harm. Plaintiffs'  
5 members have a compelling need to know that the persons who apply these RUPs are properly  
6 trained and certified in order to best protect themselves, their families, their crops and livelihoods,  
7 the environment, and their communities from the improper application of RUPs and the death,  
8 serious bodily injury, illness and other injuries that too often result from improper exposure to RUPs.

9           14.     Plaintiffs submitted or joined comments supporting EPA's draft CPA Rule. Plaintiffs  
10 and their members are adversely affected by EPA's failure to implement the CPA Rule as initially  
11 enacted and on the established timetable. They are adversely affected not only by the failure of EPA  
12 to provide proper notice and comment regarding the numerous final rules that have delayed the  
13 effective date of the CPA Rule, but by the harm that results from delaying implementation of much-  
14 needed protections included in the updated CPA Rule, including actual or threatened harm to  
15 Plaintiffs' health, the health of their families, and their professional, educational, and economic  
16 interests.

17           15.     The legal violations alleged in this Complaint have injured and continue to injure the  
18 interests of Plaintiffs and their members. Granting the relief requested in this lawsuit would redress  
19 these injuries.

20           16.     Defendant E. SCOTT PRUITT is the Administrator of the UNITED STATES  
21 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY. He is responsible for the implementation,  
22 enforcement, and administration of EPA's legal duties under both the APA and FIFRA, and is sued  
23 in his official capacity. 5 U.S.C. § 706; 7 U.S.C. §§ 136(w) and 136a(b).

24           17.     Defendant UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY is the  
25 federal agency charged with administering and implementing FIFRA's substantive, regulatory  
26 requirements and conducting lawful rulemaking pursuant to the APA.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

1  
2 18. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 7 U.S.C. §  
3 136n and 5 U.S.C. § 702.

4 19. Each of EPA’s rules delaying the effective date of the CPA Rule constitutes final  
5 agency action subject to judicial review. 5 U.S.C. §§ 702, 704, 706.

6 20. An actual controversy exists between the parties within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §  
7 2201. This Court has authority to issue the relief requested under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02 (declaratory  
8 judgment and further relief).

9 21. The requested relief would redress the harm to Plaintiffs and their members caused by  
10 EPA’s unlawful delay of the CPA Rule.

11 22. Venue is proper in this district because plaintiff PANNA resides and has its principal  
12 place of business in this judicial district, and UFW has offices in this judicial district. 28 U.S.C. §  
13 1391(c)(2).

**LEGAL BACKGROUND**

The APA

14  
15  
16 23. The APA defines “rule making” as the “agency process for formulating, amending, or  
17 repealing a rule.” 5 U.S.C. § 551(5). The APA defines “rule” to include “the whole or a part of an  
18 agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement,  
19 interpret, or prescribe law or policy.” *Id.* § 551(4).

20 24. The APA requires agencies to engage in a notice and public comment process prior to  
21 formulating, amending, or repealing a rule. 5 U.S.C. §§ 551(5), 553. This process is designed to  
22 “give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making through submission of  
23 written data, views, or arguments.” *Id.* § 553(c).

24 25. The APA permits an agency to forego notice and comment requirements if “good  
25 cause” exists that notice and comment is “impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public  
26 interest.” 5 U.S.C. § 553(b)(B). The “good cause” exception is narrowly construed.





1           31. FIFRA requires EPA to develop standards for certification of applicators, 7 U.S.C. §  
2 136i(a)(1), and allows States to certify applicators under a certification plan submitted to and  
3 approved by EPA. *Id.* § 136i(a)(2).

4           32. On January 4, 2017, EPA updated its regulations concerning the certification of, and  
5 training requirements for, individuals who apply RUPs. 82 Fed. Reg. 952-1050, Ex. A. These  
6 updates constituted the most significant revision of the rule in over 40 years since the rule's initial  
7 implementation. *See id.* The new CPA Rule imposed stricter standards to protect human health and  
8 the environment and reduce risk to those applying pesticides, including certified commercial and  
9 private pesticide applicators, non-certified pesticide applicators, in both agricultural and non-  
10 agricultural settings. *Id.* It also established minimum standards that apply to all States, Tribes, and  
11 federal agencies, in an effort to streamline RUP use across the country. 82 Fed. Reg. at 965, Ex. A.

12           33. One example of a much needed revision to the CPA Rule includes the requirement  
13 that non-certified applicators of RUPs must be trained every year and must have received training  
14 before they begin using RUPs. *See* 82 Fed. Reg. 952-1050, Ex. A. The training must include (1) the  
15 potential dangers of exposure to pesticides; (2) the appropriate use of protective equipment; (3)  
16 specific instructions about the particular pesticide used and the site where it will be used; (4) how to  
17 prevent environmental contamination such as spills, drift, and runoff; and (5) how to report pesticide  
18 safety violations to enforcement agencies. *Id.* Lastly, the training must be presented in a way the  
19 non-certified applicator understands, including a translation if needed. *Id.* at 984. EPA's delays  
20 mean that non-certified applicators of RUPs are now permitted to apply these pesticides without any  
21 training, or if they have received past training, without recent or updated training.

22           34. Another example of a critical safety gap that the new rule fixes concerns spray  
23 applications. Spray applications, particularly from aircraft, often result in pesticide drift that exposes  
24 non-target plants, animals, and bystanders to potentially severe harm. *See* 82 Fed. Reg. at 963, 977,  
25 Ex. A. EPA found that 37%-68% of acute pesticide-related illnesses in agricultural workers were  
26 caused by spray drift, including both ground-based and aerial spray applications. *Id.* at 963. Thus,  
27 the updated CPA Rule created a new category for training "commercial and private applicators  
28 performing aerial application, soil fumigation, and non-soil fumigation." *Id.* EPA's delays mean that

1 RUPs can be sprayed by applicators who have not received special training to perform this high-risk  
2 job.

3 35. The CPA Rule also established a minimum age requirement for applicators of RUPs.  
4 82 Fed. Reg. at 952, Ex. A. The revised CPA Rule specifically prohibits children from applying  
5 RUPs. *Id.* at 998 (“the final rule prohibits persons under 18 years old from becoming certified to  
6 apply RUPs”). In finalizing its revisions to the CPA Rule, EPA explained that a minimum age  
7 requirement is needed to avert unreasonable adverse effects from RUP use because children may not  
8 have the capacity to make decisions and weigh risks properly — qualities that are critical to proper  
9 application of RUPs. *Id.* at 998-99. EPA found that not only are children more likely to mis-apply  
10 RUPs because they are still developing, they are more susceptible to risks associated with RUP  
11 exposure. *Id.* at 957. EPA’s delays of the CPA Rule mean that children can continue to handle and  
12 apply RUPs.

#### 13 Rulemaking under FIFRA

14 36. Pursuant to FIFRA, before promulgating a regulation, EPA must provide the  
15 Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture (“USDA”) a copy of the regulation at least  
16 60 days prior to its publication. 7 U.S.C. § 136w(a)(2)(A). If the USDA provides comments on the  
17 regulation within 30 days after receiving it, EPA must publish the comments and EPA’s response in  
18 the Federal Register. *Id.* If the USDA does not provide comments within 30 days after receiving it,  
19 EPA may sign the regulation for publication in the Federal Register any time after such 30-day  
20 period notwithstanding the foregoing 60-day time requirement. *Id.*

21 37. For a final regulation, EPA must provide a copy to the USDA at least 30 days prior to  
22 signing the final regulation. 7 U.S.C. § 136w(a)(2)(B). If the USDA provides comments within 15  
23 days of receiving a copy of the regulation, EPA must publish the comments and EPA’s response in  
24 the Federal Register. *Id.* If the USDA does not provide comments within 15 days after receiving it,  
25 EPA may sign the regulation for publication in the Federal Register any time after such 15-day  
26 period notwithstanding the foregoing 30-day time requirement. *Id.*

27 38. In addition to providing a copy of any proposed or final regulation to the USDA for  
28 review and comment, EPA must also provide a copy to the Scientific Advisory Panel so that the

1 panel may review and comment “as to the impact on health and the environment of the action  
2 proposed.” 7 U.S.C. § 136w(d)(1). The same timelines applicable to submission to the USDA apply  
3 to submissions of any proposed or final regulation to the Scientific Advisory Panel. *Id.*

4 39. EPA must also provide a copy of any proposed and final rule or regulation to the  
5 Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture,  
6 Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, and a copy to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the  
7 House of Representatives. 7 U.S. C. § 136w(a)(3), (4). The rule or regulation shall not become  
8 effective until the passage of 60 calendar days after the rule or regulation is so transmitted. *Id.* §  
9 136w(a)(3), (4).

## 10 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

### 11 CPA Rulemaking

12 40. In 2015, in response to years of concern from those who apply and are otherwise  
13 exposed to RUPs, EPA issued a notice of proposed rulemaking to update the original CPA Rule. *See*  
14 Proposed CPA Rule, 80 Fed Reg. 51355-51422 (August 24, 2015). For the proposed rule, EPA  
15 provided proper notice and a three-month comment period that was extended for a total of 150 days.  
16 *See id.* at 51456.

17 41. During the public comment period, EPA received and reviewed over 700 unique  
18 comments including from farmworker advocates, public health advocates, certifying authorities,  
19 States and Tribes, university extension programs, growers and grower organizations and other  
20 groups, such as individual members of the public.

21 42. On January 4, 2017, EPA published the final rule revising the CPA Rule. 82 Fed.  
22 Reg. 952, Ex. A.

23 43. In issuing the final rule, EPA noted several factors that prompted EPA to propose the  
24 changes to the existing CPA Rule, which had not been updated since its enactment in 1974. These  
25 factors included “[t]he changing nature of pesticide labeling, risks associated with specific methods  
26 for applying pesticides, adverse human health and ecological incidents, inadequate protections for  
27 noncertified applicators of RUPs, an uneven regulatory landscape, and outdated and obsolete  
28

1 provisions in the rule related to the administration of certification programs by Tribes and Federal  
2 agencies.” 82 Fed. Reg. at 963, Ex. A.

3 44. In finalizing the rule, EPA noted that “[i]n addition to the hundreds of potentially  
4 avoidable acute health incidents related to RUP exposure reported each year” –a number plaintiffs  
5 contend does not reflect actual incidents due to underreporting – “several major incidents ha[d]  
6 occurred that demonstrate[d] that a single or limited misapplication of an RUP can have widespread  
7 and serious effects.” 82 Fed. Reg. at 963, Ex. A.

8 45. EPA cited in its rulemaking several instances of unreasonable and avoidable harm  
9 resulting from improper RUP use, including the widespread, nationwide misuse of a RUP in the  
10 mid-1990s that was designated only to be used on cotton crops. *See* 82 Fed. Reg. at 963, Ex. A. The  
11 RUP was used in people’s homes leading to widespread contamination of hundreds of homes,  
12 significant exposure and adverse health effects for hundreds of homeowners and children, and  
13 millions in cleanup costs. *Id.*

14 46. In another incident EPA cited as part of rulemaking, an applicator used a RUP  
15 improperly in a house, causing the death of two young children and serious illness to the rest of the  
16 family. 82 Fed. Reg. at 963, Ex. A.

17 47. EPA also cited a 2015 incident where the improper use of a RUP in the American  
18 Virgin Islands caused serious injury, including paralysis to the father and children, to a family who  
19 had rented a villa for their vacation where a RUP was improperly used. 82 Fed. Reg. at 963, Ex. A.

20 48. In addition to these non-agricultural exposures, there is the widespread and continued  
21 exposure of RUPs to the farmworkers who either handle or are exposed to RUPs, along with their  
22 families who are exposed either when the farmworker comes home in contaminated clothing or  
23 when the families are exposed through drift from improper application. Almost 20% of the millions  
24 of farmworkers in the United States regularly handle pesticides in a given year. *See* Attachment G,  
25 at Exhibit 4, fn. 3. Of those, 58 out of every 100,000 report acute pesticide poisoning, illness or  
26 injury each year. Geoffrey M. Calvert, et al., *Acute Pesticide Poisoning Among Agricultural*  
27 *Workers in the United States, 1998-2005*, 51 Am. J. Indus. Med. 883, 890 (2008). A more recent  
28 2015 survey of pesticide applicators developed by Farmworker Justice and presented to EPA in

1 recent comments found that one-third of the applicators reported a pesticide-related illness. Again,  
2 these numbers do not accurately reflect the number of exposures given that farmworkers often do not  
3 report pesticide exposures for fear of retaliation.

4 49. According to EPA, the revised CPA Rule could prevent up to 1,000 acute illnesses  
5 each year. *See* EPA, Fact Sheet on Revisions to EPA’s Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule,  
6 [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-12/documents/cert\\_final\\_rule\\_factsheet\\_0.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-12/documents/cert_final_rule_factsheet_0.pdf).

7 50. The final rule published on January 4, 2017 had an effective date of March 6, 2017.  
8 82 Fed. Reg. at 952, Ex. A. Under the final rule, States and other certifying authorities would have  
9 three years after the rule’s effective date to prepare and submit a compliance plan to EPA. *Id.* at  
10 953. EPA would then have up to two years to consider and approve the compliance plan. *See id.* at  
11 952-953 (explaining that in response to “extensive comments from entities that administer pesticide  
12 applicator certification programs,” “[t]he final rule adjusts the proposed implementation timeframe  
13 (from 2 to 3 years) to provide additional flexibility.”)

14 51. Prior to adopting the CPA Rule, EPA conducted extensive economic analyses  
15 assessing the economic impacts from rulemaking which was reviewed by the Office of Management  
16 and Budget (“OMB”). 82 Fed. Reg. at 953-54, Ex. A. These analyses not only justified EPA’s  
17 findings regarding the unreasonable risk posed to farmworkers, their families, the environment, and  
18 public generally without the finalized revisions to the CPA Rule, but also weighed the relative  
19 feasibility of implementation across the country. *Id.*

#### 20 Delay of the Effective Date of the CPA Rule

21 52. On January 26, 2017, EPA issued its first rule delaying the effective date of the CPA  
22 Rule for 60 days until March 21, 2017. 82 Fed. Reg. 8499-8501 (Jan. 26, 2017) (“First Delay  
23 Rule”). A copy of the First Delay Rule is attached hereto as Exhibit B. In issuing the First Delay  
24 Rule, EPA did not provide proper notice and opportunity for public comment. *See id.* at 8501.

25 53. EPA stated the First Delay Rule was in response to the “Regulatory Freeze Pending  
26 Review” memorandum, written on January 20, 2017, by the Assistant to the President and Chief of  
27 Staff, Reince Priebus ( “Priebus memo”). 82 Fed. Reg. at 8500, Ex. B. The memorandum directed  
28 the heads of Executive Departments and Agencies to temporarily postpone for 60 days from the date

1 of the memorandum the effective dates of all regulations that had been published in the Federal  
2 Register but had not yet taken effect. *Id.* The Priebus memo stated that should an agency delay a  
3 rule, it should consider providing an opportunity for notice and public comment of the delay,  
4 especially if the agency ended up delaying the rule after the initial 60 days.

5 54. EPA asserted that the First Delay Rule was “necessary to give Agency officials the  
6 opportunity for further review and consideration of new regulations, consistent with the  
7 memorandum.” 82 Fed. Reg. at 8500, Ex. B. EPA denied the public an opportunity to comment on  
8 the delay based on a “good cause” exception; specifically, EPA stated seeking public comment  
9 would be impracticable, unnecessary and contrary to the public interest because it was a temporary  
10 delay of only 60 days and EPA needed the time to review the regulations, not respond to public  
11 comments regarding the delay itself. *Id.*

12 55. In issuing the First Delay Rule, EPA said nothing about the ongoing unreasonable  
13 adverse effects posed by use of RUPs under a set of regulations that the agency had recently found  
14 inadequate to satisfy the requirements of FIFRA.

15 56. In issuing the First Delay Rule, EPA did not state whether it had consulted with  
16 USDA or the Scientific Advisory Panel or submitted a copy to Congress or obtained a waiver to  
17 avoid these requirements.

18 57. On March 20, 2017, EPA issued its second rule delaying the effective date of the  
19 CPA Rule for an additional 62 days until May 22, 2017. 82 Fed. Reg. 14324-25 (March 20, 2017)  
20 (“Second Delay Rule”). A copy of the Second Delay Rule is attached hereto as Exhibit C. Again,  
21 EPA failed to provide any opportunity for notice or public comment for the Second Delay Rule.

22 58. EPA justified the Second Delay Rule based on its desire to “give Agency officials the  
23 opportunity to decide whether they would like to conduct a substantive review of the five  
24 regulations, consistent with the January 20 Memo.” 82 Fed. Reg. at 14325, Ex. C. EPA again argued  
25 “good cause” existed to deny the public the opportunity to comment on the delay. *See id.*  
26 Inexplicably, EPA also claimed that allowing these regulations to go into effect now “without first  
27 deciding whether to undertake a substantive review may create public confusion.” *Id.*

28

1           59.     In issuing the Second Delay Rule, EPA said nothing about the ongoing unreasonable  
2 adverse effects posed by use of RUPs under a set of regulations that the agency had recently found  
3 inadequate to satisfy the requirements of FIFRA.

4           60.     In issuing the Second Delay Rule, EPA did not state it had consulted with the USDA  
5 or the Scientific Advisory Panel or submitted a copy to Congress or obtained a waiver to avoid these  
6 requirements.

7           61.     For both delays, EPA also argued that to the extent the extension was seen as a  
8 procedural rule, it would be exempt from notice and comment under 5 U.S.C. § 553(b)(A). 82 Fed.  
9 Reg. at 8500, Ex. B; 82 Fed. Reg. at 14325, Ex. C.

10          62.     On May 15, 2017, EPA issued its third rule delaying the effective date of the CPA  
11 Rule. 82 Fed. Reg. 22294-96 (May 15, 2017) (“Third Delay Rule”). A copy of the Third Delay  
12 Rule is attached hereto as Exhibit D. EPA stated the effective date would now be delayed over a  
13 year to May 22, 2018. *Id.* at 22294. This time, EPA provided a 4-day window for public comment  
14 as to whether implementation of the CPA Rule should be delayed for one year to allow the EPA to  
15 conduct a “substantive review” of the rule it had just adopted. *Id.* The 4-day window ended on  
16 Friday, May 19, thus ostensibly giving EPA the weekend to read, review and respond to the  
17 comments received given the Monday, May 22 effective date. *Id.*

18          63.     EPA stated “good cause” again warranted a shortened comment period, noting that a  
19 30-day comment period would be impractical, unnecessary and contrary to the public interest  
20 because it would extend beyond the May 22 effective date and thus require States, Tribes, and the  
21 regulated community to adopt new measures to comply with a regulation EPA intends to  
22 substantively review, and possibly revise. 82 Fed. Reg. at 22295, Ex. D.

23          64.     In issuing the Third Delay Rule, EPA said nothing about the ongoing unreasonable  
24 adverse effects posed by use of RUPs under a set of regulations that the agency had recently found  
25 inadequate to satisfy the requirements of FIFRA.

26          65.     In issuing the Third Delay Rule, EPA did not state it had consulted with the USDA or  
27 the Scientific Advisory Panel or submitted a copy to Congress or obtained a waiver to avoid these  
28 requirements.

1           66.     On May 22, 2017, EPA issued its fourth rule delaying the effective date to June 6,  
2 2017. 82 Fed. Reg. 23148-50 (May 22, 2017) (“Fourth Delay Rule”). A copy of the Fourth Delay  
3 Rule is attached hereto as Exhibit E. EPA extended the delay an additional two weeks to allow EPA  
4 additional time to review the comments it received in the 4-day comment period. *Id.* at 23148. The  
5 Fourth Delay Rule did not provide an opportunity for additional public comments. *Id.* at 23149.

6           67.     On June 2, 2017, EPA issued its fifth rule delaying the effective date of the CPA Rule  
7 to May 22, 2018. 82 Fed. Reg. 25529-32 (June 2, 2017) (“Fifth Delay Rule”). A copy of the Fifth  
8 Delay Rule is attached hereto as Exhibit F. EPA again asserted “good cause” for allowing the  
9 effective date of an action to be less than 30 days from its publication date. *Id.* at 25530. EPA  
10 further found “good cause” to make the rule effective immediately upon publication. *Id.*

11           68.     In issuing the Fifth Delay Rule, EPA cursorily responded to the more than 130  
12 comments received in the 4-day window. 82 Fed. Reg. at 25530-32, Ex. F. Plaintiffs were among  
13 the groups that submitted comments on May 19, 2017, opposing the one-year delay. Plaintiffs’  
14 comments emphasized how the significantly shortened time-frame for public comments precluded  
15 Plaintiffs and others from accumulating and providing detailed information about the increased risk  
16 of harm that farmworkers, their families and rural communities will face as a result of EPA’s  
17 continued delays. *See* Ps.’ Comment Letter (May 19, 2017). A copy of Plaintiffs’ Comment Letter  
18 is attached hereto as Exhibit G.

19           69.     All but 18 of the comments opposed any further delay of the CPA Rule. 82 Fed. Reg.  
20 at 25530, Ex. F. EPA responded to the 130 comments in less than a few paragraphs. *Id.* at 25530-  
21 32. As to comments regarding the unreasonable risk of harm to farmworkers, their families, and the  
22 public generally from a fourteen month delay of implementation of the rule, EPA failed to address  
23 both its earlier findings that the CPA Rule would help avert unreasonable adverse effects as well as  
24 the additional harm a delay in implementation would cause. Instead EPA noted that any immediate  
25 harm between now and May 22, 2018 would occur anyway given States, Tribes and applicators  
26 would be preparing compliance plans during this 14-month window even if the rule was not delayed.  
27 *Id.* at 25531. EPA failed to address the additional harm that came from an *additional* 14 months of  
28 no action to implement the rule itself.



1           70.     EPA stated that a 14-month delay was needed to “review” the questions of fact, law  
2 and policy. 82 Fed. Reg. at 25531, Ex. F. This is despite the multiple years of input, review and  
3 analysis EPA conducted in finalizing the CPA Rule revisions, including extensive OMB analysis  
4 regarding economic feasibility, and widespread support not only from farmworker groups, public  
5 health advocates, and the public at large, but also from the National Pest Management Association,  
6 the National Agricultural Aviation Association, and the Association of American Pesticide Control  
7 Officials as well. *See* 82 Fed. Reg. 952-1050, Ex. A.

8           71.     In issuing the Fifth Delay Rule, EPA did not state it had consulted with the USDA or  
9 the Scientific Advisory Panel or submitted a copy to Congress or obtained a waiver to avoid these  
10 requirements.

### **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

#### **Failure to Provide Proper Notice and Opportunity for Comment**

11  
12  
13           72.     Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs.

14           73.     EPA adopted the final CPA Rule as authorized by law with an effective date of  
15 March 6, 2017.

16           74.     EPA promulgated five separate rules, each of which unlawfully delayed the CPA  
17 Rule, and in so doing, repeatedly failed to provide the public with adequate notice and the  
18 opportunity to comment on its rulemaking, as required by 5 U.S.C. § 553.

19           75.     EPA did not have good cause to disregard the APA’s notice and comment  
20 requirements each time it delayed the CPA Rule. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 553 (b)(B), (d)(3).

21           76.     Each of EPA’s rules delaying the effective date for implementation of the CPA Rule  
22 was “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law,” *see* 5  
23 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), and was promulgated “without observance of procedure required by law,” *id.* §  
24 706(2)(D).

### **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

#### **Failure to Provide Adequate Justification and Consider Relevant Factors**

25  
26  
27           77.     Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs.

1 78. EPA failed to provide reasoned decision making each time it delayed the effective  
2 date of the CPA Rule.

3 79. In delaying the effective date of the CPA Rule ultimately to May 22, 2018, EPA  
4 failed to address the unreasonable adverse effects the delay in implementation would bring to  
5 farmworkers and their families who are regularly exposed to RUPs through agricultural application,  
6 or to members of the public who are exposed to RUPs due to improper residential or commercial  
7 application, or to the environment.

8 80. In delaying the effective date of the CPA Rule ultimately to May 22, 2018, EPA  
9 failed to provide a rational basis for why the CPA Rule needed to be reviewed and why such a  
10 review would take 14 months.

11 81. EPA's delays of the CPA Rule, including the rule delaying implementation until May  
12 22, 2018, are arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, not in accordance with law, and in  
13 excess of EPA's statutory jurisdiction and authority, under 5 U.S.C. § 706 and 7 U.S.C. §136 *et seq.*

14 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

15 **Failure to Consult**

16 82. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs.

17 83. In promulgating the numerous delay rules, EPA failed to submit copies of the rules to  
18 the USDA, Scientific Advisory Panel, and Congress as required by 7 U.S.C. § 136w(a).

19 84. EPA's failure to submit copies of its rules delaying the effective date of the CPA Rule  
20 was arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, not in accordance with law, and in excess of  
21 EPA's statutory jurisdiction and authority under 5 U.S.C. § 706 and 7 U.S.C. §136 *et seq.*

22 85. Even if EPA had submitted any of the rules to the USDA, the Scientific Advisory  
23 Panel, or to Congress, given the timing of each of the rulemakings, EPA failed to submit any of the  
24 rules in a manner that allowed for proper consultation before the effective date of the final rule as  
25 required by statute.

26 86. EPA's failure to consult with the USDA and in particular the Scientific Advisory  
27 Panel to allow for proper review of the environmental health consequences of a delay of the CPA  
28

1 Rule was arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, not in accordance with law, and in excess  
2 of EPA's statutory jurisdiction and authority under 5 U.S.C. §706 and 7 U.S.C. §136 *et seq.*

3 **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

4 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request this Court grant the following relief:

5 1. DECLARE that EPA's delay of the effective date of the CPA Rule without proper  
6 notice or an opportunity for public comment violates 5 U.S.C. § 553;

7 2. DECLARE that EPA's delay of the effective date of the CPA Rule is arbitrary and  
8 capricious, not in accordance with law and is in excess of EPA's statutory jurisdiction and authority  
9 under 5 U.S.C. § 706 and 7 U.S.C. § 136 *et seq.*;

10 3. VACATE each of the following final rules that unlawfully delayed the effective date  
11 for implementation of the CPA Rule:

12 a) 82 Fed. Reg. 8499-501 (Jan. 26, 2017)

13 b) 82 Fed. Reg. 14324-25 (March 20, 2017)

14 c) 82 Fed. Reg. 22294-96 (May 15, 2017)

15 d) 82 Fed. Reg. 23148-50 (May 22, 2017)

16 e) 82 Fed. Reg. 25531-32 (June 2, 2017);

17 4. DECLARE that the CPA Rule, 82 Fed. Reg. 952-1050 (January 4, 2017), is in effect;

18 5. AWARD Plaintiffs their costs of litigation, including reasonable attorney and expert  
19 witness fees; and/or

20 6. GRANT such additional relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

21  
22  
23 Respectfully submitted,

24 DATED: June 14, 2017

25 /s/ Stacey P. Geis  
26 STACEY P. GEIS, CA Bar No. 181444  
27 EVE GARTNER, (*Pro Hac Vice Applicant*)  
28 A. YANA GARCIA, CA Bar No. 282959  
Earthjustice  
50 California Street, Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
T: 415.217.2000 • F: 415.217.2040

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

E: sgeis@earthjustice.org  
egartner@earthjustice.org  
ygarcia@earthjustice.org

VIRGINIA RUIZ, CA Bar. No. 194986  
Farmworker Justice  
1126 – 16<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 270  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
T: 202.293.5420 • F: 202.293.5427  
E: vruiz@farmworkerjustice.org

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*