

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-4057

1 TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
2 Misha Tseytlin, *pro hac vice pending*
3 misha.tseytlin@troutman.com
4 227 West Monroe Street, Suite 3900
Chicago, Illinois 60606-5085
Telephone: 312.759.1920
Facsimile: 312.759.1939

5 Elizabeth Holt Andrews, Bar No. 263206
6 elizabeth.andrews@troutman.com
7 Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 800
8 San Francisco, California 94111-4057
Telephone: 415.477.5700
Facsimile: 415.477.5710

9 *Attorneys for Prospective Amici Curiae*
Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, et al.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 WESTERN DIVISION—LOS ANGELES

13 CALIFORNIA TRUCKING
14 ASSOCIATION,
15 Plaintiff,
16 AIRLINES FOR AMERICA,
Intervenor-Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY
19 MANAGEMENT DISTRICT;
20 GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
21 SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY
22 MANAGEMENT DISTRICT,
23 Defendants,
24 STATE OF CALIFORNIA;
25 CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES
26 BOARD; EAST YARD
COMMUNITIES FOR
27 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE;
28 PEOPLE’S COLLECTIVE FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE;
SIERRA CLUB; COMMUNITIES FOR
A BETTER ENVIRONMENT; &
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND,
Intervenor-Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-cv-06341-JAK-MRW

**UNOPPOSED NOTICE OF
MOTION AND MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO PARTICIPATE AS
AMICI CURIAE**

Date: February 6, 2023
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Courtroom: 10B
Judge: Hon. John A. Kronstadt

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-4057

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on February 6, 2023, at 8:30 a.m., before the
3 Honorable John A. Kronstadt, in Courtroom 10B, located in the First Street
4 Courthouse, 350 West First Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, proposed *Amici*
5 *Curiae* the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America (“Chamber”);
6 American Trucking Associations, Inc. (“ATA”); the California Chamber of
7 Commerce (“CalChamber”); the Retail Litigation Center (“RLC”); the Hispanic
8 Chamber of Commerce; the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce; the Long
9 Beach Area Chamber of Commerce; the South Bay Association of Chambers of
10 Commerce; the Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce; the San Pedro Chamber of
11 Commerce; the Garden Grove Chamber of Commerce; the Santa Maria Valley
12 Chamber of Commerce; the Southwest California Legislative Council; the
13 Murrieta/Wildomar Chamber of Commerce, Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce; the
14 Yorba Linda Chamber of Commerce; the Tulare Chamber of Commerce; the Santa
15 Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce; the Citrus Heights Chamber of Commerce;
16 the Oceanside Chamber of Commerce; the West Ventura County Business
17 Alliance; the Elsinore Valley Chamber of Commerce; the Industry Business
18 Council; the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce; the Greater High
19 Desert Chamber of Commerce; the Danville Area Chamber of Commerce; the
20 Laguna Niguel Chamber of Commerce; and the Greater Riverside Chambers of
21 Commerce (hereinafter, collectively, “Local Chambers of Commerce”) will and
22 hereby do move this Court for an order granting their Motion For Leave To
23 Participate As *Amici Curiae*. All parties have consented to the filing of this brief
24 and do not oppose this motion.

25 This Motion is based on the ground that federal preemption under the Clean
26 Air Act (“CAA”) and Airline Deregulation Act (“ADA”), as well as the Federal
27 Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994 (“FAAAA”), are important
28 issues to the nationwide business community, with wide-ranging ramifications

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-4057

1 beyond this case. As organizations representing hundreds of thousands of business
2 entities who rely on uniform rules nationwide, including the legal requirements
3 governing interstate shipping and logistics, *Amici* the Chamber, ATA, CalChamber,
4 RLC, and the Local Chambers of Commerce have unique perspectives on the issues
5 presented in Plaintiff’s and Intervenor-Plaintiff’s Motions For Summary Judgment.
6 *Amici*’s Brief therefore seeks to provide useful context for the Court’s decision-
7 making in resolving the preemption issues raised by those motions.

8 This unopposed Motion is based upon this Notice Of Motion, the
9 accompanying Memorandum Of Points And Authorities; the proposed *Amici*
10 *Curiae* Brief (attached as Exhibit A to this Motion); the pleadings and other
11 documents on file with this Court, and any other evidence and argument that the
12 Court may receive at or before the hearing on this matter.

13 Pursuant to L.R. 7-3 and the Court’s Standing Order 9(c), the parties
14 conferred via email on November 15–21, 2022, thoroughly discussed each and
15 every issue raised in this Motion, and attempted in good faith to resolve the Motion
16 in whole or in part. Counsel for all parties has advised that they do not oppose this
17 Motion.

18 Dated: November 21, 2022

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON
SANDERS LLP

19
20 By: /s/ Elizabeth Holt Andrews
21 Elizabeth Holt Andrews
Misha Tseytlin (*pro hac vice* pending)

22 *Attorneys for Prospective Amici*
23 *Curiae*
24 Chamber of Commerce of the United
25 States of America; American
26 Trucking Associations, Inc.; &
27 California Chamber of Commerce
28

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-4057

1 TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
2 Misha Tseytlin, *pro hac vice pending*
3 misha.tseytlin@troutman.com
4 227 West Monroe Street, Suite 3900
Chicago, Illinois 60606-5085
Telephone: 312.759.1920
Facsimile: 312.759.1939

5 Elizabeth Holt Andrews, Bar No. 263206
6 elizabeth.andrews@troutman.com
7 Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 800
8 San Francisco, California 94111-4057
Telephone: 415.477.5700
Facsimile: 415.477.5710

9 *Attorneys for Prospective Amici Curiae*
Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, et al.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 WESTERN DIVISION—LOS ANGELES

13 CALIFORNIA TRUCKING
14 ASSOCIATION,
15 Plaintiff,
16 AIRLINES FOR AMERICA,
Intervenor-Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY
19 MANAGEMENT DISTRICT;
20 GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
21 SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY
22 MANAGEMENT DISTRICT,
23 Defendants,
24 STATE OF CALIFORNIA;
25 CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES
26 BOARD; EAST YARD
27 COMMUNITIES FOR
28 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE;
PEOPLE’S COLLECTIVE FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE;
SIERRA CLUB; COMMUNITIES FOR
A BETTER ENVIRONMENT; &
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND,
Intervenor-Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-cv-06341-JAK-MRW

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS
AND AUTHORITIES IN
SUPPORT OF UNOPPOSED
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO
PARTICIPATE AS AMICI
CURIAE**

Date: February 6, 2023
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Courtroom: 10B
Judge: Hon. John A. Kronstadt

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-4057

1 District courts have held that a party’s participation as *amicus* is beneficial
2 where such “participation is useful to or otherwise desirable to the court” and where
3 *amici* have “unique information or perspective that can help the court beyond the
4 help that the lawyers for the parties are able to provide,” *WildEarth Guardians v.*
5 *Haaland*, 561 F. Supp. 3d 890, 905–06 (C.D. Cal. 2021). Industry associations,
6 such as *Amici*, can be particularly helpful by “explain[ing] the impact a potential
7 holding might have on an industry or other group,” which provides “important
8 assistance to the court” even if the parties are “very well represented.”
9 *Neonatology Assocs., P.A. v. Comm’r of Internal Revenue*, 293 F.3d 128, 132 (3d
10 Cir. 2002) (Alito, J.).

11 *Amici* the Chamber, ATA, CalChamber, RLC, and the Local Chambers of
12 Commerce respectfully submit that they offer this Court unique perspectives on the
13 issues presented by Plaintiff’s and Intervenor-Plaintiff’s motions for summary
14 judgment, informed by *Amici*’s positions as federations and associations
15 representing the interests of businesses all across California and the United States.

16 The Chamber is the world’s largest business federation, representing
17 approximately 300,000 direct members while also indirectly representing the
18 interest of over three million companies and professional organizations all across
19 the country, many of whom greatly benefit from federal rules that ensure uniform
20 regulatory regimes nationwide.

21 ATA is the national association related to the trucking industry, with a direct
22 membership of approximately 1,800 trucking companies while representing over
23 30,000 motor carriers nationwide through its relationships with 50 affiliated state
24 trucking organizations, including many who operate in the South Coast Air Quality
25 Management District (“SCAQMD”).

26 The CalChamber represents over 14,000 members, representing 25% of
27 California’s private sector and virtually every economic interest in the State of
28 California, including many who operate within the trucking and shipping industry,

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-4057

1 including in SCAQMD.

2 RLC is the only trade organization solely dedicated to representing the retail
3 industry in the courts. RLC’s members include many of the country’s largest and
4 most innovative retailers. Collectively, they employ millions of workers
5 throughout the United States, provide goods and services to tens of millions of
6 consumers, and account for tens of billions of dollars in annual sales. RLC member
7 retailers strive to be active allies and collaborators on combating climate change
8 and reducing emissions. RLC provides courts with retail-industry perspectives on
9 important legal issues impacting its members, and highlights industry-wide
10 consequences of significant pending cases.

11 The Local Chambers of Commerce are non-profit business associations
12 representing both individual and corporate private sector entities in the state of
13 California. The Local Chambers of Commerce act on behalf of their local
14 businesses to improve the economic and jobs climate in their respective
15 communities. *Amici* and their members thus have unique insight into transportation
16 and logistics and seek to provide their particular knowledge of relevant topics to the
17 Court as it considers the pending motions.

18 *Amici* and their members have a strong interest in ensuring stable and
19 predictable legal regimes affecting interstate and international trade, including
20 through federal preemption of local and state laws that threaten “Congress’s
21 carefully calibrated regulatory scheme,” *Engine Mfrs. Ass’n v. S. Coast Air Quality*
22 *Mgmt. Dist.*, 541 U.S. 246, 255 (2004), related to mobile source emissions and the
23 transportation of property by aircraft or motor vehicle. The current litigation puts
24 those frameworks at risk, raising critical issues regarding limits of state and local
25 law to impose varied requirements on warehouses and trucking companies related
26 to emissions. If allowed to continue, SCAQMD’s Rules 2305 and 316, which
27 impose serious penalties and compliance costs on warehouse and shipping
28 companies within the SCAQMD, threaten the “carefully calibrated” systems and

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-4057

1 rules Congress created under the CAA and the ADA, as well as the FAAAA.
2 Furthermore, permitting these Rules to continue could have wide-ranging economic
3 effects, putting greater pressure on the supply chain in a moment of already serious
4 shipping delays, while also encouraging other local and state governments to
5 concoct their own unique rules, creating a wholly disunified system.

6 Given the importance of these issues, *Amici* respectfully submit that the
7 Court would benefit from the broader perspectives of the U.S. business community
8 on the possible negative effects of allowing Rules 2305 and 316 to remain. *Amici*'s
9 brief provides important viewpoints on how CAA, ADA, and FAAAA preemption
10 apply in this case, as well as explaining the important, negative downstream effects
11 that will follow if Plaintiff's and Intervenor-Plaintiff's motions for summary
12 judgment are not granted and those Rules are permitted to continue imposing
13 harmful costs and penalties on the nationwide shipping and logistics industry.
14 *Amici*'s brief thus "explain[s] the broader regulatory or commercial context" in
15 which this case arises and "provid[es] practical perspectives on the consequences of
16 potential outcomes," thereby "contribut[ing] in clear and distinct ways" to the
17 Court's consideration of the issues. *Prairie Rivers Network v. Dynegy Midwest*
18 *Generation, LLC*, 976 F.3d 761, 763 (7th Cir. 2020).

19 Therefore, for all of these reasons, *Amici* request that the Court grant them
20 leave to participate as *amici curiae* and file the accompanying *amici curiae* brief
21 (attached as Exhibit A), in support of Plaintiff's and Intervenor-Plaintiff's motions
22 for summary judgment.

23
24
25
26
27
28

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

Dated: November 21, 2022

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON
SANDERS LLP

By: /s/ Elizabeth Holt Andrews
Elizabeth Holt Andrews
Misha Tseytlin (*pro hac vice* pending)

*Attorneys for Prospective Amici
Curiae*
Chamber of Commerce of the United
States of America, et al.

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-4057

EXHIBIT A

1 TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
Misha Tseytlin, *pro hac vice pending*
2 misha.tseytlin@troutman.com
227 West Monroe Street, Suite 3900
3 Chicago, Illinois 60606-5085
Telephone: 312.759.1920
4 Facsimile: 312.759.1939

5 Elizabeth Holt Andrews, Bar No. 263206
elizabeth.andrews@troutman.com
6 Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 800
San Francisco, California 94111-4057
7 Telephone: 415.477.5700
8 Facsimile: 415.477.5710

9 *Attorneys for Amici Curiae*
Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, et al.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 WESTERN DIVISION—LOS ANGELES

13 CALIFORNIA TRUCKING
ASSOCIATION,
14 Plaintiff,
15 AIRLINES FOR AMERICA,
16 Intervenor-Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT;
GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
19 SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT,
20 Defendants,
21 STATE OF CALIFORNIA;
22 CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES
BOARD; EAST YARD
23 COMMUNITIES FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE;
24 PEOPLE’S COLLECTIVE FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE;
25 SIERRA CLUB; COMMUNITIES FOR
A BETTER ENVIRONMENT; &
26 ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND,
27 Intervenor-Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-cv-06341-JAK-MRW
**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF
THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA, ET AL., IN SUPPORT
OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT
MOTIONS OF PLAINTIFF AND
INTERVENOR-PLAINTIFF**

Date: February 6, 2023
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Courtroom: 10B
Judge: Hon. John A. Kronstadt

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-4057

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

Page

I. INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*..... 6

II. INTRODUCTION..... 8

III. ARGUMENT 10

 A. The CAA And ADA Preempt Rules 2305 And 316 10

 B. The Rules Would Have Damaging Impacts On Warehouse, Shipping,
 And Logistics Industries Nationwide 18

IV. CONCLUSION 22

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Air Transp. Ass’n of Am. v. City & Cnty. of S.F.,
 266 F.3d 1064 (9th Cir. 2001) 13, 17

Crosby v. Nat’l Foreign Trade Council,
 530 U.S. 363 (2000)..... 10

Dan’s City Used Cars, Inc. v. Pelkey,
 569 U.S. 251 (2013)..... 10

Engine Mfrs. Ass’n v. S. Coast Air Quality Mgmt. Dist.,
 541 U.S. 246 (2004).....*passim*

Fed. Express Corp. v. Cal. Pub. Utilities Comm’n,
 936 F.2d 1075 (9th Cir. 1991) 14, 17

Gibbons v. Ogden,
 22 U.S. (9 Wheat.) 1 (1824) 10

Gobeille v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.,
 577 U.S. 312 (2016)..... 11

Kansas v. Garcia,
 140 S. Ct. 791 (2020)..... 10

Morales v. Trans World Airlines, Inc.,
 504 U.S. 374 (1992).....*passim*

Motor & Equip. Mfrs. Ass’n v. E.P.A.,
 627 F.2d 1095 (D.C. Cir. 1979)..... 22

*N.Y. State Conf. of Blue Cross & Blue Shield Plans v. Travelers
 Ins. Co.*,
 514 U.S. 645 (1995)..... 11, 12, 15, 16

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
 THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

1 *Nat’l Ass’n of Home Builders v. San Joaquin Valley Unified*
 2 *Air Pollution Control Dist.*,
 3 627 F.3d 730 (9th Cir. 2010) 16, 17
 4 *Puerto Rico v. Franklin Cal. Tax-Free Trust*,
 5 579 U.S. 115 (2016)..... 10
 6 *Rowe v. N.H. Motor Transp. Ass’n*,
 7 552 U.S. 364 (2008)..... 9, 18
 8 **Constitutional Provisions**
 9 U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2..... 10
 10 **Statutes And Rules**
 11 15 U.S.C. § 1681t 11
 12 29 U.S.C. § 1144..... 11
 13 42 U.S.C. § 7543..... 11, 12, 15, 17
 14 49 U.S.C. § 13102..... 13
 15 49 U.S.C. § 14501..... 9, 11
 16 49 U.S.C. § 41713..... 11, 13, 17
 17 **Other Authorities**
 18 CA.gov, *Logistics & Infrastructure*..... 19
 19 Cal. Dep’t of Justice, *Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation*
 20 *Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act* 19
 21 Congressional Research Serv., *Supply Disruptions and the U.S. Economy*
 22 (May 13, 2022) 20
 23 Dan Walters, *Southern Cal Ports and Warehouses Face Threats*,
 24 *Cal Matters* (July 13, 2022) 18, 19
 25 Jeff Horseman, *Inland Empire is Warehouse Central, But How Did It*
 26 *Happen?*, *The Press-Enterprise* (Sept. 29, 2021) 18, 20
 27 LA: The Port of Los Angeles, *Facts & Figures* (2021) 19, 22
 28

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
 THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

1 Mayumi Brewster, *Annual Retail Trade Survey Shows Impact of Online*
2 *Shopping on Retail Sales During COVID-19 Pandemic,*
3 Census.gov (Apr. 27, 2022)..... 19
4 N.Y.C. Office of the Mayor, *Mayor de Blasio Releases Vision for Sustainable*
5 *Freight Network* (Dec. 15, 2021)..... 22
6 PBS News Hour, *U.S. Inflation at 9.1 Percent, A Record High* (July 13, 2022)..... 20
7 SCAQMD, *Second Draft Staff Report* (Apr. 2021)..... 21
8 The White House, *FACT SHEET: Lowering Prices and Leveling the Playing*
9 *Field in Ocean Shipping* (Feb. 28, 2022) 21
10 The White House, *Why the Pandemic has Disrupted Supply Chains*
11 (June 17, 2021) 21
12 U.S. Dep’t of Transp., *Supply Chain Assessment of the Transportation*
13 *Industrial Base: Freight and Logistics* (Feb. 2022) 21
14 U.S. Dep’t of Transp., *USDOT Supply Chain Tracker Shows Historic Levels*
15 *of Goods Coming into U.S., Continued Challenges with Congestion*
16 (May 13, 2022) 20
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

1 **I. INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE**¹

2 The Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America (“Chamber”) is
3 the world’s largest business federation. It represents approximately 300,000 direct
4 members and indirectly represents the interests of more than three million
5 companies and professional organizations of every size, in every industry sector,
6 and from every region of the country. An important function of the Chamber is to
7 represent the interests of its members in matters before Congress, the Executive
8 Branch, and the courts. To that end, the Chamber regularly files *amicus curiae*
9 briefs in cases, like this one, that raise issues of concern to the nation’s business
10 community, including briefs on preemption issues.

11 American Trucking Associations, Inc. (“ATA”), is the national association of
12 the trucking industry. Its direct membership includes approximately 1,800 trucking
13 companies, and in conjunction with 50 affiliated state trucking organizations, it
14 represents over 30,000 motor carriers of every size, type, and class of motor carrier
15 operation. ATA members have an acute interest in this matter, because many of
16 them regularly move freight by commercial truck to and from warehouses within
17 the South Coast Air Quality Management District, or own or operate warehouses
18 within the District that are directly regulated by Rule 2305. In addition, ATA has
19 regularly been involved (either as a party or an amicus) in cases involving federal
20 preemption concerns relating to transportation.

21 The California Chamber of Commerce (“CalChamber”) is a non-profit
22 business association with over 14,000 members, both individual and corporate,
23 representing 25% of the state’s private sector and virtually every economic interest
24 in the state of California. While CalChamber represents several of the largest
25 corporations in California, seventy-five percent of its members have 100 or fewer

26 _____
27 ¹ No counsel for any party that authored this brief in whole or in part and no entity
28 or person, aside from *amici curiae*, its members, or its counsel, made any monetary
contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief.

1 employees. CalChamber acts on behalf of the business community to improve the
2 state’s economic and jobs climate by representing business on a broad range of
3 legislative, regulatory, and legal issues.

4 The Retail Litigation Center, Inc. (“RLC”) is the only trade organization
5 solely dedicated to representing the retail industry in the courts. RLC’s members
6 include many of the country’s largest and most innovative retailers. Collectively,
7 they employ millions of workers throughout the United States, provide goods and
8 services to tens of millions of consumers, and account for tens of billions of dollars
9 in annual sales. RLC member retailers strive to be active allies and collaborators on
10 combating climate change and reducing emissions. RLC provides courts with
11 retail-industry perspectives on important legal issues impacting its members, and
12 highlights industry-wide consequences of significant pending cases.

13 The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles Area Chamber of
14 Commerce, Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce, South Bay Association of
15 Chambers of Commerce, Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce, San Pedro
16 Chamber of Commerce, Garden Grove Chamber of Commerce, Santa Maria Valley
17 Chamber of Commerce, Southwest California Legislative Council,
18 Murrieta/Wildomar Chamber of Commerce, Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce,
19 Yorba Linda Chamber of Commerce, Tulare Chamber of Commerce, Santa Clarita
20 Valley Chamber of Commerce, Citrus Heights Chamber of Commerce, Oceanside
21 Chamber of Commerce, West Ventura County Business Alliance, Elsinore Valley
22 Chamber of Commerce, Industry Business Council, Harbor Association of Industry
23 and Commerce, Greater High Desert Chamber of Commerce, Danville Area
24 Chamber of Commerce, Laguna Niguel Chamber of Commerce, and Greater
25 Riverside Chambers of Commerce (hereinafter, collectively, “Local Chambers of
26 Commerce”), are non-profit business associations representing both individual and
27 corporate private sector entities in the state of California. The Local Chambers of
28

1 Commerce act on behalf of their local businesses to improve the economic and jobs
2 climate in their respective communities.

3 Consistent with this extensive interest and history in cases involving federal-
4 preemption principles, the Chamber, ATA, CalChamber, RLC, and Local
5 Chambers of Commerce submit this brief to provide context on the effects of the
6 Rules at issue in this litigation on the U.S. economy, including not only the trucking
7 industry but the broader transportation sector, retail, and all businesses that rely on
8 an efficient, nationally regulated transportation system. *Amici* and their members
9 greatly benefit from federal rules that advance important societal and statutory
10 objectives such as environmental protection, while providing a uniform regulatory
11 regime across the country that supports a consistent, nationwide market for
12 products and services. Local rules of the kind at issue here improperly undermine
13 the federal framework and the value it provides toward achieving these important
14 objectives.

15 **II. INTRODUCTION**

16 In Section 209(a) of the Clean Air Act (“CAA”), Congress expressly
17 preempted States and their political subdivisions from enacting any law, regulation,
18 or other standard *relating to* the emissions of new motor vehicles or new motor
19 vehicles engines. And in the Airline Deregulation Act (“ADA”), Congress
20 expressly preempted States and their political subdivisions from enacting or
21 enforcing any law, regulation, or other provision having the force of law *related to*
22 a price, route, or service of an air carrier when such carrier is transporting property
23 by motor vehicle. In violation of these express preemption provisions, Defendants
24 South Coast Air Quality Management District and its Governing Board
25 (collectively, the “District”) adopted Rule 2305 and Rule 316 (“the Rules”), which
26 effectively require warehouses within the District to purchase, or cause to be
27 purchased zero-emission or near-zero-emission vehicles to be used as the trucks
28 transporting the freight stored at District warehouses. The U.S. Supreme Court

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

1 rejected similar efforts by the District in *Engine Manufacturers Association v.*
2 *South Coast Air Quality Management District*, 541 U.S. 246 (2004). The Court
3 held that Section 209(a) applied to a command with accompanying sanctions
4 requiring persons to buy vehicles with particular emissions characteristics. So too
5 here. For the same reason, these new Rules are similarly preempted by the CAA.
6 The District’s characterization of such Rules as “indirect source reviews” in order
7 to escape the CAA’s preemptive scope fails. The Rules are designed to regulate
8 trucks, not whole facilities, thereby rendering the Rules squarely within Section
9 209(a) preemption. And because the Rules attempt to regulate the terms of service
10 for trucking companies, imposing impermissible economic regulations on trucking
11 operations related to air carriers, they are similarly preempted by the ADA.²

12 Allowing these Rules to stand would have grave consequences for the
13 Nation’s already over-stressed supply chain. The District and the related Inland
14 Empire region is a massive, nationally important hub for warehousing and shipping,
15 with particular emphasis on trucking and road-level freight shipping, responsible
16 for about a third of all goods shipped nationwide. Both increases in consumer
17 demand and the COVID-19 pandemic have led to unprecedented stress on our
18 Nation’s supply chain, further underscoring the importance of the warehouses and
19 efficient movement of goods in and out of the District.

20 To ease the stress on our Nation’s supply chain and guarantee that supply can
21 meet consumer demand, it is crucial for the transportation and logistics industries to

22
23 ² For similar reasons, the Rules are also expressly preempted by the Federal
24 Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994 (“FAAAA”), 49 U.S.C.
25 § 14501(c)(1), which contains identically worded preemption language with respect
26 to motor carriers. *See Rowe v. N.H. Motor Transp. Ass’n*, 552 U.S. 364, 370
27 (2008). However, although the plaintiff and the plaintiff-intervenor each assert
28 claims for relief based on the FAAAA in their complaints, Dkt.1 at 26–29; Dkt.32
at 31–32, their summary judgment motions are limited to their CAA and ADA
claims, and so *Amici* also limit this brief to analyzing those issues.

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

1 retain and recruit additional drivers and trucks. Yet the District’s Rules seek to
2 impose massive regulatory demands and compliance costs on one of the busiest
3 shipping and warehouse regions in the country, without regard for the inevitable
4 disruptions this will cause to the supply chain and national economy. These
5 increased costs will likely result in further delays and shortages in consumer goods,
6 causing price hikes for consumers across the country and contributing to already
7 historic levels of inflation. Allowing the Rules to stand would also encourage other
8 local and regional governments to impose similar emissions rules, creating an
9 unworkable, patchwork system of emissions requirements for shipping companies
10 and warehouses across the country, unraveling Congress’s carefully calibrated
11 national transportation system, and damaging a crucial element of our national
12 economy.

13 For these reasons, the Court should grant Plaintiff California Trucking
14 Association (“CTA”)’s and Plaintiff-Intervenor Airlines for America (“A4A”)’s
15 Motions For Summary Judgment.

16 **III. ARGUMENT**

17 **A. The CAA And ADA Preempt Rules 2305 And 316**

18 1.a. Under the Supremacy Clause, U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2, Congress has the
19 “power to preempt state law.” *Crosby v. Nat’l Foreign Trade Council*, 530 U.S.
20 363, 372 (2000); *see Gibbons v. Ogden*, 22 U.S. (9 Wheat.) 1, 211 (1824). When
21 Congress explicitly preempts state laws by enacting a preemption provision in a
22 federal statute, *see Kansas v. Garcia*, 140 S. Ct. 791, 801 (2020), all that courts
23 must do to enforce that provision “is to identify the domain expressly pre-empted.”
24 *Dan’s City Used Cars, Inc. v. Pelkey*, 569 U.S. 251, 260 (2013) (citation omitted).
25 Courts “do not invoke any presumption against pre-emption”; rather, they “instead
26 focus on the plain wording of the clause, which necessarily contains the best
27 evidence of Congress’ pre-emptive intent,” *Puerto Rico v. Franklin Cal. Tax-Free*
28 *Trust*, 579 U.S. 115, 125 (2016) (citation omitted)—including the substance and

1 breadth of such preemption, *see Morales v. Trans World Airlines, Inc.*, 504 U.S.
2 374, 383 (1992); *see also Engine Mfrs. Ass’n v. S. Coast Air Quality Mgmt. Dist.*,
3 541 U.S. 246, 252–53 (2004).

4 Congress often preempts state laws expressly by enacting preemption
5 provisions that prohibit States from enacting laws “relating to” some topic or field.
6 *See, e.g.*, CAA § 209(a) (42 U.S.C. § 7543(a)); 29 U.S.C. § 1144(a) (ERISA
7 preemption); 49 U.S.C. § 41713(b)(1) (ADA preemption); 49 U.S.C. § 14501(c)
8 (FAAAA preemption); 15 U.S.C. § 1681t(b)(1) (FCRA preemption). When
9 considering such “relating to” preemption clauses, the Supreme Court has explained
10 that such clauses have a “broad scope” and “an expansive sweep”; are “broadly
11 worded” and “deliberately expansive”; and are “conspicuous for [their] breadth.”
12 *Morales*, 504 U.S. at 383–84 (citations omitted). These express “relat[ing] to”
13 preemption clauses are, in short, “comprehensive,” *Gobeille v. Liberty Mut. Ins.*
14 *Co.*, 577 U.S. 312, 319 (2016), necessarily encompassing all state laws “ha[ving] a
15 connection with, or reference to,” the subject of the federal statute, *Morales*, 504
16 U.S. at 384 (citations omitted). Their sweep may include, moreover, state laws that
17 only “indirect[ly]” relate to the federally regulated subject matter, if the “effects” of
18 those state laws—“by intent or otherwise”—are sufficiently “acute.” *N.Y. State*
19 *Conf. of Blue Cross & Blue Shield Plans v. Travelers Ins. Co.*, 514 U.S. 645, 668
20 (1995).

21 b. This case deals with two express preemption provisions—one in Section
22 209(a) of the CAA and the other in the ADA (as well as the motor-carrier
23 preemption provision of the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of
24 1994 (“FAAAA”), which contains identically worded preemption language).

25 Section 209(a) of the CAA provides, in relevant part, that “[n]o State or any
26 political subdivision thereof shall adopt or attempt to enforce any standard relating
27 to the control of emissions from new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines
28 subject to this part.” 42 U.S.C. § 7543(a). The term “standard” in Section 209(a)

1 means “that which is established by authority, custom, or general consent, as a
2 model or example; criterion; test”—and “[t]he criteria referred to in § 209 relate to
3 the emission characteristics of a vehicle or engine.” *Engine Mfrs. Ass’n*, 541 U.S.
4 at 255 (citations omitted). So, by preempting any law of a state or political
5 subdivision thereof “relating to the control of emissions,” § 209(a) (emphasis
6 added), Section 209(a) bars those state/political-subdivision laws “ha[ving] a
7 connection with, or reference to,” *Morales*, 504 U.S. at 384 (citations omitted), “the
8 emission characteristics of a vehicle or engine,” *Engine Mfrs. Ass’n*, 541 U.S. at
9 253 (citations omitted).

10 The Supreme Court decision in *Engine Manufacturers Association*—
11 explicitly applying Section 209(a) to prior emissions-based rules issued by the same
12 District Defendant here—is particularly instructive as to the breadth of Section
13 209(a). *Engine Manufacturers Association* held that Section 209(a) applied to
14 certain “Fleet Rules” that “generally prohibit[ed] the purchase or lease by various
15 public and private fleet operators of vehicles that do not comply with stringent
16 emission requirements.” 541 U.S. at 248. Most consequentially, these rules
17 required “the purchase or lease of ‘alternative-fuel vehicles’” or “vehicles that meet
18 certain emission specifications established by [a state board].” *Id.* at 249–50. In
19 holding these rules did not escape Section 209(a)’s preemptive scope, the Court
20 rejected the District’s argument that only regulation of sellers of vehicles, not of
21 purchasers, falls within Section 209(a), explaining that such a distinction “ha[d] no
22 basis in the text of the statute” and “would make no sense” for “pre-emption
23 purposes.” *Id.* at 255. This is because “[a] command, accompanied by sanctions,
24 that certain purchasers may buy only vehicles with particular emission
25 characteristics is as much an ‘attempt to enforce’ a ‘standard’ as a command,
26 accompanied by sanctions, that a certain percentage of a manufacturer’s sales
27 volume must consist of such vehicles.” *Id.*; accord *Travelers*, 514 U.S. at 668
28 (explaining that a “relating to” preemption clause may preempt a state law that

1 “indirect[ly]” regulates the subject matter by “produc[ing] such acute . . . economic
2 effects” that force regulated entities “to adopt a certain” course of action). Finally,
3 that the rules “cover[ed] only certain purchasers and certain federally certified
4 vehicles” did not change the Section 209(a) analysis, because “if one State or
5 political subdivision may enact such rules, then so may any other; and the end
6 result would undo Congress’s carefully calibrated regulatory scheme.” *Engine*
7 *Mfrs. Ass’n*, 541 U.S. at 255.

8 In addition, this case implicates the express preemption provision of the
9 ADA. Under the ADA, a State or state agency may not “enact or enforce a law,
10 regulation, or other provision having the force and effect of law related to a price,
11 route, or service of an air carrier or carrier affiliated with a direct air carrier through
12 common controlling ownership when such carrier is transporting property by
13 aircraft or by motor vehicle (whether or not such property has had or will have a
14 prior or subsequent air movement).” 49 U.S.C. § 41713(b)(4)(A). The ADA
15 exempts from this preemptive reach only “the safety regulatory authority of a State
16 with respect to motor vehicles, the authority of a State to impose highway route
17 controls or limitations based on the size or weight of the motor vehicle or the
18 hazardous nature of the cargo, or the authority of a State to regulate motor carriers
19 with regard to minimum amounts of financial responsibility relating to insurance
20 requirements and self-insurance authorization,” or for the personal moving of
21 household goods. *Id.* § 41713(b)(4)(B); 49 U.S.C. § 13102(12). In effect, the ADA
22 prohibits state laws that affect “such things as the frequency and scheduling of
23 transportation,” as well as “the selection of markets to or from which transportation
24 is provided,” and the like. *Air Transp. Ass’n of Am. v. City & Cnty. of S.F.*, 266
25 F.3d 1064, 1071 (9th Cir. 2001).

26 In *Morales*, the Supreme Court interpreted the ADA’s broadly worded
27 preemption provision as preempting any state enforcement of rules “having a
28 connection with or reference to airline ‘rates, routes, or services.’” 504 U.S. at 384.

1 And the Ninth Circuit has further explained that ADA preemption plainly extends
2 to the “trucking operations of . . . an air carrier,” which are “part and parcel of the
3 air delivery system,” and so “preempts action by the state that regulates the rates
4 and terms of service offered by an air carrier.” *Fed. Express Corp. v. Cal. Pub.*
5 *Utilities Comm’n*, 936 F.2d 1075, 1078 (9th Cir. 1991). That preemptive reach
6 includes state regulation of the rates and terms of the trucking aspects of an air
7 carrier’s operations, which “are an essential component of the system,” because to
8 do so involves impermissible “economic regulation.” *Id.* at 1077–78. Thus, the
9 Ninth Circuit has held that a state agency’s “regulation of rates, of discounts and
10 promotional pricing, of claims, of overcharges, of bills of lading and freight bills,
11 and its imposition of fees” are all preempted, as they are either “obviously
12 economic—they bear on price”—or “relate to the terms on which the air carrier
13 offers its services” and so affect cost, all contrary to the ADA. *Id.* at 1078.

14 2. Here, both Section 209(a) of the CAA and the ADA expressly preempt the
15 District’s Rules.

16 *First*, the CAA preempts the Rules. As CTA’s brief more fully explains, the
17 District’s Rules require warehouses with 100,000 or more square feet of indoor
18 floor space to offset the emissions of the trucks that visit their facilities, or else face
19 civil or criminal penalties. California Trucking Association’s Statement Of
20 Uncontroverted Material Facts (“UF”), Dkt.63–1, at #16–19. A warehouse may
21 offset those emissions through three pathways: (1) directly acquiring zero-emission
22 or near-zero-emission trucks to replace their own fleet; (2) indirectly acquiring
23 zero-emission or near-zero-emission trucks by compelling contractors to replace
24 their fleets with such trucks; and (3) avoiding purchasing zero-emission or near-
25 zero-emission trucks, either directly or indirectly, by paying a mitigation fee,
26 installing rooftop solar equipment, purchasing filter systems, or the like. UF #23–
27 34. According to the District’s own data and projections, the bottom-line cost
28 differentials between these three pathways is significant: the average annual cost

1 per square foot for the first pathway is \$0.27; the average annual cost per square
2 foot for the second pathway is \$0.09; and the average annual cost per square foot
3 for the third pathway is \$0.86. UF #27–29. Given these substantial differences, the
4 District expects that the third, non-truck-replacement pathway will “be chosen
5 rarely as a compliance option . . . due [to its] higher cost relative to other
6 compliance options.” UF # 30.

7 Consistent with Supreme Court precedent, the District’s Rules requiring
8 warehouses to purchase (either directly or indirectly) zero-emission or near-zero-
9 emission trucks are preempted by Section 209(a) of the CAA as a “standard relating
10 to the control of emissions from new motor vehicles” from a “political subdivision”
11 of a State. 42 U.S.C. § 7543(a). Just as in *Engine Manufacturers Association*, the
12 District’s Rules force certain entities—here, warehouses; there, fleet operators—to
13 acquire vehicles that “meet certain emission specifications,” 541 U.S. at 250, thus
14 qualifying as a law “ha[ving] a connection with, or reference to,” *Morales*, 504 U.S.
15 at 384 (citations omitted), “the emission characteristics of a vehicle or engine,”
16 *Engine Mfrs. Ass’n*, 541 U.S. at 253 (citations omitted). Specifically, because the
17 Rules “command, accompanied by sanctions,” that warehouses acquire only trucks
18 “with particular emission characteristics”—zero-emission or near-zero-emission—
19 that “is as much an ‘attempt to enforce’ a ‘standard’ as a command, accompanied
20 by sanctions, that a certain percentage of a manufacturer’s sales volume must
21 consist of such vehicles.” *Id.* at 255. Thus, Section 209(a) preempts the Rules.
22 And while the Rules’ second pathway purports only to require warehouses
23 *indirectly* to acquire zero-emission or near-zero-emission trucks, such “indirect” yet
24 “acute” regulation does not escape Section 209(a)’s preemptive scope. *See*
25 *Travelers*, 514 U.S. at 668.

26 The Rules’ recognition of a third pathway that does not require the direct or
27 indirect acquisition of zero-emission or near-zero-emission trucks does not change
28 the Section 209(a) analysis. The “exorbitant” compliance costs of this pathway

1 mean that it presents nothing more than “a Hobson’s choice” that cannot erase the
2 “mandate[]” present in the first two pathways. *Travelers*, 514 U.S. at 664.

3 Even indulging the implausible hypothesis that some warehouses would
4 choose this third pathway, the Rules’ first two pathways would still undoubtedly
5 compel the overwhelming majority of warehouses to acquire zero-emission or near-
6 zero-emission trucks. If “other” political subdivisions followed the District’s lead
7 by “enact[ing] such rules,” the “end result would undo Congress’s carefully
8 calibrated regulatory scheme” under the CAA; thus Section 209(a) preempts the
9 Rules here. *Engine Mfrs. Ass’n*, 541 U.S. at 255.

10 More broadly, it “would make no sense” to allow the District to enforce the
11 Rules in the face of Section 209(a), given the District’s palpable intent and clear
12 regulatory design to impose a standard relating to the control of emissions from
13 new motor vehicles with these Rules. *Engine Mfrs. Ass’n*, 541 U.S. at 255; *accord*
14 *Travelers*, 514 U.S. at 668. As CTA’s brief powerfully shows, the District’s stated
15 “goal” with the Rules was “to reduce emissions from the most significant source—
16 trucks.” UF #49; *see also* UF #59. Thus, the District has candidly admitted that its
17 purpose with the Rules was to “provide a mechanism to require warehouse
18 operators to encourage [zero-emission] vehicle use at their facilities.” UF #56.
19 Indeed, the District believes that, with these Rules, it is trying “to solve a problem
20 that the federal government isn’t willing to step up to do, which is to regulate
21 trucks.” UF #51; *but see Engine Mfrs. Ass’n*, 541 U.S. at 255 (explaining that
22 “Congress’s carefully calibrated regulatory scheme” controls here).

23 The District’s attempts to characterize the Rules as akin to an “indirect
24 source review,” relying upon the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *National Association of*
25 *Home Builders v. San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District*, 627
26 F.3d 730 (9th Cir. 2010) (“*NAHB*”), fail. In *NAHB*, the San Joaquin Valley District
27 promulgated Rule 9510, which “regulate[d] emissions from development projects”
28 and required developers to submit information regarding “the construction

1 equipment [the developers] will use at the site in order to refine the estimate of how
2 much pollutant the site’s construction equipment will actually emit.” 627 F.3d at
3 732. The Ninth Circuit concluded that Rule 9510 escaped the CAA’s preemption
4 provision because it “target[ed] sites rather than equipment,” and evaluated such
5 development facilities “as a whole” based on a “facility-by-facility” review.
6 Because the rule looked at all sources of emissions, the Court explained, it qualified
7 as a true indirect source review properly allowed by the States. *NAHB*, 627 F.3d at
8 734–39. Here, however, the Rules are unmistakably directed at requiring
9 warehouses to acquire zero-emission or near-zero-emission trucks, UF #19–34, not
10 a whole-site review of emissions. In this regard, the Rules plainly qualify as a
11 “standard relating to the control of emissions from new motor vehicles or new
12 motor vehicle engines” preempted by the CAA, *see* 42 U.S.C. § 7543(a), not an
13 independent source rule. *NAHB* is not apposite.

14 *Second*, the Rules are similarly void under the ADA’s preemption provision.
15 As more fully explained in A4A’s brief, the District’s Rules impose statutorily
16 prohibited “economic regulation” on warehouse trucking operations, contrary to the
17 ADA. *Fed. Express*, 936 F.2d at 1078. Specifically, the Rules are directly tied to
18 the volume and nature of the trucks that arrive at warehouses in the District,
19 imposing costs and penalties on warehouses based on those trucks, *supra* pp.14–15,
20 thereby having a direct “‘connection with’ a price, route or service,” *Air Transp.*
21 *Ass’n of Am.*, 266 F.3d at 1071. Thus, the ADA preempts the Rules as
22 impermissibly “related to a price, route, or service of an air carrier or carrier
23 affiliated with a direct air carrier through common controlling ownership when such
24 carrier is transporting property by aircraft or by motor vehicle.” 49 U.S.C.
25 § 41713(b)(4)(A).

26 It does not matter whether the Rules are specifically directed at air carriers,
27 as the ADA’s preemptive reach extends further than “only state laws specifically
28 addressed to the airline industry.” *Morales*, 504 U.S. at 386. Nor does it matter

1 whether the Rules specifically seek to prescribe the prices, routes, or services of air
2 carriers, as the ADA’s “related to” preemption encompasses even laws that might
3 affect those things, *id.* at 388, more than in a “tenuous, remote, or peripheral . . .
4 manner,” *Rowe*, 552 U.S. at 371. The Rules’ extensive regime of costs and
5 penalties for warehouses and transportation companies will necessarily affect the
6 prices, routes, and services of air carriers with trucking divisions, *supra* pp.14–15
7 (and, for the same reasons, those of motor carriers, who are similarly shielded from
8 state and local regulations relating to their prices, routes, or services under the
9 FAAAA).

10 **B. The Rules Would Have Damaging Impacts On Warehouse,**
11 **Shipping, And Logistics Industries Nationwide**

12 If allowed to stand, the District’s Rules will significantly harm the shipping
13 and logistics industries nationwide, exacerbating problems already facing an over-
14 burdened supply chain in light of the persistent impacts of COVID-19.

15 The Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and their supporting warehouses,
16 are a massive hub for trucking and road-level shipping of goods nationwide. There,
17 “the supply chain doesn’t just flow. It gushes,” Jeff Horseman, *Inland Empire is*
18 *Warehouse Central, But How Did It Happen?*, *The Press-Enterprise* (Sept. 29,
19 2021),³ leading logistics to become “Southern California’s all-important . . .
20 industry,” Dan Walters, *Southern Cal Ports and Warehouses Face Threats*, *Cal*
21 *Matters* (July 13, 2022).⁴ In 2019, the Inland Empire, largely within the District’s
22 geographic coverage, was home to 21 of the country’s 100 biggest logistics leases,
23 as part of the boom of warehouse development in the region, Cal. Dep’t of Justice,
24 *Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the*

25 _____
26 ³ Available at <https://www.pressenterprise.com/2021/09/29/inland-empire-is-warehouse-central-but-how-did-it-happen/>.

27 ⁴ Available at <https://calmatters.org/commentary/2022/07/southern-cal-ports-and-warehouses-face-threats/>.
28

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

1 *California Environmental Quality Act* 1,⁵ necessary to keep up with the substantial
2 flow of goods coming through the District, stemming from the rise in Asian
3 manufacturing over the past several decades, Walters, *supra*. Roughly three
4 quarters of all goods shipped on the west coast, and 31 percent of all goods shipped
5 nationwide, pass through the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach alone,
6 accounting for approximately \$294 billion in cargo value in calendar year 2021.
7 LA: The Port of Los Angeles, *Facts & Figures* (2021);⁶ *see also* Walters, *supra*.
8 The shipping and logistics industry maintains almost 1 million jobs just in the five-
9 county region. Trucking is the predominant shipping method, with approximately
10 800 trucking companies, responsible for roughly 16,000 trucks, operating at the
11 Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to move the massive amount of freight that
12 comes through the port. CA.gov, *Logistics & Infrastructure*.⁷ Warehouses are
13 essential to store all of this cargo/freight as it enters the country, Walters, *supra*,
14 before moving to its next destination, largely by truck, CA.gov, *Logistics &*
15 *Infrastructure, supra*.

16 The COVID-19 pandemic increased the need for a stable and productive
17 supply chain, thereby underscoring the necessity for largescale shipping out of the
18 warehouses within the Inland Empire. The pandemic spiked demand for online
19 shopping and e-commerce, Mayumi Brewster, *Annual Retail Trade Survey Shows*
20 *Impact of Online Shopping on Retail Sales During COVID-19 Pandemic*,
21 Census.gov (Apr. 27, 2022),⁸ and so warehouses faced additional demands to store

23 ⁵ Available at [https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/environment/warehouse-](https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/environment/warehouse-best-practices.pdf)
24 [best-practices.pdf](https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/environment/warehouse-best-practices.pdf).

25 ⁶ Available at [https://kentico.portoflosangeles.org/getmedia/c39cbb51-d52e-44bd-](https://kentico.portoflosangeles.org/getmedia/c39cbb51-d52e-44bd-89c8-41eba408ab12/2021-facts-figures)
26 [89c8-41eba408ab12/2021-facts-figures](https://kentico.portoflosangeles.org/getmedia/c39cbb51-d52e-44bd-89c8-41eba408ab12/2021-facts-figures).

27 ⁷ Available at <https://business.ca.gov/advantages/logistics-and-infrastructure/>.

28 ⁸ Available at [https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2022/04/ecommerce-sales-](https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2022/04/ecommerce-sales-surged-during-pandemic.html)
[surged-during-pandemic.html](https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2022/04/ecommerce-sales-surged-during-pandemic.html).

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

1 goods bought virtually with one-day delivery, Horseman, *supra*. As a result, the
2 entire country suffered from “stressed supply chains, as historic levels of goods
3 coming into the U.S.,” combined with various other factors, “cause[d] bottlenecks,
4 congestion, and challenges in global markets.” U.S. Dep’t of Transp., *USDOT*
5 *Supply Chain Tracker Shows Historic Levels of Goods Coming into U.S.,*
6 *Continued Challenges with Congestion* (May 13, 2022).⁹ These numbers have
7 largely been maintained even as the country has moved beyond the height of the
8 pandemic, with the Port of Los Angeles still seeing large year-over-year gains in
9 number of containers passing through, with April of 2022 finishing as its second-
10 highest April on record. *Id.*

11 While the supply chain and trucking in particular have partially recovered
12 from the delays and problems that arose during COVID-19, there remain substantial
13 difficulties with shipping of goods across the country. Consumer demands in our
14 increasingly global economy continue apace, and supply chain pressure remains
15 higher than at any time in recent history. Congressional Research Serv., *Supply*
16 *Disruptions and the U.S. Economy* 1–2 (May 13, 2022).¹⁰ This contributes to the
17 recent inflation hikes, *id.*, that have come to a four-decade peak this year, imposing
18 a “brutal impact . . . on many families,” PBS News Hour, *U.S. Inflation at 9.1*
19 *Percent, A Record High* (July 13, 2022).¹¹ The Department of Transportation has
20 emphasized “recruit[ing] more truck drivers” and “retain[ing] more drivers in the
21 profession” in order to “address disruptions” in both the near and longer term. U.S.
22 Dep’t of Transp., *Supply Chain Assessment of the Transportation Industrial Base:*

23

24

25 ⁹ Available at <https://www.transportation.gov/briefing-room/usdot-supply-chain-tracker-shows-historic-levels-goods-coming-us-continued-challenges>.

26 ¹⁰ Available at <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IN/IN11926>.

27 ¹¹ Available at <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/economy/u-s-inflation-at-9-1-percent-a-record-high>.
28

1 *Freight and Logistics* xii–xiii (Feb. 2022).¹²

2 Despite these challenges, the Rules increase the regulatory demands and
3 corresponding costs on warehouses and shipping operations in one of the busiest
4 and most important shipping regions in the entire country, if not the world, and risk
5 further disruptions of the supply chain. The Rules apply, by the District’s own
6 assessment, to approximately 750 million square feet of warehouse space in the
7 District, over 60% of all warehouse space in the region. SCAQMD, *Second Draft*
8 *Staff Report* at 76 (Apr. 2021).¹³ As applied to those qualifying warehouses, the
9 Rules impose potential mitigation fees anywhere from \$3.1 to \$6 billion. UF #39–
10 43. Increases in shipping costs, like the inevitable increase in fees paid by
11 warehouses under the Rules, frequently get passed down to the public,
12 “translat[ing] into higher prices for American consumers.” The White House,
13 *FACT SHEET: Lowering Prices and Leveling the Playing Field in Ocean Shipping*
14 (Feb. 28, 2022).¹⁴

15 Disruptions caused by the inevitable business effects of these new and
16 exorbitant compliance costs can cause further shortages in consumer goods,
17 resulting in “abrupt price increases” for consumers of all freight. The White House,
18 *Why the Pandemic has Disrupted Supply Chains* (June 17, 2021).¹⁵ Given that the
19 Inland Empire is responsible for goods and freight shipped all across the country,
20

21 ¹² Available at [https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2022-03/EO%](https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2022-03/EO%2014017%20-%20DOT%20Sectoral%20Supply%20Chain%20Assessment%20-%20Freight%20and%20Logistics_FINAL_508.pdf)
22 [2014017%20-%20DOT%20Sectoral%20Supply%20Chain%20Assessment%20-](https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2022-03/EO%2014017%20-%20DOT%20Sectoral%20Supply%20Chain%20Assessment%20-%20Freight%20and%20Logistics_FINAL_508.pdf)
23 [%20Freight%20and%20Logistics_FINAL_508.pdf](https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2022-03/EO%2014017%20-%20DOT%20Sectoral%20Supply%20Chain%20Assessment%20-%20Freight%20and%20Logistics_FINAL_508.pdf).

24 ¹³ Available at [http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/fbmsm-docs/pr-](http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/fbmsm-docs/pr-2305_sr_2nd-draft_4-7-21_clean.pdf)
25 [2305_sr_2nd-draft_4-7-21_clean.pdf](http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/fbmsm-docs/pr-2305_sr_2nd-draft_4-7-21_clean.pdf).

26 ¹⁴ Available at [https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/02/28/fact-sheet-lowering-prices-and-leveling-the-playing-field-in-ocean-shipping/)
27 [releases/2022/02/28/fact-sheet-lowering-prices-and-leveling-the-playing-field-in-](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/02/28/fact-sheet-lowering-prices-and-leveling-the-playing-field-in-ocean-shipping/)
28 [ocean-shipping/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/02/28/fact-sheet-lowering-prices-and-leveling-the-playing-field-in-ocean-shipping/).

¹⁵ Available at [https://www.whitehouse.gov/cea/written-materials/2021/06/17/why-](https://www.whitehouse.gov/cea/written-materials/2021/06/17/why-the-pandemic-has-disrupted-supply-chains/)
[the-pandemic-has-disrupted-supply-chains/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/cea/written-materials/2021/06/17/why-the-pandemic-has-disrupted-supply-chains/).

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

1 LA: The Port of Los Angeles, *Facts & Figures*, *supra*, these consumer price
2 increases are likely to have broad-based effects on the nation’s economy, imposing
3 significant hardship on the national economy and on consumers’ already-stretched
4 wallets. The likelihood of such widespread, national repercussions merely
5 underscores the purpose of federal preemption in the CAA context—to empower
6 the federal government to enact uniform regulation of interstate commerce—even
7 in the context of nationwide regulation of emissions. *See Motor & Equip. Mfrs.*
8 *Ass’n v. E.P.A.*, 627 F.2d 1095, 1109 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

9 Finally, even beyond the adverse effects of the Rules at issue here, a decision
10 permitting the District to impose such costs on warehouses could encourage the
11 proliferation of similar requirements in other jurisdictions.¹⁶ If this Court permits
12 the District’s Rules to stand, those Rules will likely serve as a blueprint for other
13 local and regional governments to impose extensive requirements and costs upon
14 transportation and warehouse companies serving integral functions in our national
15 economy and interconnected supply chain. The inevitable result would be a
16 patchwork system of differing, and at times incompatible, requirements that would
17 destroy “Congress’s carefully calibrated regulatory scheme” intended to create a
18 unified, nationwide system for mobile source emissions. *Engine Mfrs. Ass’n*, 541
19 U.S. at 255. Disunity and disruption in the nationwide supply chain would follow.

20 **IV. CONCLUSION**

21 This Court should grant CTA’s and A4A’s motions for summary judgment,
22 finding the Rules preempted by the CAA and ADA.

23
24
25 ¹⁶ The District is not the only area in the country where local government officials
26 are concerned with air pollution attributed to the transportation sector. *See N.Y.C.*
27 *Office of the Mayor, Mayor de Blasio Releases Vision for Sustainable Freight*
28 *Network* (Dec. 15, 2021), available at <https://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-mayor/news/829-21/mayor-de-blasio-releases-vision-sustainable-freight-network>.

1 Dated: November 21, 2022

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON
SANDERS LLP

2

3

By: /s/ Elizabeth Holt Andrews

4

Elizabeth Holt Andrews

5

Misha Tseytlin

6

Attorneys for *Amici Curiae*
Chamber of Commerce of the United
States of America, et al.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111