1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 7 CONFEDERATED TRIBES AND BANDS OF 8 THE YAKAMA NATION, a federally-NO. CV-10-3050-EFS recognized Indian tribal 9 government and as parens patriae on behalf of the Enrolled members ORDER GRANTING TEMPORARY 10 of the confederated Tribes and RESTRAINING ORDER and Bands of the Yakama Nation; SETTING PRELIMINARY 11 FRIENDS OF THE COLUMBIA GORGE, and INJUNCTION HEARING Oregon non-profit corporation; 12 NORTHWEST ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE CENTER, an Oregon non-profit 13 corporation; COLUMBIA RIVERKEEPER, a Washington non-profit 14 corporation; DAWN STOVER, a Washington resident; DANIEL 15 LICHTENWALD, a Washington resident;, 16 Plaintiffs, 17 v. 18 UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE, 19 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ANIMAL AND PLANT 20 HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE; TOM VILSACK, Secretary of the United 21 States Department of Agriculture; CINDY SMITH, administrator of the 22 United States Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant 23 health Inspection Service, 24 Defendants. 25 26

A telephonic hearing occurred in the above-captioned matter on July 29, 2010, on Plaintiffs Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation's ("the Tribe") Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (Ct. Rec. 3) and Friends of Columbia Gorge, Northwest Environmental Defense Center, Columbia Riverkeeper, Dawn Stover, and Daniel Lichtenwald's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (Ct. Rec. 24). Plaintiffs seek a temporary order preventing the United States Department of Agriculture ("USDA") from authorizing shipments of Hawaiian garbage into the mainland. Plaintiffs were represented by Michael Chappell, Tom Buchele, Anthony Broadman, Gabriel Galanda, and Julio Carranza.

Defendants USDA, USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), USDA Secretary Tom Vilsack, and APHIS Administrator Cindy Smith received notice of the lawsuit and the motions. They were represented by James Booth, Ty Bair, Sara Costello, Pam DeRusha, and Margaret Burnes-Roth.

After reviewing the submitted material and relevant authority and hearing from counsel, the Court is informed. As explained below, a temporary restraining order is granted.

A temporary restraining order may be issued to maintain the status quo if the plaintiffs establish that they are "likely to succeed on the merits, that [they are] likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in [their] favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest." Winter v.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ms. DeRusha spoke on Defendants' behalf. She had an opportunity to read the Complaint, but had not yet read all of the documents relating to the motions for temporary restraining order.

NRDC, 129 S. Ct. 365, 374 (2008). The Ninth Circuit uses a "sliding scale" under which the temporary restraining order may be issued if there are serious questions going to the merits and the balance of hardships tips sharply in the plaintiffs' favor, along with satisfaction of the two other Winter factors. Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, no. 09-35756 (9th Cir. July 28, 2010).

The Court finds this standard is met. First, there are serious questions relating to whether the USDA adequately analyzed the environmental impacts of shipment and receipt of Hawaiian waste into the mainland, and in particular, receipt into a Washington or Oregon port followed by transport and burial into the Roosevelt Landfill, which is located on lands ceded by the Yakama Nation in Washington in close proximity to the Columbia River. No environmental impact statement was prepared, and the May 2010 Environmental Analysis, and related Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), failed to engage in any specific analysis of the impacts that the shipment of Hawaiian garbage may have on the Northwest area affected by this shipment, including the ports, routes of train or truck travel, and the Roosevelt Landfill. There also was no analysis of alternatives, other than a no-action alternative. For these reasons, the Court finds it likely that Plaintiffs will prevail on their National Environmental Protection Act claims. 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4370e (2000); 40 C.F.R. §§ 1501.1-1508.27 (2009). Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. National Highway Traffic Safety Admin., 538 F.3d 1172, 1220 (9th Cir. 2008). Further, there are also serious questions regarding whether the USDA complied with the National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. § 470 et seq., because it has not consulted with Washington's

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

Historic Preservation Officer. There are also serious questions about whether the USDA adequately consulted with the Tribe.

Second, Plaintiffs are likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of a temporary injunction enjoining the shipment of Hawaiian garbage. The Roosevelt Landfill is located in the area in which tribal members exercise their "in common" hunting, gathering, and fishing rights protected by the 1855 Treaty. The introduction of an invasive species or contamination by the Hawaiian garbage would immeasurably harm the resources and waterways enjoyed by the tribal members, the Plaintiff organizations, and the two individual Plaintiffs, as well as the Tribe's logging industry.

Third, the balance of equities tips sharply in Plaintiffs' favor. The USDA has an interest in encouraging economic growth, and Hawaii has an interest in having its garbage taken care off. However, the Plaintiffs' interests of ensuring that the environmental impacts, and the related economic consequences resulting from those environmental impacts, are fully considered before Hawaiian garbage is shipped to the mainland, trumps these interests. The prior USDA regulation barring the shipment of Hawaiian waste to the mainland evidences this interest.

Fourth, a temporary restraining order is in the public interest. Although garbage will remain on the ports in Hawaii longer than anticipated,<sup>2</sup> the garbage has already sat there for over 200 days. There

It is presently unknown when the Hawaiian waste is to be barged to the mainland because the USDA placed a temporary stay of such shipments by Hawaiian Waste Systems, LLC (HWS) due to tears in the plastic that wraps the bales of garbage.

was nothing before the Court indicating that a continued stay of the garbage in Hawaii would be detrimental to the Hawaiian public. In comparison, the introduction of an invasive species from Hawaii to the mainland would be detrimental to those who enjoy these lands and their wildlife and to the impacted industries, such as the logging and soft-fruit industries.

Accordingly, the Court determines Plaintiffs have established that a temporary restraining order is necessary. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- The Tribe's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (Ct. Rec.
  is GRANTED.
- 2. Friends of Columbia Gorge, Northwest Environmental Defense Center, Columbia Riverkeeper, Dawn Stover, and Daniel Lichtenwald's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (Ct. Rec. 24) is GRANTED (TRO) and RESET (the PI hearing) IN PART.
- 3. Until the Court rules on the Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Defendants are enjoined from:
  - a. authorizing shipments, subject to USDA-APHIS permitting, of Hawaiian garbage into the mainland, including those shipments authorized under any compliance agreements between Hawaiian Waste Systems, LLC ("HWS") and USDA-APHIS, and
  - b. permitting, authorizing, allowing, or otherwise granting permission to HWS or any other private trash hauling enterprise to load, ship, transport, or otherwise export Hawaiian garbage from Honolulu to the mainland.

## 

1	3. Plaintiffs shall post a \$100.00 bond no later than July 30,
2	2010.
3	4. A Preliminary Injunction hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for
4	Preliminary Injunction (Ct. Rec. $24$ ) is SET for August 30, 2010, at 9:00
5	a.m. in YAKIMA.
6	IT IS SO ORDERED. The District Court Executive is directed to
7	file this Order and provide copies of this Order to counsel.
8	<b>DATED</b> this <u>29th</u> day of July 2010
9	
10	S/ Edward F. Shea
11	EDWARD F. SHEA United States District Judge
12	
13	Q:\Civil\2010\3050.TRO.wpd
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

ORDER ~ 6