

Alaska Department of Law
List of Federal Issues and Conflicts
July 2020

<u>NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS</u>			
Case or Matter	Alignment with Federal Approach	Brief Description	Status
<p>Navigable Waterways <i>Sturgeon v. Frost</i> (in official capacity at Dept. of Interior) (Sup. Ct., 17-949).</p> <p>AAG C. Brooking</p>	Not aligned.	<p>Alaska intervened in support of plaintiff; after State’s case dismissed, filed amicus. The State intervened to challenge the U.S. Department of Interior’s (DOI) application of National Park Service (NPS) regulations to state navigable waterways. The Ninth Circuit originally ruled in favor of the DOI and dismissed the State’s independent challenge for lack of standing. State filed an amicus brief supporting Sturgeon’s challenge at the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court reversed the Ninth Circuit’s decision and remanded for further proceedings. On remand the Ninth Circuit again found for the DOI. The Supreme Court heard the case again and ruled in Mr. Sturgeon’s favor.</p>	<p>The State is not a party to the case but participated as an amicus, including supporting Mr. Sturgeon’s second cert. petition to the U.S. Supreme Court. In March 2019 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 9–0 in Mr. Sturgeon (and the State’s) favor; holding that the State’s navigable waters are not transformed into federal lands by virtue of falling within conservation system units created by the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). On remand Judge Holland issued an amended order. The NPS published proposed amended regulations.</p>
<p>Kuskokwim River/ Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA) Appeal.</p> <p>AAG J. Alloway</p>	Not aligned.	<p>The State requested a recordable disclaimer of interest on the Kuskokwim River to resolve a dispute over ownership of a portion of the riverbed. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) denied the request, and the State appealed to Interior Board of Land Appeals.</p>	<p>Briefing is complete and we are awaiting a decision by the IBLA.</p>
<p>Middle Fork, North Fork, and Dennison Fork of the Fortymile River—navigability.</p> <p>AAG J. Alloway</p>	Not aligned.	<p>BLM previously found portions of the Middle Fork of the Fortymile, North Fork of the Fortymile, Dennison Fork, and West Fork of the Dennison Fork non-navigable. In response to the State’s notice of intent to sue, BLM reversed its position on the Dennison Fork and the West Fork of the Dennison Fork, but not the other two rivers. The State filed a quiet title action on those rivers in October 2018.</p>	<p>BLM filed an answer denying the navigability of the disputed portions of the Middle Fork and North Fork of the Fortymile. The parties are engaged in discovery; trial is anticipated Summer 2021.</p>
<p>Navigable Waterways/ Togiak Public Use Management Plan (PUMP).</p> <p>AAG A. Nelson</p>	Not aligned.	<p>The PUMP asserts jurisdiction over, and directs the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to adopt regulations to limit unguided use on state navigable waterways in the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge.</p>	<p>The USFWS has not proposed the regulations yet.</p>

**Alaska Department of Law
List of Federal Issues and Conflicts**

<u>ACCESS AND LAND</u>			
Case or Matter	Alignment with Federal Approach	Brief Description	Status
<p>Roadless Rule - <i>State of Alaska v. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture</i> (D.C. Cir., 17-5260).</p> <p>AAGs M. Gramling, S. Lynch</p>	Not aligned.	<p>State challenged the application of the roadless rule in Alaska as well as nationwide. The roadless rule prohibits the building of roads in Inventoried Roadless Areas of national forests, which essentially shuts down resource development in many areas of the Tongass. On a parallel track, the State is pursuing regulatory relief for the Tongass.</p>	<p>In the litigation, the district court upheld the roadless rule, and the State appealed. Briefing has been completed, but the appellate court granted intervenor’s request to put the case on hold until the rulemaking is done. The State continues to object to the abeyance. On the rulemaking, the USDA proposed an exemption for the Tongass to the roadless rule. The public comment period for the proposed rule ended in December 2019. The USDA indicated to the court that the final environmental impact statement is anticipated to be published in July 2020 with the final rule to follow in August 2020.</p>
<p>R.S. 2477 Rights of Way - <i>State of Alaska v. U.S.</i> (4:13-cv-00008).</p> <p>AAGs J. Alloway, G. Dudek</p>	Not aligned.	<p>State sued the U.S. and others to quiet title to a number of R.S. 2477 rights-of-way near Chicken, Alaska.</p>	<p>At the district court level. The State successfully condemned the rights-of-way across Native allotment lands, which was necessary before the case proceeded on the main issues relating to land owned by the federal government. The Native allotment owners appealed that decision to the Ninth Circuit, but the remainder of the case is proceeding. The case is currently in the discovery phase, and trial is anticipated in the Fall 2021.</p>
<p>King Cove Road - <i>Friends of Izembek NWF v. Bernhardt</i> (3:19-cv-00216).</p> <p>AAGs S. Lynch, M. Gramling</p>	Aligned.	<p>For many years, residents of King Cove have been trying to get a road from the village to the airport at Cold Bay. The road would be primarily for health and safety purposes, as the airport at Cold Bay is the nearest location where large planes can land in the area’s often poor weather conditions. A road directly connecting these two towns would have to cross federally designated wilderness in the Izembek National Wildlife Refuge.</p>	<p>There have been three attempts to complete a land exchange with federal administrations. The State has participated as an intervenor-defendant and amicus curiae in past litigation. Most recently, King Cove Corporation and the U.S. Dept. of Interior (DOI) entered into a 2019 land exchange agreement, which, like previous similar agreements, has been challenged by environmental groups. On January 8, 2020, the State moved to intervene in the case in support of the agreement and the road. On June 1, 2020, the district court vacated the land exchange agreement after finding it violated the Administrative Procedures Act and Title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. The State is disappointed in the decision and considering its options.</p>

**Alaska Department of Law
List of Federal Issues and Conflicts**

<p>2016 Amendment to the Tongass Land Resources Management Plan (TLMP).</p> <p>AAGs M. Gramling, S. Lynch</p>	<p>Uncertain.</p>	<p>The 2016 TLMP amendment fully incorporated both the roadless rule and the Secretary of Agriculture’s directive to rapidly transition timber harvest from old growth to young growth. The result would effectively place millions of additional acres off-limits to timber harvest and other resource development. The timber industry would likely be forced out of business while utilities, mining and other industries would be substantially harmed.</p>	<p>The Secretary of Agriculture granted the State’s petition for a rulemaking to effectively amend the roadless rule by promulgating a state specific rule to manage roadless areas in Alaska. USDA published a Notice of Intent to commence the rulemaking on August 30, 2018. A final rule is expected by summer of 2020. But, the USDA declined the State’s request to simultaneously amend the 2016 TLMP concluding that any amended to the TLMP must be a second process after the regulation has been changed. There is no specific plan or time table to amend the TLMP.</p>
<p>2019 Amendment to the Chugach Land Resources Management Plan.</p> <p>AAG S. Lynch</p>	<p>Not aligned.</p>	<p>The new Chugach NF Plan established de facto Conservation System Units (CSUs) in violation of ANILCA’s prohibition of additional CSUs except by Act of Congress. The unauthorized CSU’s overlap existing highways, railways, and utilities and will make it difficult to impossible to expand or improve these facilities.</p>	<p>The State sought resolution of these issues with the USFS both formally and informally. On April 16, 2020 the USFS issued the final ROD and new Plan, which specifically identified the Resurrection Pass Trail as a CSU although the trail has no such congressional designation. The new Plan also mandates management of a number of river segments as if those segments were CSUs, although State highways parallel these rivers and are located within the restrictive management areas. The State is disappointed that the USFS did not resolve the State’s concerns with their management plan and the State is considering its options.</p>
<p>Eastern Interior Resource Management Plan (EIRMP).</p> <p>AAG A. Nelson</p>	<p>Not aligned.</p>	<p>The EIRMP, adopted January 6, 2017, recommends unjustified mineral closures and conservation designations that are inconsistent with Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) and Federal Land Policy Management Act’s multiple use mandate. The EIRMP also fails to provide for lifting outdated ANCSA d-1 withdrawals unless new conservation withdrawals are implemented, although BLM has lifted the withdrawals in some of the less controversial areas., facilitating conveyance of certain statehood selections.</p>	<p>We continue to monitor congressional and agency action on the issue and evaluate options, including administrative action and litigation. We also continue to monitor implementation decisions made under EIRMP.</p>
<p>Lands into Trust.</p> <p>AAG A. Nelson</p>	<p>Uncertain.</p>	<p>After the district court in Akiachak v. Dept. of Interior found in favor of plaintiffs, DOI changed its regulations to permit lands in Alaska to be taken into trust. In the summer of 2018, the Department of Justice rescinded the Solicitor’s Opinion on which the DOI relied to change its regulations. DOI has stated it will not process any new applications, but federal representatives have stated that pending applications would continue to be processed.</p>	<p>The State commented on six applications before the DOI embarked on the new rulemaking process—one from the Craig Tribal Association, three from the Central Council Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska, one from the Niniilchik Traditional Council, and one from the Native Village of Fort Yukon. BIA has granted the Craig application, but has not acted on the other applications. The BIA held public meetings and consultations with tribes throughout the State. The State submitted comments to Interior on January 25, 2019. DOI has not yet published a new rule.</p>

**Alaska Department of Law
List of Federal Issues and Conflicts**

<p>Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) Boundary IBLA Appeal.</p> <p>AAG D. Burke</p>	<p>Not aligned.</p>	<p>BLM denied the State’s request for conveyance of 20,000 acres, based on dispute over western boundary of ANWR. The State also objected to a survey plat of the area directly south of the area requested for conveyance.</p>	<p>IBLA denied BLM’s motion to dismiss and has consolidated the State’s two appeals. Briefing was completed in May 2018 and the case is now awaiting a decision from the IBLA, which continues to deal with a significant case backlog. The IBLA denied a joint motion to expedite the case in June 2019.</p>
<p>ANWR Section 1002.</p> <p>AAG J. Hartz</p>	<p>Aligned.</p>	<p>The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, Pub. L. 115- 97, opened the ANWR 1002 area to oil and gas exploration and leasing.</p>	<p>BLM finalized the EIS on September 12, 2019 and issued a notice that the final EIS was available for review on September 25, 2019. BLM must wait at least 30 days after that date to issue a Record of Decision that chooses BLM’s preferred alternative for conducting a lease sale program in the ANWR1002 area. BLM has not issued a record of decision as of the time this report was provided.</p>
<p><i>Native Village of Eklutna v. United States Department of the Interior, et al</i> (D.C. District Court No. 1:19-cv-02388).</p> <p>AAG L. Harrison</p>	<p>Aligned.</p>	<p>The Native Village of Eklutna requested a determination from the Department of the Interior that a certain Alaska Native allotment is “Indian lands” eligible for gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. The Department denied the request primarily on the grounds that the plaintiff does not have jurisdiction or “exercise governmental power” over the allotment, as required to meet IGRA’s definition of “Indian lands.” The plaintiff has challenged the denial in D.C. District Court pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act. The State has intervened in defense of the Department’s denial.</p>	<p>The parties are currently in motion practice over the content of the administrative record. Also, the Alaska Charitable Gaming Alliance has filed a motion to intervene that is still in briefing. No substantive briefing has yet been filed.</p>
<p><i>Trout Unlimited v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</i> (9th Cir. Case No. 20-35504).</p> <p>AAG L. Harrison</p>	<p>Aligned.</p>	<p>In 2019 the US EPA withdrew a 2014 proposal to prohibit Clean Water Act dredge-and-fill permitting in the Pebble deposit area of Southwest Alaska. Trout Unlimited, along with a number of other tribal and environmental organizations, sued under the APA to invalidate the withdrawal. The State intervened to defend the withdrawal. The District Court dismissed the case on the grounds that the withdrawal was unreviewable under the APA. Trout Unlimited appealed to the Ninth Circuit on an expedited basis.</p>	<p>This case is in the briefing stage. Trout Unlimited has filed its opening brief, and the briefs of the US EPA and the State are due in late July. Trout Unlimited will then have the opportunity to file a reply brief and the case is set for oral argument in August.</p>
<p>VABM (Vertical Angle Bench Mark) Ladue Statehood Entitlement Survey.</p> <p>AAG G. Dudek</p>	<p>Not aligned.</p>	<p>This matter is before the IBLA. Alaska DNR has appealed a BLM decision that found unwarranted Alaska’s objections to BLM’s proposed patent on General Selection application F-028269 (GS-913). Alaska rejected the proposed patent because the plat of survey used to describe the lands to be conveyed reflects an insufficiently surveyed or described southwesterly boundary.</p>	<p>Alaska filed the notice of appeal with the IBLA on June 5, 2020 and has requested, and received, an extension of time for filing the statement of reasons until September 4, 2020.</p>

**Alaska Department of Law
List of Federal Issues and Conflicts**

<u>CLEAN AIR ACT</u>			
Case or Matter	Alignment with Federal Approach	Brief Description	Status
<p>2017 Regional Haze State Implementation Plan Rule - <i>State v. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</i>; <i>Texas v. EPA</i> (D.C. Cir., 17-1074).</p> <p>AAG S. Mulder</p>	<p>Uncertain.</p>	<p>The State, along with North Dakota, Texas, and Arkansas, challenged the 2017 Regional Haze State Implementation Plan Rule, which imposed quantification requirements on international air emission contributions to regional haze affecting national parks and wilderness areas. The State is concerned about having international contributions to haze, that are beyond the State's control, count against Alaska and other states. The State also objects to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) shifting its modeling responsibilities and modeling costs to Alaska.</p>	<p>At the appellate court level. Briefing is currently on hold, while EPA revisits aspects of the rule and engages in a new rulemaking process.</p>
<p>Affordable Clean Energy Rule (ACE).</p> <p>AAGs S. Mulder, N. Haynes</p>	<p>Aligned.</p>	<p>The Affordable Clean Energy (ACE) rule and took effect on September 6, 2019. ACE repeals the Clean Power Plan (CPP); issues emissions guidelines for greenhouse gas emissions; and revises the emission guidelines implementing regulations under the Clean Air Act.</p>	<p>Legal challenges have been filed by various groups and states asking the court to toss the ACE rule and reinstitute the CPP. <i>Am. Lung Assoc. v. EPA</i>, No. 19-1140 (July 8, 2019 D.C. Circuit); <i>New York v. EPA</i>, No. 19-1166 (Aug. 14, 2019 D.C. Circuit). Numerous industry groups and power providers are seeking to intervene in the litigation to support EPA's ACE rule. Alaska and several other states intervened in <i>New York v. EPA</i>. The <i>Am. Lung Assoc. v. EPA</i> case is in the briefing stage.</p>
<p><i>Union of Concerned Scientists v. National Highway Safety Administration</i> (D.C. Cir., No. 19-1230); <i>Environmental Defense Fund v. National Highway Safety Administration</i> (D.C. Cir., No. 19-1200).</p> <p>AAG S. Mulder</p>	<p>Aligned.</p>	<p>Alaska and several other states intervened in two lawsuits involving a new rule promulgated by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) that will effectively preempt California laws that set vehicle emission standards that are different than the federal Clean Air Act standards.</p>	<p>Both cases are in the briefing stage.</p>

**Alaska Department of Law
List of Federal Issues and Conflicts**

<u>WATER</u>			
Case or Matter	Alignment with Federal Approach	Brief Description	Status
<p>“Waters of the U.S.” Rule - North Dakota v. EPA (ND Dist. Ct. 3:15-cv-00059).</p> <p>AAG J. Currie</p>	<p>Uncertain.</p>	<p>State joined a coalition of 12 states challenging the 2015 “waters of the U.S.” (WOTUS) rule. Among other things, the 2015 rule expands what falls under federal jurisdiction by automatically sweeping up “adjacent” or “neighboring” waters and wetlands within certain geographical limits to downstream waters already covered by federal law.</p>	<p>The district court action is currently proceeding in North Dakota Federal District Court. The WOTUS rule has been stayed by the court as to the states that are a party to this case, including Alaska. Summary judgment briefing is complete. The federal government is no longer defending the merits of the 2015 rule, though intervening environmental groups are. On April 23, 2020, there was a stay order issued on the case. In July, that stay order was extended for three months. The Plaintiff states are determining how to proceed based on the newly issued WOTUS 2020 Rule.</p>
<p>“Waters of the U.S.” Rule - State of California v. Wheeler (ND CA Dist. Ct. 3:20 cv 03005-RS).</p> <p>AAG J. Currie</p>	<p>Aligned.</p>	<p>State joined in a multi-state motion to intervene on behalf of the Defendant, EPA, in support of the 2020 “waters of the U.S.” (WOTUS) rule.</p>	<p>In 2019 EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers initiated a 2-step process for revising the rule. Step 1, repealing the 2015 rule, has been completed—reinstating the prior definition. Step 2, a rulemaking to redefine WOTUS has now been completed and the new rule has been issued. Numerous states sued the EPA arguing that the new rule was too narrow. Alaska joined a multi-state effort and intervened in the lawsuit on behalf of EPA and in support of the new rule.</p>

**Alaska Department of Law
List of Federal Issues and Conflicts**

<u>FISH AND GAME</u>			
Case or Matter	Alignment with Federal Approach	Brief Description	Status
<p>NPS and USFWS Rules on Management of Fish and Game - <i>State v. Bernhardt</i> (3:17-cv-00013)</p> <p>AAG C. Brooking</p>	Not aligned.	<p>The State is challenging regulations adopted by the National Park Service affecting hunting on preserve lands throughout Alaska and regulations adopted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service restricting hunting on the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). Three cases were filed and consolidated. The NPS regulations preempted state management of wildlife, prohibited several means of take for predators, and changed public participation procedures for hunting and fishing closures. The USFWS regulations prohibit certain activities within the Kenai NWR and the State is objecting to the prohibition on taking brown bears at black bear baiting stations, a practice that is allowed under state regulations.</p>	<p>In July 2017, NPS and USFWS were directed by the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks to initiate rulemaking procedures to reconsider their rules. In June 2018, NPS published a proposed rule that would reverse much of the 2015 rule challenged in the litigation, and the comment period closed October 5, 2018. USFWS has not published a proposed new rule. The litigation has been stayed for several months pending possible rulemaking that might moot portions of the lawsuit. In June 2020 NPS adopted final regulations reversing some of the provisions challenged in the litigation, and USFWS published a proposed rule addressing some concerns.</p>
<p>Salmon Fishery Management Plan - <i>United Cook Inlet Drift Association v. National Marine Fisheries Service</i> (Alaska intervened in support of defendants) (3:13-cv-0104)</p> <p>AAG A. Peterson</p>	Aligned.	<p>United Cook Inlet Drift Association (UCIDA) sued the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) challenging the validity of Amendment 12 to the Fishery Management Plan (FMP) for Salmon Fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) off the Coast of Alaska. Amendment 12 effectively removes federal oversight under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, thereby allowing state management, for three fishing areas beyond the three-mile limit from shore. One of these areas was the Cook Inlet EEZ, which is the focus of the lawsuit.</p>	<p>The State intervened in support of NMFS to protect the State's interest in maintaining management authority over the area. The federal district court found in favor of NMFS, upholding Amendment 12. After UCIDA appealed, the Ninth Circuit reversed the district court and held that Amendment 12 was contrary to law to the extent it removed the Cook Inlet EEZ from the FMP. The court explained that the MSA allows delegation to the state under an FMP, but does not excuse the federal government's obligation to adopt an FMP when it opts for state management. The U.S. Supreme Court denied the State's request to hear the case. The district court retained jurisdiction to oversee adoption of a new plan. The North Pacific Fishery Management Council continues to work through the issues. The plaintiffs filed a motion to enforce judgement, seeking the court's intervention in the creation of the FMP and oversight of the fishery until the plan is in place. The district court denied the plaintiff's motion, and ordered that the Council adhere to their estimated timeline and adopt a final FMP amendment by December 31, 2020, with final agency action to occur within one year thereafter.</p>

**Alaska Department of Law
List of Federal Issues and Conflicts**

MINING			
Case or Matter	Alignment with Federal Approach	Brief Description	Status
<p>2008 Mining Claim Rule - Earthworks v. U.S. Dept. of Interior (D.C. Dist. Ct. 1:09-cv-01972).</p> <p>AAG E. Fossum</p>	<p>Aligned.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs challenged the 2008 Mining Claim Rule. State intervened—in support of defendant—to support the federal rule, which eliminated some of the regulatory hurdles for miners.</p>	<p>The State is an intervenor-defendant, and the case is still pending in district court. The parties completed briefing and participated in oral argument on October 27, 2017. Both primary parties have since filed supplemental authorities. The case was reassigned to J. Rudolph Contreras in November, 2019. The plaintiff has requested another oral argument, but the court has not issued a decision as to whether new arguments are warranted.</p>
<p>Wishbone Hill Mine - Castle Mountain Coalition v. OSMRE (AK Dist. Ct., 15-cv-00043).</p> <p>AAG E. Fossum</p>	<p>Not generally aligned.</p>	<p>The State intervened—in support of defendant—to defend the validity of the state-issued mine permits, which plaintiffs asserted had automatically terminated.</p>	<p>The district court found in favor of plaintiffs and remanded the decision back to the agency. On remand, the federal agency ultimately found that the State had “good cause” to not take action because it needed additional time to come to a decision. The State issued a decision at the end of November 2018, upholding the validity of the permits. OSMRE subsequently determined that it did not have sufficient reason to believe a violation existed, and therefore did not issue a ten-day notice or order an inspection. At this time, no party has requested further review. The State is currently reviewing another request to issue permits for this mining project, which may renew this issue through state or federal agency appeals, or through federal litigation.</p>

**Alaska Department of Law
List of Federal Issues and Conflicts**

<u>OIL AND GAS</u>			
Case or Matter	Alignment with Federal Approach	Brief Description	Status
<p>Reversal of Ban on Offshore Development –<i>Trump v. League of Conservation Voters</i> (Nos. 19-35460, 19-35461, 19-35462).</p> <p>AAG L. Fox</p>	<p>Aligned.</p>	<p>Before leaving office, former President Obama issued an order pursuant to the 1953 Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act indefinitely banning all leases in certain off-shore areas, including large portions of the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas. President Trump issued an executive order rescinding the ban, and environmental groups have challenged the order. BOEM is gathering comments on a new proposed five-year National Offshore Oil and Gas Leasing Program, for years 2019-2024. The State intervened in a lawsuit to support and defend President Trump’s executive order.</p>	<p>In March 2019, the federal district court granted summary judgment to the plaintiffs (and denied summary judgment to the federal government and the State), ruling that the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act’s language permitting a president to “from time to time, withdraw” unleased lands from disposition did not permit President Trump to undo President Obama’s previous withdrawal of lands. The federal government and the State appealed to the Ninth Circuit, and briefing and argument was completed in June 2020. A decision is pending.</p>

**Alaska Department of Law
List of Federal Issues and Conflicts**

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT			
Case or Matter	Alignment with Federal Approach	Brief Description	Status
<p>Endangered Species Act Rules - <i>California v. Bernhardt</i>, (N.Cal. Dist. Ct., 4:19-cv-06013-JST); <i>Animal Legal Defense Fund v. Bernhardt</i>, (N.Cal. Dist. Ct., 4:19-cv-06812-JST0; and <i>Center for Biological Diversity v. Bernhardt</i>, (N.Cal. Dist. Ct., 4:19-cv-05206-JST0).</p> <p>AAG C. Brooking</p>	<p>Aligned.</p>	<p>Three lawsuits were filed challenging regulations adopted in 2019 by the US Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Among other things, the rules clarified the meaning of “foreseeable future” in determining whether a species is threatened, allows economic factors to be considered while still making decisions based on the best scientific and commercial data, and provided guidance on when to consider unoccupied areas as critical habitat for listed species.</p>	<p>In December 2019 and January 2020, Alaska joined twelve other states to move to intervene in all three cases to defend the new rules.</p>
<p>Seismic testing in Cook Inlet - <i>Cook Inletkeeper et al. v. Ross, et al.</i> (D. Alaska 3:19-cv-00238-SLG).</p> <p>AAG C. Brooking</p>	<p>Aligned.</p>	<p>Cook Inletkeeper and others sued to challenge permission given to Hilcorp Alaska to conduct seismic testing in Cook Inlet. The testing is permitted by the National Marine Fisheries Service under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act. The permission includes conditions to avoid and limit impacts on beluga whales. Cook Inlet belugas are listed as a distinct population segment.</p>	<p>In December 2019 the court granted Alaska’s motion to intervene. Plaintiffs filed a supplemental complaint in May 2020 and defendants filed answers. The federal record was produced. It was supplemented in July 2020.</p>

**Alaska Department of Law
List of Federal Issues and Conflicts**

<u>LABOR</u>			
<p><i>Eugene Scalia (in his official capacity as Secretary of Labor) v. State of Alaska Department of Transportation</i> (Ninth Circuit, 19-35824).</p> <p>AAG K. Demarest</p>	<p>Not aligned.</p>	<p>The Secretary of Labor challenged the State’s application of the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) to Alaska Marine Highway System workers working “rotational” schedules, such as seven days on, seven days off. The district court sided with the Secretary, holding that the phrase “twelve workweeks of leave” in the Act means only weeks the worker was “actually scheduled to work” count against the leave entitlement, because a “workweek” can never have no hours scheduled. The State argued that “workweek” means the same thing in the FMLA as it means in the Fair Labor Standards Act—a period of seven consecutive 24-hour periods. We also argued that continuous leave under the statute and regulations must be simply one continuous block, not twelve weeks separated by “off” weeks, leading to the unfair result that some employees can stay away from work for 24 full weeks.</p>	<p>The case has been briefed and argued and is ripe for decision by the Ninth Circuit.</p>