

Message

From: Jones, Enesta [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=65B8E6C6E5CA4A7A9AE85D98A4C8EEDB-EJONES02]
Sent: 6/11/2018 11:21:19 PM
To: Barbara Grzincic [REDACTED] Ex. 6
CC: Press [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b293283291dc44e0b5d1c36be9281d8a-Press]
Subject: Re: Reporter on 2:30 p.m. ET/11:30 PT deadline, re: NEDACAP v. EPA

Barbara,

“EPA is reviewing the decision.” — EPA spokesperson

On Jun 11, 2018, at 1:17 PM, Barbara Grzincic <[REDACTED] Ex. 6 > wrote:

Forwarding, per Enesta Jones' out-of-office response. Thanks!

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Barbara Grzincic** [REDACTED] Ex. 6
Date: Mon, Jun 11, 2018 at 1:15 PM
Subject: Reporter on 2:30 p.m. ET/11:30 PT deadline, re: NEDACAP v. EPA
To: andrew.doyle@usdoj.gov, holmes.carol@epa.gov, jeffrey.wood@usdoj.gov, press@usdoj.gov, jones.enesta@epa.gov

Good afternoon, counselors, I'm a writer for Westlaw's online news service and I'm working on a short article about Friday's decision by the D.C. Circuit, rejecting NEDACAP, API and APF's challenge to EPA's 2017 Regional Consistency Regulations.

What do you consider the most significant aspect of the panel's decision, and why? Also, what did you think of Senior Judge Silberman's suggestion, in the concurrence, that EPA could avoid inter-circuit conflicts by certifying more challenges as being "of nationwide scope or effect"? Is that a reasonable alternative for the EPA?

Thanks for your time. I appreciate any information you can provide by my deadline of 2:30 p.m. ET, 11:30 a.m. PT.

Regards,
Barbara Grzincic
Westlaw contract writer