HALL & ASSOCIATES

Suite 701
1620 | Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-4033

Telephone: (202) 463-1166 Web: http://www.hall-associates.com Fax: (202) 463-4207

Reply to E-mail: jhall@hall-associates.com

December 21, 2012

Via Electronic Filing

Eurika Durr Clerk of the Environmental Appeals Board Environmental Appeals Board 1103M 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. East Building Washington, D.C. 20460-0001

RE: Town of Newmarket Wastewater Treatment Plant Permit No.: NH0100196 EAB Appeal No.: NPDES 12-05 - Petitioner's Motion to Amend Response Deadlines

Dear Ms. Durr:

On December 19, 2012, the Environmental Appeals Board ("EAB" or "the Board") sent a letter to Mr. Carl Dierker, Regional Counsel for EPA Region 1 ("Region 1" or "the Region"), informing Mr. Dierker of the Great Bay Municipal Coalition's ("the Coalition") Petition for Review of the Newmarket Wastewater Treatment Plant NPDES permit No. NH0100196 ("the Petition") and the Coalition's Motion to File Supplemental Comments by January 15, 2013 ("the Motion"). In addition, the December 19, 2012 letter announced dates by which the Region needs to file responses to the Petition (February 8, 2013) and the Motion to File Supplemental Comments (January 4, 2013). However, as explained below, there is an inherent conflict with the timing of the Board's response deadlines for EPA and the Coalition's contemplated supplemental comments. Accordingly, please consider this a motion to amend the response deadlines set forth in the Board's December 19, 2012 letter.

This request centers on the Coalition's Motion to File Supplemental Comments. In that Motion, the Coalition asked to be allowed to file its supplemental comments by January 15, 2013. However, EPA's response to this Motion is not due to until January 4, 2013 and the EAB's decision on the Motion would not be expected until sometime the next week. Consequently, if the EAB were to grant the Motion, as it has in other similar cases involving extensive records on highly technical information and regulatory studies, the Coalition might have less than a week to complete the amended filling. Accordingly, the Coalition requests that, if its Motion to File Supplemental Comments is granted, it be allowed 30 days from the Board's decision to file its supplemental comments. Such a ruling would avoid the unnecessary waste of resources.

The Coalition would also suggest a similar extension to EPA's petition response deadline. If this deadline is not extended, and the Coalition is allowed to supplement its Petition, EPA would have significantly less time to respond to the Coalition's supplemented petition. Accordingly, it is suggested that, after the Coalition's supplemental petition is filed (whenever that date may be), EPA be provided 45 days to respond to the supplemented petition in full.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter and we look forward to your response.

Respectfully submitted,

__//s/<u>/</u>____

John C. Hall 1620 I St., N.W. Suite 701 Washington, D.C. 20006

Tel: (202) 463-1166 Fax: (202) 463-4207

jhall@hall-associates.com