



They noted that their motion to intervene had not been ruled upon, but requested that the attached response be accepted as FOE/SC's response to the arguments raised in WASA's response to their petition for review. *Id.* n. 1. By so stating, FOE/SC *did not* intend to withdraw their motion to intervene or to suggest that their latter motion for leave to reply superseded their pending motion to intervene.

On July 26 the Board issued an Order stating, *inter alia*:

FOE/SC request he Board to allow this response to serve as FOE/SC's reply to WASA's petition, to the extent the issues raised in WASA's petition overlap with the issues discussed herein." Motion for Leave to Reply at n.1. The Board interprets this statement to mean that FOE/SC's Motion for Leave to Reply supersedes its June 26,2007 Motion for Leave to Intervene, in which FOE/SC requested leave to intervene in Appeal 07-11 and to respond to the issues raised therein. Accordingly, in light of the Board's acceptance of FOE/SC's Reply Brief, it is unnecessary for the Board to rule on Motion for Leave to Intervene.

Dkt. # 30 at n. 5.

#### **B. Request**

FOE and Sierra Club have longstanding and substantial interests in the matters at issue. They have not found it necessary to file a separate reply brief addressing issues raised by WASA, because so far those issues have been adequately addressed in briefs filed by EPA and by FOE/SC. However, as explained in the motion to intervene, FOE/SC have a strong interest in continued participation in this matter, particularly given their disagreements with EPA on significant issues regarding the permit.

As explained above, FOE/SC did not withdraw their motion to intervene and consider it to be pending before the Board. To the extent the Board requires that it be renewed, this filing can be considered a renewal of FOE/SC's original motion to intervene.

For the reasons stated in their motion to intervene, FOE/SC have a substantial interest in the issues raised in WASA's petition. FOE/SC's intervention will not cause unnecessary delay

or prejudice to any party, and their motion was timely filed. Therefore, FOE/SC respectfully request leave to intervene.

DATED October 26, 2007.



Jennifer C. Chavez  
David S. Baron  
Earthjustice  
1625 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, #702  
Washington, D.C. 20036-2212  
(202) 667-4500 (Phone)  
(202) 667-2356 (Fax)  
*Counsel for Friends of the Earth and Sierra Club*

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing CLARIFICATION REGARDING MOTION OF FRIENDS OF THE EARTH AND SIERRA CLUB FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE IN D.C. WASA PETITION FOR REVIEW was served on each of the following by first-class mail, postage prepaid, on October 26, 2007:

Amy McDowell, Esquire  
Jon A. Mueller, Esquire  
Chesapeake Bay Foundation  
Philip Merrill Environmental Center  
6 Herndon Avenue  
Annapolis MD 21403

Deane Bartlett  
Senior Assistant Regional Counsel  
Office of Regional Counsel  
EPA Region 3  
1650 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029

David Evans  
Stewart Leeth  
McGuire Woods LLP  
One James Center  
901 East Cary Street  
Richmond, VA 23219

John A. Sheehan  
F. Paul Calamita  
AquaLaw, PLC  
801 E. Main St., Suite 1002  
Richmond, VA 23219

Dated October 26, 2007.



Jennifer C. Chavez