

## UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

RECEIVED U.S. E.P.A.

7014 MAY 14 PM 2: 50

ENVIR. APPEALS DOARD

May 14, 2014

OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE

### VIA HAND-DELIVERY

Clerk of the Board U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Environmental Appeals Board 1201 Constitution Avenue, N.W. WJC East Building, Room 3334 Washington, D.C. 20004

Re: Complainant Environmental Protection Agency's Response to Respondent Elementis Chromium Inc.'s Request for Oral Argument; Docket No. TSCA-HQ-2010-5022.

Dear Clerk of the Board:

Please find enclosed and served upon you for filing Complainant's Response to Respondent's Request for Oral Argument; Docket No. TSCA-HQ-2010-5022.

Sincerely,

Erin Saylor <sup>c</sup>

Attorney-Advisor

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Pennsylvania Ave

Washington, DC 20460

202-564-6124; saylor.erin@epa.gov

#### Enclosure

cc: John J. McAleese (by U.S. mail and email)

Ronald J. Tenpas (by U.S. mail and email)

Headquarters Hearing Clerk (by U.S. mail and email)

Honorable Susan L. Biro (by U.S. mail)

# UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATOR

| IN THE MATTER OF:                                      |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Elementis Chromium Inc., f/k/a Elementis Chromium, LP, | ) Docket No. TSCA-HQ-2010-5022 |
| Respondent.  | )                              |
|  |                                |
|  | )                              |
|  |                                |

# COMPLAINANT'S RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Complainant, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (Complainant or EPA), respectfully submits this response in opposition to Respondent Elementis Chromium Inc.'s (Respondent's or Elementis') Request for Oral Argument before the Environmental Appeals Board (Board or EAB). Elementis has not demonstrated good cause for oral argument in a matter which even Respondent characterizes as having been briefed "extensively." (Resp't Reply Brief at 1). As Respondent notes in its Request for Oral Argument, the parties have filed four briefs on the issues raised by Respondent's appeal of the Presiding Officer's exhaustive 93-page Initial Decision, including reply and surreply briefs not contemplated by the Rules of Consolidated Practice which the Board specially granted leave to file. Complainant also notes that the parties filed four post-hearing briefs before the Presiding Officer. In addition, the parties engaged in extensive motion practice prior to the hearing which entailed the filing of briefs in support and

opposition to Respondent's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings and Complainant's Motion for Accelerated Decision on Liability. As such, the issues on appeal before the EAB have been thoroughly briefed by the parties.

Additionally, Respondent asserts in its Request for Oral Argument that oral argument is warranted because the Complainant has "changed or abandoned several of its arguments." (Resp't Request for Oral Argument at 1). Specifically, Respondent cites to Complainant's discussion of the proper level of deference the Agency should be afforded and the Complainant's reliance on the Supreme Court case of <u>Toussie v. United States</u> in its Response and Surreply briefs. <u>Id.</u> at 1-2. Complainant thoroughly and succinctly stated its position regarding these two issues in its Surreply Brief.

In view of the extensive briefing in this matter, Complainant opposes Respondent's request for open-ended oral argument on the issues on appeal. If the Board has specific questions that would aid the EAB in its review of the issues on appeal, Complainant would gladly make itself available to answer those questions.

Respectfully submitted,

5/14/14

Data

Mark A.R. Chalfant, Attorney

Erin Saylor, Attorney

Waste and Chemical Enforcement Division

Office of Civil Enforcement

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

(MC 2249A)

Washington, D.C. 20460-0001

303-312-6177

Counsel for Complainant

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that the foregoing Complainant's Response to Respondent's Request for Oral Argument in Docket No. TSCA-HQ-2010-5022, dated May 14, 2014, was sent this day in the following manner to the addresses listed below:

Original by hand and email to:

Clerk of the Board

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Environmental Appeals Board 1201 Constitution Avenue, NW WJC East Building, Room 3334

Washington, DC 20004 durr.erika@epa.gov

## Copy by U.S. mail and email to:

Attorneys for Respondent:

John J. McAleese, III McCarter & English, LLP 1735 Market Street, Suite 700 Philadelphia, PA 19103 jmcaleese@mccarter.com

Ronald J. Tenpas

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, LLP 1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20004-2541 rtenpas@morganlewis.com

## Copy by U.S. mail and email to:

Office of the Hearing Clerk: Sybil Anderson

Headquarters Hearing Clerk

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office of Administrative Law Judges (1900R)

William Jefferson Clinton Building 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20460 anderson.sybil@epa.gov

### Copy by U.S. mail:

Administrative Law Judge:

Honorable Susan L. Biro

Administrative Law Judge

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office of Administrative Law Judges (1900R)

William Jefferson Clinton Building 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20460

Tony R. Effis, Case Officer

Waste and Chemical Enforcement Division (2249A)

Office of Civil Enforcement

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20460

Telephone: 202-564-4167 Email: ellis.tony@epa.gov

Date: May 14, 2014