

RECEIVED  
JUL 21 2009  
ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD

July 21, 2009

Eurika Durr,  
Clerk of the Board  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Environmental Appeals Board

Dear Eurika,


Thank you very much for taking time to look for our letter to the EAB. We used USPS Express Mail to send the letter on February 7, 2009. It was signed for by A Dundul on February 9, 2009.

I have included the original letter, USPS receipt, and the tracking and confirm printout. We would appreciate having our letter added to the others provided for the Final Decision on City and County of Honolulu's Sand Island Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Final Decision of City and County of Honolulu's Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant.

We do have an error in the subject line: 2) should read -  
2) Final Decision on City and County of Honolulu's Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant Application for a Modified NPDES Permit under Section (301)h of Clean Water Act

Again, thank you very much for your help. Take care and have a great evening.

Aloha,



Victor D. Moreland  
1378 Mahiole Street  
Honolulu, HI 96819-1748

February 7, 2009

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Environmental Appeals Board  
1341 G Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Subject: 1) Final Decision on City and County of Honolulu's Sand Island Wastewater Treatment Plant Application for a Modified NPDES Permit under Section 301(h) of Clean Water Act (CWA) and

2) Final Decision on City and County of Honolulu's Sand Island Wastewater Treatment Plant Application for a Modified NPDES Permit under Section 301(h) of Clean Water Act

Dear Environmental Appeals Board,

We request a review of the subject final decisions signed by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Regional Administrator, Wayne Nastri, on January 5, 2009, and served on January 6, 2009. We provided our comments to EPA Tentative Decision Document for both the Sand Island and the Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant Applications for modified NPDES permits under Section 301(h) of the CWA. We feel that the EPA has cavalierly dismissed our comments which were made in good faith and, we believe, on the basis of protecting the public health and the total environment at the least cost, both financially and with regard to detrimental secondary impacts on the environment.

Every action taken has consequences, some of which are good or beneficial and some of which are harmful. Because the consequences may not be directly related to the problem that triggers the need for action, a thoughtful, comprehensive and holistic evaluation must be performed. Then and only then can a rational and best decision on what action should be taken. If the good outweighs the bad, the action should be taken. If not, other alternative actions should be investigated until the best solution is found.

In a recent memo to EPA employees, EPA Administrator, Lisa P. Jackson stated "Science must be the backbone for EPA programs. The public health and environmental laws that Congress has enacted depend on rigorous adherence to the best available science. The President believes that when EPA addresses scientific issues, it should rely on the expert judgment of the Agency's career scientists and independent advisors. When scientific judgments are suppressed, misrepresented or distorted by political agendas, Americans can lose faith in their government to provide strong public health and environmental protection."

She further stated "EPA must follow the rule of law. The President recognizes that respect for Congressional mandates and judicial decisions is the hallmark of a principled regulatory agency. Under our environmental laws, EPA has room to exercise discretion, and Congress has often looked to EPA. to fill in the details of general policies. However EPA needs to exercise policy

discretion in good faith and in keeping with the directives of Congress and the courts." She cautioned, however, that "The laws that Congress has written and directed EPA to implement leave room for policy judgments. However: policy decisions should not be disguised as scientific findings. I pledge that I will not compromise the integrity of EPA's experts in order to advance a preference for a particular regulatory outcome."

Jackson continues with "EPA's actions must be transparent. In 1983, EPA Administrator Ruckelshaus promised that EPA would operate "in a fishbowl" and "will attempt to communicate with everyone from the environmentalists to those we regulate, and we will do so as openly as possible." and "As your Administrator, I will uphold the values of scientific integrity, rule of law and transparency every day. If ever you feel I am not meeting this commitment, I expect you to let me know." This certainly was not the case for these denials.

These statements were based on President Obama's outline of the environmental program for his administration. A key element of his program is reduction of greenhouse gas emissions which EPA had ignored until reminded by the US Supreme Court in a decision rendered in April 2008 that under the Clean Air Act EPA had the duty to consider regulation of greenhouse gases.

As noted in our comments to the two TDDs, construction of a secondary treatment process is akin to construction of a greenhouse gas factory. It is a matter that requires serious consideration.

In responding to our comments to the two TDDs, EPA takes the position that it is not allowed any discretion in making its decisions. Although we have not done a comprehensive review of the CWA or other environmental laws, it appears that the following examples indicate that EPA can exercise discretion.

Example 1:

SEC. 217 [33 U.S.C. 1297] Cost-Effectiveness Guidelines

Any guidelines for cost-effectiveness analysis published by the Administrator under this title shall provide for the identification and selection of cost effective alternatives to comply with the objective and goals of this Act and sections 201(b), 201(d), 01(g)(2)(A), and 301(b)(2)(B) of this Act.

Example 2:

Sec. 304(b)(1)(B) states:

Factors relating to the assessment of best practicable control technology currently available to comply with subsection (b)(1) of section 301 of this Act shall include consideration of the total cost of application of technology in relation to the effluent reduction benefits to be achieved from such application,..."

Further, as noted in the quotations from Administrator Jackson's memo, EPA does have room to exercise discretion.

We believe that the EPA has not performed a rigorous evaluation of the costs and benefits of its action of denying the two applications from the City and County of Honolulu. We therefore

request that reconsideration be allowed and that the EPA be mandated to perform a comprehensive evaluation.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Victor D. Moreland". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

For :

James K. Honke, PE  
Hans J. Krock, PhD, PE  
James S. Kumagai, PhD, PE  
Victor D. Moreland, PhD, PE



EH 561922293 US



Customer Copy  
Label 11-9, March 2004

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

Post Office To Addressee

ORIGIN (POSTAL SERVICE USE ONLY)			
PO ZIP Code <b>96820</b>	Day of Delivery <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Next <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2nd <input type="checkbox"/> 2nd Del. Day	Postage <b>\$ 17.50</b>	
Date Accepted Mo. <b>2</b> Day <b>7</b> Year <b>09</b>	Scheduled Date of Delivery Month <b>2</b> Day <b>9</b>	Return Receipt Fee <b>\$</b>	
Time Accepted <b>0958</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	Scheduled Time of Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Noon <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 PM	COD Fee <b>\$</b>	Insurance Fee <b>\$</b>
Flat Rate <input type="checkbox"/> or Weight lbs. <b>3</b> ozs.	Military <input type="checkbox"/>	Total Postage & Fees <b>\$ 17.50</b>	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 2nd Day <input type="checkbox"/> 3rd Day	Acceptance Emp. Initials <i>W</i>	
	Int'l Alpha Country Code		

DELIVERY (POSTAL USE ONLY)		
Delivery Attempt	Time <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	Employee Signature
Mo. Day		
Delivery Attempt	Time <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	Employee Signature
Mo. Day		
Delivery Date	Time <input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	Employee Signature
Mo. Day		

CUSTOMER USE ONLY	
PAYMENT BY ACCOUNT Express Mail Corporate Acct. No.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Federal Agency Acct. No. or Postal Service Acct. No.	

FROM: (PLEASE PRINT) PHONE ( )

**MORELAND**  
**1378 MAHIOLIE ST**  
**HONOLULU, HI 96819-1748**

TO: (PLEASE PRINT) PHONE ( )

**U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**  
**AGENCY**  
**CLERK OF THE BOARD, EAB**  
**1341 G Street, NW, Suite 600**  
**Washington, DC 20005**

FOR PICKUP OR TRACKING  
Visit [www.usps.com](http://www.usps.com)  
Call 1-800-222-1811

ZIP + 4 (U.S. ADDRESSES ONLY. DO NOT USE FOR FOREIGN POSTAL CODES.)

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

FOR INTERNATIONAL DESTINATIONS, WRITE COUNTRY NAME BELOW.



[Home](#) | [Help](#) | [Sign In](#)

[Track & Confirm](#)

[FAQs](#)

## Track & Confirm

### Search Results

Label/Receipt Number: EH56 1922 293U S  
Status: Delivered

Your item was delivered at 11:44 am on February 09, 2009 in WASHINGTON, DC 20005. The item was signed for by A DUNDUL.

Additional information for this item is stored in files offline.

### Track & Confirm

Enter Label/Receipt Number.

[Go >](#)

[Restore Offline Details >](#)



[Return to USPS.com Home >](#)

### Notification Options

#### Proof of Delivery

Verify who signed for your item by email, fax, or mail. [Go >](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Customer Service](#)

[Forms](#)

[Gov't Services](#)

[Careers](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Terms of Use](#)

[Business Customer Gateway](#)

Copyright© 2009 USPS. All Rights Reserved.

No FEAR Act EEO Data

FOIA



U.S. Postal Inspection Service  
1900-0000, 000-0000



United States Postal Service  
1-800-ASK-USA