

## CONSERVATION LAW FOUNDATION

November 23, 2005

Ms. Erica Durr, Clerk
Environmental Appeal Board
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Ariel Ross Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20460-0001

Re: NPDES Appeal Nos. 05-07 and 05-08

Dear Ms. Durr:

Enclosed for filing are the original and five copies of our Response to the Westborough Treatment Plant Board's Motion to Reconsider the Board's Order Allowing Submission of Amicus Brief by the Conservation Law Foundation and Motion to Strike the Amicus Brief.

Very truly yours,

John L. Davenport

1 3. E. Marie

# BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (1997) WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mary MASTORY

In re: City of Westborough	)	
Waste Treatment Works	)	APPEAL NOS:
	)	NPDES 05-07
NPDES Permit No. MA0100412	)	NPDES 05-08
	)	

CONSERVATION LAW FOUNDATION'S RESPONSE TO WESTBOROUGH TREATMENT PLANT BOARD'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER ORDER ALLOWING SUBMISSION OF AMICUS BRIEF BY CONSERVATION LAW FOUNDATION AND MOTION TO STRIKE AMICUS BRIEF

#### BACKGROUND

By motion filed with the Environmental Appeals Board on October 17, 2005, the Conservation Law Foundation ("CLF") sought leave to intervene in the above captioned appeals, as well as in the appeals of the Marlborough Westerly Wastewater Treatment Facility's NPDES Permit No. MA0100480 (Appeal Nos. 05-05 and 05-09) and the now withdrawn appeals of the Maynard Water Pollution Control Facility's NPDES Permit No. MA0101001. On October 24, 2005 the Westborough Treatment Plant Board (the "Westborough Board") filed with the EAB its Opposition to CLF's motion for leave to intervene. By Order dated October 18, 2005, the EAB denied CLF's request for intervenor status but allowed CLF, no later than November 4, 2005, to submit a brief in support of its position and participate as *amicus curiae* in these matters. CLF accordingly filed its amicus brief with the EAB on November 4, 2005. The Westborough Board,

by motion dated November 9, 2005, now requests EAB to reconsider its October 18, 2005 order allowing CLF to submit its amicus brief and to strike its brief from the record. CLF respectfully opposes such request.

#### ARGUMENT

The Westborough Board grounds its assertion that CLF should not be allowed to file an amicus brief primarily on 40 C.F.R. §124.19(c). That provision, however, states only that, after the EAB grants review of an NPDES permit, the public notice of that grant shall state that "any interested person may file an amicus brief". Nothing in §124.19(c) prohibits the EAB, before granting or denying review, from exercising its discretion to allow an interested person<sup>1</sup>, even though not entitled under 40 C.F.R. §124.19(a) to petition for review, to submit an amicus brief setting forth the reasons why it believes the EAB should grant or deny another party's petition for review. If the EAB denies review, the permit becomes final and the administrative proceedings are ended. At that point it is futile and pointless for a party urging review to file an amicus brief.

In its January 10, 2005 Order in In re City of Marlborough. Massachusetts, Easterly

Wastewater Treatment Facility, NPDES Appeal No. 04-13, EAB, August 11, 2005 (the "Hop

Brook case"), the EAB, prior to its decision granting review, allowed CLF to participate as

amicus curiae and respond to the petitions for review, even though it was not entitled under 40

C.F.R. §124.19(a) to petition for review because of lack of timeliness. The procedural posture of
these appeals at this point in time is identical to that of the Hop Brook case on January 10. There

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> CLF's interest in these appeals is set forth in full on pages 8 and 9 of its memorandum of law in support of its motion for leave to intervene filed on October 17, 2005.

is no rationale basis for granting CLF the right to participate as amicus curiae in the Hop Brook

case and denying it in this case.

The Westborough Board suggests that the EAB's order granting amicus status should be

reversed and its brief stricken because of "CLF's failure to appropriately participate in the public

process leading up to the issuance of this permit". As noted above, while failure to file comments

on the draft permit or participate in the public hearings may disqualify a person from petitioning

the EAB to review an NPDES permit under 40 C.F.R. §124.19(a), it does not prevent the EAB

from exercising discretion to allow an interested party to submit its views on whether or not the

EAB should grant another's petition for review.

For the above reasons, the Westborough Board's motion to reconsider and strike CLF's

amicus curiae brief should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

CONSERVATION LAW FOUNDATION

By Its Attorney,

John L. Davenport, Esq.

Conservation Law Foundation

62 Summer Street

Boston, MA 02110-1016

Ph: (617) 350-0990

Fax: (617) 350-4030

Dated: November 23, 2005

3

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing Response to the Westborough

Treatment Plant Board's Motion to Reconsider Order Allowing Submission of Amicus

Brief by the Conservation Law Foundation and Motion to Strike Amicus Brief werc

served by United States First Class Mail on the following persons, this 23rd day of

November, 2005:

Donald L. Anglehart, Esq. Gadsby Hannah LLP 225 Franklin Street Boston, MA 02110

Kenneth L. Kimmell, Esq. Bernstein, Cushner & Kimmell, P.C. 585 Bolyston Street, Suite 400 Boston, MA 02116

Robert Varney, Regional Administrator U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 1
One Congress Street, Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02114-2023

Dated: November 23, 2005

Joseph M. Hamilton, Esq. Mirick O'Connell 100 Front Street Worcester, MA 01608-1477

D. ya au

Julia Blatt Organization for the Assabet River 9 Damon Mill Square, Suite 1E Concord, MA 01742