

RECEIVED

MAY 09 2011

EPA ORC
Office of Regional Hearing Clerk WS

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region 1

IN THE MATTER OF)	DOCKET NO.: CWA 01-2010-0079
)	
DANBURY, CONNECTICUT)	
)	
155 DEER HILL AVENUE)	RESPONDENT DANBURY,
DANBURY, CT 06810)	CONNECTICUT'S MOTION FOR A SECOND
)	EXTENSION OF TIME TO REQUEST A
Respondent.)	HEARING AND ANSWER COMPLAINT
)	

RESPONDENT CITY OF DANBURY'S MOTION FOR A SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME TO REQUEST A HEARING AND ANSWER COMPLAINT

Pursuant to 40 C.F.R. § 22.7, the City of Danbury, Connecticut ("City" or "Respondent") hereby moves for an extension of time to file its answer to the complaint and request a hearing in this matter on the grounds that the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") and the City continue to be engaged in settlement discussions and it is in the interests of this proceeding and the parties to avoid engaging in costly and potentially unnecessary litigation while those discussions are ongoing. Further, the City requests additional time so that the parties can exchange and review information regarding the complex allegations in the complaint, which are drawn from two different Clean Water Act programs.

On April 7, 2011, the Acting Regional Judicial Officer previously granted the City a thirty day extension from April 11, 2011 to May 11, 2011. By email on April 8, 2011, the Regional Hearing Clerk confirmed that the first thirty day extension applied to the hearing request, as well as the other elements of the City's answer. The present motion seeks an extension on the same terms.

EPA has represented through counsel that it assents to this second motion. Respondent City of Danbury, therefore, respectfully requests a thirty day extension to answer the complaint and to request a hearing, from May 11, 2011 to June 10, 2011.

DISCUSSION

An extension of time for filing “any document” may be granted if the motion is “timely” and “good cause” is shown, after considering any “prejudice to other parties.” 40 C.F.R. §22.7(b). In addition, a motion for extension of time must be filed “sufficiently in advance” of the due date. *Id.*

In this case, the City’s motion for extension of time is filed sufficiently in advance of the May 11, 2011 response deadline to provide a reasonable opportunity to rule on the motion prior to the deadline. Moreover, granting the City’s motion for an extension will not prejudice any other party to the proceeding. On May 5, 2011, the only other party to this matter, EPA, represented to the City, through counsel, that it assents to and does not oppose a motion to seek a thirty day extension of the time in which to request a hearing and file an answer. There is, therefore, no question of prejudice to EPA.


Finally, there is good cause for a thirty day extension of time in which to file a responsive pleading. The City and EPA are currently in the midst of settlement negotiations and Respondent is hopeful that the case will resolve without the need to engage in costly litigation. Rather than expend valuable time and resources on litigation, the City would prefer to focus on settlement talks with EPA and move forward toward a resolution of this case. This would benefit both the Presiding Officer and the parties by conserving scarce judicial resources and

avoiding the distraction and expense of litigation while the parties review, analyze and negotiate a potential settlement. In addition, the parties can exchange information that will provide clarification regarding the complex complaint, which is drawn from two different Clean Water Act programs and regard compliance questions and efforts that date back several years. The additional time and information will allow the City to adequately and fully respond to the complaint.

CONCLUSION

As provided above, there is good cause to grant Respondent City of Danbury's motion for a second extension of time to file its answer and request a hearing. The City respectfully requests a thirty day extension of the deadline to file its answer and request for a hearing, from May 11, 2011 to June 10, 2011.

Dated: May 6, 2011



Robert S. Melvin, Esq.
Lauren M. Vinokur
Robinson & Cole LLP
280 Trumbull Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3597
Telephone: (203) 275-8200
rmelvin@rc.com
lvinokur@rc.com
DOCKET NO.: CWA 01-2010-0079

Counsel for Respondent
City of Danbury, Connecticut

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region 1

IN THE MATTER OF) DOCKET NO.: CWA 01-2010-0079
)
DANBURY, CONNECTICUT)
)
155 DEER HILL AVENUE) [PROPOSED] ORDER
DANBURY, CT 06810)
)
Respondent.)
)

ORDER

Respondent Danbury, Connecticut's Motion for a Second Extension of Time to Request a Hearing and Answer Complaint was timely submitted and no opposition was received. Having considered the Motion, and good cause appearing therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

Respondent Danbury, Connecticut's Motion for a Second Extension of Time to Request a Hearing and Answer Complaint is hereby granted, and the date by which Respondent must file its answer and request for a hearing is June 10, 2011.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____, 2011


REGIONAL JUDICIAL OFFICER

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the original of the foregoing Motion for a Second Extension of Time to Request a Hearing and Answer Complaint and Proposed Order was given to a commercial delivery service on May 6, 2011 for filing by delivery on May 9, 2011 with the Regional Hearing Clerk, Region 1, and that a copy was sent on May 6, 2011 by electronic and U.S. Mail to:

Jeffery Kopf, Senior Enforcement Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency- Region I
5 Post Office Square – Suite 100
Mail Code OES04-4
Boston, MA 02109-3912
Tel: (617) 918-1796
Kopf.jeff@epa.gov

Dated: May 6, 2011



Robert S. Melvin, Esq.
Robinson & Cole LLP
280 Trumbull Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3597
Telephone: (203) 275-8200
rmelvin@rc.com
lvinokur@rc.com
DOCKET NO.: CWA 01-2010-0079

Counsel for Respondent
City of Danbury, Connecticut