

U.S. Department of Justice

Environment and Natural Resources Division

JABryson 90-5-1-4-17228

Appellate Section
P.O. Box 23795
L'Enfant Plaza Station
Washington, DC 20026-3795

Telephone (202) 514-2740 Facsimile (202) 353-1873

March 1, 2006

Mr. Mark Langer, Clerk
U.S. Court of Appeals for the
District of Columbia Circuit
333 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Re:

Friends of the Earth v. United States Environmental

Protection Agency, D.C. Cir. No. 05-5015;

Oral argument scheduled for March 2, 2006

Dear Mr. Langer:

Pursuant to Rule 28(j), appellants have submitted EPA's very recent decision on February 15, 2006, approving in part and disapproving in part amendments to the District of Columbia water quality standards. Appellants assert EPA's decision is relevant to arguments about recreational and aesthetic uses considered in the TSS TMDL. EPA's decision establishing the TSS TMDL was issued March 1, 2002, and must be judged on the basis of the administrative record of the agency's decision at that time and not on subsequent decisions. This recent decision is not relevant to recreational use in the TSS TMDL.

The recent approval of these amendments, however, appears to EPA to raise a serious question whether the instant case continues to present a live case or controversy under Article III. Appellants challenge two TMDLs established to address impaired water quality of the Anacostia River because of exceedances of the water quality standards for DO and turbidity. The TMDLs established wasteload allocations for reducing loading of BOD pollutants and TSS, which allocations were derived from computer modeling employing numerical endpoints for satisfying the DO and turbidity standards. JA 677-685, 747-749. The District of Columbia has now made material changes to those standards, effective upon EPA's approval. The DO standard now applies criteria under EPA's guidance for protecting the Chesapeake Bay to all tidal influenced Class C waters, which includes the Anacostia and some or all of its tributaries within the District of Columbia, that are different from the previously applicable numerical criteria. See 21 DCMR 1104.8, Table 1, Note 3. Moreover, the standards now establish numeric criteria for turbidity and

water clarity that did not exist in the prior standards. Table 1. Because of these changes, it is not clear that the TMDLs are designed to implement the currently applicable water quality standards. To assist the Court in determining its continuing jurisdiction, EPA is concurrently filing a motion for leave to file a supplemental brief addressing whether this case is moot.

Sincerely,

John A. Bryson

Appellate Section

Joh A. Bur

Environment & Natural Resources Division Post Office Box 23795 - L'Enfant Plaza Station Washington, D.C. 20026

(202) 514-2740

Enclosures

Howard Fox Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund 1625 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. Suite 702 Washington, D.C. 20036-2212

David Evans Stewart T. Leeth McGuire Woods LLP 901 East Cary Street Richmond, VA 23219

John A. Sheehan AquaLaw, PLC 801 E. Main Street Suite 1002 Richmond, VA 23219

Alexandra Dapolito Dunn National Association of Clean Water Agencies 1816 Jefferson Place, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036-2505