

)	
MARYLAND DEPARTMENT)	
OF THE ENVIRONMENT, et al.,)	
)	
Appellants,)	
)	Case No. 2199
v.)	Sept. Term, 2013
)	
ANACOSTIA RIVERKEEPER, et al.,)	
)	
Appellees.)	
)	

Proposed amici curiae Maryland Association of Counties, Maryland Municipal Stormwater Association, National Association of Clean Water Agencies, Wet Weather Partnership, and Baltimore County (collectively, “County Amici”), by their counsel, respectfully submit this Reply to Petitioners’ Opposition to County Amici’s motion for leave to file an amicus brief in the above-styled appeal. This reply briefly responds to Petitioners’ mischaracterization of County Amici’s brief as “violat[ing] the rules” and “false and misleading.” Opp. 1 fn.1.

County Amici represent localities across Maryland and other clean water agencies throughout the entire nation. The County Amici's Maryland members are the regulated entities that are the targets of this litigation on a matter of statewide legal significance. They are subject to Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System ("MS4") permits and are required to meet the revenue requirements of their permits through local stormwater utility fees or taxes. Their voice should be heard in this matter of statewide importance, namely the proper legal standard governing the scope and extent of their MS4 permit requirements. In addition to alerting the Court of this significant statewide interest and

impact, County Amici's brief is desirable for the Court in that it provides (1) disclosure of the separate but related question of MDE's discretionary authority (not at issue in this case about whether MDE is under a mandate to impose water quality standards compliance in the permit); (2) a broader perspective on the real-world implications of Petitioners' arguments, including for multi-billion dollar MS4 compliance costs to be borne by the public; (3) more legislative and regulatory background on the Clean Water Act ("CWA") provisions at issue; and (4) a more detailed assessment of the relevant case law on the statutory mandate aspect of the issue. For all of these reasons, the amicus curiae brief is desirable and will aid the Court in adjudicating the legal questions at issue.

II. County Amici Did Not Intentionally Misrepresent Petitioners' Position

Petitioners allege that County Amici "falsely claim that Appellees seek to force compliance with Maryland's water quality standards 'within a single five-year permit term.'" Opp. at 2 (quoting Mot. Leave 2). It is only in response to County Amici's brief that Petitioners now admit for the first time in this litigation that "their argument in no way addresses the timing of compliance." *Id.* Their admission is also surprising given that the thrust of their prior briefs has been to seek a judicial order requiring the permit – *which by law can have a term of no more than five years* – to compel the permittee to meet water quality standards. Given the maximum five-year term and Petitioners' complete silence on the issue throughout the litigation, it is only reasonable to infer that they sought compliance within the life of the permit they are challenging. Rather than intentionally misrepresent Petitioners' arguments, County Amici merely took them at face value. In any event, despite Petitioners' recent concession on timing, their attack on the CWA § 402(p)(3)(B)(iii) practicability standard remains pending as the heart of this case and thus the full substance of County Amici's brief remains valid, useful and desirable.

III. County Amici Have Not Interjected Any New Arguments

Petitioners assert that County Amici are seeking to interject a new issue into the case by addressing the extent of the Maryland Department of the Environment's ("MDE") *discretionary* authority, if any, to require strict compliance with the water

quality standards notwithstanding the CWA § 402(p)(3)(B)(iii) practicability standard. County Amici have the exact opposite intention. Although there have been references to MDE's discretionary authority in the briefing in this appeal and in the case below, no party has asserted that the Court must address that issue to adjudicate any of the questions presented. Accordingly, County Amici's intent is merely to make the Court aware that an ancillary issue mentioned in some of the parties' briefs is contested elsewhere but not by any party here, and that this issue may arise in a future action where it would be better decided as a true controversy following full briefing that has not occurred at any time in the course of this litigation. It is precisely *because* the parties to this appeal are in apparent agreement on this otherwise contested issue of generally applicable law that this appeal presents a poor vehicle to address it.

IV. Cost and Practicability Sources Were Properly Cited

Petitioners request that the certain sources cited by County Amici be stricken because they are not part of the record. The challenged sources highlight the extraordinary cost and other practicability issues MS4 localities must overcome as they continue improving water quality. These sources are cited for two proper reasons. First, they demonstrate County Amici's interest in this case as required by Rule 8-511(b)(1)(A). Second, they are relevant to the purely legal question of what standard applies under the CWA and related state law.

Judicial review of agency action takes two forms: (1) "determining if there is substantial evidence in the record as a whole to support the agency's findings and conclusions" and (2) "to determine if the administrative decision is premised upon an erroneous conclusion of law." *Motor Vehicle Admin. v. Lipella*, 48 A.3d 803, 810, 427 Md. 455, 467 (2010). The administrative record is expressly relevant *only* to the Court's review of the evidentiary basis for MDE's findings and conclusions; not to whether its actions were premised upon an erroneous conclusion of law. Before this Court can evaluate MDE's findings and conclusions in light of the record, it must first decide the purely legal question of what CWA standard applies to MS4s—that is, whether the maximum extent practicable standard mandated by CWA § 402(p)(3)(B)(iii) replaces the

requirement in § 301(b) to comply with water quality standards. County Amici's brief addresses this threshold question of law. The state and local governmental sources cited by County Amici properly provide context to this broader legal issue which must be decided independently of any evidentiary issues associated with the administrative record. This is a traditional role of an amicus brief.

Petitioners also expressly take issue with the accuracy of the cost figures cited by County Amici. While the County Amici believe that citing state and local governmental documents for context is perfectly appropriate, we also note that the precise sums are not material here. The point is that Petitioners' position on the practicability standard of CWA § 402(p)(3)B)(iii) is a multi-billion dollar issue impacting localities throughout the state and this disclosure as context for the legal issue at stake is completely appropriate.

Dated: August 13, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Chris Pomeroy", written in black ink over a horizontal line.

Christopher D. Pomeroy

Lisa M. Ochsenhirt

Justin W. Curtis

AQUALAW PLC

6 South 5th Street

Richmond, VA 23219

Chris@AquaLaw.com

(804) 716-9021

(804) 716-9022 (facsimile)

Counsel for Amici Curiae