



Legal Challenge to EPA's Promulgation of Final Chesapeake Bay TMDL

Scientific and Technical Advisory Com.

Multiple Models for Management in the Chesapeake Bay



February 26, 2013





- Litigation filed January 10, 2011
 - AFBF and other plaintiffs are challenging the lawfulness of EPA's Bay TMDLs.
 - Plaintiffs want declaratory and injunctive relief prohibiting EPA from issuing and enforcing Bay TMDLs.





Am. Farm Bureau Fed'n v. EPA

Plaintiffs

- American Farm Bureau Federation
- Pennsylvania Farm Bureau
- The Fertilizer Institute
- National Chicken Council
- U.S. Poultry & Egg Association
- National Pork Producers Council
- National Corn Growers Association
- National Turkey Federation
- National Association of Home Builders





- Intervenor Defendants
 - Chesapeake Bay Foundation
 - Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future
 - Defenders of Wildlife
 - Jefferson County Public Service District
 - Midshore Riverkeeper Conservancy
 - National Wildlife Federation
 - Virginia Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies
 - Maryland Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies
 - National Association of Clean Water Agencies
 - Pennsylvania Municipal Authorities Association
- Amicus City of Annapolis





Am. Farm Bureau Fed'n v. EPA

Relief Requested by AFBF:

- Declare that Final TMDL is contrary to federal law
- Declare that EPA violated the APA in issuing the Final TMDL
- Vacate the Final TMDL
- Enjoin enforcement, application, and implementation of Final TMDL





Am. Farm Bureau Fed'n v. EPA

• Arguments asserted by AFBF:

- EPA exceeded authority granted under Clean Water Act;
- EPA violated Administrative Procedures Act in the process of developing TMDLs;
- The rulemaking is arbitrary and capricious.





- Argument: EPA exceeded authority
 - No authority exists for EPA to dictate implementation requirements
 - States have exclusive authority over implementation.
 - CWA sections 303 and 117 do not provide authority for implementation.
 - Executive order and consent decree do not provide authority.





Am. Farm Bureau Fed'n v. EPA

• Argument: EPA exceeded authority

- EPA cannot assign allocations for upstream states within a TMDL for downstream states.
- Proper use of authority would be to revise upstream state's water quality standards.





- Argument: EPA violated notice and comment
 - Only 45 days for public review
 - Key information related to "Scenario Builder", Watershed, and Water Quality and Sediment Transport models were not available for review during the public comment period.





- Argument: Rulemaking was arbitrary and capricious
 - Decisions were made that were beyond predictive capacity of models.
 - Cannot be used for allocations at local watershed level.
 - Used freeway / parking lot analogy





- Argument: Rulemaking was arbitrary and capricious
 - "EPA fed its models flawed data."
 - EPA determined 50% of crops used conventional tillage while NRCS reported figure as being 7%.
 - EPA used inaccurate assumptions on manure runoff
 - Assumed all AFOs are covered with impervious surfaces and that all manure on impervious surfaces directly flows into watercourse.





- Arguments asserted by EPA:
 - AFBF failed to prove standing.
 - Standing requires injury and causal connection with Defendant.
 - Submitted no evidence to establish basis for representation of its members' interests.





Am. Farm Bureau Fed'n v. EPA

• Arguments asserted by EPA:

- Establishment of Final TMDL was proper exercise of authority.
 - TMDL does not impose implementation requirements.
 - TMDL was developed through collaborative process.
 - Watershed states requested EPA to develop the TMDL.





Am. Farm Bureau Fed'n v. EPA

• Arguments asserted by EPA:

- EPA complied with Administrative Procedures Act requirements.
 - 45 days is sufficient time period for notice and comment.
 - Open debate has been in progress for more than a decade.
 - TMDL is an "informal adjudication" not a rule, and thus does not require notice and comment.





Am. Farm Bureau Fed'n v. EPA

Arguments asserted by EPA:

- EPA complied with Administrative Procedures Act requirements.
 - Adequate documents were available for public review.
 - All documents related to final models could not be made available for public review as comments were incorporated.
 - AFBF has not shown prejudice.





- Arguments asserted by EPA:
 - Action to establish TMDL was not arbitrary nor capricious.
 - Use of models will be overturned only if there is no rational relationship between model and situation.
 - Used more comprehensive data re: conservation tillage than NRCS data.
 - Entitled to deference on decision.





Am. Farm Bureau Fed'n v. EPA

Procedural Status:

- Briefing on Motions for Summary Judgment has been completed.
 - Last Reply Brief filed on July 20, 2012.
- Argument scheduled for October 4, 2012.
- Court requested additional briefing on question of deference.
 - Additional briefing completed on November 2, 2012.





Am. Farm Bureau Fed'n v. EPA

What's next:

- Case is resolved?
 - TMDL process moves forward as planned?
 - TMDLs are vacated?
 - Some aspects of TMDL need to be amended?
- Case continues to move forward?



The Agricultural Law Resource and Reference Center Prof. Ross Pifer, Director Phone: (814) 865-3723 Email: rpifer@psu.edu Web: www.law.psu.edu/aglaw Blog: www.pennstatelawbayblog.com