

1 HON. JAMES L. ROBART  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
13 **WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

---

14 CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY )  
15 Plaintiff, )  
16 v. )  
17 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION )  
18 AGENCY; GINA McCARTHY, )  
19 ADMINISTRATOR; DENNIS McLERRAN, )  
20 REGION 10 ADMINISTRATOR, UNITED )  
21 STATES ENVIRONMENTAL )  
22 PROTECTION AGENCY )  
23 Defendants. )  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

---

Case No: 13-cv-1866 JLR

**UNITED STATES' CROSS-MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND  
COMBINED MEMORANDUM IN  
SUPPORT OF CROSS-MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND  
IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT**

**NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:  
November 7, 2014**

**ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED**

22 Defendants, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Gina McCarthy,  
23 Administrator, Dennis McLerran, Region 10 Administrator, United States Environmental  
24 Protection Agency (collectively, "EPA") oppose the motion for summary judgment filed by  
25 Plaintiff, Center for Biological Diversity ("Plaintiff" or "CBD") [ECF Doc. 33] and cross-move  
26 for summary judgment on all issues.  
27  
28

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION .....  | 1  |
| STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND .....   | 2  |
| I.    Water Quality Standards .....   | 2  |
| A.    Washington's Water Quality Standards .....  | 3  |
| B.    Oregon's Water Quality Standards .....  | 4  |
| II.    CWA Section 303(d) Lists of Impaired Waters .....  | 4  |
| FACTUAL BACKGROUND .....  | 6  |
| I.    Ocean Acidification .....   | 6  |
| II.    EPA's Decisions .....  | 6  |
| A.    EPA's Approval of Washington's 303(d) List .....  | 6  |
| B.    EPA's Partial Approval/Partial Disapproval of Oregon's 303(d) List and<br>EPA's Additions to Oregon's 303(d) List .....   | 8  |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW .....  | 9  |
| ARGUMENT .....  | 10 |
| I.    EPA Reasonably Determined that the Data and Information Readily Available<br>at the Time of the Challenged Decisions Did Not Require that the Coastal and<br>Estuarine Waters in Washington and Oregon Be Listed as Impaired Due to<br>Pollutants Associated With or Conditions Attributable to Ocean Acidification ..... | 10 |
| A.    Washington Reasonably Decided Not to List Waters for Non-attainment<br>of the Numeric pH Water Quality Criteria Based Upon Evaluation of<br>Information Available at the Time it Submitted its List, and EPA<br>Reasonably Approved the List Upon Evaluation of Information<br>Available at the Time of Approval .....    | 11 |
| 1.    Washington's Decision .....   | 12 |
| 2.    EPA Review .....  | 15 |

|    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1  | B. EPA Reasonably Determined that the Information Available at the Time of<br>EPA's Decisions Did Not Demonstrate that Either Washington's or Oregon's<br>Coastal and Estuarine Waters Failed To Meet Applicable Narrative Water<br>Quality Criteria for Protection of Aquatic Life..... | 17 |
| 2  |  |    |
| 3  | 1. EPA Reasonably Determined That Anecdotal Information Was<br>Insufficient to Support Listing Decisions in Either State .....   | 18 |
| 4  |  |    |
| 5  | 2. EPA Reasonably Determined that Laboratory-Based Studies Were<br>Not Sufficient to Support Listing Decisions in Either State .....   | 19 |
| 6  |  |    |
| 7  | 3. EPA Reasonably Determined That Shellfish Hatchery Information<br>Was Not Sufficient to Support Listing Decisions in Oregon.....   | 20 |
| 8  |  |    |
| 9  | C. EPA Reasonably Determined that Listing Was Not Required Based on<br>Aragonite Undersaturation.....  | 22 |
| 10 |  |    |
| 11 | D. The Court Should Afford Judicial Deference to EPA's Decisions.....  | 23 |
| 12 |  |    |
| 13 | II. EPA Considered All Existing and Readily Available Information in Approving<br>the Washington 303(d) List and in its Additions to the Oregon 303(d) List .....  | 25 |
| 14 |  |    |
| 15 | III. CBD is Not Entitled to the Remedy It Seeks .....  | 28 |
| 16 |  |    |
| 17 | CONCLUSION.....  | 29 |
| 18 |  |    |
| 19 |  |    |
| 20 |  |    |
| 21 |  |    |
| 22 |  |    |
| 23 |  |    |
| 24 |  |    |
| 25 |  |    |
| 26 |  |    |
| 27 |  |    |
| 28 |  |    |

## 1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### 2 CASES

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| 3 <i>Am. Wildlands v. Browner</i> , 260 F.3d 1192 (10th Cir. 2001) .....  | 2     |
| 4 <i>Arkansas v. Oklahoma</i> , 503 U.S. 91 (1992) .....  | 2     |
| 5 <i>Asarco, Inc. v. EPA</i> , 616 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1980).....   | 28    |
| 6 <i>Ass'n of Data Processing Svc. Orgs. v. Bd. of Governors</i> , 745 F.2d 677 (D.C. Cir. 1984).....                             | 10    |
| 7 <i>Barnum Timber Co. v. EPA</i> , 835 F. Supp. 2d 773 (N.D. Cal. 2011).....   | 27    |
| 8 <i>City of Albuquerque v. Browner</i> , 97 F.3d 415 (10th Cir. 1996) .....  | 27    |
| 9 <i>City of Arcadia v. EPA</i> , 411 F.3d 1103 (9th Cir. 2005).....  | 2, 27 |
| 10 <i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. EPA</i> , 749 F.3d 1079 (D.C. Cir. 2014).....  | 6     |
| 11 <i>Dickinson v. Zurko</i> , 527 U.S. 150 (1999) .....  | 10    |
| 12 <i>Dioxin/Organochlorine Ctr. v. Clarke</i> , 57 F.3d 1517 (9th Cir. 1995).....  | 9     |
| 13 <i>Env'tl. Def. Fund, Inc. v. Costle</i> , 657 F.2d 275 (1981).....  | 9     |
| 14 <i>Fed. Power Comm'n v. Idaho Power Co.</i> , 344 U.S. 17 (1952).....  | 28    |
| 15 <i>Fla Pub. Interest Research Grp. Citizen Lobby Inc. v. EPA</i> , 386 F.3d 1070 (11th Cir. 2004) .....                        | 24    |
| 16 <i>Gebhart v. SEC</i> , 595 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2010) .....  | 10    |
| 17 <i>George v. Bay Area Rapid Transit</i> , 577 F.3d 1005 (9th Cir. 2009).....   | 9     |
| 18 <i>Greater Yellowstone Coal. v. Lewis</i> , 628 F.3d 1143 (9th Cir. 2010).....   | 10    |
| 19 <i>IRS v. Fed. Labor Relations Auth.</i> , 494 U.S. 922 (1990).....  | 28    |
| 20 <i>Kleppe v. Sierra Club</i> , 427 U.S. 390 (1976) .....   | 28    |
| 21 <i>League of Wilderness Defenders Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project v. Allen</i> , 615 F.3d 1122<br>22 (9th Cir. 2011) ..... | 9     |
| 23 <i>Motor Vehicle Mfr. Ass'n v. State Farm Ins.</i> , 463 U.S. 29 (1983).....   | 9     |
| 24 <i>Mont. Wilderness Ass'n v. McAllister</i> , 666 F.3d 549 (9th Cir. 2011) .....   | 24    |
| 25 <i>Nat'l Tank Truck Carriers, Inc. v. EPA</i> , 907 F.2d 177 (D.C. Cir. 1990) .....  | 28    |

|    |  |      |
|----|--|------|
| 1  | <i>Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc. v. EPA</i> , 16 F.3d 1395 (4th Cir. 1993).....            | 27   |
| 2  | <i>Natural Res. Def. Council v. EPA</i> , 863 F.2d 1420 (9th Cir. 1988).....                 | 6    |
| 3  | <i>NLRB v. Food Store Emps. Union, Local 347</i> , 417 U.S. 1 (1974) .....                   | 28   |
| 4  | <i>PUD No. 1 of Jefferson Cnty. v. Wash. Dep't of Ecology</i> , 511 U.S. 700 (1994) .....    | 2, 3 |
| 5  | <i>Sierra Club v Leavitt</i> , 488 F.3d 904 (11th Cir. 2007).....                            | 26   |
| 6  | <i>Sierra Club v. EPA</i> , 346 F.3d 955 (9th Cir. 2003).....                                | 23   |
| 7  | <i>Sierra Club v. Hankinson</i> , 939 F. Supp. 865 (N.D. Ga. 1996) .....                     | 25   |
| 8  | <i>UOP v. United States</i> , 99 F.3d 344 (9th Cir. 1996) .....                              | 28   |
| 9  | <i>Ursack Inc. v. Sierra Interagency Black Bear Grp.</i> , 639 F.3d 949 (9th Cir. 2011)..... | 10   |
| 10 | <i>Utah Shared Access Alliance v. Carpenter</i> , 463 F.3d 1125 (10th Cir. 2006).....        | 10   |
| 11 | <i>Vigil v. Leavitt</i> , 381 F.3d 826 (9th Cir. 2004).....                                  | 10   |
| 12 | <i>Western Oil &amp; Gas Ass'n v. EPA</i> , 633 F.2d 803 (9th Cir. 1980) .....               | 29   |

## STATUTES

|    |                                 |       |
|----|---------------------------------|-------|
| 16 | 5 U.S.C. § 706(2).....          | 28    |
| 17 | 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).....       | 9, 28 |
| 18 | 33 U.S.C. § 1251(a) .....       | 2     |
| 19 | 33 U.S.C. § 1251(a)(2).....     | 2     |
| 20 | 33 U.S.C. § 1251(b) .....       | 2     |
| 21 | 33 U.S.C. § 1251(d) .....       | 2     |
| 22 | 33 U.S.C. § 1313(a) .....       | 3     |
| 23 | 33 U.S.C. § 1313(a)-(c).....    | 2     |
| 24 | 33 U.S.C. § 1313(b) .....       | 3     |
| 25 | 33 U.S.C. § 1313(c)(2)(A) ..... | 3     |
| 26 | 33 U.S.C. § 1313(c)(3)-(4)..... | 3     |
| 27 | 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d)(1) .....    | 4     |

|   |                              |      |
|---|------------------------------|------|
| 1 | 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d)(2) ..... | 5, 6 |
| 2 | 33 U.S.C. § 1362(7) .....    | 6    |
| 3 | 33 U.S.C. § 1362(8) .....    | 6    |
| 4 |                              |      |

## **REGULATIONS**

|    |                                   |          |
|----|-----------------------------------|----------|
| 5  | 40 C.F.R. § 130.7 .....           | 5, 27    |
| 6  | 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(4) .....     | 4        |
| 7  | 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5) .....     | 5        |
| 8  | 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(6) .....     | 5, 26    |
| 9  | 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(6)(iv) ..... | 5        |
| 10 | 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(d) .....        | 5        |
| 11 | 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(d)(2) .....     | 6, 8, 27 |
| 12 | 40 C.F.R. § 131.6 .....           | 3        |
| 13 | 40 C.F.R. § 131.10-12 .....       | 3        |
| 14 | 40 C.F.R. § 131.12 .....          | 2        |
| 15 | 40 C.F.R. § 131.12(a)(1) .....    | 3        |
| 16 | 40 C.F.R. § 131.12(a)(2) .....    | 3        |
| 17 | 40 C.F.R. § 131.12(a)(3) .....    | 3        |
| 18 | 40 C.F.R. § 131.21 .....          | 3        |
| 19 |                                   |          |
| 20 |                                   |          |
| 21 |                                   |          |
| 22 |                                   |          |
| 23 |                                   |          |
| 24 |                                   |          |
| 25 |                                   |          |
| 26 |                                   |          |
| 27 |                                   |          |
| 28 |                                   |          |

## **INTRODUCTION**

Ocean acidification (“OA”) refers to the decrease in pH of the Earth’s oceans. OA is primarily caused by increasing concentrations of carbon dioxide – a greenhouse gas – in the atmosphere. The carbon dioxide is absorbed by the oceans, resulting in lower pH levels. OA can also be caused or enhanced by other chemical additions or subtractions from the ocean. While the ultimate consequences of OA are still unknown, there is a risk of ecosystem changes that threaten coral reefs, fisheries, protected species, and other natural resources of value to society.<sup>1</sup>

EPA recognizes that a growing body of research indicates the seriousness of global OA risks and the potential that conditions related to OA may have significant adverse impacts on aquatic life in the coastal waters of Washington and Oregon, and elsewhere. However, the science is complex - and experts agree that more research and analyses are needed to fully understand the sources, causes and impacts of OA in different aquatic environments. More information and data are available now than were available in 2010, the end of the reporting period for the water quality impairment listings submitted to EPA by Washington and Oregon, or in 2012 when EPA made the decisions challenged in this case. Research is continuing through a number of Federal, State, and private programs; thus, even more data are likely to be available when the States conduct and report on their next biennial reviews of impaired waters.

The issue before this Court, however, is the validity of EPA’s 2012 decisions on the States’ 2010 lists of impaired waters. Those decisions must be reviewed based on the information available at that time, as reflected in the administrative records presented to the Court. EPA evaluated all of the information submitted by CBD to the States and to EPA, and also considered additional information that was not reviewed by the States, and reasonably concluded that the information available was insufficient to support a finding that the coastal and estuarine waters in the States of Washington and Oregon failed to meet the States’ respective water quality standards. Because those decisions are fully supported by the administrative records and are entitled to

<sup>1</sup> For more information on OA, see Questions and Answers on OA and the CWA 303(d) Program [WA-001133], citing National Research Council of the National Academies, “*Ocean Acidification: A National Strategy to Meet the Challenges of a Changing Ocean*” (2010).

1 deference, the Court should deny Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and grant judgment  
2 for EPA.

3 **STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND**

4 The Clean Water Act ("CWA") establishes a comprehensive program "to restore and  
5 maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters" and to attain  
6 "water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife."  
7 33 U.S.C. § 1251(a), (a)(2). Although EPA generally administers the Act, *see* 33 U.S.C. §  
8 1251(d), the States are principally responsible for implementing much of the statute. *Id.* §  
9 1251(b). ("It is the policy of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary  
10 responsibilities and rights of States to prevent, reduce, and eliminate pollution."). The CWA's  
11 statutory scheme "anticipates a partnership between the States and the Federal Government,"  
12 *Arkansas v. Oklahoma*, 503 U.S. 91, 101 (1992), in which "States remain at the front line in  
13 combating pollution," *City of Arcadia v. EPA*, 411 F.3d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 2005). The CWA  
14 establishes distinct roles for the Federal and State governments in that partnership. *PUD No. 1 of*  
15 *Jefferson Cnty. v. Wash. Dep't of Ecology*, 511 U.S. 700, 704-05 (1994).

16 **I. Water Quality Standards**

17 CWA subsections 303(a) through (c) direct the States, with EPA approval and oversight,  
18 to establish water quality standards ("WQS") for water bodies within their boundaries. *See* 33  
19 U.S.C. § 1313(a)-(c). These standards consist principally of: (a) designated beneficial uses for  
20 waters, such as water supply, fish propagation, or navigation; (b) water quality criteria, which  
21 define the amounts of pollutants, in either numeric or narrative form, that the waters can contain  
22 without impairment of their designated beneficial uses; and (c) an antidegradation policy.<sup>2</sup> 33  
23 U.S.C. § 1313(c)(2)(A); 40 C.F.R. §§ 131.6, 131.10-12; *see also PUD No. 1 of Jefferson Cnty.*,  
24

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>2</sup> An antidegradation policy generally aims to protect against unauthorized degradation of water quality. Like all  
27 State WQS, it is subject to EPA review and approval. 40 C.F.R. § 131.12. EPA's antidegradation regulation provides  
28 for three "Tiers" of water quality protection. See generally 40 C.F.R. § 131.12; *Am. Wildlands v. Browner*, 260 F.3d  
1192, 1194-95 (10th Cir. 2001). Tier 1 sets forth the baseline level of protection applicable to all waters in the State  
and requires that "[e]xisting instream water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses  
shall be maintained and protected." 40 C.F.R. § 131.12(a)(1). Tier 2 protections apply to "high quality" waters and  
Tier 3 waters are outstanding resource waters and receive the most stringent protection. *Id.* at § 131.12(a)(2) & (3).

1 511 U.S. at 704-07 (describing the regime used to establish water quality standards). Upon  
2 review, if EPA determines that a State's new or revised water quality standards are inconsistent  
3 with the Act, then EPA so notifies the State. 33 U.S.C. § 1313(b), (c)(3)-(4); 40 C.F.R. § 131.21.  
4 If the State does not adopt timely changes, EPA does so. 33 U.S.C. § 1313(c)(3)-(4).

5 CWA section 304(a) authorizes EPA to publish recommendations for water quality  
6 criteria, which provide guidance for States to consider in developing water quality standards for  
7 waters within their jurisdiction. 33 U.S.C. § 1313(a). Pursuant to that authority, EPA published  
8 recommendations for pH criteria for the protection of marine aquatic life. *See* "Quality Criteria  
9 for Water," PB-263 943, p. 337-354 (July 26, 1976):<sup>3</sup>

10 For open ocean waters where the depth is substantially greater than the euphotic  
11 zone, the pH should not be changed more than 0.2 units from the naturally  
12 occurring variation or in any case outside the range of 6.5 to 8.5. For shallow,  
13 highly productive coastal and estuarine waters where naturally occurring pH  
14 variations approach the lethal limits of some species, changes in pH should be  
15 avoided but in any case should not exceed the limits established from fresh  
16 water, i.e., 6.5-9.0. As with freshwater criteria, rapid pH fluctuations that are  
17 due to waste discharges should be avoided.

18 *Id.* at 337.

19 **A. Washington's Water Quality Standards**

20 Washington's water quality standards are codified in Chapter 173-201A of Washington's  
21 Administrative Code ("WAC"). Washington has established numeric water quality criteria for  
22 marine aquatic life uses as well as protection of shellfish harvesting and wildlife habitat uses.

23 WAC 173-201A-210 (1-4). The marine numeric criteria for pH establishes an acceptable range of  
24 pH for waters designated as "extraordinary quality" or "excellent quality" of 7.0 – 8.5, with a  
25 human-caused variation within that range of less than 0.2 (for extraordinary quality) or 0.5 (for  
26 excellent quality). WAC 173-201A-210(1) at Table 210(1)(f).

27 Washington has established an overarching narrative designated use provision that  
28 requires protection of all aquatic life uses, which includes "all indigenous fish and nonfish aquatic

---

<sup>3</sup> This is known as the "Red Book." It is available at:  
[http://water.epa.gov/scitech/swguidance/standards/criteria/current/upload/2009\\_01\\_13\\_criteria\\_redbook.pdf](http://water.epa.gov/scitech/swguidance/standards/criteria/current/upload/2009_01_13_criteria_redbook.pdf)

1 species.” WAC 173-201A-210(1). Aquatic life uses for waters designated as “extraordinary  
2 quality” or “excellent quality” are “salmonid and other fish migration, rearing and spawning;  
3 clam, oyster and mussel rearing and spawning; crustaceans and other shellfish (crabs, shrimp,  
4 crayfish, scallops, etc.) rearing and spawning.” *Id.*

5 Washington has also established a narrative criterion to protect aquatic life designated  
6 uses that requires that “deleterious material concentrations must be below those which have the  
7 potential, either singularly or cumulatively, to adversely affect characteristic water uses, [or]  
8 cause acute or chronic conditions to the most sensitive biota dependent upon those waters.”  
9 WAC 173-201A-260(2)(a).

10 **B. Oregon’s Water Quality Standards**

11 Oregon’s water quality standards are codified in Chapter 340, Div. 41 of Oregon’s  
12 Administrative Regulations (“OAR”). Oregon has adopted numeric water quality criteria for pH  
13 that establishes an acceptable range for pH in marine waters of 7.0-8.5. OAR-340-041-0021. For  
14 estuarine and fresh waters there are basin-specific criteria that range from 6.5-9.5, depending on  
15 the location. OAR-340-041-0101 through 0350. Oregon also has adopted a narrative water  
16 quality criterion for protection of aquatic life designated uses. OAR-340-041-007(10). *See also*  
17 OAR 340-041-0011 “waters of the State must be of sufficient quality to support aquatic species  
18 without detrimental changes in the resident biological communities.”

19 **II. CWA Section 303(d) Lists of Impaired Waters**

20 CWA section 303(d) directs States to identify and list the waters within their boundaries  
21 for which the CWA’s technology-based pollutant control measures are insufficient to achieve  
22 applicable water quality standards; these are referred to as “impaired waters.” 33 U.S.C.  
23 § 1313(d)(1). The State need not identify the source of pollutants causing the impairment, but  
24 must identify the pollutant causing the impairment, if known. 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(4). The list  
25 of impaired waters (“Section 303(d) List” or “List”) must be submitted to EPA for approval. 33  
26 U.S.C. § 1313(d)(2). To implement this requirement, EPA regulations direct each State to submit  
27 its Section 303(d) List to EPA biennially. 40 C.F.R. § 130.7 (d).

1        In developing the List, each State is required to “assemble and evaluate all existing and  
2 readily available water quality-related data and information.” 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(5). A State  
3 submission to EPA must include supporting documentation, including, at a minimum: (i) “A  
4 description of the methodology used to develop the list;”<sup>4</sup> (ii) “[a] description of the data and  
5 information used to identify waters;” (iii) “[a] rationale for any decision to not use any existing  
6 and readily available data and information” for certain categories of waters; and (iv) “[a]ny other  
7 reasonable information requested by the [EPA].” *See id.* at § 130.7(b)(6). Upon request by EPA,  
8 a State also must demonstrate good cause for not including a water or waters on the 303(d) List.  
9 *See id.* at § 130.7(b)(6)(iv).

10      EPA’s 2002 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report Guidance  
11 (November 19, 2001) (“2002 IR Guidance”) [WA-001310-335] recommends that States place  
12 waters into categories. Under the Guidance, “Category 5” is for waters where the water quality  
13 standard is not attained. *Id.* at 7 [WA-001316]. The Category 5 waters constitute the Section  
14 303(d) List. Under the CWA and implementing regulations, EPA only approves or disapproves a  
15 State’s Section 303(d) List, i.e., Category 5 listings. 40 C.F.R. § 130.7. EPA does not approve or  
16 disapprove the States’ placement of waters in other categories except to the extent that EPA  
17 determines such waters should be placed in Category 5. The 2002 IR Guidance provides that:

18      EPA’s review and approval of the 303(d) list will be based on a determination that  
19 the state’s or territory’s assessment and listing methodology was used to prepare  
20 the list, that the assessment and listing methodology is scientifically sound, that it  
21 is consistent with the state’s or territory’s water quality standards, and that the  
22 state or territory reasonably considered all existing and readily available data and  
23 information, and listed all waters not attaining water quality standards.

24      2002 IR Guidance at 10-11 [WA-001319-20].

25      EPA is directed to approve or disapprove a State’s List within 30 days of its submission.  
26 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d)(2). EPA must ensure that the State has satisfied the minimum requirements

27      <sup>4</sup> Washington and Oregon have developed listing methodologies for their 2010 Lists. Those methodologies address,  
28 among other things, the quality of the data used for listing, as well as the predicates for listing waters as impaired for  
non-attainment of narrative water quality criteria. Washington State “Water Quality Program Policy, WQP Policy  
1-11, Chapter 1, 2012 [WA-001361] and Chapter 2, September, 2006. [WA-001641]; “Methodology for Oregon’s  
2010 Water Quality Report and List of Water Quality Limited Waters,” (last updated 5/12/2011) [OR1-00080 and  
OR1-000122].

1 set forth in CWA Section 303(d) and the implementing regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(d)(2),  
2 including whether the State has assessed the water against the applicable water quality standards.  
3 If EPA disapproves a State's List for failing to include certain waters, EPA is to identify such  
4 impaired waters for the State within 30 days of the disapproval. *Id.*

5 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

6 **I. Ocean Acidification**

7 Ocean acidification science is complex and still in early stages, especially in regard to  
8 coastal waters of the territorial seas and estuarine waters.<sup>5</sup> Many of the published studies and  
9 reports addressing OA that EPA reviewed for the 2010 303(d) Lists recognized that the effects of  
10 ocean acidification on coastal and estuarine systems needed more study.<sup>6</sup> *See Ctr. for Biological*  
11 *Diversity v. EPA*, 749 F.3d 1079, 1086 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (recognizing the scientific uncertainty  
12 and complexity of the issues related to pollutants believed to be the precursors of acid rain, which  
13 contributes to ocean acidification). Thus, while more is known today about the causes and effects  
14 of OA on coastal and estuarine waters than was understood only a few years ago -- when the  
15 States compiled their Section 303(d) Lists and when EPA undertook its review -- the associated  
16 underlying science continues to evolve.

17 **II. EPA's Decisions**

18 **A. EPA's Approval of Washington's 303(d) List**

19 The State of Washington, through its Department of Ecology ("Ecology") submitted its  
20 initial Integrated Report for 2010 to EPA Region 10 on December 28, 2011. [WA-000200]. By  
21

---

22 <sup>5</sup> Waters of a State include the "territorial seas," a belt of the seas measured from the coast and extending seaward  
23 three miles. 33 U.S.C. § 1362(7) & (8); *Natural Res. Def. Council v. EPA*, 863 F.2d 1420, 1436 (9th Cir. 1988). In  
24 this brief, the term "coastal waters" refers to marine waters of a State in the territorial seas, as opposed to marine  
waters of the oceans. Estuaries are areas where inland fresh waters (like rivers) meet saline ocean waters.

25 <sup>6</sup> *See, e.g.*, Wootton, *et al.* (2008) at 18851 (results point to "a need for more detailed investigation of the processes  
26 controlling ocean pH in higher latitudes and coastal habitats;" and "results highlight the urgent need for more  
spatially distributed and temporally intensive studies of ocean pH dynamics and their underlying causal mechanisms  
27 and consequences"); Feely, *et al.* (2010) at 20 ("Further study of ocean acidification in estuaries is thus warranted");  
Barton, *et al.* (2010) at 707 (noting that a significant shortcoming in understanding the effects of acidification on  
natural populations was the prediction of how carbonate conditions will vary in coastal and estuarine environments,  
28 and that before predictive models could be developed, high resolution monitoring of carbon dioxide chemistry was  
still needed). [WA-000731 (CD containing all of these documents)].

1 letter dated January 12, 2012, EPA informed Ecology that the submission was incomplete and  
2 that further documentation would be required before EPA could take action. EPA specifically  
3 requested Washington to include “any memos to the file, etc. documenting decisions surrounding  
4 comments submitted by CBD” [WA-000198]. Washington submitted further documentation on  
5 March 20, 2012, and again on June 8, 2012 [WA-000005]. Altogether, Ecology’s submissions  
6 included the 2010 Section 303(d) List, a response to public comments on the List, the final list  
7 methodology, a TMDL priority ranking, and an Integrated Report on the status of Washington’s  
8 waters [WA-000001]. The List did not identify any coastal or estuarine waters as impaired due to  
9 pollutants associated with OA or to conditions attributable to OA.<sup>7</sup>

10 After careful review and consideration of the information submitted by Washington, and  
11 evaluation of additional information that was not available to Washington but was available to  
12 EPA (including additional information provided to EPA by CBD), EPA approved Washington’s  
13 2010 Section 303(d) List:

14 The EPA has also conducted a detailed review of Ecology’s justification for not  
15 placing Puget Sound or other Washington waters, including Willapa Bay,  
16 Gray’s Harbor, The Strait of Juan de Fuca, and the Pacific Coast, on the 2010  
17 303(d) list for impairments associated with water quality standards that could be  
18 related to ocean acidification, including marine pH, and narrative criteria under  
19 aquatic life designated uses, or antidegradation. Based on this review, the EPA  
has concluded that Ecology has adequately addressed all statutory and  
regulatory requirements for excluding these waters from Category 5 of the  
Integrated Report.

20 Letter dated Dec. 21, 2012 from Opalski to Susewind, approving Washington’s Section 303(d)  
21 List (“Approval Letter”) [WA-000001-2]. *See also* EPA Review of Ecology’s Analysis of Ocean  
22 Acidification Data and Information (“Approval Letter, Encl. 2”) [WA-000011] (same).

23  
24  
25  
26 <sup>7</sup> Washington did, however, identify Puget Sound in “Category 2” (waters of concern) for potential impacts to fish  
27 and shellfish habitat attributable to human activities, including conditions that may be related to ocean acidification.  
28 June 8, 2012 letter from Ecology to EPA, Encl. 4 [WA-000153, 154]. Washington concluded that “some credible  
data created concerns of possible impact to designated uses, but fall short of demonstrating that there is a persistent  
problem.” *Id.* But, because the information did not demonstrate a failure of the Puget Sound to attain the State’s  
water quality standards, a Category 5 listing was not appropriate. *Id.*

## **B. EPA's Partial Approval/ Partial Disapproval of Oregon's 303(d) List and EPA's Additions to Oregon's 303(d) List**

Oregon submitted its Integrated Report (which included its Section 303(d) List) to EPA on May 23, 2011. The Oregon List did not identify any coastal, or estuarine waters as impaired for conditions related to OA. In its Response to Comments on Final Supplement to Oregon's 2010 Integrated Report [OR1-000168-179], Oregon addressed comments submitted by CBD regarding OA, and explained that available data did not demonstrate nonattainment of the numeric water quality standard for pH, and that there was insufficient evidence demonstrating nonattainment of the general beneficial use goal in any one of Oregon's narrative criteria. *Id.* at 7 [OR1-000177]. Oregon explained that the articles submitted by CBD did not contain any usable data that could be used for evaluating water quality. *Id.* at 8 [OR1-000178].

Following careful review and consideration, EPA issued a decision partially approving and partially disapproving Oregon's 303(d) List. *See* Letter dated March 15, 2012 from Michael Bussell to Greg Aldrich [OR2-000337-38]. In the partial disapproval, EPA found that Oregon had not considered readily available data and water-quality related information for water bodies of the State and failed to list waters for a variety of pollutants for which EPA had approved numeric water quality criteria. *Id.* Because of the partial disapproval, CWA § 303(d) and EPA regulations, 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(d)(2), required that EPA identify waters not meeting the State's water quality standards.

On December 14, 2012, EPA issued its decision adding 870 additional water quality limited segments to the Oregon 2010 List. *See* Letter dated December 14, 2012 from Daniel Opalski to Greg Aldrich (“Final Additions to Oregon’s 2010 303(d) List”) [OR2-000001-9]. EPA did not identify any water quality segments as impaired due to pollutants associated with or conditions attributable to OA. EPA explained that there was no evidence of impairment based on nonattainment of Oregon’s water quality standards applicable to ocean acidification. *See id.*, Attachment 3, Response to Comments on the EPA’s Additions to Oregon’s 2010 CWA 303(d) List at 18-19, 22 [OR2-000271-272, 275]. *See also* EPA Evaluation of Ocean Acidification Information [OR2-000286]: “EPA has determined that, at this time, there is not sufficient evidence demonstrating non-attainment of Oregon’s marine pH criteria and/or state-wide

1 narrative criteria related to aquatic life designated uses to warrant listing any coastal waters as  
2 impaired or threatened related to these WQS.”

3 **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

4 This Court reviews EPA’s actions under the Administrative Procedure Act’s (“APA’s”)  
5 arbitrary and capricious standard. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A); *Dioxin/Organochlorine Ctr. v. Clarke*,  
6 57 F.3d 1517, 1521 (9th Cir. 1995); *Env'l. Def. Fund, Inc. v. Costle*, 657 F.2d 275, 283 (1981).  
7 EPA’s approval of Washington’s 303(d) List and partial approval of Oregon’s 303(d) List must  
8 be upheld unless it is “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance  
9 with law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). The Ninth Circuit only finds a decision arbitrary or capricious  
10 if “the agency has relied on factors which Congress has not intended it to consider, entirely failed  
11 to consider an important aspect of the problem, offered an explanation for its decision that runs  
12 counter to the evidence before the agency, or is so implausible that it could not be ascribed to a  
13 difference in view or the product of agency expertise.” *Dioxin/Organochlorine*, 57 F.3d at 1521  
14 (quoting *Motor Vehicle Mfr. Ass'n v. State Farm Ins.*, 463 U.S. 29, 44 (1983)). Even if the  
15 “[agency] made missteps . . . the burden is on [the plaintiff] to demonstrate that the [agency’s]  
16 ultimate conclusions are unreasonable.” *George v. Bay Area Rapid Transit*, 577 F.3d 1005, 1011  
17 (9th Cir. 2009).

18 “This ‘arbitrary and capricious’ standard of review is a highly deferential one which  
19 presumes the agency’s action to be valid.” *Env'l. Def. Fund*, 657 F.2d at 283. Under this  
20 standard, a court may not substitute its judgment for that of the agency. *Motor Vehicle Mfrs.*  
21 *Ass'n* . 463 U.S. at 43. Instead, the agency’s action must be affirmed if the agency has considered  
22 the relevant factors and articulated a “rational connection between the facts found and the choice  
23 made.” *Id.* (citation omitted).

24 The Court’s deference to the agency “is highest when reviewing an agency’s technical  
25 analyses and judgments involving the evaluation of complex scientific data within the agency’s  
26 technical expertise.” *League of Wilderness Defenders Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project v.*  
27 *Allen*, 615 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir. 2011). “Agencies have discretion to rely on their own  
28 experts’ reasonable opinions to resolve a conflict between or among specialists, even if [a

1 reviewing court] find[s] contrary views more persuasive. *Greater Yellowstone Coal. v. Lewis*, 628  
2 F.3d 1143, 1148 (9th Cir. 2010). “[W]here, as here, a court reviews an agency action  
3 involve[ing] primarily issues of fact, and where analysis of the relevant documents requires a high  
4 level of technical expertise, we must defer to the informed discretion of the responsible federal  
5 agencies.” *Vigil v. Leavitt*, 381 F.3d 826, 833 (9th Cir. 2004). The Ninth Circuit has said “we  
6 must defer to the agency’s finding on these matters unless the record shows that the agency’s  
7 findings were not supported by substantial evidence—i.e., unless the evidence in the record  
8 ‘would *compel* a reasonable finder of fact to reach a contrary result.’ ” *Ursack Inc. v. Sierra*  
9 *Interagency Black Bear Grp.*, 639 F.3d 949, 958 (9th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Gebhart v. SEC*, 595  
10 F.3d 1034, 1043 (9th Cir. 2010)). The “substantial evidence” standard is the most stringent  
11 standard that can apply to questions of evidentiary sufficiency for factual determinations. *See*  
12 *Dickinson v. Zurko*, 527 U.S. 150, 164 (1999); *see also Utah Shared Access Alliance v.*  
13 *Carpenter*, 463 F.3d 1125, 1134 (10th Cir. 2006); *Ass’n of Data Processing Svc. Orgs. v. Bd. of*  
14 *Governors*, 745 F.2d 677, 683-84 (D.C. Cir. 1984). That standard is more deferential even than  
15 the “clearly erroneous” standard for appellate review of trial court findings. *Zurko*, 527 U.S. at  
16 162, 164.

17 **ARGUMENT**

18 **I. EPA Reasonably Determined that the Data and Information Readily Available**  
19 **at the Time of the Challenged Decisions Did Not Require that the Coastal and**  
20 **Estuarine Waters in Washington and Oregon Be Listed as Impaired Due to**  
**Pollutants Associated With or Conditions Attributable to Ocean Acidification.**

21 CBD argues that ocean acidification has caused violation of the States’ narrative water  
22 quality standards for protection of aquatic life (CBD Br. at 13-19), the numeric criteria for pH  
23 (CBD Br. 19-21), and a non-existent criterion for “aragonite undersaturation” and corrosive  
24 seawater conditions (CBD Br. at 21-24). EPA recognizes that ocean acidification has the  
25 potential to adversely affect aquatic life in marine waters. But, at the time EPA made the  
26 challenged decisions regarding the Washington and Oregon Lists, EPA reasonably determined  
27 that existing and readily available information did not support a finding that the States’ coastal  
28 and estuarine waters failed to meet the States’ applicable water quality standards.

1       With respect to Washington, EPA concluded that the information submitted by CBD,  
2 both to Ecology and to EPA, did not provide sufficient ambient water quality data, nor could such  
3 data be reasonably extrapolated, to demonstrate that the State's water quality standards were not  
4 met for pollutants associated with OA or conditions attributable to OA. *See Approval Letter,*  
5 Encl. 2, EPA Review of Ecology's Analysis of Ocean Acidification Data and Information [WA-  
6 000011, 14]. With respect to Oregon, EPA similarly determined that the references provided by  
7 CBD did not identify sufficient evidence to demonstrate non-attainment of Oregon's water quality  
8 standards so as to warrant listing such waters as impaired due to pollutants associated with or  
9 conditions attributable to OA. *See EPA Evaluation of Ocean Acidification Information [OR2-  
10 000286].* As demonstrated below, both of EPA's determinations are reasonable, explained in the  
11 decision documents, supported by the administrative records, and should be afforded judicial  
12 deference.

13       A. **Washington Reasonably Decided Not to List Waters for Non-attainment of the**  
14 **Numeric pH Water Quality Criteria Based Upon Evaluation of Information**  
15 **Available at the Time it Submitted its List, and EPA Reasonably Approved the**  
16 **List Upon Evaluation of Information Available at the Time of Approval.**<sup>8</sup>

17       Washington's water quality criteria for pH provide that pH levels should be within the  
18 range of 7.0-8.5, with an anthropogenic (human-caused) variation within that range of less than  
19 0.2 units (for extraordinary marine quality waters) or less than 0.5 units (for excellent marine  
20 quality waters). All of the pH data in the record are within the acceptable range, and CBD does  
21 not contend otherwise. CBD relies entirely on a single study that documented a decrease in pH  
22 levels of greater than 0.2 units, but still within the acceptable range in the pH water quality  
23 criteria. J. Timothy Wootton, *et al, Dynamic Patterns and Ecological Impacts of Declining*  
24 *Ocean pH in a High-Resolution Multi-Year Dataset* (2008) [WA-000731] ("Wootton Study").  
25 The Wootton Study evaluated samples collected from a single monitoring location over an eight-  
26  
27

---

27       <sup>8</sup> In its Motion for Summary Judgment, CBD does not challenge EPA's decision that the readily available data and  
28 information did not support a finding of nonattainment of Oregon's numeric water quality criteria for pH.

1 year period in waters that are not subject to Washington's water quality standards.<sup>9</sup> On the basis  
2 of the Woottton Study, CBD argues that all of Washington's marine waters should be listed as  
3 impaired for pH. (CBD Br. at 19-21). Washington disagreed, and, as discussed below, EPA  
4 reasonably concurred with Washington.

5 **1. Washington's Decision**

6 CBD criticizes Washington's decision, asserting that "Washington declined to examine  
7 the pH data" (CBD Br. at 19). However, the record demonstrates otherwise. Washington  
8 reviewed all of the documents submitted by CBD, prepared a detailed response to CBD's specific  
9 assertions, and concluded that none of the referenced studies demonstrated non-attainment of the  
10 pH criteria:

11 We reviewed each of the documents referenced by CBD as support for their  
12 assertions to see if they included pH data not meeting our water quality  
13 standards. None of the documents included data that showed any data outside  
14 of the accepted range, and in particular, no data demonstrated a decline in pH  
15 at any Washington marine water body of greater than 0.2 or 0.5 pH units  
16 (depending on the waterbody use designation) due to a human-caused  
variation within the accepted range. Therefore, a Category 5 listing of  
threatened or impaired for coastal waters was not triggered based on the pH  
numeric criteria.

17 Letter dated June 12, 2012 from Ecology to CBD [WA-000066, 67]. *See also* Washington's  
18 Response to Comments from CBD [WA-000417] (same). Washington prepared a table listing all  
19 of the references submitted by CBD to Washington (a total of 128) [WA-000072-86], specifically  
20 referencing the Woottton Study [WA-000086], and explained that "Ecology reviewed all of the  
21 references to determine if the studies provided relevant documentation of declines in pH not  
22 within the acceptable limits or documenting violations of the narrative standards for protecting  
23 existing and designated aquatic life uses." [WA-000071]. Washington reviewed all of the  
24 available data and information, and concluded that "[m]ost of the studies submitted by CBD did  
25 not provide sufficient or appropriate information to assess whether or not Washington waters

27  
28 <sup>9</sup> The monitoring location was near Tatoosh Island, in the Strait of San Juan de Fuca, within the waters of the Makah  
Indian Tribe.

1 were attaining the water quality standards.” June 12, 2012 letter from Ecology to CBD at 4 [WA-  
2 000069].<sup>10</sup>

3 Ecology’s Environmental Assessment Program staff, with expertise in marine science,  
4 prepared a separate and more detailed assessment of the references that it found to be potentially  
5 relevant, including the Wootton Study. *See* Ecology Assessment of Relevant CBD References  
6 (“Ecology Assessment”) [WA-000087-94]. The team evaluated the Wootton Study and the  
7 associated data set “to determine if the pH and biology data collected as part of the study could be  
8 used as a basis for listing on Category 5 in the 2010 Marine Assessment.” *Id.* at 7 [WA-000093].  
9 Ecology staff communicated directly with the principal author of the Wootton Study in  
10 developing responses to the comments. *See* letter (undated) from Wootton to Ecology and EPA  
11 [WA-000824-26]. The Ecology Assessment explained why the Wootton Study did not support a  
12 finding that Washington’s marine waters did not attain the pH water quality criteria:

13 While the Wootton study may be valid for Tatoosh Island, a spatial  
14 extrapolation of long-term trends from the study area to a larger regional  
15 change would exhibit high uncertainty since the data are from only one  
16 sampling location. Also, the study does not provide conclusive evidence  
17 that the cause of the pH change is due to human sources. For instance, the  
18 change could be caused by natural sources related to inputs from river  
19 discharges, long-shore shelf transport and planktonic specifics composition  
(i.e., the pH changes could be related to changes in physical conditions due  
to the location and changes in the patterns of primary productivity and  
species composition).

20 Ecology Assessment at 7 [WA-000093]. Ecology thus concluded that “[f]urther follow-up studies  
21 would be needed before Ecology could support using the data for documenting human-caused  
22 variations in pH or aquatic life impairment for Washington’s coastal water bodies leading to a  
23 Category 5 listing. This study does not provide any pH data showing impairments of Washington  
24 waters, nor does it provide conclusive evidence that Washington’s coastal aquatic life in the  
25 natural environment are being impaired by ocean acidification.” *Id.*

26

---

27 <sup>10</sup> Washington evaluated the data submitted by CBD and concluded that much of the data did not meet credible data  
28 requirements mandated by the Water Quality Data Act, RCW 90.48.570-90.48.590 and the Water Quality Program  
Policy 1-11 [WA-001361]. Washington described its credible data requirements and explained why certain data  
failed to meet the requirements in its June 12, 2012 letter to CBD at 4 [WA-00069].

1 Washington also concluded that the Wootton Study data could not be extrapolated to  
2 other waters in Washington, because all of the samples were collected at a single location, and  
3 that location was not representative of other marine waters. The sampling site was unique  
4 because it is where oceanic waters mix with estuarine water (including inland freshwater) from  
5 the Strait of Juan de Fuca. *Id.* Moreover, the waters at the monitoring site where the Wootton  
6 Study was conducted are not subject to Washington's water quality standards because it is located  
7 within the boundaries of the Makah Indian reservation and States do not have regulatory authority  
8 over Tribal lands, waters, or individual Tribal members. *Id.*<sup>11</sup>

9 Washington also considered a study by Feely, *et al.*, *The Combined Effects of Ocean*  
10 *Acidification, Mixing, and Respiration On pH and Carbonate Saturation in an Urbanized*  
11 *Estuary* (2010) ("Feely Study") [WA-000731] that evaluated inorganic carbon measurements in  
12 Puget Sound. *See* Encl. 1 to 6/12/12 letter from Ecology to CBD at 6 [WA-000071, 76]. The  
13 Feely Study found that decreasing pH in the Puget Sound is largely the result of natural mixing,  
14 circulation, and biological processes, and that OA plays a smaller role. Feely concluded that  
15 since the Industrial Revolution "a reasonable estimate of the range of the present-day pH decrease  
16 in the Puget Sound region due to ocean acidification is between .05 and .15 pH units." Feely  
17 Study at 12 [WA-000731]. Thus, even if 100% of that decline in pH were due to anthropogenic  
18  
19

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

---

<sup>11</sup> While CBD notes that Washington has, in the past, included waters on tribal lands on its 303(d) list (CBD Br. at 21, n. 5), those listings have occurred in response to requests by the interested Tribe, and are listed with an express qualification that Washington State does not have jurisdiction over the waters. This is consistent with EPA Guidance. *See* Recommended Framework for EPA Approval Decisions on 2002 State Section 303(d) List Submissions at 10-11 [WA-001304-05]. CBD's assertion that the Makah Tribe wanted its waters listed (CBD Br. at 21) is not supported by the record, and its quote from the Makah letter is not complete. The complete quote is: "We believe that our ability to consult [government to government] would be enhanced by being able to cite Ocean Acidification (OA) in our [Tribal Water Quality Standards] on the issue." [WA-WA-002138] (emphasis is the portion of the quote omitted by CBD). The Makah Tribe was proposing a consultation to consider establishing a water quality standard of its own, rather than proposing that the State include tribal waters on its List. Moreover, the record demonstrates that EPA responded to the Makah Tribe by offering to arrange such consultation, but the Tribe did not pursue consultation. [WA-000181 (Supp. AR)]. *See also* letter from the Makah declining listing of the Strait of Juan de Fuca on the State's 2010 List for reasons other than OA [WA-000208]. If the Tribe sought listing of the Strait of Juan de Fuca due to pollutants associated with or conditions attributable to OA, then the Tribe would have so indicated in that letter.

1 causes, the change would still be less than the 0.2 pH unit variation that would indicate non-  
2 attainment of the criteria.

3 Based on its evaluation of this available pH data, including all of the information and data  
4 referenced by CBD, Washington reasonably concluded that none of the studies demonstrated non-  
5 attainment of the pH standard for any Washington marine waters: “None of the documents  
6 included data that showed any data outside of the accepted range [7.0-8.5], and in particular, no  
7 data demonstrated a decline in pH at any Washington marine water body of greater than 0.2 or 0.5  
8 pH units (depending on the waterbody use designation) due to a human-caused variation within  
9 the accepted range.” Letter dated June 12, 2010 from Ecology to CBD at 2 [WA-000067]. *See*  
10 *also* Washington’s specific comments on Feely Study, Enclosure 2 to the June 12 letter [WA-  
11 000087, 89-90].

12 **2. EPA Review**

13 EPA reviewed Washington’s submittal package, including all of the information submitted  
14 by CBD to Washington, and reached the same conclusion: The data did not support a finding of  
15 non-attainment of the numeric water quality criteria for pH:

16 The EPA has also conducted a detailed review of Ecology’s justification  
17 for not placing Puget Sound or other Washington waters, including  
18 Willapa Bay, Gray’s Harbor, The Strait of Juan de Fuca, and the Pacific  
19 Coast, on the 2010 303(d) list for impairments associated with water  
20 quality standards that could be related to ocean acidification, including  
21 marine pH and narrative criteria under aquatic life designated uses, or  
22 antidegradation. Based on this review, the EPA has concluded that  
23 Ecology has adequately addressed all statutory and regulatory  
24 requirements for excluding these waters from Category 5 of the  
25 Integrated Report.

26 Approval Letter at 1 [WA-000001].<sup>12</sup> EPA’s further analysis confirmed that, “for a variety of  
27 reasons, including the unique sampling location in the [Wootton] study, information from those  
28

---

26 <sup>12</sup> EPA conducted an independent review of Ecology’s Analysis of Ocean Acidification Data and Information [WA-  
27 000011-20]. Appendix A addresses EPA’s Review of Ocean Acidification References [WA-000021-65], including  
28 a table identifying all Ocean Acidification References Reviewed by the EPA (Table 1) [WA-000021-50], as well as  
a separate table providing an assessment of CBD references that were flagged as having potentially usable data or  
information to assess to Washington’s water quality standards (Table 2) [WA-000051-65].

1 documents was insufficient to determine the attainment status of Washington's marine pH  
2 criteria." Approval Letter, Encl. 2 (EPA Review of Ecology's Analysis of Ocean Acidification  
3 Data and Information) at 5 [WA-000015].

4 In addition to the review and evaluation conducted by Washington, EPA independently  
5 evaluated the Wootton Study and associated data set. *See Factors Influencing Trends in pH in the*  
6 *Wootton, et al. (2008) Dataset, by Cheryl Brown of EPA's Pacific Coastal Ecology Branch,*  
7 *Western Ecology Division, Office of Research and Development (2012) ("Brown") [WA-001338-*  
8 *60].* Dr. Brown concluded that there are other drivers (particularly river flow) that influence pH  
9 in the region that were not considered in the Wootton Study.<sup>13</sup> Because it was not possible to  
10 determine from the data whether the decline in pH observed in the Wootton Study was due to  
11 natural or anthropogenic causes, EPA reasonably determined that the Wootton Study's conclusion  
12 that the decline in pH was strictly related to anthropogenic atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> was not supported.  
13 Brown at 22 [WA-001359].<sup>14</sup>

14 Dr. Brown also agreed with Washington that the sampling location on Tatoosh Island was  
15 unique.<sup>15</sup> Dr. Brown compared the Tatoosh Island data with data collected at Yaquina Estuary in  
16 Oregon. If the decline in pH observed in the Wootton dataset was representative of other marine  
17 waters, one would expect similar results at other locations in the Pacific Northwest, such as the  
18 Yaquina Estuary. Yet comparison of the data showed no such correlation. Brown at 15-16 [WA-  
19 001352-52]. Because the sampling location was not representative of Washington marine waters,  
20

---

21 <sup>13</sup> CBD incorrectly interpreted the Brown analysis as concluding that pH changes resulting from the river flow were  
22 caused by climate change (i.e., human-caused increase in CO<sub>2</sub>). CBD Br. at 20. In fact, the Brown analysis  
23 concluded that it was not possible to discern from the data whether the alterations resulted from climate change.  
Brown at 22 [WA-001338].

24 <sup>14</sup> Brown's conclusions are consistent with the Feely Study, finding that the decline in pH at Tatoosh Island may be  
25 related to local conditions and "is probably explained by a combination of factors, including enhanced upwelling of  
waters off the Washington coast resulting from changes in regional ocean circulation as well as smaller contribution  
from ocean acidification. Feely Study at 18 [WA-000731].

26 <sup>15</sup> Brown explained that the sampling site is unique because "The oceanography in this region is influenced by  
numerous physical factors including complex bathymetry upwelling (both wind driven and tidal) and the presence of  
large-scale eddies and multiple river plumes. This region is subjected to strong tidal estuarine and wind-driven  
flows." Brown at 2 [WA-001338].

1 EPA agreed with Ecology's conclusion that it would be inappropriate to extrapolate the biology  
2 data collected near Tatoosh Island, from the Makah waters, to waters of the State." *See also*  
3 Approval Letter, Encl. 2 (EPA's Review of Ecology's Analysis of Ocean Acidification Data and  
4 Information) at 6 [WA-000016]. *See also id.* at 5 [WA-000015] (describing a host of variables  
5 that make the extrapolation of data across large geographic range, for the purposes of determining  
6 non-attainment of water quality standards, difficult and inappropriate).<sup>16</sup>

7 In sum, the data in the record do not support a finding of non-attainment of the water  
8 quality criteria for pH in the marine waters of Washington. Washington's conclusion was  
9 reasonable, and EPA's review and concurrence with that decision was also reasonable.

10 **B. EPA Reasonably Determined that the Information Available at the Time of**  
11 **EPA's Decisions Did Not Demonstrate that Either Washington's or Oregon's**  
12 **Coastal and Estuarine Waters Failed To Meet Applicable Narrative Water**  
**Quality Criteria for Protection of Aquatic Life.**

13 EPA reasonably concluded that the existing and readily available information did not  
14 support a finding that coastal and estuarine waters in Washington or Oregon were impaired based  
15 on the States' respective narrative standards for protection of aquatic life due to conditions related  
16 to ocean acidification. *See* Approval Letter at 1 [WA-000001]; EPA Evaluation of Ocean  
17 Acidification Information [OR2-000290].

18 Washington concluded that the available data and information did not provide sufficient  
19 evidence that aquatic uses in the natural environment were being threatened or impaired by  
20 environmental alterations related to ocean acidification. June 12, 2012 letter at 3 [WA-000068].  
21 Washington provided a detailed summary of the information it considered, and an assessment of  
22 its conclusions. *See* Ecology Assessment of Relevant CBD References [WA-000087-94]. EPA  
23 agreed with Washington's analysis, concluding that: "No data or information was presented  
24

25 <sup>16</sup> CBD has selectively quoted a provision from the EPA 2010 OA Guidance indicating that EPA supports a  
26 "presumption that the pollutant source (particularly when from atmospheric deposition, such as mercury) is  
27 uniformly affecting segments in large geographic areas." (CBD Br. at 21). However, the next sentence qualifies  
28 EPA's the statement, indicating that "EPA supports the use of these methods for making attainment decisions related  
to OA where appropriate" (emphasis added). Because of the significant data and information gaps concerning OA  
in coastal waters, and because a variety of factors may influence pH levels in coastal and estuarine waters, EPA  
reasonably concluded that it would not be appropriate to extrapolate inconclusive data over large geographic areas.

1 demonstrating impaired health of wild, natural populations in Washington waters, therefore an  
2 impairment determination for the aquatic life designated uses cannot be made at this time.” EPA  
3 Review of Ecology’s Analysis of Ocean Acidification Data and Information at 7 [WA-000017];  
4 and EPA reached similar conclusions with respect to attainment of Oregon’s narrative criteria.

5 See EPA Evaluation of Ocean Acidification Information [OR2-000289].<sup>17</sup>

6 EPA provided a detailed and rational explanation of why it determined that the available  
7 information was insufficient for the purpose of determining non-attainment of applicable water  
8 quality standards. There were no *in situ* field studies documenting adverse effects on the health of  
9 aquatic life populations in either State. Nor was there any other information documenting effects  
10 on indigenous populations of aquatic life in State waters indicating stressors attributable to ocean  
11 acidification. The only information available regarding aquatic life in ambient waters under  
12 natural conditions was inconclusive.<sup>18</sup> CBD relies only upon anecdotal observations, laboratory  
13 experiments, and data collected at artificial habitats, specifically, on-shore oyster seed hatcheries.  
14 As demonstrated below, EPA’s determination that existing information was insufficient to  
15 support a decision to list the waters as impaired was reasonable.

16 **1. EPA Reasonably Determined That Anecdotal Information Was**  
17 **Insufficient to Support Listing Decisions in Either State.**

18 CBD relies on statements found in articles and conference reports, without reference to  
19 any data supporting the assertions. For example, CBD begins its hyperbolic argument with  
20 reference to an article in the *New Yorker* discussing the pteropod – which makes no mention of

21

---

22 <sup>17</sup> CBD challenges EPA’s statement that “[n]o data or information was presented demonstrating impaired health of  
23 wild, natural populations in Oregon waters,” arguing that EPA’s qualification “wild, natural” is in error as a matter  
24 of law (CBD Br. at 17), but does not object to EPA’s similar conclusion with regard to Washington’s waters. The  
25 quoted statement was made in EPA’s Evaluation of Ocean Acidification Information [OR2-000289] and was in  
response to specific articles discussing laboratory studies. As explained below, EPA reasonably found that neither  
the laboratory data, nor the hatchery data, were sufficient to support a finding of impairment of aquatic life narrative  
standard absent any data indicating effects on the wild, natural populations in the State’s coastal and estuarine  
waters.

26

27 <sup>18</sup> CBD’s statement that “EPA acknowledges that evidence shows ocean acidification has killed billions of oyster  
28 larvae in the Pacific Northwest” is a gross overstatement. EPA acknowledged that there was some information that  
acidified/low carbonate water was affecting oyster larvae in on-shore hatcheries (e.g., the Barton Study), but that  
information was insufficient to determine non-attainment of applicable water quality standards. There is no  
information in the record to support the claims for non-hatchery shellfish.

1 any pteropods in the coastal waters of Washington and Oregon, and the referenced study (Kolbert  
2 (2006)) [OR2-003021] does not refer to the waters of the relevant States. (CBD Br. at 2).

3 While CBD asserts that the oyster population in Willapa Bay has “crashed,” (CBD Br. at  
4 14), it did not present either State, EPA or the Court any actual oyster population or harvesting  
5 data from Willapa Bay to support its assertion.<sup>19</sup> CBD relies on the Southern California Coastal  
6 Water Research Project (2010) (“SCCWRP”), but that report does not purport to explain the  
7 degree of, or reasons for, the decline in wild oyster populations in Willapa Bay. On the contrary,  
8 the SCCWRP report recognized that “[s]ets of wild oysters have been recorded in Willapa Bay  
9 since 1942 and there have been other periods of 4 to 6 years where sets of wild oysters have been  
10 poor. It is unknown if the present declines in wild set will end, as other periods have, or if the  
11 declines will continue.” SCCWRP at B-5 [WA-000731]. EPA reasonably determined that such  
12 inconclusive and anecdotal statements did not provide sufficient basis to list Willapa Bay as  
13 impaired due to non-attainment of the narrative water quality criteria attributable to ocean  
14 acidification conditions.<sup>20</sup>

15 **2. EPA Reasonably Determined that Laboratory-Based Studies Were Not**  
16 **Sufficient to Support Listing Decisions in Either State.**

17 CBD relies upon several laboratory studies that correlate ocean acidification conditions  
18 with adverse impacts to shellfish. (CBD Br. at 15, citing Crim (2011) at 272 [WA-000731],  
19 Hettinger (2012) at 30 [WA-000731], Gaylord (2011) at 2586 [WA-000731]). EPA determined  
20 that it would not be appropriate to rely solely on the findings in such studies as a basis for  
21 determining non-attainment of the narrative water quality criteria in natural waterbodies, because

---

22  
23 <sup>19</sup> Moreover, CBD’s assertion that the oyster population in Willapa Bay has “crashed” is difficult to reconcile with  
24 its assertion that the oysters [in a hatchery] are raised from broodstock “from sustaining native populations in  
Willapa Bay, WA.” CBD Br. at 17.

25 <sup>20</sup> CBD also argues that even if the cause for the decline in shellfish in Washington waters is not known (i.e., that the  
26 decline cannot be attributed to OA), the water must still be listed based on actual impairment even though the  
27 impairment cannot be attributed to a pollutant. CBD Br. at 15, citing EPA Guidance [WA-001231]. The cited EPA  
Guidance is not applicable here, because there has been no finding or demonstration of impairment. The Guidance  
relates to circumstances where there is a finding of impairment, but an unknown cause.

1 the data and information did not sufficiently account for the potential adaption and acclimation of  
2 wild and/or indigenous populations. *See* EPA Review of Ecology's Analysis of Ocean  
3 Acidification Data and Information at 7 [WA-000017]; EPA Evaluation of Ocean Acidification  
4 Information [OR2-000289]. EPA reviewed articles documenting that laboratory experiments  
5 suffered from a reduced ecological complexity (Honisch, *et al.* 2012) [WA-000731]. Some of the  
6 experiments used parameters that were tightly controlled and manipulated and thus did not reflect  
7 the conditions in the natural environment. EPA explained that "these variables make the  
8 extrapolation of data/information from the laboratory and hatchery studies submitted by CBD, for  
9 the purposes of determining non-attainment of water quality standards, difficult and inappropriate  
10 in these circumstances. More information is needed on the biological condition within the  
11 waterbody (e.g., *in situ* field studies documenting the health of aquatic life populations) or  
12 laboratory studies that are designed to account for natural variability and ecological complexity  
13 within a particular system." EPA Response to Comments on EPA's Additions to Oregon's 2010  
14 303(d) List at 22 [OR2-000275]. Thus, EPA reasonably concluded that data and information  
15 were not sufficient to make a determination of non-attainment of the States' narrative criteria.

16       **3. EPA Reasonably Determined That Shellfish Hatchery Information Was Not**  
17       **Sufficient to Support Listing Decisions in Oregon.**<sup>21</sup>

18       EPA determined that it would not be appropriate to make listing decisions based on  
19 observations from on-shore oyster seed hatcheries because they are artificial habitats and are not  
20 representative of natural conditions in ambient waters. EPA explained that the artificial nature of  
21 the monoculture found in an on-shore shellfish hatchery did not accommodate the adaptation and  
22 acclimatization that would be found in ambient waters. *See* EPA's Decision Document, "Final  
23 Additions to Oregon's 2010 303(d) List, December 14, 2012, Encl. 3 (Response to Comments),  
24 Attach. 3 (EPA Evaluation of Ocean Acidification Information) [OR2-000286, 000288]. In

25  
26       

---

<sup>21</sup> CBD raised this issue only with respect to EPA's decision on listing waters in Oregon. CBD does not argue that  
27 the hatchery data provide a basis for challenging EPA's approval of the Washington List, even though EPA found  
28 the hatchery data insufficient for listing of waters in Washington for the same reasons it found the data insufficient  
for listing waters in Oregon.

1 particular, EPA cited the SCCWRP conference proceedings that concluded that there was a need  
2 for improved linkages between biological and oceanographic data, and recognized that “hatchery  
3 operators operate with tendencies that may obscure the relationship between water chemistry and  
4 recruitment” and concluded that “[u]ltimately, analysis of ocean chemistry resulted in discovery  
5 of a correlation between upwelling of lower pH water and larval mortalities in the hatcheries.  
6 However, it is unclear what is actually driving these decreases both in the hatcheries as well as in  
7 the wild.” *Id.*

8 EPA also addressed the Barton, *et al.* (2012) study of hatcheries [OR2-001521-533]  
9 (“Barton Study”) upon which CBD relies, and explained why it did not find the information  
10 sufficient to support a listing decision. *See* EPA’s Decision Document, “Final Additions to  
11 Oregon’s 2010 303(d) List, December 14, 2012, Encl. 3 (Response to Comments), Attach. 3  
12 (EPA Evaluation of Ocean Acidification Information) [OR2-000286, 000289]. The Barton Study  
13 included no data regarding the health of wild aquatic organisms, and the only pH data presented  
14 in the Barton Study indicated a pH in Netarts Bay between 7.6 and 8.2, both within the acceptable  
15 range of 7.0-8.5 for marine waters and 6.5-8.5 for estuarine waters. *Id.* Measurements of pH  
16 within the acceptable range confounded conclusions that ocean acidification would be the cause  
17 for the observed hatchery losses. The Barton Study also found variability of shellfish larvae  
18 responses within the hatchery (“within cohort variability”), and observed that some shellfish  
19 larvae grew without incident, casting further doubt on the conclusion.

20 CBD argues that EPA should consider information about the observed effects and other  
21 knowledge and data in areas with limited site-specific monitoring because EPA’s 2010  
22 Memorandum on OA supports the use of such information and data to make impairment decisions  
23 “when extrapolation of such information to a wider geographic area is appropriate.” EPA  
24 Evaluation of Ocean Acidification Information, citing (EPA 2010) [OR2-000286, 000287].  
25 (CBD Br. at 18). EPA’s evaluation of the articles submitted by CBD, however, revealed that the  
26 papers’ authors made reference to “data gaps preventing definitive conclusions to be drawn about  
27 the degree to which ocean acidification impacts can be extrapolated to other locations.” *Id.* For  
28 example, the Barton Study identified gaps that rendered extrapolation difficult and inappropriate:

1 [T]wo significant shortcomings exist with regard to understanding acidification  
2 effects on natural populations of organisms in variable coastal and estuarine  
3 habitats: prediction of how carbonate conditions will vary in coastal and estuarine  
4 environments with increasing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> and a better understanding of the  
fundamental biology underlying the responses of multicellular organisms to  
acidification.

5 EPA Evaluation of Ocean Acidification Information (quoting Barton Study) [OR2-000289]. The  
6 Barton Study went on to explain that “limited experience suggests that the multitude of forcing  
7 time scales still requires high-resolution monitoring of water CO<sub>2</sub> chemistry before we are fully  
8 capable of developing predictive models.” *Id.*

9 Moreover, EPA explained that studies reveal that physical and seasonal variables make  
10 the extrapolation of data across a large geographic range for purposes of determining non-  
11 attainment of water quality standards in local water bodies difficult and inappropriate. *Id.* [OR2-  
12 000286]. EPA relied on a variety of studies documenting these variables.<sup>22</sup> Based on the record,  
13 it was reasonable for EPA to determine that it was not appropriate to list marine and estuarine  
14 waters in Oregon.

15 **C. EPA Reasonably Determined that Listing Was Not Required Based on**  
16 **Aragonite Undersaturation.**

17 EPA agrees with CBD’s assertion that an increase of carbon dioxide in seawater reduces  
18 aragonite saturation. Aragonite is used by aquatic life to build shells and skeletons, and reduced  
19 saturation of aragonite can weaken or preclude formation of shells and skeletons. (CBD Br. at  
20 22). However, neither Washington nor Oregon has adopted a numeric water quality criterion for  
21 assessing aragonite saturation, nor has EPA published recommended water quality criteria for  
22 aragonite saturation state. Therefore, failure to attain a numeric aragonite saturation criterion  
23 based on alleged undersaturation of aragonite would not provide a basis for listing waters as

24  
25  
26 <sup>22</sup> See, e.g., Juranek, *et al.* (2009) describing the distinct seasonal cycle offshore from in Newport, Oregon relating to  
27 upwelling dynamics; Langston (May 26, 2011) describing natural processes and pollution may contribute to low pH  
values in Hood Canal, Washington. EPA noted that Netarts Bay, Oregon is a lagoon-type estuary dominated by  
28 ocean inputs, while water exchange between the ocean and the four basins of Puget Sound is limited by bottom  
morphology at Admiralty Inlet, relying on Barton, *et al.* (2012) and Feely, *et al.* (2010). [OR2-001317-4494].

1 impaired.<sup>23</sup> CBD argues, however, that EPA failed to consider information concerning aragonite  
2 undersaturation to evaluate whether it caused non-attainment of either State's narrative water  
3 quality criteria for protection of aquatic life. (CBD Br. at 23).

4 EPA did consider all of the studies submitted by CBD and explained why it found the  
5 information insufficient to support a listing decision. *See* CBD Cited References on Ocean  
6 Acidification [WA-00071-86]; EPA's Review of References Submitted by CBD [OR2-000292-  
7 329]; Index of Ocean Acidification Articles Reviewed by EPA [OR2-001299-1316].<sup>24</sup> Moreover,  
8 CBD expressly referenced EPA's conclusions regarding those studies. (CBD Br. at 24). Thus,  
9 while CBD may disagree with EPA's conclusions, the record does not support its argument that  
10 EPA ignored the information. As explained above, EPA reasonably concluded that the readily  
11 available data and information considered by EPA was insufficient to support a listing of coastal  
12 and estuarine waters for nonattainment of the States' narrative water quality criteria; and, as  
13 discussed below, that decision is entitled to deference.

14 **D. The Court Should Afford Judicial Deference to EPA's Decisions.**

15 As discussed above (*see* Standard of Review, *supra* at 9-10), EPA's decisions based on  
16 scientific and technical information within its area of expertise are entitled to heightened  
17 deference. Notwithstanding that fundamental premise of administrative law, CBD encourages the  
18 Court to reject EPA's evaluation of the information before it, relying on a series of cases that  
19 provide no support.

20 CBD misleadingly relies on *Sierra Club v. EPA*, 346 F.3d 955, 963 (9th Cir. 2003), in  
21 which the Ninth Circuit vacated an EPA decision because the Agency's decision was based upon  
22 assumptions of fact that were shown to be invalid. In this case, EPA did not rely on any invalid  
23

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>23</sup> The appropriate remedy would be to petition the State to establish a water quality criterion for aragonite. In fact,  
26 CBD has petitioned EPA to recommend water quality criteria under CWA section 304(a) to address aragonite  
saturation state and calcification rates.  
[http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/campaigns/ocean\\_acidification/pdfs/EPA\\_OA\\_petition\\_2013.pdf](http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/campaigns/ocean_acidification/pdfs/EPA_OA_petition_2013.pdf) (April 17,  
2013).

27 <sup>24</sup> EPA determined that some of the studies [OR2-002882, OR2-000310] contained no data suitable for analysis  
28 under Oregon water quality standards; and found that some studies [WA-00060, WA-000056-57, WA-000731]  
provided no evidence of non-attainment regarding Washington water quality standards in Puget Sound and along the  
State's west coast.

1 assumptions of fact; it determined that the information available to EPA was inconclusive or  
2 insufficient to support listing the waters as impaired. Moreover, *Sierra Club* case did not involve  
3 the Agency's evaluation of technical and scientific information within its expertise, and for which  
4 it is entitled to the greatest deference.

5 The records of decision in this case also differ from the matter considered in *Mont.*

6 *Wilderness Ass'n v. McAllister*, 666 F.3d 549, 561 (9th Cir. 2011), in which the Forest Service  
7 failed to consider an important element of the applicable statute (the "1977 Study Act") based on  
8 its erroneous understanding of its legal obligations under the 1977 Study Act. Here, EPA did not  
9 misapprehend its legal obligations, but clearly understood the applicable decisional threshold -  
10 attainment of numeric and narrative water quality standards. EPA considered all existing and  
11 readily available data and information before it and applied its technical expertise and concluded  
12 that the readily available data and information was insufficient to support a finding of non-  
13 attainment of the applicable standards.

14 CBD's reliance on *Fla Pub. Interest Research Grp. Citizen Lobby Inc. v. EPA*, 386 F.3d  
15 1070 (11th Cir. 2004) is similarly inapposite. The challenge there was not to EPA's review of a  
16 state's Section 303(d) List; rather, the plaintiff contended that Florida's adoption of a rule  
17 establishing a methodology for listing waters as impaired amounted to a *de facto* amendment of  
18 Florida's water quality standards. Here, there is no suggestion that the States' water quality  
19 standards are invalid or inconsistent with the CWA; nor is there any allegation that either State or  
20 EPA has amended the water quality standards through application of listing methodologies.

21 In sum, CBD is relying on inapplicable authorities. The Ninth Circuit case law is clear  
22 that EPA's approval of Washington's 2010 303(d) List, and EPA's decision-making in its  
23 additions to Oregon's 2010 303(d) List, are entitled to deference, and the Court should uphold  
24 them.

25  
26  
27  
28

1 **II. EPA Considered All Existing and Readily Available Information in Approving the**  
2 **Washington 303(d) List and in its Additions to the Oregon 303(d) List.**

3 CBD submitted six letters to Washington and 128 references; CBD submitted six letters to  
4 Oregon and over 125 references. EPA reviewed all of the information submitted to the States, as  
5 well as 14 letters and 175 references submitted by CBD to EPA, and information otherwise  
6 identified independently by EPA.<sup>25</sup> If there was any additional, readily available, information to  
7 support listing of waters in Washington or Oregon as impaired due to conditions related to OA,  
8 CBD would certainly have provided the information to EPA.

9 CBD argues that EPA erred in failing to add additional waters to Oregon's list because it  
10 did not consider all existing and readily available data and information. CBD identifies two  
11 sources of information by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ("NOAA") that  
12 CBD claims EPA should have considered, but did not: (1) NOAA's National Estuarine Research  
13 Reserve System and National Data Center and (2) NOAA's Pacific Marine Environmental  
14 Laboratory and Integrated Ocean Observing System.<sup>26</sup> CBD does not suggest, much less identify  
15 any relevant information, in either of the two referenced sources that would have led to a different  
16 decision. *See Sierra Club v. Hankinson*, 939 F. Supp. 865, 870 (N.D. Ga. 1996) (cited in CBD  
17 Br. at 25), rejecting an argument that the State failed to consider "all existing readily available  
18 water quality-related data and information" in preparing its 303(d) list because there was no  
19 evidence in the record indicating that the State's failure to use the identified information resulted  
in the exclusion of waters that should have been listed.

20 CBD also argues that Washington failed to consider all existing and readily available  
21 information in developing its 2010 303(d) List. CBD asserts that Washington should have  
22 consulted data available from EPA's Storage and Retrieval warehouse ("STORET"), United  
23 States Geological Survey ("USGS") water data repository and the Laboratory Analytical and  
24

25 <sup>25</sup> See WA-000710, -734, -739, -744, -751, -763, -771, -800, -831, -832, -840, -850, -888, -895, -916, -936, -956, -959, -969, -977, -980, -992, -001005, OR2-004495-OR2-004805.

26 <sup>26</sup> While EPA recommends that States consider these sources in its 2010 OA Memorandum at 7 [WA-001122], the recommendations are not binding requirements, *id.* at 5 [WA-001118], and the States and EPA have discretion in determining the data and information upon which to rely.

1 Strorage Retrieval (“LASAR”) databases, arguing that those sources were existing and readily  
2 available because they were consulted by EPA for its additions to the Oregon List. The record  
3 developed by Washington, however, demonstrates that the State did consult both the STORET  
4 and USGS databases.<sup>27</sup> The Washington database contains records for which the source is  
5 identified as STORET or USGS, and some of the records in the Washington submission to EPA  
6 derive from those sources. [WA-000097]. It is thus apparent that Washington consulted both of  
7 those sources for relevant information as part of its listing methodology. In fact, CBD recognizes  
8 that Washington consulted the STORET and USGS databases for pH data and relied upon that  
9 information for listing the Soleduck River. (CBD Br. at 27, n. 8).

10 CBD further asserts that Washington should have considered data collected in Puget  
11 Sound by NOAA and should have pursued data cited by Dr. Feely of NOAA. (CBD Br. at 29).  
12 Again, the record reflects that Washington did consider those data, but concluded that the data  
13 were not appropriate to support listing decisions. Washington acted consistent with EPA  
14 regulations: “While States are required to evaluate all existing and readily available water  
15 quality-related data and information, a State may decide to rely or not rely on particular data or  
16 information in determining whether to list particular waters.” [WA-000003]. *See also Sierra*  
17 *Club v Leavitt*, 488 F.3d 904, 913 (11th Cir. 2007) (regulations require state to evaluate all data,  
18 but state has right to decide not to use certain data). Washington explained its credible data  
19 policy and asserted that all readily available data meeting the requirements of its policy were  
20 analyzed. Washington also considered documents from Dr. Feely, which validated its decision  
21 not to use some existing datasets collected from Puget Sound for attainment decision-making  
22 because the pH probes used to collect the Puget Sound data were subject to a high rate of error.  
23 *See* June 12, 2012 Letter from Washington to CBD [WA-000066, 69]. Therefore, the record  
24  
25  
26

---

27 CBD also suggests that Washington should have considered the LASAR database that was reviewed by EPA for  
28 the Oregon list. LASAR is an Oregon Department of Environmental Quality database, so it only contains data  
considered relevant to Oregon waters, thus there would be no reason for Washington to consider that database.

1 demonstrates that Washington appropriately considered and evaluated all existing readily  
2 available data and information.<sup>28</sup>

3 More importantly, the issue in this case is not the validity of Washington's decision, but  
4 rather, EPA's decision approving Washington's 2010 Section 303(d) List. EPA necessarily has a  
5 limited role when acting in its oversight capacity to review and approve or disapprove State  
6 Section 303(d) Lists, as the law provides EPA 30 days to approve or disapprove a State's List. 40  
7 C.F.R. § 130.7(d)(2). The nature of EPA review of a Section 303(d) List was addressed in  
8 *Barnum Timber Co. v. EPA*, 835 F. Supp. 2d 773, 779 (N.D. Cal. 2011), explaining that Congress  
9 assigned primary responsibility for identifying impaired waters to the States and provided EPA an  
10 oversight role, and recognizing that the short period for EPA to review the States' Lists confirms  
11 that its role is limited. The 10th Circuit reached the same result in *City of Albuquerque v.*  
12 *Browner*, 97 F.3d 415, 425 (10th Cir. 1996) ("the time restriction for the EPA's review of state . . .  
13 water quality standards supports our conclusion that Congress intended the EPA to have a very  
14 limited role.") *See also Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc. v. EPA*, 16 F.3d 1395, 1399 (4th Cir.  
15 1993). Although the Ninth Circuit has not defined the scope of EPA's oversight role in reviewing  
16 State Section 303(d) lists, it has recognized the primacy of the States in combating pollution in  
17 State waters. *City of Arcadia*, 411 F.3d at 1106.

18 Notwithstanding EPA's limited role, EPA did conduct a detailed review of Washington's  
19 justification for not listing waters as impaired based on water quality standards that could be  
20 associated with OA. *See* EPA Decision Document [WA-000001] and EPA Review of Ecology's  
21

---

22 <sup>28</sup> While States must consider all existing and readily available water quality-related data and information, there is  
23 no requirement that a State forward to EPA all of the information it considered. The State needs only to include in its  
24 submission (1) a description of the methodology used to develop the list; (2) a description of the data and information  
25 used to identify waters; (3) any other reasonable information requested by the Region and (4) rationale for decision  
not to use data. 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(b)(6). In this case, EPA emphasized the importance of the Washington's  
consideration of all existing and readily available data and information for coastal and estuarine waters, including pH,  
in developing the 2010 List per 40 C.F.R. § 130.7." *See* 6/8/12 letter from Bussell to Susewind [WA-000153]. In a  
letter dated Jan 12, 2012 from Bussell to Susewind, EPA specifically asked Washington to include "[a]ny memos to  
the file, etc. documenting decisions surrounding comments submitted by the Center for Biological Diversity" [WA-  
000198]. Ecology provided a full response, identifying all resources it considered and relied upon. [WA-000153-  
56]. *See also* letter dated 6/12/12 from Ecology to CBD, explaining why certain information provided to Washington  
by CBD was not relied upon. [WA-000066-70].

1 Analysis of Ocean Acidification Data and Information [WA-000011-65]. EPA agreed with  
2 Washington's conclusion that the information available did not support listing of Washington  
3 waters as impaired for conditions related to OA.

4 **III. CBD is Not Entitled to the Remedy It Seeks.**

5 Should the Court determine that either of EPA's decisions was arbitrary and capricious,  
6 the appropriate remedy authorized by the APA is to remand the decision to EPA to take  
7 appropriate action. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). *See, e.g., UOP v. United States*, 99 F.3d 344, 350-51  
8 (9th Cir. 1996); *Asarco, Inc. v. EPA*, 616 F.2d 1153, 1160 (9th Cir. 1980) ("If the court  
9 determines that the agency's course of inquiry was insufficient or inadequate, it should remand  
10 the matter to the agency for further consideration and not compensate for the agency's dereliction  
11 by undertaking its own inquiry into the merits." CBD acknowledges that vacatur of the decision  
12 during the remand proceedings would not be appropriate (CBD Br. at 29-30). However, CBD  
13 inappropriately – and unrealistically - requests that the court "direct EPA to disapprove Oregon  
14 and Washington's impaired waters lists and identify waters impaired by ocean acidification with  
15 30 days of the disapproval." (CBD Br. at 30).

16 The Supreme Court has long held that if a reviewing court disapproves of an agency's  
17 action, it ought not to order the agency to take specific action on remand. *See NLRB v. Food*  
18 *Store Emps. Union, Local 347*, 417 U.S. 1, 10 (1974) ("when a reviewing court concludes that an  
19 agency invested with broad discretion . . . has apparently abused that discretion . . . remand to the  
20 agency for reconsideration, and not enlargement of the agency order, is ordinarily the reviewing  
21 court's proper course"); *Fed. Power Comm'n v. Idaho Power Co.*, 344 U.S. 17, 20 (1952) ("[T]he  
22 guiding principle [of APA review] is that the function of the reviewing court ends when an error  
23 of law is laid bare. At that point the matter once more goes to the [agency] for reconsideration").  
24 On remand, it is therefore the agency's responsibility, not the Court's, to evaluate alternative  
25 courses of action and ultimately make a choice. *Kleppe v Sierra Club*, 427 U.S. 390, 410 n. 21  
26 (1976). *See also, IRS v. Fed. Labor Relations Auth.*, 494 U.S. 922, 933 (1990) (An agency's task  
27 on remand remains "infused with judgment and discretion, requiring the 'accommodation of  
28 conflicting policies that were committed to the agency's care.'") (citation omitted).

The preservation of agency discretion in the environmental sphere is particularly important given the complex scientific and technical knowledge required to implement environmental statutes. As the Ninth Circuit has stated, judicial “intervention into the process of environmental regulation, a process of great complexity, should be accomplished with as little intrusiveness as feasible.” *Western Oil & Gas Ass’n v. U.S. EPA*, 633 F.2d 803, 813 (9th Cir. 1980).

In sum, if either decision is found to be arbitrary and capricious, the only appropriate remedy is remand to the agency. On remand, EPA would have the discretion to approve or disapprove the States' 2010 Lists consistent with the CWA and EPA regulations and any Order of this Court. CBD is not entitled to an Order compelling disapproval of the Lists; and particularly is not entitled to an Order compelling EPA to identify any particular waters as impaired by ocean acidification.

## CONCLUSION

EPA’s actions on Washington’s and Oregon’s 2010 Section 303(d) Lists of impaired waters were lawful, reasonable, and well supported by the administrative records. CBD’s motion for summary judgment should be denied; EPA’s cross-motion for summary judgment should be granted.

Dated: August 15, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

**SAM HIRSCH**  
Acting Assistant Attorney General  
Environment and Natural Resources Division

/s/ Cynthia J. Morris  
CYNTHIA J. MORRIS  
United States Department of Justice  
Environment and Natural Resources Division  
Environmental Defense Section  
P.O. Box 7611  
Washington, D.C. 20044  
Telephone: (202) 616-7554  
Facsimile: (202) 514-8865  
Email: c.j.morris@usdoj.gov

1 JENNY A. DURKAN  
2  
3 United States Attorney

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 BRIAN C. KIPNIS  
12 Assistant United States Attorney  
13 Western District of Washington  
14 Office of the United States Attorney for the Western  
15 District of Washington  
16 5220 United States Court House  
17 700 Stewart Street  
18 Seattle, WA 98101  
19 Telephone: (206) 553-7970  
20 Email: brian.kipnis@usdoj.gov

21 OF COUNSEL:

22 Lori Houck Cora,  
23 Assistant Regional Counsel  
24 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10  
25 1200 Sixth Avenue, Ste. 900  
26 Seattle, Washington 98101  
27 WA Bar # 28051

28 Stephen J. Sweeney  
29 Office of General Counsel (2355A)  
30 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
31 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
32 Washington D.C. 20460

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
5510  
5511  
5512  
5513  
5514  
5515  
5516  
5517  
5518  
5519  
5520  
5521  
5522  
5523  
5524  
5525  
5526  
5527  
5528  
5529  
5530  
5531  
5532  
5533  
5534  
5535  
5536  
5537  
5538  
5539  
55310  
55311  
55312  
55313  
55314  
55315  
55316  
55317  
55318  
55319  
55320  
55321  
55322  
55323  
55324  
55325  
55326  
55327  
55328  
55329  
55330  
55331  
55332  
55333  
55334  
55335  
55336  
55337  
55338  
55339  
55340  
55341  
55342  
55343  
55344  
55345  
55346  
55347  
55348  
55349  
55350  
55351  
55352  
55353  
55354  
55355  
55356  
55357  
55358  
55359  
55360  
55361  
55362  
55363  
55364  
55365  
55366  
55367  
55368  
55369  
55370  
55371  
55372  
55373  
55374  
55375  
55376  
55377  
55378  
55379  
55380  
55381  
55382  
55383  
55384  
55385  
55386  
55387  
55388  
55389  
55390  
55391  
55392  
55393  
55394  
55395  
55396  
55397  
55398  
55399  
553100  
553101  
553102  
553103  
553104  
553105  
553106  
553107  
553108  
553109  
553110  
553111  
553112  
553113  
553114  
553115  
553116  
553117  
553118  
553119  
553120  
553121  
553122  
553123  
553124  
553125  
553126  
553127  
553128  
553129  
553130  
553131  
553132  
553133  
553134  
553135  
553136  
553137  
553138  
553139  
553140  
553141  
553142  
553143  
553144  
553145  
553146  
553147  
553148  
553149  
553150  
553151  
553152  
553153  
553154  
553155  
553156  
553157  
553158  
553159  
553160  
553161  
553162  
553163  
553164  
553165  
553166  
553167  
553168  
553169  
553170  
553171  
553172  
553173  
553174  
553175  
553176  
553177  
553178  
553179  
553180  
553181  
553182  
553183  
553184  
553185  
553186  
553187  
553188  
553189  
553190  
553191  
553192  
553193  
553194  
553195  
553196  
553197  
553198  
553199  
553200  
553201  
553202  
553203  
553204  
553205  
553206  
553207  
553208  
553209  
553210  
553211  
553212  
553213  
553214  
553215  
553216  
553217  
553218  
553219  
553220  
553221  
553222  
553223  
553224  
553225  
553226  
553227  
553228  
553229  
553230  
553231  
553232  
553233  
553234  
553235  
553236  
553237  
553238  
553239  
553240  
553241  
553242  
553243  
553244  
553245  
553246  
553247  
553248  
553249  
553250  
553251  
553252  
553253  
553254  
553255  
553256  
553257  
553258  
553259  
553260  
553261  
553262  
553263  
553264  
553265  
553266  
553267  
553268  
553269  
553270  
553271  
553272  
553273  
553274  
553275  
553276  
553277  
553278  
553279  
553280  
553281  
553282  
553283  
553284  
553285  
553286  
553287  
553288  
553289  
553290  
553291  
553292  
553293  
553294  
553295  
553296  
553297  
553298  
553299  
553300  
553301  
553302  
553303  
553304  
553305  
553306  
553307  
553308  
553309  
553310  
553311  
553312  
553313  
553314  
553315  
553316  
553317  
553318  
553319  
553320  
553321  
553322  
553323  
553324  
553325  
553326  
553327  
553328  
553329  
553330  
553331  
553332  
553333  
553334  
553335  
553336  
553337  
553338  
553339  
553340  
553341  
553342  
553343  
553344  
553345  
553346  
553347  
553348  
553349  
553350  
553351  
553352  
553353  
553354  
553355  
553356  
553357  
553358  
553359  
553360  
553361  
553362  
553363  
553364  
553365  
553366  
553367  
553368  
553369  
553370  
553371  
553372  
553373  
553374  
553375  
553376  
553377  
553378  
553379  
553380  
553381  
553382  
553383  
553384  
553385  
553386  
553387  
553388  
553389  
553390  
553391  
553392  
553393  
553394  
553395  
553396  
553397  
553398  
553399  
553400  
553401  
553402  
553403  
553404  
553405  
553406  
553407  
553408  
553409  
553410  
553411  
553412  
553413  
553414  
553415  
553416  
553417  
553418  
553419  
553420  
553421  
553422  
553423  
553424  
553425  
553426  
553427  
553428  
553429  
553430  
553431  
553432  
553433  
553434  
553435  
553436  
553437  
553438  
553439  
553440  
553441  
553442  
553443  
553444  
553445  
553446  
553447  
553448  
553449  
553450  
553451  
553452  
553453  
553454  
553455  
553456  
553457  
553458  
553459  
553460  
553461  
553462  
553463  
553464  
553465  
553466  
553467  
553468  
553469  
553470  
553471  
553472  
553473  
553474  
553475  
553476  
553477  
553478  
553479  
553480  
553481  
553482  
553483  
553484  
553485  
553486  
553487  
553488  
553489  
553490  
553491  
553492  
553493  
553494  
553495  
553496  
553497  
553498  
553499  
553500  
553501  
553502  
553503  
553504  
553505  
553506  
553507  
553508  
553509  
553510  
553511  
553512  
553513  
553514  
553515  
553516  
553517  
553518  
553519  
553520  
553521  
553522  
553523  
553524  
553525  
553526  
553527  
553528  
553529  
553530  
553531  
553532  
553533  
553534  
553535  
553536  
553537  
553538  
553539  
553540  
553541  
553542  
553543  
553544  
553545  
553546  
553547  
553548  
553549  
553550  
553551  
553552  
553553  
553554  
553555  
553556  
553557  
553558  
553559  
553560  
553561  
553562  
553563  
553564  
553565  
553566  
553567  
553568  
553569  
553570  
553571  
553572  
553573  
553574  
553575  
553576  
553577  
553578  
553579  
553580  
553581  
553582  
553583  
553584  
553585  
553586  
553587  
553588  
553589  
553590  
553591  
553592  
553593  
553594  
553595  
553596  
553597  
553598  
553599  
553600  
553601  
553602  
553603  
553604  
553605  
553606  
553607  
553608  
553609  
553610  
553611  
553612  
553613  
553614  
553615  
553616  
553617  
553618  
553619  
553620  
553621  
553622  
553623  
553624  
553625  
553626  
553627  
553628  
553629  
553630  
553631  
553632  
553633  
553634  
553635  
553636  
553637  
553638  
553639  
553640  
553641  
553642  
553643  
553644  
553645  
553646  
553647  
553648  
553649  
553650  
553651  
553652  
553653  
553654  
553655  
553656  
553657  
553658  
553659  
553660  
553661  
553662  
553663  
553664  
553665  
553666  
553667  
553668  
553669  
5536610  
5536611  
5536612  
5536613  
5536614  
5536615  
5536616  
5536617  
5536618  
5536619  
5536620  
5536621  
5536622  
5536623  
5536624  
5536625  
5536626  
5536627  
5536628  
5536629  
5536630  
5536631  
5536632  
5536633  
5536634  
5536635  
5536636  
5536637  
5536638  
5536639  
5536640  
5536641  
5536642  
5536643  
5536644  
5536645  
5536646  
5536647  
5536648  
5536649  
5536650  
5536651  
5536652  
5536653  
5536654  
5536655  
5536656  
5536657  
5536658  
5536659  
5536660  
5536661  
5536662  
5536663  
5536664  
5536665  
5536666  
5536667  
5536668  
5536669  
55366610  
55366611  
55366612  
55366613  
55366614  
55366615  
55366616  
55366617  
55366618  
55366619  
55366620  
55366621  
55366622  
55366623  
55366624  
55366625  
55366626  
55366627  
55366628  
55366629  
55366630  
55366631  
55366632  
55366633  
55366634  
55366635  
55366636  
55366637  
55366638  
55366639  
55366640  
55366641  
55366642  
55366643  
55366644  
55366645  
55366646  
55366647  
55366648  
55366649  
55366650  
55366651  
55366652  
55366653  
55366654  
55366655  
55366656  
55366657  
55366658  
55366659  
55366660  
55366661  
55366662  
55366663  
55366664  
55366665  
55366666  
55366667  
55366668  
55366669  
553666610  
553666611  
553666612  
553666613  
553666614  
553666615  
553666616  
553666617  
553666618  
553666619  
553666620  
553666621  
553666622  
553666623  
553666624  
553666625  
553666626  
553666627  
553666628  
553666629  
553666630  
553666631  
553666632  
553666633  
553666634  
553666635  
553666636  
553666637  
553666638  
553666639  
553666640  
553666641  
553666642  
553666643  
553666644  
553666645  
553666646  
553666647  
553666648  
553666649  
553666650  
553666651  
553666652  
553666653  
553666654  
553666655  
553666656  
553666657  
553666658  
553666659  
553666660  
553666661  
553666662  
553666663  
553666664  
553666665  
553666666  
553666667  
553666668  
553666669  
5536666610  
5536666611  
5536666612  
5536666613  
5536666614  
5536666615  
5536666616  
5536666617  
5536666618  
5536666619  
5536666620  
5536666621  
5536666622  
5536666623  
5536666624  
5536666625  
5536666626  
5536666627  
5536666628  
5536666629  
5536666630  
5536666631  
5536666632  
5536666633  
5536666634  
5536666635  
5536666636  
5536666637  
5536666638  
5536666639  
5536666640  
5536666641  
5536666642  
5536666643  
5536666644  
5536666645  
5536666646  
5536666647  
5536666648  
5536666649  
5536666650  
5536666651  
5536666652  
5536666653  
5536666654  
5536666655  
5536666656  
5536666657  
5536666658  
5536666659  
5536666660  
5536666661  
5536666662  
5536666663  
5536666664  
5536666665  
5536666666  
5536666667  
5536666668  
5536666669  
55366666610  
55366666611  
55366666612  
55366666613  
55366666614  
55366666615  
55366666616  
55366666617  
55366666618  
55366666619  
55366666620  
55366666621  
55366666622  
55366666623  
55366666624  
55366666625  
55366666626  
55366666627  
55366666628  
55366666629  
55366666630  
55366666631  
55366666632  
55366666633  
55366666634  
55366666635  
55366666636  
55366666637  
55366666638  
55366666639  
55366666640  
55366666641  
55366666642  
5536666664