

OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON
CIVIL DIVISION
Natural Resources

Norm Maleng
Prosecuting Attorney

900 King County Administration Building
500 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104
(206) 296-8820
FAX (206) 296-0415

February 21, 2007

RECEIVED

FEB 21 2007

DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
OFFICE OF DIRECTOR

Judy Greear, Clerk
Environmental Hearings Office
Washington State Pollution Control Hearings Board
4224 Sixth Ave. SE, Rowe Six, Bldg. 2
Lacey, WA 98504-0903

Re: Phase I Municipal Stormwater Permit, PCHB case Puget Soundkeeper Alliance and People for Puget Sound, Appellants v. Department of Ecology, # 07-021

To the Clerk of the Board:

On behalf of King County, we are enclosing for consideration by the Board the original and one copy of the following:

1. King County's Petition to Intervene
2. Declaration of Curt Crawford in support of King County's Petition to Intervene
3. Declaration of Service

King County is one of six identified Permittees under the Phase I Municipal Stormwater Permit that is on appeal. King County requests that this Petition be filed in the above captioned appeal. King County requests that the Petition to Intervene be decided on the County's written submissions, unless the matter is contested. If contested, the County reserves the right to request that oral argument occur during the Prehearing Conference (if the matters are consolidated) or in each Prehearing Conference (if the matters are not consolidated).

I have contacted the parties to this appeal and they have indicated that they do not oppose intervention by King County so long as King County does not seek to raise new legal grounds for appeal that were not raised in the six notices of appeal that have been filed in PCHB Nos. 07-021, 07-026, 07-027, 07-028, 07-029, and 07-030. King County concurs with this condition.

cc: Env. Database Board
 Rev/Rec - G

File Fr ATG

ATG Book

Ann Ludlow

Initial: Mc 2/21/07


Prosecuting Attorney
King County

Judy Greear, Clerk
February 21, 2007
Page 2

I can be reached directly at 206-296-0421 for any questions. Thank you for your assistance

Sincerely,

For NORM MALENG
King County Prosecuting Attorney

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Joseph B. Rochelle".

Joseph B. Rochelle
Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

cc: Jan Hasselman
Todd True
Richard Smith
Mary Sue Wilson/ Ronald Lavigne (all with enclosures)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
STATE OF WASHINGTON

PUGET SOUNDKEEPER ALLIANCE; PEOPLE)	
FOR PUGET SOUND,)	No P 07-021
)	
Appellants,)	
)	KING COUNTY'S
v.)	PETITION TO INTERVENE
)	
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

I. PETITION

King County petitions the Pollution Control Hearings Board (Board) for an order allowing it intervention in the caption-referenced appeal with regard to the issuance of the State of Washington Department of Ecology's Phase I Municipal Stormwater Permit on January 17, 2007. The Appellants and Respondent in this matter have been contacted and do not oppose this Petition so long as King County does not seek to raise new legal grounds for appeal that have not been raised in the five notices of appeal that have been filed in PCHB Nos. 07-026, 07-027, 07-028, 07-029 and 07-030, and in the above captioned appeal. This Petition is made pursuant to WAC 371-08-420 and WAC 371-08-450.

Norm Maleng, Prosecuting Attorney
CIVIL DIVISION
Natural Resources Section
900 King County Administration Building
500 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104
(206) 296-8820 Fax (206) 296-0415

1 II. INTERVENOR

2 King County is a political subdivision of the State of Washington, organized as a home
3 rule charter county under Article XI, Section 4 of the Washington State Constitution. This
4 petition is brought by and through the Office of the King County Prosecuting Attorney. King
5 County's contact information is:

6 King County Water and Land Resources Division
7 Stormwater Services Section
8 201 S Jackson St., Suite 600
9 Seattle, Washington 98104-3855

10 Counsel for King County is:

11 Joseph B. Rochelle
12 Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
13 500 Fourth Avenue, Suite 900
14 Seattle, Washington 98104-2316
15 Ph: 206-296-0421; fax 206-296-0415
16 joe.rochelle@metrokc.gov

17 III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

18 The Department of Ecology (Ecology) has issued a Phase I Municipal Stormwater Permit
19 on January 17, 2007, with an effective date of February 16, 2007 (Permit), that regulates
20 municipal stormwater discharges of the Permittees identified in the Permit, including the City of
21 Tacoma, the City of Seattle, Clark County, King County, Pierce County and Snohomish County,
22 and Secondary Permittees identified in the Permit as the Port of Seattle and the Port of Tacoma.
23 Puget Soundkeeper Alliance and People for Puget Sound have filed an appeal of the Permit on
various grounds and have named the Department of Ecology as Respondent in the appeal. The
appeal generally asserts that certain provisions in the Permit contain conditions or standards that
are unlawful or inappropriate for discharges of municipal stormwater.

1 IV. ANALYSIS

2 King County seeks to intervene in the above appeal for all purposes.

3 Intervention before the Pollution Control Hearing Board is governed by WA 371-08-420:

- 4 (1) The presiding officer may grant a petition for intervention at any time, upon
5 determining that the petitioner qualifies as an intervenor pursuant to civil rule 24,
6 that the intervention will serve the interests of justice and that the prompt and
7 orderly conduct of the appeal will not be impaired.
- 8 (2) The presiding officer may impose conditions upon the intervenor's participation
9 on the proceedings.

10 In ruling on a petition to intervene, the presiding officer analyzes the submission under
11 CR 24, which provides for two types of intervention:

- 12 (a) Intervention of Right. Upon timely application anyone shall be permitted to
13 intervene in an action: (1) when a statute confers an unconditional right to
14 intervene; or (2) when the applicant claims an interest relating to the property or
15 transaction which is the subject of the action and he is so situated that the
16 disposition of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede his ability to
17 protect that interest, unless the applicant's interest is adequately represented by
18 existing parties.
- 19 (b) Permissive Intervention. Upon timely application, anyone may be permitted to
20 intervene in an action: (1) When a statute confers a conditional right to intervene;
21 or (2) When an applicant's claim or defense and the main action have a question
22 of law or fact in common. When a party to an action relies for ground of claim or
23 defense upon any statute or executive order administered by a federal or state
governmental officer or agency or upon any regulation, order, requirements, or
agreement issued or made pursuant to the statute or executive order, the officer or
agency upon timely application may be permitted to intervene in the action. In
exercising its discretion the court shall consider whether the intervention will
unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the rights of the original parties.

24 In analyzing intervention of right, the Washington courts have recognized the inquiry
25 must be specific to the case in question. "Rather, it is for the court in each instance to analyze
26 and balance the relative concerns, not only of the absentee in having his interest protected, but
27 also of the parties to the main action in controlling their own lawsuit, and of the public in the

1 efficient resolution of controversies” *American Discount Corporation v. Saratoga West, Inc.*,
2 81 Wn.2d 34, 42, 499 P 2d 869 (1972).

3 The decisions in *Westerman v. Carey*, 125 Wn.2d 277, 303, 892 P.2d 1067 (1994)
4 described a four-part test for intervention as a matter of right:

5 This rule thus imposes four requirements that must be satisfied before intervention must
6 be granted: (1) timely application for intervention; (2) an applicant claims an interest
7 which is the subject of the action; (3) the applicant is so situated that the disposition will
8 impair or impede the applicant’s ability to protect the interest; and (4) the applicant’s
9 interest is not adequately represented by the existing parties.

10 Timeliness. This petition to intervene is timely and, if granted, will not cause any
11 delay in the proceedings, as the pre-hearing conference in which the issues will be further
12 specified and formulated and the timeline for the proceedings established, has not been
13 held. King County's petition to intervene is thus timely.

14 King County’s Interest. King County is identified in the Permit as a Permittee in
15 its own right, and as a Co-Permittee with the City of Seattle for discharges from outfalls
16 King County owns or operates within the City of Seattle. The appeal has raised broad
17 issues about the legality of many provisions in the Permit. Any decisions that the Board
18 makes regarding the interpretation, application, implementation or revision of the Permit
19 will have direct consequences for King County as an entity subject to the Permit, and will
20 have direct impacts on King County's stormwater program and the county's management
21 and control of stormwater within its jurisdictional area. King County's interest here is
22 clearly significant and sufficient for the purposes of intervention in this matter.

23 Impairment of the County’s Interest. The outcome of the Board's decisions with
regard to interpretation, application and implementation of the Permit will directly affect
King County's obligations under the Permit, the means it uses to manage stormwater

1 within the county, and the nature, scope and priorities of its stormwater program. If King
2 County were to be denied participation in this appeal, then it would be forced to operate
3 under a permit whose provisions were decided upon as a result of briefings, hearings and
4 other proceedings in which the county had no part. Without participation in this appeal,
5 King County's interests in managing its stormwater under the obligations of the Permit
6 will be impeded and impaired


7 King County's Interests are Inadequately Represented by the Existing Parties. No
8 other party can adequately represent King County's interests. As demonstrated in the
9 Declaration of Curt Crawford, filed with this petition, King County has its own set of
10 authorities establishing and governing its surface water management program. (Crawford
11 Decl. ¶ 7). Further, King County's approach to addressing compliance under the Permit
12 will be affected by the actions of the parties in the course of the proceedings in this
13 appeal, as King County's surface water management programs have features that are
14 specially tailored to King County's needs. (Crawford Decl. ¶ 8). King County has
15 geographic and physical characteristics that differ from those of the other Permittees that
16 will affect its stormwater management practices under the Permit. (Crawford Decl. ¶ 9).
17 Although King County is in agreement with the Department of Ecology's approach in
18 many aspects of the Permit, the Department of Ecology's role as regulator inherently
19 distinguishes it from the other parties to the appeal. The appellants, as entities not directly
20 subject to the requirements of the Permit, also have interests that are inherently different
21 and distinct from King County's interests as Permittee regulated under the Permit.
22 (Crawford Decl. ¶ 10). King County is the proper entity to represent King County's
23 interests in the Permit that has been appealed.

1 V. CONCLUSION

2 King County respectfully states that it has met the required demonstration for
3 intervention as a matter of right and should be allowed to intervene in the referenced
4 appeal. King County requests that its Petition for Intervention be granted and that no
5 conditions be placed on King County's participation in the appeal before the Board,
6 except as specified below. Appellants Puget Soundkeeper Alliance and People for Puget
7 Sound, and Respondent Department of Ecology have been contacted and do not oppose
8 this Petition for Intervention by King County, so long as King County does not seek to
9 raise new legal grounds for appeal that have not been raised in the five notices of appeal
10 that have been filed in PCHB Nos. 07-026, 07-027, 07-028, 07-029 and 07-030, and in
11 the above captioned appeal. King County concurs with this condition. King County
12 requests that King County's Petition to Intervene be decided on the County's written
13 submission, unless the Petition is contested, in which case King County requests oral
14 argument. If the Board so requests, King County will provide a proposed form of order.

15 Dated this 21st day of February, 2007.

16 NORM MALENG
17 KING COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY

18 By: 
19 Joseph B. Rochelle, WSBA # 26978
20 Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
21 Attorney for King County
22
23

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
STATE OF WASHINGTON

PUGET SOUNDKEEPER ALLIANCE; PEOPLE)
FOR PUGET SOUND,)
Appellants,)
v.)
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,)
Respondent.)

No. P 07-021
DECLARATION OF
CURT W. CRAWFORD, P.E.

CURT W. CRAWFORD declares as follows:

1. I am competent to testify to the following:
2. I am the Manager of the Stormwater Services Section of the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks. I make this declaration based on personal knowledge, or based on facts disclosed by public documents.
3. I am a licensed professional engineer registered in the State of Washington to practice Civil Engineering. I have an Associate Degree in Civil Engineering Technology from Shoreline Community College and a Bachelor of Science Degree in Civil Engineering from the

Norm Maleng, Prosecuting Attorney
CIVIL DIVISION
Natural Resources Section
900 King County Administration Building
500 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104
(206) 296-8820 Fax (206) 296-0415

1 University of Washington. I have 28 years of work experience in the field of stormwater
2 management and have had extensive training and exposure to published information related to
3 stormwater management. I am currently a member of the American Water Resources
4 Association and the American Public Works Association.

5 4. The Stormwater Services Section that I currently manage is responsible for the
6 general municipal stormwater permits issued to King County under the federal Clean Water Act
7 and the Washington Water Pollution Control Act. The section is also responsible for many of
8 the stormwater management programs required by the permits, including investigation of
9 reported drainage and water quality problems, identification and construction of capital
10 improvement projects to fix these problems, correction of drainage and water quality code
11 violations through enforcement actions, inspection and maintenance of stormwater facilities that
12 control and treat runoff from developed sites, and updating the stormwater facility design
13 standards applied to new development and redevelopment projects.

14 5. I am familiar with and have reviewed the Phase I Municipal Stormwater Permit
15 issued by the State of Washington Department of Ecology on January 17, 2007 (Permit). The
16 Permit constitutes the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and State Waste
17 Discharge General Permit for discharges from Large and Medium Separate Storm Sewer
18 Systems under state and federal authorities. The Permit identifies the cities of Seattle and
19 Tacoma and the counties of Clark, King, Pierce and Snohomish as Permittees under its coverage.

20 6. It is my understanding that Puget Soundkeeper Alliance and People for Puget
21 Sound have filed an appeal with the Pollution Control Hearings Board in regard to a number of
22 provisions in the Permit issued by Respondent Department of Ecology, including the application
23 of specified standards or the omission of standards to the discharges of stormwater into waters of

1 the state. King County's interest will not be adequately represented by the existing parties to this
2 appeal due to a number of circumstances or characteristics that are particular to King County.

3 7. First, King County has its own set of authorities establishing and governing its
4 surface water management program. These include:

5 a) A stormwater management manual approved by the King County Council for
6 regulating the design of stormwater control facilities required on new development and
7 redevelopment projects in King County, i.e., the 2005 King County Surface Water Design
8 Manual;

9 b) A water quality source control manual for reducing or preventing stormwater pollution
10 caused by business and residential activities, i.e., the 2005 King County Stormwater Pollution
11 Prevention Manual;

12 c) An adopted set of land use regulations for preserving and protecting streams, wetlands,
13 and other designated critical areas from development impacts; these regulations are codified in
14 the King County Code Title 21A; and

15 d) An adopted set of clearing regulations that include required soil amendments in all
16 cleared areas to mimic natural retention of stormwater and that contain limitations of 35% to
17 50% on removal of forest cover on rural area residential lots to minimize stormwater impacts;
18 these regulations are codified in the King County Code Title 16.

19 8. Second, King County's approach to addressing compliance under the Permit could
20 be affected by the actions of the parties in the course of the proceedings in this appeal as King
21 County has:

22 a) A set of programs, staffing, and funding levels for addressing the various
23 programmatic requirements of the Permit, including stormwater capital improvements, facilities

1 maintenance, public education, basin stewards, development review, water quality compliance,
2 etc., all tailored to the demands, needs, and physical characteristics of King County;

3 b) A water quality monitoring program tailored specifically to King County's
4 waterbodies, activities, projects, facilities, and pollutants of concern; and

5 c) A set of programs, policies, procedures, and expertise in promoting compliance with
6 stormwater best management practices in King County.

7 9. Third, King County has geographic and physical characteristics that differ from
8 the other Permittees that will affect its stormwater management practices under the Permit.

9 Examples include:

10 a) King County is more populated and has more separate municipalities with stormwater
11 management programs it must interface with than any other county in the state;

12 b) King County has a higher proportion of designated urban areas than other counties in
13 the state;


14 c) Because of its larger proportion of older development, King County has a higher
15 diversity of land development types, including older urban, older and more recent suburban,
16 rural, and agricultural lands that require a blend of stormwater best management practices in
17 coordination with land development regulations; and

18 10. Finally, the Department of Ecology, as issuer of the Permit, and as a regulator, has
19 interests that are inherently different and distinct from King County's interests as a Permittee
20 regulated under the Permit. The appellants, as entities not directly subject to the requirements of
21 the Permit, also have interests that are inherently different and distinct from King County's
22 interest as Permittee regulated under the Permit.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

I swear under penalty of perjury under the laws of Washington that the foregoing is true
and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated this 21st day of February, 2007 at Seattle, Washington.


Curt W. Crawford, P.E.

1 Washington State Attorney General's Office
2 2425 Bristol Court SW, 2nd Floor
3 P.O. Box 40117
4 Olympia, WA 98504-0117

5 Washington State Department of Ecology
6 300 Desmond Drive
7 Lacey, WA 98503

8 I also caused true and correct copies to be delivered in the manner indicated to the
9 parties listed below:

10 Theresa Wagner, Assistant City Attorney (via U.S. Mail)
11 Seattle City Attorney's Office
12 600 Fourth Avenue, 10th Floor
13 Seattle, WA 98104-1877

14 Doug Mosich (via U.S. Mail)
15 Tacoma City Attorney's Office
16 747 Market St., Rm. 1120
17 Tacoma, WA 98402

18 Bronson Potter (via U.S. Mail)
19 Clark County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
20 Civil Division
21 P.O. Box 5000
22 Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

23 Tad Shimazu (via U.S. Mail)
Williams Kastner & Gibbs, PLLC
601 Union Street, Suite 4100
P.O. Box 21926
Seattle, Washington 98101

Phil Prettyman (via U.S. Mail)
Pierce County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
955 Tacoma Avenue S., Ste. 301
Tacoma, WA 98402

Catherine Drews (via U.S. Mail)
Elizabeth Anderson
Civil Division
Snohomish County Prosecutor's Office

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
AND MAILING

- 2

Norm Maleng, Prosecuting Attorney
CIVIL DIVISION
Natural Resources Section
900 King County Administration Building
500 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104
(206) 296-8820 Fax (206) 296-0415

1 3000 Rockefeller, M/S 504
2 Everett, WA 98201-4046

3 Susan Ridgley
4 Port of Seattle Legal Department
5 P.O. Box 1209
6 Seattle WA 98111

(via U.S. Mail)

7 Stephen J. Tan
8 Tanya Barnett
9 Cascadia Law Group PLLC
10 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 320
11 Seattle, WA 98101

(via U.S. Mail)


12 Jan Hasselman
13 Todd True
14 Earthjustice
15 705 Second Avenue, Suite 203
16 Seattle, WA 98104

(via U.S. Mail)

17 Richard A. Smith
18 Smith & Lowney, PLLC
19 2317 East John Street
20 Seattle, WA 98112

(via U.S. Mail)

21 Dated this 21st day of February, 2007.

22 
23 Mary A. Livermore
Legal Secretary to Joseph B. Rochelle

