BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER
CITY OF SEATTLE

In the Matter of the Appeals of:

FOSS MARITIME COMPANY AND
PORT OF SEATTLE,

From an interpretation issued by the Director,
Department of Planning and Development.

Hearing Examiner File Nos.
S-15-001; S-15-002

ALASKA MARINE LINES, AMERICAN
SEAFOODS COMPANY, AMERICAN
WATERWAY OPERATORS, ARCTIC
FJORD, INC., ARCTIC STORM, INC.,
BALLARD OIL COMPANY, CROWLEY
MARITIME CORPORATION, GLACIER
FISH COMPANY, PREMIER PACIFIC
SEAFOODS, SAILORS’ UNION OF THE
PACIFIC, SSA TERMINALS, LLC,
TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE AND
VIGOR INDUSTRIAL LLC’S MOTION TO
INTERVENE

(Code Interpretation No. 15-001)

I. INTRODUCTION

COMES NOW Intervenors Alaska Marine Lines, American Seafoods Company,
American Waterway Operators, Arctic Fjord, Inc., Arctic Storm, Inc., Ballard Oil Company,
Crowley Maritime Corporation, Glacier Fish Company, Premier Pacific Seafoods, Sailors’
Union Of The Pacific, SSA Terminals, LLC, Transportation Institute and Vigor Industrial LLC
T-5 INTERVENORS’,
MOTION TO INTERVENE

Veris Law Group PLLC
1809 Seventh Avenue, Suite 1400
Seattle, Washington 98101
tel 206.829.9590 fax 206.829.9245

(Collectively, “T-5 Intervenors”), by and through their attorneys, Joshua C. Allen Brower and Molly K.D. Barker of Veris Law Group PLLC, and respectfully requests the Hearing Examiner grant its Motion to Intervene (“Motion”) in this appeal. Foss Maritime Company (“Foss”) and the Port of Seattle (“Port”) filed separate appeals challenging the issuance of an interpretation by the Director (“Director”) of the Department of Planning and Development (“DPD” or “Department”) “in response to general questions it has received regarding a proposal to moor an exploratory drilling rig and two accompanying tugboats at the Port of Seattle’s (Port’s) Terminal 5 facility” (DPD Interpretation No. 15-001, hereinafter the “Interpretation”).

T-5 Intervenors seek intervention because individually and collectively they possess interests in the outcome of this appeal that, if not allowed to intervene, will not be adequately represented. Specifically, T-5 Intervenors hold or rely upon various landward or water-dependent land use entitlements and permits from the DPD and the City of Seattle (“City”) and have made business decisions, including, among others, signing leases and contracts, in reliance thereon. Additionally, T-5 Intervenors use and rely upon Port and other water-dependent and landward facilities in Elliot Bay and throughout Seattle beyond Terminal 5, the continued and future use of which could be adversely impacted by the outcome of this matter. In particular, American Seafoods Company, Arctic Storm, Inc., Arctic Fjord, Inc. and Premier Pacific Seafoods moor

---

1 Additional maritime/industrial businesses and groups may be added to the T-5 Intervenor group. In that case, all members of the T-5 Intervenor group will be represented by the undersigned counsel and will follow and abide by the Hearing Examiner’s case schedule and orders hereunder.
2 American Seafoods Company, based out of Seattle, is one of the largest seafood companies in North America. American Seafoods owns and operates a fleet of six catcher/processor vessels out of Seattle and regularly uses and relies upon the Port’s facilities and other facilities in Seattle.
3 Arctic Storm, Inc. is a Seattle-based company that oversees the fishing and processing of four fishing vessels (one of which is the Arctic Storm, a 334 foot long catcher processor vessel) that operate throughout the West Coast and Alaska. Arctic Storm homeports in Seattle.
their respective vessels at Terminal 91. Crowley Maritime Corporation\(^6\) moors its vessels and provides services to its customers from Pier 17 at Terminal 18, while SSA Terminals, LLC\(^7\) operates Terminal 18, the largest container facility in the Pacific Northwest, and other terminals within Seattle. Glacier Fish Company\(^8\) and Sea Storm Fisheries, Inc.\(^9\) moor their fishing vessels at Fisherman’s Terminal in Salmon Bay. Alaska Marine Lines\(^10\) moors its vessels at Terminal 115. Vigor Industrial\(^11\) has a 27-acre vessel construction and repair facility located on Harbor Island at the entrance of Seattle’s Duwamish Waterway, which spans 170,000 square feet and is comprised of six piers and two dry docks, and serves the Pacific Northwest maritime community. Ballard Oil\(^12\) operates a 350-foot marine fuel facility located on a pier on the north side of the Lake Washington Ship Canal, in Salmon Bay, that provides fuel and other goods and supplies to

\[^4\] Arctic Fjord, Inc. is a Seattle-based company that oversees the fishing and processing of four fishing vessels (one of which is the Arctic Fjord, a 272 foot long catcher processor vessel) that operate throughout the West Coast and Alaska. Arctic Fjord homeports in Seattle.

\[^5\] Premier Pacific Seafoods, based out of Seattle, manages and oversees the operation of two of the three at-sea fish processing ships for the North Pacific Pollock and Hake fisheries, which operate off of the coast of Alaska, Washington and Oregon. Premier’s fleet homeports in Seattle.

\[^6\] Crowley Maritime Corporation is a worldwide company providing marine solutions, transportation and logistics to a wide variety of maritime, industrial and other businesses. In Seattle, among other services, Crowley provides vessel assist and escort services, and vessel preparation prior to deployment for destinations along the west coast and Alaska.

\[^7\] SSA Terminals, LLC is a subsidiary of SSA Marine, Inc., based out of Seattle, which provides a full spectrum of transportation services, including marine terminal and rail operations, and operates more cargo terminals than any other company in the world, and is known for its unprecedented diversity of cargo, volumes, commercial models and ports throughout its industry.

\[^8\] Glacier Fish Company, located in Seattle, Washington, operates three catching and processing vessels which operate off of the coast of Alaska, Washington and Oregon.

\[^9\] Sea Storm Fisheries, Inc. is a Seattle-based company closely affiliated with Arctic Storm, Inc. and Arctic Fjord, Inc.’s fishing and processing vessels, and owns and operates its own vessel, Sea Storm.

\[^10\] Alaska Marine Lines is a Seattle-based marine transportation provider with barge service to and from Alaska and Hawaii. For some communities, Alaska Marine Lines is the only regularly scheduled marine service; for example, it is the only barge line through Southeast Alaska, offering twice a week service to those communities, most of which lack road access.

\[^11\] Vigor Industrial provides shipbuilding, complex fabrication, ship repair and conversion in Seattle. Vigor routinely services fishing vessels, ferries, barges, ships and vessels that are operated throughout the region. Vigor now owns and operates nine separate locations throughout the area, including Ketchikan and Seward in Alaska, Portland and Clackamas in Oregon, Tacoma, Seattle, Port Angeles, and Vancouver in Washington.

\[^12\] Ballard Oil Company serves the Pacific Northwest and Alaska fishing fleets with diesel fuel, lubricants, hydraulic oils, filters and many other supplies and services.
commercial, government and private vessels, including the Pacific Northwest fishing fleet. Its shoreline activities, along with Vigor’s, are heavily regulated pursuant to State and local water-dependent permits and land use entitlements and their operations would be greatly impacted by after-the-fact permit reinterpretation. The Transportation Institute,13 Sailors’ Union Of The Pacific14 and The American Waterways Operators15 advocate for the development and implementation of sound maritime policy and labor and environmental standards. These entities are at the forefront of ensuring that maritime laws and industry regulations are constructed in a way that is supportive of a flourishing and vibrant maritime economy.

The continued vitality of the T-5 Intervenors—individually and collectively as a maritime community—is dependent upon the enjoyment of constitutional rights of navigation, moorage and use, and upon the sanctity and reliability of water-dependent permits, land use entitlements and sound maritime policy. As such, the T-5 Intervenors have a significant interest in the outcome of this appeal separate and distinct from the other parties.

The interests of the T-5 Intervenors also are separate and distinct from those of Foss and the Port based on the varied nature of the operations, services and functions they provide. As illustrated above, the T-5 Intervenors are fishing vessel owners and operators, a worldwide maritime company, a shipyard, freight shipping and barge companies, labor unions, one of four remaining fixed-fueling facilities in the entire State of Washington, and industry and trade

13 Transportation Institute is a Washington-based non-profit dedicated to maritime education and promotion. The Institute campaigns for ensuring a robust and sustainable maritime policy through promoting and safeguarding the development of waterborne commerce, transportation, and international security.
14 Sailors’ Union of the Pacific is an American labor union of mariners, fisherman and boatmen working on deck, engine and steward’s departments aboard U.S. flag vessels. The headquarters of the Union is in San Francisco, California, with branch offices in Wilmington, California, Seattle, Washington and Honolulu, Hawaii.
15 The American Waterways Operators is the national trade association representing the nation’s tugboat, towboat and barge industry, which operates along the rivers, coasts, Great Lakes and harbors of the U.S. American Waterways lobbies for an efficient, environmentally sustainable, and productive maritime industry.
groups, all operating on different scales in terms of vessel size, dock location, and range of economic industries reached, as compared to Foss or the Port. If the Hearing Examiner upholds DPD’s Interpretation, the decision would directly and indirectly impair the T-5 Intervenors’ ability to carry out their many activities of fish processing, vessel assist, ship repair, vessel fueling, freight shipping and ensuring that sound maritime policies are in place for the greater Pacific Northwest maritime community. To protect these interests, T-5 Intervenors respectfully request that the Hearing Examiner grant intervention.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On February 9, 2015, Foss entered into a lease with the Port to utilize Terminal 5 as a marine cargo terminal (the “Lease”). Pursuant to the Lease, Foss intends to provide a variety of services (the “Operations”) to Shell Offshore, Inc. (“Shell”) and its contractors. The Operations will generally include receiving and storing goods, cargo, equipment, supplies, stores, provisions and other materials; loading and unloading goods, cargo, equipment, supplies, stores, provisions and other materials on to and off of vessels; for those vessels to use and to transport those goods and cargo to other locations; temporary moorage of vessels; and other related activities, including standard routine “run and maintain” activities.

In apparent response to political controversy about Shell, the City—through DPD—undertook review regarding whether the Operations are consistent with the previously approved cargo terminal use of Terminal 5. The Director issued the Interpretation on May 7, 2015, “in response to general questions [DPD] has received regarding a proposal to moor an exploratory drilling rig and two accompanying tugboats at the Port of Seattle’s (Port’s) Terminal 5 facility.” See Foss Amended Notice of Appeal, Exh. 1. The Interpretation purports to interpret certain
rights of use under Projects 9404118 and 9404124 (among others) issued to the Port of Seattle, as applicant, for the property located at Terminal 5 (2701 26th Avenue SW) in Seattle (the “Permit”). *Id.* The Interpretation specifically objects to the moorage of one of two drilling rigs and two tug boats “during winter months.” *Id.* The Interpretation concludes that the Operations are consistent with the category of “transportation use,” but concludes that the Operations are not consistent with the cargo terminal use, contrary to DPD’s historical implementation of its Land Use Code. *Id.* The City has historically shared the same interpretation of the scope of a cargo terminal use that would include the intended Operations and similar activities, as reflected in permitting decisions on Port projects presented in the Port’s submission.

Foss filed a Notice of Appeal challenging the Director’s Interpretation on May 13, 2015, and filed its Amended and Restated Notice of Appeal on May 21, 2105, which is incorporated herein by reference (the “Foss Appeal”). The Port of Seattle also filed a separate Notice of Appeal challenging the Interpretation on May 15, 2015, which is also incorporated by reference (the “Port Appeal”) (the Foss Appeal and the Port Appeal are, collectively, the “Appeals”). The Hearing Examiner consolidated the Appeals on May 27, 2015, and has scheduled a hearing beginning on Thursday, July 23, 2015. T-5 Intervenors now seek to intervene in the Appeals.

**III. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE**

Should the Hearing Examiner grant T-5 Intervenors’ Motion when T-5 Intervenors has demonstrated that it satisfies the Hearing Examiner Rule of Procedure Rule 3.09?

**IV. EVIDENCE RELIED UPON**

This Motion relies upon the pleadings and papers on file in this matter.

**V. ARGUMENT**
The Hearing Examiner Rules of Procedure (“HER” or “Rules”) on intervention state:

(a) Intervention is not a substitute means of appealing a decision for those who could have appealed but failed to do so.

(b) A person, organization or other entity who has not filed an appeal may request by motion to participate in the appeal. The request must state how the person or entity making it is affected by or interested in the matter appealed, and must demonstrate a substantial interest that is not otherwise adequately represented. Except as provided in HER 3.09(d) below, a written request for intervention must be filed with the Hearing Examiner and served on all parties to the appeal no later than 10 business days prior to the scheduled hearing date.

(c) In determining the merits of a request for intervention, the Hearing Examiner shall consider whether intervention will unduly delay the hearing process, expand the issues beyond those stated in the appeal, or prejudice the rights of the parties. If intervention is granted, the Hearing Examiner may limit its nature and scope.

(d) The Hearing Examiner may allow a substantially interested person, organization, or other entity who has not filed an appeal to intervene for the sole purpose of preserving the right to appeal. Such intervention may be permitted at any time up to the start of the hearing.

HER 3.09. T-5 Intervenors meet the requirements of this rule.

T-5 Intervenors are both affected by and interested in this Appeal. The T-5 Intervenors handle, load and unload various kinds cargo, goods and foods at numerous facilities, both Port and otherwise, throughout the City of Seattle. They operate fishing vessels and barges that call into and dock at facilities in the City of Seattle, where they load and unload goods and supplies. They operate water-dependent businesses that moor vessels of many types including but not limited to loading/unloading of cargo, fueling and repairing/fabricating vessels at various locations throughout the City of Seattle. They represent organized labor working in maritime industries. They operate the terminals themselves. They also work to create and protect consistent policies and standards necessary for a productive and viable maritime economy in Seattle and the Pacific Northwest. If upheld in this Appeal, DPD’s reinterpretation of the Permit could adversely impact all of these operations by directly affecting operations at Terminal 5; by
indirectly adversely impacting operations at other Port or maritime facilities throughout Seattle; and by calling into question the validity/viability of permits and land use entitlements issued to the T-5 Intervenors or the parties with whom they do business.

T-5 Intervenors’ substantial interests also are not adequately represented by Foss or the Port. While Appellants are focused on DPD’s Interpretation that the Operations are no longer a cargo terminal use, DPD’s Interpretation carries a broader significance to the T-5 Intervenors. DPD’s attempt to reinterpret an issued permit after-the-fact has serious far-reaching implications on the viability and reliability of the myriad and numerous permits granted to and relied upon by the T-5 Intervenors. For example, any one of the T-5 Intervenors could potentially receive a Notice of Violation at a moment’s notice upon DPD’s reinterpretation of their permits in response to intense political pressure. Or fishing vessels or freight barges could be barred from calling into and docking or mooring for off-season storage and maintenance at Port facilities because DPD changed its mind regarding those operations for similar perceived political reasons at issue in the Appeal. Such a reinterpretation that effectively ejects vessels from their regular operation will undoubtedly and indirectly affect Vigor’s, SSA Terminals, LLC’s and Ballard Oil’s ability to service the array of shipbuilding, repairing, fueling and loading needs of such vessels and operators throughout the region. Neither T-5 Intervenors— nor anyone doing business in Seattle for that matter— can afford to have the terms of their permits and entitlements redefined after issuance. While the Appellants are focused on the Permit and Interpretation at issue in this Appeal, the T-5 Intervenors are focused on the sanctity and security of the permits and entitlements that are part of the bedrock of the maritime industrial community in Seattle and the Pacific Northwest.
Without intervention, T-5 Intervenors would be deprived of the ability to present relevant factual information and legal argument to challenge the broad and unintended consequences of DPD’s Interpretation. The failure to litigate T-5 Intervenors Code Interpretation concerns at this stage could result in a decision that has a binding impact on T-5 Intervenors without its consent or participation. See Loveless v. Yantis, 82 Wn.2d 754, 759, 513 P.2d 1023, 1026 (1973).

Lastly, T-5 Intervenors’ Motion is timely as it is filed and served on all parties at least 10 days before the hearing date set for the week of July 23, 2015. The existing parties will not suffer any prejudice as a result of T-5 Intervenors’ intervention.

Because “substantial interest” is not defined in HER 3.09(b), the Hearing Examiner may also look to the Civil Rules of Procedure when evaluating a motion to intervene. HER 1.03. Intervention as of right under CR 24(a) has been allowed broadly in the land use context. See Loveless, 82 Wn.2d at 759. For example, in Loveless, the court found that the parties had an interest in the subject matter of the action, an interest they would be unable to protect if they were not allowed to intervene. Id. Such is also the case here. T-5 Intervenors’ distinct interests in the finality of the validly issued permits and entitlements is what is at stake here. Intervention under CR 24(a) should be allowed.

**RELIEF REQUESTED**

T-5 Intervenors meet the intervention criteria set forth in HER 3.09 in this Appeal and respectfully requests that the Hearing Examiner grant its Motion to Intervene.
DATED this 10th day of June, 2015.

VERIS LAW GROUP PLLC

By /s/ Joshua Brower
Joshua C. Allen Brower, WSBA #25092
Molly K.D. Barker, WSBA #46587
Attorneys for T-5 Intervenors
DECLARATION OF SERVICE
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Foss Maritime Company
John C. McCullough
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David R. West
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Port of Seattle
Traci Goodwin
Goodwin.T@portseattle.org

and

Patrick Schneider
Foster Pepper
schnp@foster.com

City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development
Eleanore Baxendale
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Earthjustice, Intervenors
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mbaca@earthjustice.org
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Dated at Seattle, Washington, this 10th day of June, 2015.

/s/ Whitney Jackson
Whitney Jackson
Legal Assistant