DECEIVE OCT - 8 2001

POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

-			HEARINGS O
3	AIRPORT COMMUNITIES)	No. 01-133
_	COALITION,)	No. 01-160
4)	
	Appellant,)	DECLARATION OF ROBERT
5		j	SHECKLER IN SUPPORT OF ACC'S
6	v.)	REPLY ON MOTION FOR STAY
7	STATE OF WASHINGTON,	j	(Section 401 Certification No.
•	DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY; and	j	1996-4-02325 and CZMA
8	THE PORT OF SEATTLE,	j	concurrency statement, issued August
	·	j	10, 2001, Reissued September 21,
9	Respondents.	j	2001, under No. 1996-4-02325
0			(Amended-1))

Robert Sheckler declares as follows:

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

- 1. I am over the age of 18, am competent to testify, and have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein.
- 2. I am Mayor Pro Tem and a City Councilmember for the City of Des Moines, Washington. I am also Chair of the Airport Communities Coalition (ACC) Executive Committee. The ACC Executive Committee, per interlocal agreement of the ACC jurisdictions (Burien, Des Moines, Federal Way, Normandy Park, Tukwila, and the Highline School District), has engaged a number of independent scientists and technical experts to review and comment on the Port of Seattle's successive Clean Water Act Section 401 applications for certification of the Port's third runway and related major projects.
 - 3. ACC has taken an active role in this process because of the dramatic effect which

construction of the third runway would have on our member jurisdictions. We have particular DECLARATION OF ROBERT SHECKLER IN SUPPORT OF ACC'S MOTION FOR STAY - 1

HELSELL FETTERMAN LLP 1500 Puget Sound Plaza 1325 Fourth Avenue Seattle, WA 98101-2509

Rachael Paschal Osborn Attorney at Law 2421 West Mission Avenue Spokane, WA 99201

ORIGINAL

AR 007184

stewardship responsibilities under state law and our own municipal codes for the streams and watersheds within our boundaries, including Des Moines Creek, Miller Creek, Walker Creek, and Gilliam Creek, as well as various small lakes, all of which will be affected by the Port's projects. The value of these resources to the communities is illustrated by how we use them.

- 4. For example, the mouth of Des Moines Creek is located in Des Moines Beach Park, a major focus for our community. The park includes a marina, senior center and numerous historical buildings, and is enjoyed by South King County residents as a whole for its water-oriented amenities. Based in part on its concern for this park, the City of Des Moines takes very seriously its stewardship responsibilities for the creek and its watershed.
- 5. Similarly, as ACC's original Notice of Appeal to this Board, filed in August, describes, the Normandy Park Community Recreation Center sits at the mouth of Miller Creek. This community beach parcel includes a community club building, tennis courts, swim club, baseball fields, boat launch and picnic areas on the beach and near the streams. Miller and Walker Creeks flow around and through the community center property, providing a beautiful natural setting for community activities. From an early age and through their school years, children are taught about and enjoy the streams and lakes and participate in field trips and stream restoration projects on them. Over the years our community groups have undertaken significant efforts to protect and enhance these streams and make them fish-friendly. Many residents fish in the streams and lakes.
- 6. I am aware that some of the statements submitted to this Board in opposition to ACC's request for a stay, including statements by Department of Ecology personnel, suggest that the Port's

DECLARATION OF ROBERT SHECKLER IN SUPPORT OF ACC'S MOTION FOR STAY - 2

HELSELL FETTERMAN LLP 1500 Puget Sound Plaza 1325 Fourth Avenue Seattle, WA 98101-2509 Rachael Paschal Osborn Attorney at Law 2421 West Mission Avenue Spokane, WA 99201

DECLARATION OF ROBERT SHECKLER IN SUPPORT OF ACC'S MOTION FOR STAY - 3

HELSELL FETTERMAN LLP 1500 Puget Sound Plaza 1325 Fourth Avenue Seattle, WA 98101-2509

Rachael Paschal Osborn Attorney at Law 2421 West Mission Avenue Spokane, WA 99201

proposal should be viewed as a stream restoration project, reversing supposed neglect by our communities. This presents an inaccurate and distorted picture to the Board. The homes and neighborhoods whose elimination the Port and Ecology cite as elements of the "restoration" project were mature rural/suburban communities. These should not be confused with the gashes across the environment which new plats in other locations may sometimes create. The neighborhoods' vegetation is mature, the houses by and large modest, and the lots not intensely developed. The Port's and Ecology's attempt to demonize these mature neighborhoods which were living in supportive coexistence with the area streams and wetlands into entities whose obliteration is synonymous with watershed restoration is a gross distortion.

- 7. In fact, those neighborhoods and our communities as a whole have valued and protected the quantity and quality of water in our streams. We are vitally concerned about the headwaters and wetlands of those streams which are within the third runway project construction impact area, and, based on advice from our scientists, we are particularly concerned that Ecology's 401 Certification does a disservice to the community because it is not based on actual reasonable assurance that water quality standards will not be violated.
- 8. As ACC Chair, and as a long-time elected official in this area, I can therefore convey to the Board that the Ecology and Port claims of "overriding public interest" in opposition to a stay are not well-founded. For example, I am aware that the Department of Ecology suggests that a stay of its 401 decision would prevent Ecology from providing environmental protections that would otherwise apply as the Port proceeds with construction work. In fact, Ecology, despite repeated requests, has not

9.

13

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

DECLARATION OF ROBERT SHECKLER IN SUPPORT OF ACC'S MOTION FOR STAY - 4

HELSELL FETTERMAN LLP 1500 Puget Sound Plaza 1325 Fourth Avenue Seattle, WA 98101-2509

offered any environmental protection for work which the Port has already performed over the past

apparently come to the realization that such work ought to be subject to environmental regulation. It

overriding public interest against a stay of a 401 decision which, if implemented, will not protect water

amount to a claim that the Port cannot afford to lose a single day in pursuing its third runway project.

In fact, the Port itself delayed the project for several years by failing to submit competent application

materials to Ecology for 401 certification. The Port's first 401 application resulted in a decision by

Ecology which the Port promptly appealed, claiming that it was too stringent. That certification and

accurately represented the amount of wetlands which would be impacted by its project. The Port's

second 401 certification application, submitted in the fall of 1999, was withdrawn one year ago, when

the Port was advised by Ecology that, if it were not withdrawn, it would have to be denied. Shortly

after, Tom Luster, Ecology's longtime 401 expert who had given the public at large some basis for

confidence in Ecology's review process, was abruptly removed from responsibility for review of the

Port application. The Port then subsequently reapplied for a third time and obtained certification

approval in August, 2001. As the Board knows, Ecology later rescinded and reissued its August

the Port's application were subsequently withdrawn when it was learned that the Port had not

I am also aware of the Port's arguments for overriding public interest, which basically

many months at what the Port calls "its own risk." We appreciate that Ecology has, belatedly,

does not make sense, however, to suggest that the need for environmental protection creates an

quality, according to ACC's scientists and Ecology's own former senior 401 expert.

Rachael Paschal Osborn Attorney at Law 2421 West Mission Avenue Spokane, WA 99201

certification in September, 2001, with amendments to satisfy Port complaints about the August conditions.

- 10. ACC scientists -- and Tom Luster -- have testified in writing to the Board that the flaws in the first two applications were not cured in the third, and that the difference appears to be in how Ecology has viewed the application, applied the applicable standards for 401 certification, and allowed the Port to defer resolution of issues which have been outstanding now for more than three years.
- In light of this history of delay by the Port, its suggestion that the Board should deny a stay of the 401 because there is an overriding public interest in immediate commencement of the project, which can brook no delay, does not ring true. The overriding public interest here must be in the integrity of the 401 certification process, whose ultimate goal is to protect water quality. The history of the Port's applications and the basis on which its third application was finally approved demonstrate that the overriding public interest here must be in ensuring that the Board has an opportunity to review the 401 Certification and make an effective decision on it before implementation commences. At best, the "public interest" which the Port and Ecology cites is one among many, and does not override these vital considerations.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED this day of October, 2001, at

7617 11

Robert Sheckler

g:\lu\acc\pehb\sheckler-decl-reply.doc

DECLARATION OF ROBERT SHECKLER IN

SUPPORT OF ACC'S MOTION FOR STAY - 5

HELSELL FETTERMAN LLP
1500 Puget Sound Plaza
1325 Fourth Avenue
Swattle, WA 98101-2509

Rachael Paschal Osborn
Attorney at Law
2421 West Mission Avenue
Spokane, WA 99201