

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

PORT OF TACOMA; SSA TERMINALS, LLC; AND
SSA TERMINALS (TACOMA), LLC,

Petitioners,

v.

PUGET SOUNDKEEPER ALLIANCE,

Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF FOR PETITIONERS

BRADFORD T. DOLL
LYNNE M. COHEE
FOSTER GARVEY PC
1111 Third Avenue
Suite 3000
Seattle, WA 98101
*Counsel for Petitioner
Port of Tacoma*

BRADLEY B. JONES
DIANNE K. CONWAY
GORDON THOMAS
HONEYWELL LLP
1201 Pacific Avenue
Suite 2100
Tacoma, WA 98402
*Counsel for Petitioners
SSA Terminals, LLC, and
SSA Terminals (Tacoma),
LLC*

GREGORY G. GARRE
Counsel of Record
ROMAN MARTINEZ
BLAKE E. STAFFORD
CHRISTINA R. GAY
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 Eleventh Street, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20004
(202) 637-2207
gregory.garre@lw.com
*Counsel for Petitioners
Port of Tacoma,
SSA Terminals, LLC, and
SSA Terminals (Tacoma),
LLC*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF.....	1
CONCLUSION.....	4

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

Petitioners submit this supplemental brief in response to the notice of supplemental authority filed by Puget Soundkeeper Alliance (“Soundkeeper”) on December 5, 2024, concerning the 2025 Industrial Stormwater General Permit (“2025 ISGP”) issued by the State of Washington Department of Ecology (“Ecology”) on December 2, 2024.¹

Soundkeeper’s notice is yet another attempt to distract this Court from the important question presented on which—as Soundkeeper itself has acknowledged—the circuits are split. In its notice, Soundkeeper doubles down on the baseless vehicle objection it floated in its opposition brief as to the 2015 ISGP. BIO 13-15. Only this time, it relies on documents related to the 2025 ISGP—a permit issued a few weeks ago that has never been a part of this case. Whether the State purported to exercise federal “residual designation” authority under the Clean Water Act (“CWA”), rather than state law, in the 2025 ISGP has no bearing on this petition. The case before this Court concerns only Petitioners’ alleged violations of the *2015 ISGP*. See BIO 15-16 (referring to the 2015 ISGP as “the only [permit] at issue in this petition”); see also Reply.11-12.

Regardless, even as to the 2025 ISGP, Soundkeeper’s assertion that the State used federal “residual designation” authority to regulate discharges from docks and wharfs—areas that EPA itself expressly *exempted from* the federal industrial-stormwater program, Pet.5-6—is unfounded. Like

¹ See Ecology, 2025 Industrial Stormwater General Permit (effective Jan. 1, 2025), https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/ezshare/wq/permits/ISGP_2025_FinalPermit.pdf.

every prior version of the permit, the face of the 2025 ISGP—the relevant document establishing the terms and conditions under which permittees must operate—nowhere identifies, much less claims to exercise, any federal “residual” authority. Indeed, the words “residual designation,” the CWA provision purportedly granting this authority, and the EPA regulation expounding on it, are all conspicuously absent from the 100-page permit. That omission is fatal.

Moreover, the “Fact Sheet” issued with the draft and final 2025 ISGP, which sets out the State’s “regulatory . . . bases” for its permitting decisions, explicitly states that the State “us[ed] its *State Authority* . . . to require ISGP coverage” for docks, wharfs, and other areas of transportation facilities.² Like the face of the permit, the Fact Sheet contains no record of a federal “residual” designation. Soundkeeper’s suggestion that the State somehow expanded the scope of the 2025 ISGP based on a federal “residual designation”—despite that the 2025 ISGP itself is silent on such a claim, and the Fact Sheet explicitly states the opposite—has no merit.

In the face of that, Soundkeeper claims (at 1) to quote a statement from the “fact sheet issued along with the permit” referencing the federal “residual designation” statutory and regulatory provisions. But Soundkeeper’s quote actually comes from Ecology’s responses to comments on the draft 2025 ISGP. Those responses are neither part of the ISGP nor even the

² Ecology, Fact Sheet for Draft ISGP 4 (Purpose of this Fact Sheet), 35, 80 (May 15, 2024), https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/ezshare/wq/permits/ISGP_2025_FinalFactSheet.pdf (emphasis added).

separate “Fact Sheet.” And even these responses are at best inconclusive because they separately assert that the State also used “state authority” to regulate docks and wharfs.³ In all events, an agency’s responses to comments are insufficient to change the federal NPDES program, much less to override the express exemption in the regulations for stormwater runoff from the facilities at issue here. Pet.5-6.

In short, Soundkeeper’s attempt to turn the 2025 ISGP into a vehicle problem is just as baseless (if not *more* so) than its failed attempt to manufacture a vehicle problem out of the 2015 ISGP. As Petitioners have explained, the conventional certiorari criteria are readily met here—there is a conceded conflict on an important and recurring question. *See* Pet.15-37; Reply.1-8. Denying the petition will only perpetuate that conflict, harming the numerous interests—represented by amici ranging from States to business and labor groups—that are impacted by unauthorized citizen suits, and creating an incentive for States to adopt expansive permit conditions going beyond the scope of the CWA without transparently identifying the authority on which they are purporting to act.

In other words, Soundkeeper’s latest ploy to evade this Court’s review provides all the more reason to *grant* certiorari in this case, not deny it.

³ Ecology, Response to Comments, ISGP Addendum to Fact Sheet: Appendix C at 12-13 (Dec. 2, 2024), https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/ezshare/wq/permits/ISGP_2025_ResponseToComments.pdf.

CONCLUSION

The petition for certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

BRADFORD T. DOLL
LYNNE M. COHEE
FOSTER GARVEY PC
1111 Third Avenue
Suite 3000
Seattle, WA 98101
*Counsel for Petitioner
Port of Tacoma*

BRADLEY B. JONES
DIANNE K. CONWAY
GORDON THOMAS
HONEYWELL LLP
1201 Pacific Avenue
Suite 2100
Tacoma, WA 98402
*Counsel for Petitioners
SSA Terminals, LLC, and
SSA Terminals (Tacoma),
LLC*

GREGORY G. GARRE
Counsel of Record
ROMAN MARTINEZ
BLAKE E. STAFFORD
CHRISTINA R. GAY
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 Eleventh Street, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20004
(202) 637-2207
gregory.garre@lw.com
*Counsel for Petitioners
Port of Tacoma,
SSA Terminals, LLC,
and SSA Terminals
(Tacoma), LLC*

December 17, 2024