

Stormwater Manual

Vol. **4** Stormwater Code Enforcement Manual

**Director's Rules for
Seattle Municipal Code
Chapters 22.800 - 22.808**

**Directors' Rules:
2009-006 SPU
18-2009 DPD**

**City of Seattle
Seattle Public Utilities
Department of Planning & Development
November 2009**



Note:

Some pages in this document have been purposefully skipped or blank pages inserted so that this document will copy correctly when duplexed.

DPD	Director's Rule 18-2009
SPU	Director's Rule 2009-006

Applicant: Department of Planning & Development Seattle Public Utilities	Page ii	Supersedes 27-2000
	Publication: 11/5/2009	Effective: 12/1/2009
Subject: Stormwater Manual Vol. 4 of 4: Stormwater Code Enforcement Manual	Code and Section Reference: SMC 22.800-22.808	
	Type of Rule Code interpretation	
	Ordinance Authority 3.06.040 SMC	
Index: Title 22.800 Stormwater Code	Approved: __ (signature on file) _____ 11/25/09 __ Diane M. Sugimura, Director, DPD	Date:
	Approved: __ (signature on file) _____ 11/30/09 __ Ray Hoffman, Acting Director, SPU	Date:

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 - Introduction	1-2
1.1 Background.....	1-2
1.2 Definitions	1-2
Chapter 2 - Penalty Assessment Matrix.....	2-1
2.1 Enforcement Penalty Matrix.....	2-1
2.2 Application of Penalty Criteria.....	2-2

Tables

Table 1.	Enforcement Penalty Matrix	2-1
Table 2.	Penalty Points Rating and Corresponding Penalty Amount	2-1

Chapter 1 - Introduction

1.1 Background

The City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development (DPD) and Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) produced this document as a joint Directors' Rule (DR) to interpret the enforcement provisions that are described in the Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) 22.800 – 22.808 *Stormwater Code*. This Code was revised in 2009 to improve water quality enforcement by environmental compliance inspections and response to both water quality complaints and spills. This technical document is designed to help clarify the application of enforcement for businesses, developers, the general public, and the public agencies in Seattle.

1.2 Definitions

The following terms are defined exclusively for this DR. Refer to the *Stormwater Code* for additional definitions of terms that govern this rule.

1. **Adversely Impacting Infrastructure** – damage on a publicly owned infrastructure that contributes towards its impairment.
2. **Code** – refers to the *Stormwater Code*.
3. **Departments** – refers to Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) and Department of Planning and Development (DPD).
4. **Economic Benefit** – gain and/or no loss in resources.
5. **Public Health Risk** – risk involving the physical or social well-being of a community or environment.

Chapter 2 - Penalty Assessment Matrix

If the Director finds a violation of the Code has occurred or is occurring, a Notice of Violation (NOV) or an Order is given to the responsible party of that violation. The civil penalty attached with the NOV or Order is determined using the enforcement penalty matrix described below.

2.1 Enforcement Penalty Matrix

The enforcement penalty matrix (Table 1) is comprised of a set of criteria formulated as questions for the Director to evaluate and answer. The Director uses the guidelines of Section 2.2 to determine the total points to be assessed according to the violation. Once the total amount of penalty points is determined, a rating and a corresponding penalty amount is established (Table 2).

Table 1. Enforcement Penalty Matrix

Enforcement Evaluation Criterion	No (0 points)	Possibly (1 point)	Probably (2 points)	Definitely (3 points)
Public Health Risk?				
Environmental Damage or Adversely Impacting Infrastructure?				
Willful or Knowing Violation?				
Unresponsive in Correcting Action?				
Improper Operation or Maintenance?				
Failure to Obtain Necessary Permits and Approval?				
Economic Benefit to Non-Compliance?				
Repeat Violation?				

Table 2. Penalty Points Rating and Corresponding Penalty Amount

Rating	1-2	3-4	5-8	9-11	12-14	15
Penalty	\$250	\$500	\$1,000	\$1,500	\$2,000	\$2,500
Rating	16	17	18	19	20+	
Penalty	\$3,000	\$3,500	\$4,000	\$4,500	\$5,000	

2.2 Application of Penalty Criteria

The framework below provides guidance on how to rate each criterion of the enforcement penalty matrix. The civil penalty is determined by the total score of the matrix.

1. Did the violation result in a public health risk?
 - a. Answer “no” if there is no evidence to support a claim of public health risk or adverse health effects.
 - b. Answer “possibly” if evidence supports a claim of public health risk and there is a plausible connection between this violation and health effect.
 - c. Answer “probably” if evidence supports a claim of public health risk and there is a likely connection between this violation and health effect.
 - d. Answer “definitely” if there is direct evidence linking public health risk or adverse effects with the violation.
2. Did the violation result in environmental damage or adversely impact infrastructure?
 - a. Answer “no” if there is no evidence to support a claim of environmental or infrastructure damage.
 - b. Answer “possibly” if environmental or infrastructure damage can be inferred from evidence or knowledge of the effects of the violation.
 - c. Answer “probably” if there is evidence to support a claim of environmental or infrastructure damage and there is a likely connection between the violation and the damage/impairment.
 - d. Answer “definitely” if there is direct evidence linking environmental or infrastructure damage with the violation.

3. Was the action a willful and knowing violation?
 - a. Answer “no” if the violator obviously did not know that the action or inaction constituted a violation.
 - b. Answer “possibly” if the violator should have known.
 - c. Answer “probably” if it is likely the violator knew.
 - d. Answer “definitely” if the violator clearly knew or was previously informed by the probing inspectors.
4. Was the responsible party unresponsive in correcting the violation?
 - a. Answer “no” if the violation was corrected as soon as the responsible party learned of it.
 - b. Answer “possibly” if the violation was corrected in a less timely and cooperative fashion.
 - c. Answer “probably” if the responsible person made some attempt to correct the problem, but did not correct it.
 - d. Answer “definitely” if the responsible party made no attempt to correct the violation.
5. Was the violation a result of improper operation or inadequate maintenance? (i.e. TESC¹ plans, PPP², O&M³ manual, DCP⁴).
 - a. Answer “no” if the violation was not the result of improper operation or inadequate maintenance.
 - b. Answer “possibly” if the facility has an O&M, DCP, PPP, or TESC plan or manual but it is out of date or inadequate.
 - c. Answer “probably” if there is no O&M, DCP, PPP, or TESC plan or manual and the violation would have been less severe if the plan were developed and followed.
 - d. Answer “definitely” if the facility has no plans or did not follow its plan AND the violation was clearly the result of improper operation or maintenance.

¹ Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control

² Pollution Prevention Plan

³ Operations and Maintenance

⁴ Drainage Control Plan

6. Did the responsible party fail to obtain and comply with the necessary permits, certifications and approvals from the agency with jurisdiction to operate at the time of the violation?
 - a. Answer “no” if the paperwork was complete and appropriate for the job or task that caused the violation.
 - b. Answer “possibly” if the responsible party obtain and received approval for some but not all of the required permit(s).
 - c. Answer “probably” if the responsible party obtained some but not all of the required permit(s) and did not receive approvals for the job or task that caused the violation.
 - d. Answer “definitely” if the responsible party either did not obtain the necessary permits or did obtain permits but did not comply with their conditions.
7. Did anyone benefit economically from non-compliance?
 - a. Answer “no” if it is clear that no one gained an economic benefit.
 - b. Answer “possibly” if someone might have benefited.
 - c. Answer “probably” if anyone benefited, but the benefit is not quantifiable.
 - d. Answer “definitely” if the economic benefit is quantifiable.
8. Is this violation a repeat violation⁵?
 - a. Answer “no” to indicate that there have been no prior violations.
 - b. Answer “possibly” to indicate that there has been one prior violation.
 - c. Answer “probably” to indicate that there have been two prior violations.
 - d. Answer “definitely” to indicate that there have been three or more prior violations.

⁵ From Stormwater Code (SMC 22.801.190): “Repeat violation” means a prior violation of this subtitle within the preceding five years that became a final order or decision of the Director or a court. The violation does not need to be the same nor occur on one site to be considered repeat.