

A PROPESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

50 West Liberty Street Suite 750 Reno, Nevada 89501 Telephone 775.323.1601 Facsimile 775.348.7250

Reno + Las Vegas + Salt Lake City

Ross E. de Lipkau

Direct Diał (775) 789-6545 E-Mail RdeLipkau@parsonsbehle.com

February 23, 2009

Via EMail Only: jbwalker@ndep.nv.gov

John B. Walker, Executive Secretary State of Nevada State Environmental Commission (SEC) 901 S. Stewart Street Suite 4001 Carson City, NV 89701

> Re: Rockview Farms, Inc. - NDEP Client-Matter No. 17423.001 In re: ACE Petition for Declaratory Order or Advisory Opinion (01.08.2009) Opposition to Petition for Leave to Intervene

Dear Mr. Walker:

Please find enclosed an Opposition to Petition for Leave to Intervene as filed on behalf of Rockview Farms, Inc., as Operator of the Ponderosa Dairy.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this document. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Parsons Behle & Latimer

John R. Zimmerman

/sdl

Enclosure

cc: Rose Marie Reynolds, SEC/DAG (Via EMail Only: <u>rreynolds@ag.nv.gov</u>) William J. Frey, SDAG (Via EMail Only: <u>bfrey@ag.nv.gov</u>) John L. Marshall (Via EMail Only: <u>johnmarshall@charter.net</u>)

1 2	PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER Jim B. Butler, NSB# 8389 John R. Zimmerman, NSB# 9729	
3	50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750 Reno, NV 89501	
4	Telephone: (775) 323-1601 Facsimile: (775) 348-7250	
5	Attorneys for Rockview Farms, Inc.	
6		
7		
8	BEFORE THE STATE ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION	
9	STATE OF NEVADA	
10		
11	In re:	
12	Appeal of Permit NV0023027	
13	OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE	
14	COMES NOW, Rockview Farms, Inc., as operator of the Ponderosa Dairy, and hereby	
15	files its opposition to the Amargosa Citizens for the Environment's (ACE) Petition for leave to	
16	Intervene filed on February 13, 2009. Rockview Farms' opposition is based on the following	
17	points and authorities, all documents on file with the Nevada Division of Environmental	
18		
19	Protection (NDEP), and any oral argument the Commission may require.	
20	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES	
21	<u>Facts</u>	
22	In February 2007, NDEP issued its Fact Sheet regarding Rockview Farms' application to	
23	renew Permit NV0023027. The Fact Sheet contained a detailed description of the entire	
24	Ponderosa Dairy facility and the proposed crop type and acreage, nutrient application, and	
25	effluent limitations. The Fact Sheet also set forth NDEP's rationale for the Permit, the procedure	
26	for submitting public comment, and NDEP's tentative determination to renew the Permit for	
27		
28	another five-year term. In addition to the Fact Sheet, NDEP conducted a public hearing in May	
	M Contraction of the second	

ì

Parsons Behle & Latimer

1	2007 to hear and respond to public comments on the proposed renewal of the Permit. At the
2	hearing, Rockview Farms' consultants also responded to questions from the public and explained
3	the reason for the renewal of NV0023027. The record shows that there were numerous public
4	comments received by NDEP, including comments and questions from the officers of ACE.
5	NDEP's decision to renew Rockview Farms' Permit was issued on October 25, 2007. The
6 7	decision was appealed to the Commission by John F. Bosta and Antonio Guerra Martinez in
8	November 2007. Also in November 2007, Rockview Farms requested to intervene in the
9	proceedings. Since late 2007 Bosta and Martinez have taken no action on the appeal.
10	Now, more than a year after the deadline to file an appeal of the Permit, ACE seeks to
11	enter the case and present evidence and argument challenging NDEP's issuance of the Permit.
12	Essentially, if allowed to intervene, ACE would be allowed to appeal a Permit more than a year
13	
14	after the deadline to file an appeal. If ACE believed NDEP should not have renewed Rockview
15	Farms' Permit, however, it should have filed an appeal within the time required by
16	NAC 445A.8915. The intervention process should not be used to enable a party to file an
17	untimely appeal and the Commission should deny ACE's request as untimely and unwarranted
18	under the circumstances.
19	Argument
20	I. The Commission should dismiss ACE's Petition for Leave to Intervene because
21	it is not timely.
22	The Petition is untimely and ACE has failed to offer any reasonable excuse for the delay.
23	A petition for leave to intervene in a proceeding before the Commission must be filed within 10
24 25	days after the notice of appeal is filed. NAC 445B.8915. Here, the appeals by Bosta and
25 26	Martinez were filed in November 2007—more than a year before either the instant Petition or
20	ACE's recent petition for a declaratory order and an advisory opinion. Accordingly, ACE's
28	Petition failed to comply with the Commission's regulations and should be denied.
S z	17423.001/4826-3629-7219.1 - 2 -
x	

PARSONS Behle & Latimer

1	ACE offers no reasonable excuse for not filing an appeal of Rockview Farms' Permit.	
2	ACE's sole reason for its untimely Petition is simply untenable and based on an incorrect	
3	representation of the Commission's remarks regarding ACE's petition for a declaratory order and	
4	an advisory opinion. First, ACE states that its Petition is in response to the Commission's	
5	decision to deny ACE's petition for a declaratory order and an advisory opinion. But ACE filed	
6 7	the petition for a declaratory order and an advisory opinion on January 9, 2009. Accordingly,	
8	ACE's assertion that it should be excused for failing to timely file a petition for leave to intervene	
9	is unreasonable because it is based on actions that were taken long after the appeal deadline had	
10	expired. Second, ACE asserts that the Commission denied its petition for a declaratory order and	
11	an advisory opinion because ACE's concerns regarding the Ponderosa Dairy "would be more	
12	appropriately considered during the appeals of the Ponderosa Dairy's NPDES permit." But the	
13		
14	Commission simply stated that ACE's concerns should not be considered in a petition for a	
15	declaratory order or an advisory opinion. Moreover, the Commission denied ACE's petition for a	
16	declaratory order and an advisory opinion in part because the petition improperly requested the	
17	Commission to engage in ad hoc rule making. Rockview Farms submits that ACE's Petition is	
18	untimely, having been filed over a year after the appeal deadline has passed, and is simply an	
19 20	improper attempt to circumvent the appeals process. Because ACE failed to timely file an appeal	
20 21	or a petition for leave to intervene despite having notice of, and actually participating in, the	
22	underlying proceedings, the Commission should deny the Petition and not allow ACE to	
23	intervene in the appeals filed by Bosta and Martinez.	
24	II. The Commission should dismiss the Petition because ACE fails to adequately	
25	demonstrate any direct and substantial interest in the appeals and seeks to unreasonably broaden the scope of the appeals.	
26	ACE's Petition should be denied because it has not adequately demonstrated a direct and	
27	substantial interest in the subject matter of the appeal. ACE failed to list its members or	
28	17423.001/4826-3629-7219.1 - 3 -	
		_

.

Parsons Behle & Latimer specifically describe where they live or work in the Amargosa Valley or how their interests would be impacted if they are not allowed to intervene in the Bosta and Martinez appeals. ACE simply has not satisfied its burden under NAC 445B.8915 in this case. Further, ACE's Petition also raises issues outside the scope of the appeal such as air quality, groundwater depletion, and the general quality of life in the Amargosa Valley. These issues would unreasonably broaden the scope of these appeals and complicate the issues to the detriment of Rockview Farms. Therefore the Commission should deny ACE's request to intervene in the Bosta and Martinez appeals.

9 10

III. The Commission should dismiss the Petition because Rockview Farms' interests will be prejudiced if ACE is allowed to circumvent the appeals process.

Rockview Farms' interest will be prejudiced because ACE's Petition is simply an attempt 11 to circumvent the appeals process to challenge the Permit and is untimely. As stated above, more 12 13 than one year after the issuance of the Permit, ACE wants the Commission to ignore the deadline 14 to file an appeal under NAC 445A.890 and allow it to attack Rockview Farms' Permit as though 15 it had filed an appeal. As with its recent petition for declaratory order or an advisory opinion, 16 ACE is attempting to circumvent the appeal process. Granting ACE's Petition effectively would 17 allow an appeal to be filed at any time prior to the appeal hearing. Accordingly, the Commission 18 should deny ACE's Petition. 19

Here, the prejudice to Rockview Farms by allowing ACE to intervene outweighs ACE's interest in intervening in the Bosta and Martinez appeals. First, Bosta clearly has not prosecuted his appeal diligently. Bosta filed his appeal in November 2007 and has done nothing to prepare his case to the Commission. Likewise, ACE has failed to take any steps to appeal Rockview Farms' Permit. The Commission should not reward an appellant for failing to prepare its appeal in a diligent manner.

Lastly, only Rockview Farms' interest will be prejudiced by the delay. Rockview Farms
is aware of and takes seriously the Commission's commitment to a fair and open process,
17423.001/4826-3629-7219.1 - 4 -

PARSONS Behle & Latimer

1	however, denying ACE's Petition is not contrary to that policy. After being given an opportunity
2	to participate in the permitting process ACE failed to do anything until over a year after an appeal
3	had been filed. Further, ACE and its members will be given the opportunity to present their
4	views during the public comment period at the appeal hearing. Accordingly, the Commission
5	should deny ACE's Petition.
6 7	Conclusion
8	Based on the foregoing, Rockview Farms respectfully requests the Commission to deny
9	ACE's Petition to Intervene in the appeals filed by Bosta and Martinez.
10	AFFIRMATION
11	Pursuant to NRS 239B.030, the undersigned hereby affirms that the preceding document
12	does not contain the Social Security number of any person.
13	PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
14	DATED this $\underline{23}$ day of February, 2009 By: $\frac{1}{23}$ By: $\frac{1}{23}$
15	Jim B. Butler, NSB# 8389 John R. Zimmerman, NSB# 9729
16 17	
17	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26 27	
27	
Parsons Behle & Latimer	<u>17423.001/4826-3629-7219.1</u> - 5 -