

165 F.3d 35 (Table)
 Unpublished Disposition

(Cite as: 165 F.3d 35, 1998 WL 833628 (9th Cir.))

NOTICE: THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
 OPINION.

(The Court's decision is referenced in a "Table of Decisions Without Reported Opinions" appearing in the Federal Reporter. Use FI CTA9 Rule 36-3 for rules regarding the citation of unpublished opinions.)

United States Court of Appeals,
 Ninth Circuit.

CITY OF NORMANDY PARK; City of Des
 Moines; City of Burien; City of Federal Way;
 City of Tukwila; Highline School District, No.
 401, individually and

collectively as the Airport Communities
 Coalition; Petitioners,

v.

PORT OF SEATTLE, a Washington municipal
 corporation, Intervenor-Respondent,

v.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION;
 U.S. Department of Transportation,
 Respondents.

No. 97-70953.

Argued and Submitted Nov. 6, 1998.
 Decided Nov. 24, 1998.

Petition to Review a Decision of the United States
 Department of Transportation Federal Aviation
 Administration.

Before CANBY and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges,
 and SILVER, [FN**] District Judge.

FN** Honorable Roslyn O. Silver, United States
 District Judge for the District of Arizona, sitting
 by designation.

MEMORANDUM [FN*]

FN* This disposition is not appropriate for
 publication and may not be cited to or by the courts
 of this circuit except as provided by Ninth Circuit
 Rule 36.3.

**1 Petitioners ("the Cities") appeal the Federal
 Aviation Administration's decision granting final

approval of the Master Plan development project
 adopted by the Port of Seattle for the expansion of
 the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport ("Sea-
 Tac"). We affirm.

The Cities argue that the Administrator's decision
 improperly relied on a "no growth" demand model
 and a limited prediction forecast thereby failing to
 accurately assess the project's environmental
 impacts and necessary mitigation measures. Under
 the Airport and Airway Improvement Act
 ("AAIA"), 49 U.S.C. 47106(c)(1)(C), an
 Administrator may approve an airport development
 project that is found to have significant
 environmental effects "only after finding that ...
 every reasonable step has been taken to minimize
 the adverse effects." Here, the Administrator's
 lengthy decision indicates a careful review of the
 project's potential environmental impacts, a host of
 mitigation measures and the entire administrative
 record. Moreover, it was within the agency's
 discretion to select a testing method for determining
 airport demand. *See Seattle Comm. Council
 Federation v. Federal Aviation Admin.* 961 F.2d
 829, 833-34 (9th Cir.1991). Because intervening
 circumstances called into question the 2020 model's
 accuracy, the Administrator was also entitled to rely
 on a prediction forecast to the year 2010. *See City
 of Los Angeles v. Federal Aviation Admin.* 138
 F.3d 806, 808 (9th Cir.1998).

Next, the Cities argue that the Administrator's
 decision violates the AAIA, 47106(a)(1), which
 requires that "the project is consistent with plans ...
 of public agencies authorized by the State in which
 the airport is located to plan for the development of
 the area surrounding the airport." The Cities'
 argument is unavailing because the Administrator
 was allowed to rely on the approval of the Puget
 Sound Regional Council, the designated
 Metropolitan Planning Organization responsible for
 transportation planning in the region, to satisfy the
 consistency requirements. *See Suburban O'Hare
 Comm'n v. Dole*, 787 F.2d 186, 199 (7th Cir.1986).
 Moreover, the administrative record indicates that
 every effort was made to ensure consistency with
 planning efforts of local communities.

Finally, the Cities contend that the Sea-Tac project
 violates the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7506(c).

165 F.3d 35 (Table)
(Cite as: 165 F.3d 35, 1998 WL 833628, **1 (9th Cir.))

that prohibits federal agencies from supporting "any activity which does not conform to [the State's] implementation plan." This contention also fails because the FAA conducted extensive environmental analyses, including a conformity analysis, and ultimately found that the air emissions levels would be "de minimis." 40 §F.R. 93.153(c)(1). Moreover, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the State of Washington Department of Ecology, and the Puget

Sound Air Pollution Control Agency all agree with the FSEIS conclusion.

The FAA Administrator's decision was supported by substantial evidence.

**2 AFFIRMED.

END OF DOCUMENT