Mark C. Rutzick, r.c.

870 Pioneer Tower 888 S.W. Fifth Avenue Portland, Oregon 97204

PHONE: (503) 243-2710 * FAX: (503) 243-2717 * E-MAIL: RUTZICKPC@ADL.COM

Mark C. Rutzick
Admitted to practice in
Ovegon, Washington and New York

June 11, 2001

RE.

JUN 1 2 2001

Ms. Cathy Catterson
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit

Stoel Rives LLP

95 Seventh Street San Francisco, California 94103-1526

Re: Airport Communities Coalition, et al. v. Federal Aviation Administration and Port of Seattle, No. 00-70848

Dear Ms. Catterson:

Enclosed for filing are the original and four copies of Petitioners' Motion for Voluntary Dismissal. Counsel for the Federal Aviation Administration and the Port of Seattle have been served.

Very muly yours.

Mark C. Rutzick

Enclosures cc: Counsel

No. 00-70848

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

AIRPORT COMMUNITIES COALITION, et al.,

Petitioners.

VS.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION and PORT OF SEATTLE,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR REVIEW OF FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION ORDER

PETITIONERS' MOTION FOR VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL

Petitioners Airport Communities Coalition (ACC), City of Des Moines, City of Normandy Park, City of Burien, City of Federal Way, City of Tukwila, and Highline School District No. 401 move for voluntary dismissal pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 42(b) on the ground that petitioners have achieved substantially all the relief they sought in this case through issuance of a biological opinion by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in May 2001 addressing the effects of the ongoing implementation of the Master Plan Update Development Actions (MPU) for Seattle-Tacoma International Airport on threatened Coastal/Puget Sound bull trout and endangered marbled murrelets; and by the issuance of a letter of concurrence by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on May 31, 2001 addressing the effects of the MPU on Puget Sound chinook salmon.

Before ACC filed this case and the related pending action in the Western District of Washington, respondents Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Port of Seattle, Washington

(Port of Seattle) had completely ignored their duties under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). 16 U.S.C. §§1531 et seq. They had never conducted any biological review on the bull trout and chinook salmon, and had never performed any consultation with FWS or NMFS on the bull trout, chinook salmon or marbled murrelet. They had completely disregarded the interests of endangered species as they relentlessly pushed ahead with their Third Runway project.

By filing this case and the related district court case, ACC compelled the FAA and the Port of Seattle to comply with the Endangered Species Act. The FAA prepared a biological assessment on the effect of the entire Master Plan Update actions, including the Third Runway, on all the protected species, which was then substantially revised and expanded at the request of the wildlife agencies—exactly as ACC had demanded. The FAA enlarged the "action area" it studied in the biological assessment to encompass the terrestrial, estuarine and near-shore marine environments in the watersheds near the airfield—exactly as ACC had demanded. On June 15, 2000, in response to ACC's motion for a preliminary injunction in the district court case, the FAA initiated formal consultation with FWS and NMFS on the protected species—exactly as ACC had demanded. The FAA extracted from the Port of Seattle a promise to obey §7(d) of the ESA during those consultations—exactly as ACC had demanded.

The FWS biological opinion and NMFS concurrence letter contain a list of commitments by the FAA and Port to modify the Third Runway project to protect the affected species, which are incorporated as conditions of the opinion and letter. The failure of the FAA or Port to honor these commitments could trigger a reinitiation of consultation. The commitments include strict toxicity and monitoring standards in the fill dirt for the runway embankment, erosion control, sediment retention and cover practices during and after construction, compliance with the turbidity standard for Class AA waters, and improved treatment and handling of stormwater runoff at the airfield. The

biological opinion also includes a set of 13 conservation recommendations to additionally enhance the level of protection for the species, and the concurrence letter has eight further recommendations.

The effect of the biological opinion and concurrence letter is exactly what ACC had sought to achieve in this case and the related district court case – to provide substantial additional protections for bull trout, chinook salmon and marbled murrelets. These administrative actions have rendered this case largely moot. ACC therefore seeks voluntary dismissal of this petition under Fed. R. App. P. 42(b).

Conclusion

The motion for voluntary dismissal should be granted, with each party to bear its own attorney fees and costs.

Dated this 11th day of June, 2001.

Mark C. Ruzick

MARK C. RUTZICK, P.C.

870 Pioneer Tower

888 S.W. Fifth Avenue

Portland, Oregon 97204

(503) 243-2710

Kwn L. Foch M.

Kevin L. Stock

HELSELL FETTERMAN LLP

1500 Puget Sound Plaza

1325 Fourth Avenue

Seattle, WA 98101-2509

(206) 292-1144

Attorneys for Petitioners

Certificate of Service

I certify that on June 11, 2001 I served one copy of PETITIONERS' MOTION FOR VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL, by FedEx, to the following counsel of record:

Kathryn E. Kovacs
Attorney, Appellate Section
Environment & Natural Resources Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Room 8929
601 D Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Mr. Karl B. Lewis
Office of Regional Counsel
Federal Aviation Administration
1601 Lind Avenue, SW
Renton, WA 98055-4099

Attorneys for Federal Aviation Administration

Beth S. Ginsberg Stoel Rives LLP 600 University Street Suite 3600 Seattle, WA 98101-3197

Thomas A. Newlon Traci M. Goodwin POS P.O. Box 1209 Seattle, WA 98111

Attorneys for Port of Seattle