05-8026, 05-8027, 05-8035 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

STATE OF WYOMING, WYOMING WOOL GROWERS, et al., and the COUNTY OF PARK Plaintiffs/Appellants

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, et al.

Defendants/Appellees,
and
GREATER YELLOWSTONE COALITION, et al.
Defendants-Intervenors/Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Wyoming The Honorable Alan B. Johnson, District Court Judge D.C. No.'s 04-CV-0123-J and 04-CV-0253-J (Consolidated)

MOTION TO STRIKE OF APPELLANTS WYOMING WOOL GROWERS, ET AL. (WOLF COALITION)

Harriet M. Hageman
Kara Brighton
HAGEMAN & BRIGHTON, P.C.
1822 Warren Avenue
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001
Telephone: (307) 635-4888
ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANTS
WYOMING WOOL GROWERS, ET AL.,
(WOLF COALITION)

Plaintiff/Appellants, Wyoming Wool Grower's, et al., (Wolf Coalition), by and through their attorneys, Hageman & Brighton, P.C., hereby move this Court for an Order striking all references to materials outside of the Administrative Record that the Intervenor-Appellees Sierra Club and Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) included in their Response Brief and Supplemental Appendix. In support of this Motion the Wolf Coalition states as follows:

- 1. Pursuant to 10th Cir. R. 27.3, Counsel for the Wolf Coalition conferred with Attorney Jim Davis, who stated that Intervenor Park County, Wyoming supports this motion. Counsel for the Wolf Coalition also conferred with David C. Shilton, who stated that the Federal Defendants take no position on the current motion. Jack Tuholske (representing intervenors Greater Yellowstone Coalition, et al) and Douglas L. Honnold (representing intervenors Sierra Club and the NRDC) oppose the Wolf Coalition's motion to strike. Counsel was unable to make contact Attorney Jay Jerde, who represents the State of Wyoming.
- 2. Intervenors Sierra Club and NRDC have included in their Response Brief arguments and references that are based upon information that is outside of the Administrative Record that is currently before this Court. They have also filed a "Supplemental Appendix" of select pages from the Wyoming Game and Fish Department's 2004 Annual Report, which was published more than six (6) months

after the Federal Defendants issued their final decision on January 13, 2004 rejecting the Wyoming Gray Wolf Management Plan (the subject of this appeal). They have not filed a motion to supplement the Administrative Record.

- 3. Their reliance upon extra-record information, summarized below, is improper and all such information, references and citations should be stricken:
 - * Page 13, first full paragraph: Fish an Wildlife Service website and related quoted statement;
 - * Page 15, full paragraph: website and related information (two separate website references);
 - * Page 26, fn. 8: website and related information and references to "WGFD's 2004 Annual Report" (Supplemental Appendix);¹
 - * Page 36, incomplete paragraph near the top: website.
- 4. The extra-record information and references included in the Sierra Club's and NRDC's Response Brief and Supplemental Appendix should be stricken as violating the scope of review provision of the Administrative Procedures Act, which requires

¹ Intervenors Sierra Club and NRDC cite to the Aplts.App. Vol. 6 at 1653 as a reference for the "WGFD's 2004 Annual Report. The referenced page from the Appellants' Joint Appendix, however, is from the State of Wyoming's final Gray Wolf Management Plan, which was published in 2003. The 2004 Annual Report was not published until after the end of 2004, which was several months after the Federal Defendants produced the Administrative Record that is the subject of this appeal.

that judicial review of agency action be generally limited to the Administrative Record.

5. As explained by this Court in *Custer County Action Association v. Garvey*, 256 F.3d 1024, 1028, fn 1 (10th Cir. 2001),

Judicial review of an agency decision is generally limited to review of the administrative record. See Federal Power Comm'n v. Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp., 423 U.S. 326, 331, 96 S.Ct. 579, 46 L.Ed.2d 533 1976); accord Airport Neighbors Alliance, Inc. v. United States, 90 F.3d 426, 433 n. 7 (10th Cir. 1996). The circumstances which warrant consideration of extra-record materials are 'extremely limited.' American Mining Cong. v. Thomas, 772 F.2d 617, 626 (10th Cir. 1985) (listing possible justification as: (1) the agency action is not adequately explained and cannot be reviewed properly without considering the cited materials; (2) the record is deficient because the agency ignored relevant factors it should have considered in making its decision; (3) the agency considered factors that were left out of the formal record; (4) the case is so complex and the record so unclear that the reviewing court needs more evidence to enable it to understand the issues; and (5) evidence coming into existence after the agency acted demonstrates the actions were right or wrong), cert denied, 476 U.S. 1158, 106 S.Ct. 2276, 90 L.Ed.2d 718 (1986).

6. The United States Supreme Court has described the scope of review as follows:

[O]rdinarily review of administrative decisions is to be confined to consideration of the decision of the agency . . . and of the evidence on which it was based. (Citation and internal quotations omitted). [T]he focal point for judicial review should be the administrative record already in existence, not some new record made initially in the reviewing court. (Citation and internal quotations omitted). If the decision of the agency is not sustainable on the administrative record made, then the . . . decision must be vacated and the matter remanded . . . for further consideration." (Citation and internal quotations omitted). Clearly it is this mode of review that is contemplated by the statute providing for

judicial review of Commission decisions, § 19(b) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 717r(b).

Federal Power Commission v. Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, 423 U.S., 326, 331, 96 S.Ct. 579, 46 L.Ed.2d 533 (1976).

- 7. This Court reached a similar decision in *Airport Neighbors Alliance, Inc. v. United States*, 90 F.3d 426, 433 fn. 7 (10th Cir. 1996), which involved questions regarding the adequacy of an analysis performed under the National Environmental Policy Act.
- 8. The Sierra Club's and NRDC's attempt to expand the Administrative Record by filing a Supplemental Appendix and referencing the Court to website information is improper. The Sierra Club and NRDC have never received permission to supplement the Administrative Record with the information contained in their Supplemental Appendix. They have also failed to obtain permission to submit the electronic extra-record information, and would not be entitled to simply attach such information to their Response Brief. They cannot circumvent that limitation by quoting from and citing to the website where the same information can be found.
- 9. The Sierra Club and NRDC have made no effort to justify their reliance upon, or citation to, information that is outside of the Administrative Record. They have apparently assumed that, because the information is found on a website, it is subject to review by this Court. That assumption is legally indefensible. Rather than being

benign, their references to various websites is especially troubling considering the fact that such sources expand the scope of the Administrative Record to the point of infinity, with no limit to the amount of information that can be posted and that could be reviewed by the Court.

10. The information included in the Supplemental Appendix and that is available on the identified websites does not become part of the Administrative Record merely because it was developed and compiled by the Federal Defendants or some other agency.² Such information does not become subject to inclusion in the Administrative

² The Wolf Coalition disputes the accuracy of the extra-record information and the purpose for which the Sierra Club and NRDC are using it. The Wolf Coalition's "failure to manage" claim is based, in part, upon the Federal Defendants' refusal to accurately identify and to appropriately respond to wolf kills. As such, the information presented by the Sierra Club and NRDC raises questions of fact. Those questions of fact cannot be addressed or resolved in the context of this appeal.

It is also important to note that the Federal Defendants stated during the November 17, 2004 hearing on the Wolf Coalition's Motion to Consolidate that they have not yet compiled or produced the Administrative Record related to the "failure to manage" claims. "[I]t is correct that the Defendants had read the State of Wyoming's Complaint more narrowly. And we do actually have an extensive record that we would need to compile on livestock depredation issues, as well as an extensive record that would need to be compiled for the NEPA claim." Aplt.App.Vol. 2 at 477-478. It would be patently unfair to allow the Sierra Club and NRDC to slip into the Administrative Record information that they argue supports denying the Wolf Coalition the opportunity to pursue their failure to manage claim, while at the same time argue that the Wolf Coalition should be prevented from presenting evidence to the contrary.

Record merely because it can be found at an electronic location, the address for which begins with "www" or "http". Citing to a string of letters does not expand the Administrative Record that is before this Court to include any online document that may somehow relate to wolf introduction, management or control. Access to the internet does not change the fundamental rules regarding judicial review of agency action. Access to the internet does not expand the scope of review to include whatever information may be found on a particular (often self-serving) website.

11. The Administrative Record is comprised of the information provided by the Federal Defendants. The Appellants filed a copy of that Administrative Record with the Court. The scope of review of this action does not include "surfing the web" as suggested by the Sierra Club and NRDC. These Intervenors must be precluded from unilaterally expanding that Record, especially when they have utterly failed to justify their attempt to doing so.

WHEREFORE, the Wolf Coalition respectfully requests that this Court strike the Sierra Club's and NRDC's Supplemental Appendix, as well as all references and citations to, and reliance upon, electronic information that is outside of the Administrative Record. The Wolf Coalition also respectfully requests that the Court enter such other and further relief as is appropriate under the circumstances.

Dated this 8th day of September, 2005.

WYOMING WOLF COALITION

__/s/____

Harriet M. Hageman

Kara Brighton

HAGEMAN & BRIGHTON, P.C.

1822 Warren Avenue

Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

Telephone: (307) 635-4888 Facsimile: (307) 632-5111

hhageman@hblawoffice.com

CERTIFICATE OF DIGITAL SUBMISSION

I hereby certify that (1) no privacy redactions are required. Every document submitted in Digital Form and scanned PDF format is an exact copy of the written document filed with the Court and served on the parties. I further certify that the digital submissions have been scanned with the most recent virus scanning program (Norton Antivirus, System Works Professional 2004; most recent update September 8, 2005) and, according to the program, are free of viruses.

____/s/____

Harriet M. Hageman

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on the 8th day of September, 2005, a true and correct copy of the **MOTION TO STRIKE OF APPELLANTS WYOMING WOOL GROWERS, ET AL., (WOLF COALITION),** was served upon the Clerk of Court and the following Parties as indicated.

Clerk of the U.S. Court of Appeals Tenth Judicial Circuit Byron White U.S. Courthouse 1823 Stout Street	[] U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid[] Hand Delivery[X] Federal Express[] Facsimile:
Denver, Colorado 80257	[X] Other: <u>Electronic Mail</u> <u>esubmission@ca10.uscourts.gov</u>
David C. Shilton	[] U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
U.S. Department of Justice	[] Hand Delivery
Appellate Section - ENRD	[X] Federal Express
PHB Mail Room 2121	[] Facsimile:
601 D Street NW	[X] Other: Electronic Mail
Washington, D.C. 20004	David.Shilton@usdoj.gov
Patrick J. Crank	[X] U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
Jay Jerde	[] Hand Delivery
Wyoming Attorney General's Office	[] Federal Express
123 Capitol Building	[] Facsimile:
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002	[X] Other: Electronic Mail
	jjerde@state.wy.us
Bryan A. Skoric	[X] U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
James F. Davis	[] Hand Delivery
Park County Attorney's Office	[] Federal Express
1002 Sheridan Avenue	[] Facsimile:
Cody, Wyoming 82414	[X] Other: Electronic Mail
	idavis@parkcounty.us

Thomas M. France National Wildlife Federation 240 N. Higgins, Ste 2 Missoula, Montana 59802	 [X] U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid [] Hand Delivery [] Federal Express [] Facsimile:
Jack Tuholske Tuholske Law Office Box 7458 Missoula, Montana 59897	[X] U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid [] Hand Delivery [] Federal Express [] Facsimile: [X] Other: Electronic Mail tuholske@centric.net
Thomas F. Darin P.O. Box 2728 Jackson, Wyoming 83001	 [X] U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid [] Hand Delivery [] Federal Express [] Facsimile:
Douglas L. Honnold Abigail M. Dillen Mark W. Poe Earthjustice	[X] U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid[] Hand Delivery[] Federal Express[] Facsimile:
209 South Willson Avenue Bozeman, Montana 59715	[X] Other: <u>Electronic Mail</u> <u>dhonnold@earthjustice.org</u>
Timothy C. Kingston Graves Miller & Kingston 408 West 23 rd Street Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001	[X] U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid[] Hand Delivery[] Federal Express[] Facsimile:
	[X] Other: Electronic Mail kingston@rockymtnlaw.com
Harrie	/s/ et M. Hageman
Harriet M. Hageman	