1		The Honorable Ronald B. Leighton
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8 9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
10 11	OLYMPIC FOREST COALITION, a Washington non-profit corporation,	Civil Action No. 3:16-cv-05068-RBL
12 13 14	Plaintiff, v. COAST SEAFOODS COMPANY, a	AMENDED ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO CERTIFY ORDER FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL AND MOTION TO STAY
15 16	Washington corporation, Defendant.	
17	THIS MATTER having come	before the Court on Defendant's Motion to Certify
18	Order for Interlocutory Appeal and Motion to Stay, and the Court having considered the records	
19	and files herein, the Court expressly finds as follows:	
20	1. The Court's order denying defendant Coast Seafoods Company's ("Coast")	
21	motion to dismiss, entered June 3, 2016 (Dkt. 21) (the "Order"), involves a controlling question	
22	of law as to which there is a substantial ground for difference of opinion.	
23	2. The question of law presented in the Order is whether the Clean Water	
24	Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251-1376, requires an aquatic animal production facility that is not a	
25	concentrated facility under 40 C.F.R. § 122.24, but that discharges effluent from a discrete	
26	conveyance, to obtain a National Pollutant D	ischarge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit.

AMENDED ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO CERTIFY ORDER FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL AND MOTION TO STAY

1	This question turns on the applicability and interpretation of Ass'n to Protect Hammersley, Eld.	
2	& Totten Inlets v. Taylor Res., Inc., 299 F.3d 1007 (9th Cir. 2002), League of Wilderness	
3	Defenders/Blue Mountain Biodiversity Project v. Forsgren, 309 F.3d 1181 (9th Cir. 2002), and	
4	Nw. Envtl. Def. Cir. v. Brown, 640 F.3d 1063 (9th Cir. 2011), rev'd on other grounds, 133 S.Ct.	
5	1326 (2013).	
6	3. An immediate appeal from the Order may materially advance the	
7	termination of this litigation.	
8	Based on these findings:	
9	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Coast Seafoods Company's motion to certify the	
10	Order for interlocutory appeal is GRANTED.	
11	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, in the event the Ninth Circuit accepts	
12	certification, this proceeding is stayed during the pendency of the interlocutory appeal.	
13	DATED this 8 th day of August, 2016.	
14		
15	Konal D. Leyhtun	
16	Ronald B. Leighton United States District Judge	
17	Presented by:	
18		
19	By: <u>s/ Joseph Vance, P.C.</u> Joseph Vance, P.C., WSB No. 25531 Hong N. Huynh, WSB No. 45044 Miller Nash Graham & Dunn LLP 111 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 3400 Portland, Oregon 97204 Telephone: (503) 224-5858 Fax: (503) 224-0155 E-mail: hong.huynh@millernash.com E-mail: joseph.vance@millernash.com	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	Attorneys for Defendant Coast Seafoods Company	
25		
26		