



December 6, 2018

VIA EMAIL

Clarice Julka
Office of the Secretary
U.S. Department of the Interior
MS-7328, MIB
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240
os_foia@ios.doi.gov

Carrie Hyde-Michaels
Chief, Branch of FOIA, Records, Privacy
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
5275 Leesburg Pike
MS:IRTM
Falls Church, VA 22041
fwhq_foia@fws.gov

Ryan Witt, FOIA Officer
Bureau of Land Management
Attn: FOIA Office (WO-640)
1849 C St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20240
BLM_WO_FOIA@blm.gov

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Freedom of Information Officers:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, and the Department of the Interior's (DOI) implementing regulations, 43 C.F.R. Part 2, American Oversight makes the following request for records.

The Endangered Species Act has stood as a keystone of environmental protection in the United States for over four decades. Despite the Act's numerous successes as the United States' strongest conservation legislation,¹ certain members of Congress and the Administration, as well as private interests, are opposed to the Act's purpose and application as written, and seek to weaken its ability

¹ See, e.g., Rebecca Heisman, *Bald Eagle, The Ultimate Endangered Species Act Success Story*, AM. BIRD CONSERVANCY, May 24, 2018, <https://abcbirds.org/bald-eagle-the-ultimate-endangered-species-act-success-story/>; Laura Beans, *10 Success Stories Thanks to the Endangered Species Act*, ECOWATCH, Dec. 7, 2013, <https://www.ecowatch.com/10-success-stories-thanks-to-the-endangered-species-act-1881837279.html>; *Defining Success Under the Endangered Species Act*, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERV., July 12, 2013, <https://www.fws.gov/endangered/news/episodes/bu-04-2013/coverstory/index.html>; Roddy Scheer & Doug Moss, *Is the Endangered Species Act a Success or Failure?*, SCIENTIFIC AM., Aug. 9, 2012, <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/endangered-species-act-success-failure>.



to protect at-risk species.² American Oversight submits this request to shed light on the influence of entities outside of DOI—whether in Congress or otherwise—on decisions related to the protection of threatened and endangered species.

Requested Records

American Oversight requests that DOI produce the following within twenty business days:

- 1) All records reflecting communications (including email messages, email attachments, calendar entries/invitations) between any of the custodians listed below and any of the following individuals (including emails where any custodian is copied or blind copied):
 - a. Senator John Barrasso or any staffer or representative of Senator Barrasso (including any email address ending in @barrasso.senate.gov)
 - b. Senator James Inhofe or any staffer or representative of Senator Inhofe (including any email address ending in @inhofe.senate.gov)
 - c. Senator Mike Lee or any staffer or representative of Senator Lee (including any email address ending in @lee.senate.gov)
 - d. Representative Rob Bishop or any staffer or representative of Representative Bishop (including but not limited to emails to or from rob.bishop@mail.house.gov)
 - e. Representative Pete Olson or any staffer or representative of Representative Olson (including but not limited to emails to or from pete.olson@mail.house.gov)
 - f. Representative Dan Newhouse or any staffer or representative of Representative Newhouse (including but not limited to emails to or from dan.newhouse@mail.house.gov)
 - g. Representative Louie Gohmert or any staffer or representative of Representative Gohmert (including but not limited to emails to or from louie.gohmert@mail.house.gov)
 - h. Representative Bill Huizenga or any staffer or representative of Representative Huizenga (including but not limited to emails to or from bill.huizenga@mail.house.gov)
 - i. Representative Andy Biggs or any staffer or representative of Representative Biggs (including but not limited to emails to or from andy.biggs@mail.house.gov)
 - j. Representative Steve Pearce or any staffer or representative of Representative Pearce (including but not limited to emails to or from steve.pearce@mail.house.gov)
 - k. Representative Scott Tipton or any staffer or representative of Representative Tipton (including but not limited to emails to or from scott.tipton@mail.house.gov)

² See, e.g., *Barrasso, Senate Republicans Renew Attack on Endangered Species Act*, Press Release, CTR. FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, Nov. 14, 2018, https://www.biologicaldiversity.org/news/press_releases/2018/endangered-species-attacks-11-14-2018.php; Timothy Cama, *Zinke Hires Endangered Species Act Critic for Senior Post*, THE HILL (Sept. 5, 2018, 11:17 AM), <https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/405146-zinke-hires-endangered-species-act-critic-for-senior-post>.

- l. Representative Bruce Westerman or any staffer or representative of Representative Westerman (including but not limited to emails to or from bruce.westerman@mail.house.gov)
 - m. Representative Don Young or any staffer or representative of Representative Young (including but not limited to emails to or from don.young@mail.house.gov)
 - n. Representative Ralph Norman or any staffer or representative of Representative Norman (including but not limited to emails to or from ralph.norman@mail.house.gov)
 - o. Representative Mike Johnson or any staffer or representative of Representative Johnson (including but not limited to emails to or from mike.johnson@mail.house.gov)
 - p. Representative Paul Gosar or any staffer or representative of Representative Gosar (including but not limited to emails to or from paul.gosar@mail.house.gov)
 - q. Representative Tom McClintock or any staffer or representative of Representative McClintock (including but not limited to emails to or from tom.mcclintock@mail.house.gov)
- 2) All records reflecting communications (including email messages, email attachments, calendar entries/invitations) sent by any of the custodians listed below to any person or entity outside of DOI and its components (including emails on which such entities are copied or blind copied) containing any of the following terms:
- a. “endangered species”
 - b. “threatened species”
 - c. “listed species”
 - d. ESA
 - e. delist
 - f. “de-list”
 - g. downlist
 - h. “best scientific and commercial data”
 - i. “recovery teams”
 - j. “species recovery”
 - k. “economic loss”
 - l. “economic impact”
 - m. “disturbance and destruction”

DOI may limit its search to:

- Ryan Zinke, Secretary
- Heather Swift, Senior Advisor
- Daniel Jorjani, Special Assistant to the Secretary
- Scott Cameron, Acting Assistant Secretary/ Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget
- Robert Gordon, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget
- Katharine “Kate” MacGregor, Deputy Chief of Staff for Policy
- Brandon Middleton, Deputy Solicitor for Water Resources
- Landon “Tucker” Davis, Policy Advisor

BLM may limit its search to:

- Brian Steed, Deputy Director, Policy and Programs, Exercising Authority of the Director
- Kathleen Benedetto, Senior Advisor
- Thomas Baptiste, Advisor

FWS may limit its search to:

- Margaret Everson, Principal Deputy Director Exercising the Authority of the Director
- Jim Kurth, Deputy Director
- Steve Guertin, Deputy Director
- Greg Sheehan, Former Deputy Director
- Zach Gambill, Advisor

Please provide all responsive records from January 20, 2017, to the date the search is conducted.

In addition to the records requested above, American Oversight also requests records describing the processing of this request, including records sufficient to identify search terms used, locations and custodians searched, and any tracking sheets used to track the processing of this request. If your agency uses FOIA questionnaires or certifications completed by individual custodians or components to determine whether they possess responsive materials or to describe how they conducted searches, we also request any such records prepared in connection with the processing of this request.

American Oversight seeks all responsive records regardless of format, medium, or physical characteristics. In conducting your search, please understand the terms “record,” “document,” and “information” in their broadest sense, to include any written, typed, recorded, graphic, printed, or audio material of any kind. We seek records of any kind, including electronic records, audiotapes, videotapes, and photographs, as well as letters, emails, facsimiles, telephone messages, voice mail messages and transcripts, notes, or minutes of any meetings, telephone conversations or discussions. Our request includes any attachments to these records. **No category of material should be omitted from search, collection, and production.**

Please search all records regarding agency business. **You may not exclude searches of files or emails in the personal custody of your officials, such as personal email accounts.** Records of official business conducted using unofficial systems or stored outside of official files are subject to the Federal Records Act and FOIA.³ **It is not adequate to rely on policies and procedures that require officials to move such information to official systems within a certain period of time; American Oversight has a right to records contained in those files even if material has not yet been**

³ See *Competitive Enter. Inst. v. Office of Sci. & Tech. Policy*, 827 F.3d 145, 149–50 (D.C. Cir. 2016); cf. *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Kerry*, 844 F.3d 952, 955–56 (D.C. Cir. 2016).

moved to official systems or if officials have, through negligence or willfulness, failed to meet their obligations.⁴

In addition, please note that in conducting a “reasonable search” as required by law, you must employ the most up-to-date technologies and tools available, in addition to searches by individual custodians likely to have responsive information. Recent technology may have rendered your agency’s prior FOIA practices unreasonable. **In light of the government-wide requirements to manage information electronically by the end of 2016, it is no longer reasonable to rely exclusively on custodian-driven searches.⁵ Furthermore, agencies that have adopted the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) Capstone program, or similar policies, now maintain emails in a form that is reasonably likely to be more complete than individual custodians’ files.** For example, a custodian may have deleted a responsive email from his or her email program, but your agency’s archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone. Accordingly, American Oversight insists that your agency use the most up-to-date technologies to search for responsive information and take steps to ensure that the most complete repositories of information are searched. American Oversight is available to work with you to craft appropriate search terms. **However, custodian searches are still required; agencies may not have direct access to files stored in .PST files, outside of network drives, in paper format, or in personal email accounts.**

Under the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, agencies must adopt a presumption of disclosure, withholding information “only if . . . disclosure would harm an interest protected by an exemption” or “disclosure is prohibited by law.”⁶ If it is your position that any portion of the requested records is exempt from disclosure, American Oversight requests that you provide an index of those documents as required under *Vaughn v. Rosen*, 484 F.2d 820 (D.C. Cir. 1973), *cert. denied*, 415 U.S. 977 (1974). As you are aware, a *Vaughn* index must describe each document claimed as exempt with sufficient specificity “to permit a reasoned judgment as to whether the material is actually exempt under FOIA.”⁷ Moreover, the *Vaughn* index “must describe *each* document or portion thereof withheld, and for *each* withholding it must discuss the consequences of disclosing

⁴ See *Competitive Enter. Inst. v. Office of Sci. & Tech. Policy*, No. 14-cv-765, slip op. at 8 (D.D.C. Dec. 12, 2016) (“The Government argues that because the agency had a policy requiring [the official] to forward all of his emails from his [personal] account to his business email, the [personal] account only contains duplicate agency records at best. Therefore, the Government claims that any hypothetical deletion of the [personal account] emails would still leave a copy of those records intact in [the official’s] work email. However, policies are rarely followed to perfection by anyone. At this stage of the case, the Court cannot assume that each and every work related email in the [personal] account was duplicated in [the official’s] work email account.” (citations omitted)).

⁵ Presidential Memorandum—Managing Government Records, 76 Fed. Reg. 75,423 (Nov. 28, 2011), <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/11/28/presidential-memorandum-managing-government-records>; Office of Mgmt. & Budget, Exec. Office of the President, Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments & Independent Agencies, “Managing Government Records Directive,” M-12-18 (Aug. 24, 2012), <https://www.archives.gov/files/records-mgmt/m-12-18.pdf>.

⁶ FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 § 2 (Pub. L. No. 114-185).

⁷ *Founding Church of Scientology v. Bell*, 603 F.2d 945, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

the sought-after information.”⁸ Further, “the withholding agency must supply ‘a relatively detailed justification, specifically identifying the reasons why a particular exemption is relevant and correlating those claims with the particular part of a withheld document to which they apply.’”⁹

In the event some portions of the requested records are properly exempt from disclosure, please disclose any reasonably segregable non-exempt portions of the requested records. If it is your position that a document contains non-exempt segments, but that those non-exempt segments are so dispersed throughout the document as to make segregation impossible, please state what portion of the document is non-exempt, and how the material is dispersed throughout the document.¹⁰ Claims of nonsegregability must be made with the same degree of detail as required for claims of exemptions in a *Vaughn* index. If a request is denied in whole, please state specifically that it is not reasonable to segregate portions of the record for release.

You should institute a preservation hold on information responsive to this request. American Oversight intends to pursue all legal avenues to enforce its right of access under FOIA, including litigation if necessary. Accordingly, you are on notice that litigation is reasonably foreseeable.

To ensure that this request is properly construed, that searches are conducted in an adequate but efficient manner, and that extraneous costs are not incurred, American Oversight welcomes an opportunity to discuss its request with you before your agency undertakes a search or incurs search or duplication costs. By working together at the outset, we can decrease the likelihood of costly and time-consuming litigation in the future.

Where possible, please provide responsive material in electronic format by email or in PDF or TIF format on a USB drive. Please send any responsive material being sent by mail to American Oversight, 1030 15th Street NW, Suite B255, Washington, DC 20005. If it will accelerate release of responsive records to American Oversight, please also provide responsive material on a rolling basis.

Fee Waiver Request

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii) and 43 CFR § 2.45(a), American Oversight requests a waiver of fees associated with processing this request for records. The subject of this request concerns the operations of the federal government, and the disclosures will likely contribute to public understanding of those operations in a significant way.¹¹ Moreover, the request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.¹²

American Oversight requests a waiver of fees because disclosure of the requested information is “in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding” of the

⁸ *King v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 830 F.2d 210, 223–24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (emphases in original).

⁹ *Id.* at 224 (citing *Mead Data Central, Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of the Air Force*, 566 F.2d 242, 251 (D.C. Cir. 1977)).

¹⁰ *Mead Data Central*, 566 F.2d at 261.

¹¹ 43 C.F.R § 2.45(a)(1).

¹² 43 C.F.R § 2.45(a)(2).

operations or activities of the federal government.¹³ The disclosure of the information sought under this request will reveal the operations of the federal government, including what outside interests may be influencing or otherwise involved in efforts to undermine the Endangered Species Act within DOI. The public has an important interest in preserving at-risk species that cannot be replaced, and a weakened Endangered Species Act would harm that interest. And, as described in more detail below, American Oversight “will disseminate the information to a reasonably broad audience of persons” through its social media accounts and its website.¹⁴

This request is primarily and fundamentally not for commercial purposes, but rather the primary interest is in public disclosure of responsive records. As a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, American Oversight does not have a commercial purpose and the release of the information requested is not in American Oversight’s financial interest. American Oversight’s mission is to promote transparency in government, to educate the public about government activities, and to ensure the accountability of government officials. American Oversight uses the information gathered, and its analysis of it, to educate the public through reports, press releases, or other media. American Oversight also makes materials it gathers available on its public website and promotes their availability on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter.¹⁵ American Oversight has demonstrated its commitment to the public disclosure of documents and creation of editorial content. For example, after receiving records regarding an ethics waiver received by a senior DOJ attorney,¹⁶ American Oversight promptly posted the records to its website and published an analysis of what the records reflected about DOJ’s process for ethics waivers.¹⁷ As another example, American Oversight has a project called “Audit the Wall,” where the organization is gathering and analyzing information and commenting on public releases of information related to the administration’s proposed construction of a barrier along the U.S.-Mexico border.¹⁸

Accordingly, American Oversight qualifies for a fee waiver.

¹³ 43 C.F.R. § 2.48(a)(1)-(4).

¹⁴ 43 C.F.R. § 2.48(a)(2)(iii)-(v).

¹⁵ American Oversight currently has approximately 12,100 page likes on Facebook and 49,300 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, <https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/> (last visited Dec. 6, 2018); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <https://twitter.com/weareoversight> (last visited Dec. 6, 2018).

¹⁶ *DOJ Civil Division Response Noel Francisco Compliance*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance>.

¹⁷ *Francisco & the Travel Ban: What We Learned from the DOJ Documents*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/francisco-the-travel-ban-what-we-learned-from-the-doj-documents>.

¹⁸ *Audit the Wall*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/investigation/audit-the-wall>.

Conclusion

We share a common mission to promote transparency in government. American Oversight looks forward to working with your agency on this request. If you do not understand any part of this request, have any questions, or foresee any problems in fully releasing the requested records, please contact Hart Wood at foia@americanoversight.org or 202.873.1743. Also, if American Oversight's request for a fee waiver is not granted in full, please contact us immediately upon making such a determination.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Austin R. Evers". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the left.

Austin R. Evers
Executive Director
American Oversight