



United States Department of the Interior



FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE Mountain-Prairie Region

IN REPLY REFER TO:
FWS/FOIA

MAILING ADDRESS:
Post Office Box 25486
Denver Federal Center
Denver, Colorado 80225-0486

STREET LOCATION:
134 Union Boulevard
Lakewood, Colorado 80228-1807

October 4, 2019

Via email: reilly.patrickf@gmail.com

Patrick Reilly
500 S. Higgins Ave.
Missoula, MT 59801

REF: FWS-2019-00122

Dear Mr. Reilly:

This letter is in regard to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request dated November 6, 2018 for the following:

- *Any and all emails, and all attachments, exchanged between former National Bison Range Complex Project Leader Jeff King and Region 6 Refuge Supervisor Bernie Petersen between May 26, 2017 and January 31, 2018 containing the terms "National Bison Range" or "CCP"*
- *Any and all emails, and all attachments, sent to or from Bernie Petersen between May 26, 2017 and January 31, 2018 containing the term "Jeff King" and either of the following terms: "National Bison Range" or "CCP"*

On August 19, 2019 we sent you a partial response. In that response, we stated we were still reviewing records responsive to your request. Our review is complete, and we withholding twenty-six (26) pages in full and twenty-six (26) pages in part as described below.

Twenty-six (26) pages are being withheld in full and five (5) pages are being withheld in part under FOIA exemption 5. Exemption 5 allows an agency to withhold "inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party... in litigation with the agency." [5 U.S.C. § 552\(b\)\(5\)](#). Exemption 5 therefore incorporates the privileges that protect materials from discovery in litigation, including the deliberative process, attorney work-product, attorney-client, and commercial information privileges. We are withholding the documents in full under Exemption 5 because they qualify to be withheld under the deliberative process privilege.

Deliberative Process Privilege

The deliberative process privilege protects the decision-making process of government agencies and encourages the frank exchange of ideas on legal or policy matters by ensuring agencies are not forced to operate in a fish bowl. A number of policy purposes have been attributed to the deliberative process

privilege. Among the most important are to: (1) assure that subordinates will feel free to provide the decision maker with their uninhibited opinions and recommendations; (2) protect against premature disclosure of proposed policies; and (3) protect against confusing the issues and misleading the public.

The deliberative process privilege protects materials that are both pre-decisional and deliberative. The privilege covers records that reflect the give-and-take of the consultative process” and may include “recommendations, draft documents, proposals, suggestions, and other subjective documents which reflect the personal opinions of the writer rather than the policy of the agency.

The materials that have been withheld under the deliberative process privilege of Exemption 5 are both pre-decisional and deliberative. They do not contain or represent formal or informal agency policies or decisions. They are the result of frank and open discussions among employees of the Department of the Interior. Their contents have been held confidential by all parties and public dissemination of this information would expose the agency’s decision-making process in such a way as to discourage candid discussion within the agency, and thereby undermine its ability to perform its mandated functions.

The deliberative process privilege does not apply to records created 25 years or more before the date on which the records were requested.

Twenty-one (21) pages are being withheld in part and ten (10) pages are being withheld in full under FOIA Exemption 6. Exemption 6 allows an agency to withhold “personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” [5 U.S.C. § 552\(b\)\(6\)](#).

The phrase “similar files” covers any agency records containing information about a particular individual that can be identified as applying to that individual. To determine whether releasing records containing information about a particular individual would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, we are required to balance the privacy interest that would be affected by disclosure against any public interest in the information.

Under the FOIA, the only relevant public interest to consider under the exemption is the extent to which the information sought would shed light on an agency’s performance of its statutory duties or otherwise let citizens ‘know what their government is up to. The burden is on the requester to establish that disclosure would serve the public interest. When the privacy interest at stake and the public interest in disclosure have been determined, the two competing interests must be weighed against one another to determine which is the greater result of disclosure: the harm to personal privacy or the benefit to the public. The purposes for which the request for information is made do not impact this balancing test, as a release of information requested under the FOIA constitutes a release to the general public.

The information that has been withheld under Exemption 6 consists private individuals’ addresses and contact information, and we have determined that the individuals to whom this information pertains have a substantial privacy interest in withholding it. Additionally, we have determined that the disclosure of this information would shed little or no light on the performance of the agency’s statutory duties. Because the harm to personal privacy is greater than whatever public interest may be served by disclosure, release of the information would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of

these individuals and we are withholding it under Exemption 6.

Five (5) pages are being withheld in part under FOIA Exemption 5, Deliberative Process Privilege, Exemption 6, Exemption 7(C) and Exemption 7(E). Certain names and personal identifiers of any individual in law enforcement files have been withheld under FOIA Exemptions 6 and 7(C).

Exemption 6 allows an agency to withhold “personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6). The phrase “similar files” covers any agency records containing information about a particular individual that can be identified as applying to that individual. See *United States Dep't of State v. Washington Post Co.*, 456 U.S. 595, 602 (1982). To determine whether releasing records containing information about a particular individual would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, we are required to balance the privacy interest that would be affected by disclosure against any public interest in the information. See *United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 773-75 (1989).

Under the FOIA, “the only relevant public interest” to consider under the exemption is “the extent to which the information sought would ‘she[d] light on an agency’s performance of its statutory duties’ or otherwise let citizens ‘know what their government is up to.’” *United States Dep’t of Def. v. Fed. Labor Relations Auth.*, 510 U.S. 487, 495-96 (1994) (quoting *Reporters Comm.*, 489 U.S. at 775). The burden is on the requester to establish that disclosure would serve the public interest. See *National Archives and Records Admin. v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157, 171-72 (2004). When the privacy interest at stake and the public interest in disclosure have been determined, the two competing interests must be weighed against one another to determine which is the greater result of disclosure: the harm to personal privacy or the benefit to the public. The purposes for which the request for information is made do not impact this balancing test, as a release of information requested under the FOIA constitutes a release to the general public. See *Reporters Comm.*, 489 U.S. at 771.

The information that has been withheld under Exemption 6 consists of personal information, and we have determined that the individuals to whom this information pertains have a substantial privacy interest in withholding it. Additionally, we have determined that the disclosure of this information would shed little or no light on the performance of the agency’s statutory duties. Because the harm to personal privacy is greater than whatever public interest may be served by disclosure, release of the information would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of these individuals and we are withholding it under Exemption 6.

Exemption 7(C) protects law enforcement records if their release could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. It is regularly applied to withhold references to individuals in law enforcement files, including Federal employees involved in law enforcement investigations. For the materials that have been withheld under 7(C), we have determined that releasing them would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy because they identify individuals referenced in law enforcement records and the release of this information would not shed light on an agency’s performance of its statutory duties.

Exemption 7(E) protects law enforcement records if their release would disclose techniques and

procedures for law enforcement investigation or prosecutions, or would disclose guidelines for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions if the disclosure could reasonably be expected to risk circumvention of the law. For the materials that have been withheld under 7(E), we have determined that they are techniques for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions whose release could reasonably be expected to risk circumvention of the law.

We reasonably foresee that disclosure would harm an interest protected by one or more of the nine exemptions to the FOIA's general rule of disclosure.

Stacey Cummins, FWS FOIA Coordinator, is responsible for this partial denial. Dana Jacobsen, Attorney-Advisor, in the Office of the Solicitor was consulted.

Please note that you may seek dispute resolution services from our FOIA Public Liaison, Cathy Willis, Acting FWS FOIA Officer, 720-425-5173 and/or seek dispute resolution services from the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS).

If you choose to contact OGIS, you may do so in any of the following ways:

Office of Government Information Services
National Archives and Records Administration
8601 Adelphi Road - OGIS
College Park, MD 20740-6001
E-mail: ogis@nara.gov
Web: <https://ogis.archives.gov>
Telephone: 202-741-5770
Fax: 202-741-5769
Toll-free: 1-877-684-6448

You may also appeal this response to the Department's FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer. If you choose to appeal, the FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer must receive your FOIA appeal **no later than 90 workdays** from the date of this letter. Appeals arriving or delivered after 5 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, will be deemed received on the next workday.

Your appeal must be made in writing. You may submit your appeal and accompanying materials to the FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer by mail, courier service, fax, or email. All communications concerning your appeal should be clearly marked with the words: "FREEDOM OF INFORMATION APPEAL." You must include an explanation of why you believe the Service's response is in error. You must also include with your appeal copies of all correspondence between you and the Service concerning your FOIA request, including your original FOIA request and the Service's response. Failure to include with your appeal all correspondence between you and the Service will result in the Department's rejection of your appeal, unless the FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer determines (in the FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer's sole discretion) that good cause exists to accept the defective appeal.

Please include your name and daytime telephone number (or the name and telephone number of an

appropriate contact), email address and fax number (if available) in case the FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Officer needs additional information or clarification of your appeal.

DOI FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Office Contact Information

Department of the Interior
Office of the Solicitor
1849 C Street, N.W.
MS-6556 MIB
Washington, DC 20240
Attn: FOIA/Privacy Act Appeals Office
Telephone: (202) 208-5339
Fax: (202) 208-6677
Email: FOIA.Appeals@sol.doi.gov

This is our final response and closes your request, FWS-2019-00122. If you have any questions, you may contact me by phone at 303-236-4473, by email at fw6_foia@fws.gov, or by mail at 134 Union Blvd, Lakewood, Colorado 80228.

Sincerely,

Stacey Cummins
Region 6 FOIA Coordinator

Enclosure