



United States Department of the Interior



FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

5275 Leesburg Pike, MS: IRTM-FOIA
Falls Church, Virginia 22041

In Reply Refer To:
FWS/FOIA

May 25, 2022

Mr. William S. Eubanks II
Eubanks & Associates PLLC
1331 H Street N.W., Suite 902
Washington, D.C. 20005

REF: DOI-FWS-2022-001429 (Final)

Dear Mr. Eubanks:

This partially responds to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request dated January 5, 2022, in which you seek the following: “*responsive records that pertain to the Nebraska Public Power District’s proposed transmission line known as the “R-Project.”*” Please refer to tracking number above in communications regarding this request.

Response

In this fourth and final response to your request, 243 pages are being released to you. Based on this office’s review, we reasonably foresee that disclosure of certain information in documents that fall under this request would harm an interest protected by one or more of the nine exemptions to the FOIA’s general rule of disclosure. Accordingly, from the responsive records, portions of 51 records are partially redacted, and 60 records are being withheld in full pursuant to FOIA Exemptions (b)(5) and (b)(6), as described below. Multiple redactions may be applied to a single document.

Exemptions

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 71 pages in part and 72 pages in full in accordance with the attorney-client privilege of Exemption 5. The attorney-client privilege protects confidential communications between an attorney and his client relating to a legal matter for which the client has sought professional advice and is not limited to the context of litigation. Moreover, although it fundamentally applies to confidential facts divulged by a client to his/her attorney, this privilege also encompasses any opinions given by an attorney to his/her client based upon, and thus reflecting, those facts, as well as communications between attorneys that reflect confidential client-supplied information.

The information that has been withheld under the attorney-client privilege of Exemption 5 constitutes confidential communications between Federal attorneys and agency clients, related to legal matters for which the client sought professional legal assistance and services. It also encompasses opinions given by attorneys to their clients based on client-supplied facts. Additionally, the Federal employees who communicated with the attorneys regarding this information were clients of the attorneys at the time the information was generated, and the attorneys were acting in their capacities as lawyers at the time they communicated legal advice. Finally, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has held this information confidential and has not waived the attorney-client 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 predecisional 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 deliberative process privilege does not apply to records created 25 years or more before the date on which the records were requested. None of the records here were created prior to 25 years from the request date.

Under the deliberative process privilege of Exemption 5, 215 pages have been withheld and 67 pages are partially redacted that are both predecisional 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 these drafts would have a chilling effect on the agency's deliberative processes.

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). We are withholding 14 pages in part under Exemption 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 of contact information (e.g. names, email addresses and phone numbers), and we have determined that the individuals to whom this information pertains have a substantial privacy interest in withholding it. Additionally, you have not provided information that explains a relevant public interest under the FOIA in the disclosure of this personal information and 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.

Mediation/Dispute Resolution

The 2007 FOIA amendments created the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) to offer mediation services to resolve disputes between FOIA requesters and Federal agencies as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation. Using OGIS services does not affect your right to pursue litigation. You may contact OGIS 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

Please note that using OGIS services does not affect the timing of filing an appeal with the Department’s FOIA & Privacy Act Appeals Officer.

Contact information for the Department’s FOIA Public Liaison, whom you may also seek dispute resolution services from, is available at <https://www.doi.gov/foia/foiacenters>.

Appeal Rights

The undersigned is responsible for this denial. This response to your FOIA request was made in consultation with Kathryn Williams-Shuck, Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Solicitor, Rocky Mountain Region, U.S. Department of the Interior (Department). You may 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 final response. 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 this response is in error. You must also include with your appeal copies of all correspondence between you and FWS concerning your FOIA request, including your original FOIA request and this response. Failure to include with your appeal all correspondence between you and FWS 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

Conclusion

For your information, Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIA. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(c) (2006 & Supp. IV (2010)). This response is limited to those records that are subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that is given to all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist.

This completes the Service's response. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this request, please contact Government Information Specialist, David Tischer, by email at david_tischer@fws.gov.

Sincerely,

FOIA Coordinator