



May 8, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

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

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request: Review of National Monument Designations

Dear FOIA Officer:

This is a request under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, *as amended* (“FOIA”), from the Center for Biological Diversity (“Center”), a non-profit organization that works to secure a future for all species hovering on the brink of extinction through science, law, and creative media, and to fulfill the continuing educational goals of its membership and the general public in the process.

REQUESTED RECORDS

The Center requests the following records from the U.S. Department of the Interior (“Interior Department”):

1. All records from January 20, 2017 to the date of this search that mention, include, or reference national monument designations made by any President of the United States since January 1, 1996 (*See Attachment A. State by State Monuments List*); and
2. All records mentioning, including, or referencing Exec. Order No. 13792, 82 F.R. 20429 (Apr. 26, 2017), “Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act” (*See Attachment B. Presidential Executive Order on the Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act*).

For this request, the term “all records” refers to, but is not limited to, any and all documents, correspondence (including, but not limited to, inter and/or intra-agency correspondence as well as correspondence with entities or individuals outside the federal government), emails, letters, notes, telephone records, telephone notes, minutes, memoranda, comments, files, presentations, consultations, biological opinions, assessments, evaluations, schedules, telephone logs, papers published and/or unpublished, reports, studies, photographs and other images, data (including raw data, GPS or GIS data, UTM, LiDAR, etc.), maps, and/or all other responsive records, in draft or final form.

This request is not meant to exclude any other records that, although not specially requested, are reasonably related to the subject matter of this request. If you or your office have destroyed or determine to withhold any records that could be reasonably construed to be responsive to this request, I ask that you indicate this fact and the reasons therefore in your response.

Under the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, agencies are prohibited from denying requests for information under FOIA unless the agency reasonably believes release of the information will harm an interest that is protected by the exemption. FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 (Public Law No. 114-185), codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(8)(A).

Should you decide to invoke a FOIA exemption, please include sufficient information for us to assess the basis for the exemption, including any interest(s) that would be harmed by release. Please include a detailed ledger which includes:

1. Basic factual material about each withheld record, including the originator, date, length, general subject matter, and location of each item; and
2. Complete explanations and justifications for the withholding, including the specific exemption(s) under which the record (or portion thereof) was withheld and a full explanation of how each exemption applies to the withheld material. Such statements will be helpful in deciding whether to appeal an adverse determination. Your written justification may help to avoid litigation.

If you determine that portions of the records requested are exempt from disclosure, we request that you segregate the exempt portions and mail the non-exempt portions of such records to my attention at the address below within the statutory time limit. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b).

The Center is willing to receive records on a rolling basis.

Finally, FOIA's "frequently requested record" provision was enacted as part of the 1996 Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments, and requires all federal agencies to give "reading room" treatment to any FOIA-processed records that, "because of the nature of their subject matter, the agency determines have become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records." *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(2)(D)(ii)(I). Also, enacted as part of the 2016 FOIA Improvement Act, FOIA's Rule of 3 requires all federal agencies to proactively "make available for public inspection in an electronic format" "copies of records, regardless of form or format ... that have been released to any person ... and ... that have been requested 3 or more times." 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(2)(D)(ii)(II). Therefore, we respectfully request that you make available online any records that the agency determines will become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records, and records that have been requested three or more times.

FORMAT OF REQUESTED RECORDS

Under FOIA, you are obligated to provide records in a readily accessible electronic format and in the format requested. *See, e.g.*, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B) ("In making any record available to a

person under this paragraph, an agency shall provide the record in any form or format requested by the person if the record is readily reproducible by the agency in that form or format.”). “Readily accessible” means text-searchable and OCR-formatted. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). We ask that you please provide all records in an electronic format. Additionally, please provide the records either in (1) load-ready format with a CSV file index or Excel spreadsheet, or; (2) for files that are in .PDF format, without any “portfolios” or “embedded files.” Portfolios and embedded files within files are not readily accessible. *Please do not provide the records in a single, or “batched,” .PDF file.* We appreciate the inclusion of an index.

If you should seek to withhold or redact any responsive records, we request that you: (1) identify each such record with specificity (including date, author, recipient, and parties copied); (2) explain in full the basis for withholding responsive material; and (3) provide all segregable portions of the records for which you claim a specific exemption. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Please correlate any redactions with specific exemptions under FOIA.

REQUEST FOR FEE WAIVER

FOIA was designed to provide citizens a broad right to access government records. FOIA’s basic purpose is to “open agency action to the light of public scrutiny,” with a focus on the public’s “right to be informed about what their government is up to.” *U.S. Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 773-74 (1989) (internal quotation and citations omitted). In order to provide public access to this information, FOIA’s fee waiver provision requires that “[d]ocuments shall be furnished without any charge or at a [reduced] charge,” if the request satisfies the standard. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). FOIA’s fee waiver requirement is “liberally construed.” *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossotti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 2003); *Forest Guardians v. U.S. Dept. of Interior*, 416 F.3d 1173, 1178 (10th Cir. 2005).

The 1986 fee waiver amendments were designed specifically to provide non-profit organizations such as the Center access to government records without the payment of fees. Indeed, FOIA’s fee waiver provision was intended “to prevent government agencies from using high fees to discourage certain types of requesters and requests,” which are “consistently associated with requests from journalists, scholars, and *non-profit public interest groups*.” *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F.Supp. 867, 872 (D. Mass. 1984) (emphasis added). As one Senator stated, “[a]gencies should not be allowed to use fees as an offensive weapon against requesters seeking access to Government information” 132 Cong. Rec. S. 14298 (statement of Senator Leahy).

I. The Center Qualifies for a Fee Waiver.

Under FOIA, a party is entitled to a fee waiver when “disclosure of the information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the [Federal] government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). The Interior Department FOIA regulations at 43 C.F.R. § 2.48(a)(1)-(4) establish the same standard.

Thus, the Interior Department must consider four factors to determine whether a request is in the public interest: (1) whether the subject of the requested records concerns “the operations or

activities of the Federal government,” (2) whether the disclosure is “likely to contribute” to an understanding of government operations or activities, (3) whether the disclosure “will contribute to public understanding” of a reasonably broad audience of persons interested in the subject, and (4) whether the disclosure is likely to contribute “significantly” to public understanding of government operations or activities. 43 C.F.R. § 2.48(a)(1)-(4). As shown below, the Center meets each of these factors.

A. The Subject of This Request Concerns “The Operations and Activities of the Government.”

The subject matter of this request concerns the operations and activities of the Interior Department. This request asks for: (1) all records from January 20, 2017 to the date of this search that mention, include, or reference national monument designations made by any President of the United States since January 1, 1996 (*See Attachment A*); and (2) all records mentioning, including, or referencing Exec. Order No. 13792, 82 F.R. 20429 (Apr. 26, 2017), “Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act” (*See Attachment B*).

B. Disclosure is “Likely to Contribute” to an Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The requested records are meaningfully informative about government operations or activities and will contribute to an increased understanding of those operations and activities by the public.

Disclosure of the requested records will allow the Center to convey to the public information about how the U.S. government is carrying out congressional mandates under the Antiquities Act, 54 U.S.C. § 320301 - 320303, Federal Land and Policy Management Act, 43 U.S.C. ch. 35 § 1701 (“FLPMA”), and National Forest Management Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1600 - 161 (“NFMA”), *inter alia*. This request will reveal how the current administration makes decisions regarding protections of public lands and resources, specifically national monuments. The Center will glean from the records whether evidence exists of correspondence between government agencies and extractive and/or fossil fuel industries, and as such whether the key players in national monument designations have conflicts of interest that are related to seeking the review of national monuments. Once the information is made available, the Center will analyze it and present it to its 1.3 million members and online activists and the general public in a manner that will meaningfully enhance the public’s understanding of this topic.

Thus, the requested records are likely to contribute to an understanding of the Interior Department operations and activities.

C. Disclosure of the Requested Records Will Contribute to a Reasonably Broad Audience of Interested Persons’ Understanding of the Review of National Monument Designations

The requested records will contribute to public understanding of how the Interior Department actions are consistent with the Antiquities Act, FLPMA, and NFMA, amongst other relevant

environmental laws. As explained above, the records will contribute to public understanding of this topic.

Designation of national monuments generally, and specifically the current administration's review of past designations and possible collusion with industries that pose a threat to environmental health are areas of interest to a reasonably broad segment of the public. The Center will use the information it obtains from the disclosed records to educate the public at large about what basis federal agencies are utilizing to review national monument designations. *See W. Watersheds Proj. v. Brown*, 318 F.Supp.2d 1036, 1040 (D. Idaho 2004) (“... find[ing] that WWP adequately specified the public interest to be served, that is, educating the public about the ecological conditions of the land managed by the BLM and also how ... management strategies employed by the BLM may adversely affect the environment.”).

Through the Center's synthesis and dissemination (by means discussed in Section II, below), disclosure of information contained and gleaned from the requested records will contribute to a broad audience of persons who are interested in the subject matter. *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F.Supp. at 876 (benefit to a population group of some size distinct from the requester alone is sufficient); *Carney v. Dep't of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807, 815 (2d Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 823 (1994) (applying “public” to require a sufficient “breadth of benefit” beyond the requester's own interests); *Cnty. Legal Servs. v. Dep't of Hous. & Urban Dev.*, 405 F.Supp.2d 553, 557 (E.D. Pa. 2005) (in granting fee waiver to community legal group, court noted that while the requester's “work by its nature is unlikely to reach a very general audience,” “there is a segment of the public that is interested in its work”).

Indeed, the public does not currently have an ability to easily evaluate the requested records, which concern national monument designation review that are not currently in the public domain – *e.g.*, in the docket on regulations.gov. *See Cnty. Legal Servs. v. HUD*, 405 F.Supp.2d 553, 560 (D. Pa. 2005) (because requested records “clarify important facts” about agency policy, “the CLS request would likely shed light on information that is new to the interested public.”). As the Ninth Circuit observed in *McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Carlucci*, 835 F.2d 1282, 1286 (9th Cir. 1987), “[FOIA] legislative history suggests that information [has more potential to contribute to public understanding] to the degree that the information is new and supports public oversight of agency operations... ”¹

Disclosure of these records is not only “likely to contribute,” but is certain to contribute, to public understanding of how the government is effectuating congressional mandates under various environmental laws, and how the administration's decision making takes into account protections to public lands and national monuments. The public is always well served when it knows how the government conducts its activities, particularly matters touching on legal questions. Hence, there can be no dispute that disclosure of the requested records to the public will educate the public about the basis for review of national monument designations.

¹ In this connection, it is immaterial whether any portion of the Center's request may currently be in the public domain because the Center requests considerably more than any piece of information that may currently be available to other individuals. *See Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1315.

D. Disclosure is Likely to Contribute Significantly to Public Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The Center is not requesting these records merely for their intrinsic informational value. Disclosure of the requested records will significantly enhance the public's understanding of the basis for review of national monument designations as compared to the level of public understanding that exists prior to the disclosure. Indeed, public understanding will be *significantly* increased as a result of disclosure because the requested records will help reveal more about whether the key players in reviewing national monument designations have corresponded with extractive and/or fossil fuel industries, and the adverse impact these potential conflicts of interest would have on environmental health.

The records are also certain to shed light on the Interior Department's compliance with the Antiquities Act, FLPMA, and NFMA, for example. Such public oversight of agency action is vital to our democratic system and clearly envisioned by the drafters of the FOIA. Thus, the Center meets this factor as well.

II. The Center has a Demonstrated Ability to Disseminate the Requested Information Broadly.

The Center is a non-profit organization that informs, educates, and counsels the public regarding environmental issues, policies, and laws relating to environmental issues. The Center has been substantially involved in the activities of numerous government agencies for over 25 years, and has consistently displayed its ability to disseminate information granted to it through FOIA.

In consistently granting the Center's fee waivers, agencies have recognized: (1) that the information requested by the Center contributes significantly to the public's understanding of the government's operations or activities; (2) that the information enhances the public's understanding to a greater degree than currently exists; (3) that the Center possesses the expertise to explain the requested information to the public; (4) that the Center possesses the ability to disseminate the requested information to the general public; (5) and that the news media recognizes the Center as an established expert in the field of imperiled species, biodiversity, and impacts on protected species. The Center's track record of active participation in oversight of governmental activities and decision making, and its consistent contribution to the public's understanding of those activities as compared to the level of public understanding prior to disclosure are well established.

The Center intends to use the records requested here similarly. The Center's work appears in more than 2,500 news stories online and in print, radio and TV per month, including regular reporting in such important outlets as *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Los Angeles Times*. Many media outlets have reported on national monuments and public lands utilizing information obtained by the Center from federal agencies including the Interior Department. In 2016, more than 2 million people visited the Center's extensive website, viewing a total of more than 5.2 million pages. The Center sends out more than 277 email newsletters and action alerts per year to more than 1.3 million members and supporters. Three times a year, the Center sends printed newsletters to more than 58,016 members. More than 233,000 people have "liked" the

Center on Facebook, and there are regular postings regarding protections of public lands. The Center also regularly tweets to more than 52,200 followers on Twitter. The Center intends to use any or all of these far-reaching media outlets to share with the public information obtained as a result of this request.

Public oversight and enhanced understanding of the Interior Department's duties is absolutely necessary. In determining whether disclosure of requested information will contribute significantly to public understanding, a guiding test is whether the requester will disseminate the information to a reasonably broad audience of persons interested in the subject. *Carney v U.S. Dept. of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807 (2nd Cir. 1994). The Center need not show how it intends to distribute the information, because "[n]othing in FOIA, the [agency] regulation, or our case law require[s] such pointless specificity." *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1314. It is sufficient for the Center to show how it distributes information to the public generally. *Id.*

III. Obtaining the Requested Records is of No Commercial Interest to the Center.

Access to government records, disclosure forms, and similar materials through FOIA requests is essential to the Center's role of educating the general public. Founded in 1994, the Center is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit conservation organization (EIN: 27-3943866) with more than 1.3 million members and online activists dedicated to the protection of endangered and threatened species and wild places. The Center has no commercial interest and will realize no commercial benefit from the release of the requested records.

IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Center qualifies for a full fee waiver. We hope that the Interior Department will immediately grant this fee waiver request and begin to search and disclose the requested records without any unnecessary delays.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (971) 717-6409 or foia@biologicaldiversity.org. All records and any related correspondence should be sent to my attention at the address below.

Sincerely,



Margaret E. Townsend
Open Government Staff Attorney
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
P.O. Box 11374
Portland, OR 97211-0374
foia@biologicaldiversity.org



April 6, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

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

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request: Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke's
Correspondence

Dear FOIA Officer:

This is a request under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, *as amended* ("FOIA"), from the Center for Biological Diversity ("Center"), a non-profit organization that works to secure a future for all species hovering on the brink of extinction through science, law, and creative media, and to fulfill the continuing educational goals of its membership and the general public in the process.

REQUESTED RECORDS

The Center requests all of the following records from the U.S. Department of Interior Headquarters ("DOI") since January 20, 2017: all correspondence, including but not limited to, all letters, emails, text messages, instant messages, voicemails, and phone logs for any phones utilized by the new U.S. Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke ("Secretary") from any and all agency and DOI servers, cloud portals, secure websites, computers, tablets, smart phones, etc., sent to and/or from Mr. Zinke, with the exception of any records that are or will be publicly available (e.g., through regulations.gov). Please note, the Center is not requesting the actual email addresses utilized by the Secretary in the course of his official duties, but only the correspondence sent to and from his email addresses.

For purposes of this request, "records" is consistent with the meaning of the term under FOIA. This includes, but is not limited to, documents of any kind including electronic as well as paper documents, e-mails, writings (handwritten, typed, electronic or otherwise produced, reproduced or stored), correspondence, letters, memoranda, reports, consultations, papers, studies, notes, field notes, recordings, telephone conversation recordings, voice mails, telephone logs, messages, instant messages, G-chats, text messages, chats, telefaxes, data, data bases, drawings, surveys, graphs, charts, photographs, videos, meeting notes or minutes, electronic and magnetic recordings of meetings, maps, GIS layers, GPS, UTM, LiDAR, CDs, and any other compilations

of data from which information can be obtained. All of the foregoing is included in this request if it is in DOI's possession and control. If such records are no longer under the control of DOI, but were at any time, please refer this request to the relevant federal agency or agencies. This request is being sent to DOI with the understanding that it will be forwarded to any other agency offices where responsive records may be located.

The Center seeks records of Mr. Zinke's correspondence on DOI accounts or otherwise addressing work-related matters, all of which are "agency records." The Center notes that this request is sufficiently specific and narrow, requires no forwarding to other offices for processing, and is a "simple" request.

This request is not meant to exclude any other records that, although not specially requested, are reasonably related to the subject matter of this request. If you or your office have destroyed or determine to withhold any records that could be reasonably construed to be responsive to this request, I ask that you indicate this fact and the reasons therefore in your response.

Under the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, agencies are prohibited from denying requests for information under FOIA unless the agency reasonably believes release of the information will harm an interest that is protected by the exemption. FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 (Public Law No. 114-185), codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(8)(A).

Should you decide to invoke a FOIA exemption, please include sufficient information for us to assess the basis for the exemption, including any interest(s) that would be harmed by release. Please include a detailed ledger which includes:

1. Basic factual material about each withheld record, including the originator, date, length, general subject matter, and location of each item; and
2. Complete explanations and justifications for the withholding, including the specific exemption(s) under which the record (or portion thereof) was withheld and a full explanation of how each exemption applies to the withheld material. Such statements will be helpful in deciding whether to appeal an adverse determination. Your written justification may help to avoid litigation.

In addition, if you determine that portions of the records requested are exempt from disclosure, we request that you segregate the exempt portions and mail the non-exempt portions of such records to my attention at the address below within the statutory time limit. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b).

Under rolling production we seek responsive records processed and produced independent of any others where no such production is dependent upon other records being released.

FORMAT OF REQUESTED RECORDS

Under FOIA, you are obligated to provide records in a readily-accessible electronic format and in the format requested. *See, e.g.*, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B) ("In making any record available to a person under this paragraph, an agency shall provide the record in any form or format requested

by the person if the record is readily reproducible by the agency in that form or format.”). “Readily-accessible” means text-searchable and OCR-formatted. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). Please provide all records in a readily-accessible, electronic .pdf format. Additionally, please provide the records either in (1) load-ready format with a CSV file index or excel spreadsheet, or if that is not possible; (2) in .pdf format, without any “portfolios” or “embedded files.” Portfolios and embedded files within files are not readily-accessible. *Please do not provide the records in a single, or “batched,” .pdf file.* We appreciate the inclusion of an index.

If you should seek to withhold or redact any responsive records, we request that you: (1) identify each such record with specificity (including date, author, recipient, and parties copied); (2) explain in full the basis for withholding responsive material; and (3) provide all segregable portions of the records for which you claim a specific exemption. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Please correlate any redactions with specific exemptions under FOIA.

RECORD DELIVERY

We appreciate your help in expeditiously obtaining a determination on the requested records. As mandated in FOIA, we anticipate a reply within 20 working days. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). Failure to comply within the statutory timeframe may result in the Center taking additional steps to ensure timely receipt of the requested materials. Please provide a complete reply as expeditiously as possible. You may email or mail copies of the requested records to:

Amy Atwood
Center for Biological Diversity
P.O. Box 11374
Portland, OR 97211
atwood@biologicaldiversity.org

If you find that this request is unclear, or if the responsive records are voluminous, please call me at (971) 717-6401 to discuss the scope of this request.

REQUEST FOR FEE WAIVER

FOIA was designed to provide citizens a broad right to access government records. FOIA’s basic purpose is to “open agency action to the light of public scrutiny,” with a focus on the public’s “right to be informed about what their government is up to.” *U.S. Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 773-74 (1989) (internal quotation and citations omitted). In order to provide public access to this information, FOIA’s fee waiver provision requires that “[d]ocuments shall be furnished without any charge or at a [reduced] charge,” if the request satisfies the standard. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). FOIA’s fee waiver requirement is “liberally construed.” *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossotti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 2003); *Forest Guardians v. U.S. Dept. of Interior*, 416 F.3d 1173, 1178 (10th Cir. 2005).

The 1986 fee waiver amendments were designed specifically to provide non-profit organizations such as the Center access to government records without the payment of fees. Indeed, FOIA’s fee waiver provision was intended “to prevent government agencies from using high fees to

discourage certain types of requesters and requests,” which are “consistently associated with requests from journalists, scholars, and *non-profit public interest groups*.” *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F.Supp. 867, 872 (D. Mass. 1984) (emphasis added). As one Senator stated, “[a]gencies should not be allowed to use fees as an offensive weapon against requesters seeking access to Government information” 132 Cong. Rec. S. 14298 (statement of Senator Leahy).

I. The Center Qualifies for a Fee Waiver.

Under FOIA, a party is entitled to a fee waiver when “disclosure of the information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the [Federal] government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). The Department of the Interior FOIA regulations at 43 C.F.R. § 2.48(a)(1)-(4) establish the same standard.

Thus, the DOI must consider four factors to determine whether a request is in the public interest: (1) whether the subject of the requested records concerns “the operations or activities of the Federal government,” (2) whether the disclosure is “likely to contribute” to an understanding of government operations or activities, (3) whether the disclosure “will contribute to public understanding” of a reasonably-broad audience of persons interested in the subject, and (4) whether the disclosure is likely to contribute “significantly” to public understanding of government operations or activities. 22 C.F.R. § 171.16(a)(1)(i) – (iv). As shown below, the Center meets each of these factors.

A. The Subject of This Request Concerns “The Operations and Activities of the Government.”

The subject matter of this request concerns the operations and activities of the new Secretary of the Interior. The Center requests the following records from DOI since January 20, 2017: all correspondence, including but not limited to, all letters, emails, text messages, instant messages, voicemails, and phone logs for any phones utilized by the new Secretary of the Interior from any and all agency and DOI servers, cloud portals, secure websites, computers, tablets, smart phones, etc., sent to and/or from Mr. Zinke, with the exception of any records that are or will be publicly available (e.g., through regulations.gov). Please note, the Center is not requesting the actual email addresses utilized by the Secretary in the course of his official duties, but only the correspondence sent to and from his email addresses.

This FOIA request will provide the Center and the public with crucial insight into the new Secretary’s correspondence. It is clear that Mr. Zinke’s communications involve extensive and specifically identifiable activities of the government, in this case the federal agency of DOI. *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1313 (“[R]easonable specificity is all that FOIA requires with regard to this factor”) (internal quotations omitted). Thus, the Center meets this factor.

B. Disclosure is “Likely to Contribute” to an Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The requested records are meaningfully informative about government operations or activities and will contribute to an increased understanding of those operations and activities by the public.

Disclosure of the requested records will allow the Center to convey information to the public about the communications and correspondence of Mr. Zinke, which will reflect his actions, objectives, and priorities as the new Secretary of the Interior. Once the information is made available, the Center will analyze it and present it to its 1.2 million members and online activists and the general public in a manner that will meaningfully enhance the public’s understanding of the direction the DOI is headed under the new Secretary’s leadership.

Thus, the requested records are likely to contribute to an understanding of the DOI’s operations and activities under its new Secretary.

C. Disclosure of the Requested Records Will Contribute to a Reasonably-Broad Audience of Interested Persons’ Understanding of Mr. Zinke’s Correspondence.

The requested records will contribute to public understanding of how the DOI’s operations and activities are consistent with the DOI’s mandated duties. As explained above, the records will contribute to public understanding of the DOI’s operations and activities.

How the DOI fulfills its mission and manages its priorities, generally, and specifically what actions are included within Mr. Zinke’s communications, are areas of interest to a reasonably-broad segment of the public. The Center will use the information it obtains from the disclosed records to educate the public at large about the DOI’s operations and activities. *See W. Watersheds Proj. v. Brown*, 318 F.Supp.2d 1036, 1040 (D. Idaho 2004) (“... find[ing] that WWP adequately specified the public interest to be served, that is, educating the public about the ecological conditions of the land managed by the BLM and also how ... management strategies employed by the BLM may adversely affect the environment.”).

Through the Center’s synthesis and dissemination (by means discussed in Section II, below), disclosure of information contained and gleaned from the requested records will contribute to a broad audience of persons who are interested in the subject matter. *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F.Supp. at 876 (benefit to a population group of some size distinct from the requester alone is sufficient); *Carney v. Dep’t of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807, 815 (2d Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 823 (1994) (applying “public” to require a sufficient “breadth of benefit” beyond the requester’s own interests); *Cnty. Legal Servs. v. Dep’t of Hous. & Urban Dev.*, 405 F.Supp.2d 553, 557 (E.D. Pa. 2005) (in granting fee waiver to community legal group, court noted that while the requester’s “work by its nature is unlikely to reach a very general audience,” “there is a segment of the public that is interested in its work”).

Indeed, the public does not currently have an ability to easily evaluate the requested records, which concern Mr. Zinke’s correspondence, that are not currently in the public domain – *e.g.*, in the docket on regulations.gov. *See Cnty. Legal Servs. v. HUD*, 405 F.Supp.2d 553, 560 (D. Pa.

2005) (because requested documents “clarify important facts” about agency policy, “the CLS request would likely shed light on information that is new to the interested public.”). As the Ninth Circuit observed in *McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Carlucci*, 835 F.2d 1282, 1286 (9th Cir. 1987), “[FOIA] legislative history suggests that information [has more potential to contribute to public understanding] to the degree that the information is new and supports public oversight of agency operations... .”¹

Disclosure of these records is not only “likely to contribute,” but is certain to contribute, to public understanding of Mr. Zinke’s priorities and intentions as the new Secretary. The public is always well served when it knows how the government conducts its activities, particularly matters touching on legal questions. Hence, there can be no dispute that disclosure of the requested records to the public will educate the public about the operations and activities of DOI.

D. Disclosure is Likely to Contribute Significantly to Public Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The Center is not requesting these records merely for their intrinsic informational value. Disclosure of the requested records will significantly enhance the public’s understanding of the operations and activities of the DOI, as compared to the level of public understanding that exists prior to disclosure. Indeed, public understanding will be *significantly* increased as a result of disclosure because the requested records will help reveal more about what Mr. Zinke’s communications demonstrate about his strategic planning, priorities, and course of action for the future of the DOI.

The records are also certain to shed light on DOI’s compliance with its mission and purpose. Such public oversight of agency action is vital to our democratic system and clearly envisioned by the drafters of the FOIA. Thus, the Center meets this factor as well.

II. The Center has a Demonstrated Ability to Disseminate the Requested Information Broadly.

The Center is a non-profit organization that informs, educates, and counsels the public regarding environmental issues, policies, and laws relating to environmental issues. The Center has been substantially involved in the activities of numerous government agencies for over 25 years, and has consistently displayed its ability to disseminate information granted to it through FOIA.

In consistently granting the Center’s fee-waivers, agencies have recognized: (1) that the information requested by the Center contributes significantly to the public’s understanding of the government’s operations or activities; (2) that the information enhances the public’s understanding to a greater degree than currently exists; (3) that the Center possesses the expertise to explain the requested information to the public; (4) that the Center possesses the ability to

¹ In this connection, it is immaterial whether any portion of the Center’s request may currently be in the public domain because the Center requests considerably more than any piece of information that may currently be available to other individuals. *See Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1315.

disseminate the requested information to the general public; (5) and that the news media recognizes the Center as an established expert in the field of imperiled species, biodiversity, and impacts on protected species. The Center's track record of active participation in oversight of governmental activities and decision-making, and its consistent contribution to the public's understanding of those activities as compared to the level of public understanding prior to disclosure are well established.

The Center intends to use the records requested here similarly. The Center's work appears in more than 2,500 news stories online and in print, radio and TV per month, including regular reporting in such important outlets as *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Los Angeles Times*. Many media outlets have reported on the changing priorities under the Trump Administration, utilizing information obtained by the Center from federal agencies. In 2016, more than 2 million people visited the Center's extensive website, viewing a total of more than 5.2 million pages. The Center sends out more than 277 email newsletters and action alerts per year to more than 1.2 million members and supporters. Three times a year, the Center sends printed newsletters to more than 52,343 members. More than 199,000 people have "liked" the Center on Facebook, and there are regular postings regarding the incoming Secretary, and how his leadership may have an impact on environmental policy. The Center also regularly tweets to more than 49,700 followers on Twitter. The Center intends to use any or all of these far-reaching media outlets to share with the public information obtained as a result of this request.

Public oversight and enhanced understanding of the Secretary's duties and correspondence is absolutely necessary. In determining whether disclosure of requested information will contribute significantly to public understanding, a guiding test is whether the requester will disseminate the information to a reasonably-broad audience of persons interested in the subject. *Carney v U.S. Dept. of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807 (2nd Cir. 1994). The Center need not show how it intends to distribute the information, because "[n]othing in FOIA, the [agency] regulation, or our case law require[s] such pointless specificity." *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1314. It is sufficient for the Center to show how it distributes information to the public generally. *Id.*

III. Obtaining the Requested Records is of No Commercial Interest to the Center.

Access to government records, disclosure forms, and similar materials through FOIA requests is essential to the Center's role of educating the general public. Founded in 1994, the Center is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit conservation organization (EIN: 27-3943866) with more than 1.2 million members and online activists dedicated to the protection of endangered and threatened species and wild places. The Center has no commercial interest and will realize no commercial benefit from the release of the requested records.

IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Center qualifies for a full fee-waiver. We hope that DOI will immediately grant this fee waiver request and begin to search and disclose the requested records without any unnecessary delays.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (971) 717-6401 or foia@biologicaldiversity.org. All records and any related correspondence should be sent to my attention at the address below.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'AA', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Amy Atwood
Endangered Species Legal Director
Senior Attorney
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
P.O. Box 11374
Portland, OR 97211-0374
foia@biologicaldiversity.org



April 6, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

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

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request: Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke's Schedules

Dear FOIA Officer:

This is a request under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, *as amended* ("FOIA"), from the Center for Biological Diversity ("Center"), a non-profit organization that works to secure a future for all species hovering on the brink of extinction through science, law, and creative media, and to fulfill the continuing educational goals of its membership and the general public in the process.

REQUESTED RECORDS

The Center requests all of the following records from the U.S. Department of the Interior Headquarters ("DOI") and the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, since January 23, 2017: all schedules, including but not limited to travel and/or meeting schedules, of the U.S. Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke ("Secretary").

For purposes of this request, "records" is consistent with the meaning of the term under FOIA. This includes, but is not limited to, documents of any kind including electronic as well as paper documents, e-mails, writings (handwritten, typed, electronic or otherwise produced, reproduced or stored), correspondence, letters, memoranda, reports, consultations, papers, studies, notes, field notes, recordings, telephone conversation recordings, voice mails, telephone logs, messages, instant messages, G-chats, text messages, chats, telefaxes, data, data bases, drawings, surveys, graphs, charts, photographs, videos, meeting notes or minutes, electronic and magnetic recordings of meetings, maps, GIS layers, GPS, UTM, LiDAR, CDs, and any other compilations of data from which information can be obtained. All of the foregoing is included in this request if it is DOI's and/or Office of the Secretary's possession and control. If such records are no longer under the control of DOI and/or Office of the Secretary, but were at any time, please refer this request to the relevant federal agency or agencies. This request is being sent to DOI Headquarters and the Office of the Secretary with the understanding that it will be forwarded to any other agency offices where responsive records may be located.

The Center seeks emails on DOI and the Office of the Secretary accounts or otherwise addressing work-related matters, all of which are "agency records." The Center notes that this request is

sufficiently specific and narrow, requires no forwarding to other offices for processing, and is a “simple” request.

This request is not meant to exclude any other records that, although not specially requested, are reasonably related to the subject matter of this request. If you or your office have destroyed or determine to withhold any records that could be reasonably construed to be responsive to this request, I ask that you indicate this fact and the reasons therefore in your response.

Under the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, agencies are prohibited from denying requests for information under FOIA unless the agency reasonably believes release of the information will harm an interest that is protected by the exemption. FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 (Public Law No. 114-185), codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(8)(A).

Should you decide to invoke a FOIA exemption, please include sufficient information for us to assess the basis for the exemption, including any interest(s) that would be harmed by release. Please include a detailed ledger which includes:

1. Basic factual material about each withheld record, including the originator, date, length, general subject matter, and location of each item; and
2. Complete explanations and justifications for the withholding, including the specific exemption(s) under which the record (or portion thereof) was withheld and a full explanation of how each exemption applies to the withheld material. Such statements will be helpful in deciding whether to appeal an adverse determination. Your written justification may help to avoid litigation.

In addition, if you determine that portions of the records requested are exempt from disclosure, we request that you segregate the exempt portions and mail the non-exempt portions of such records to my attention at the address below within the statutory time limit. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b).

Under rolling production we seek responsive records processed and produced independent of any others where no such production is dependent upon other records being released.

FORMAT OF REQUESTED RECORDS

Under FOIA, you are obligated to provide records in a readily-accessible electronic format and in the format requested. *See, e.g.,* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B) (“In making any record available to a person under this paragraph, an agency shall provide the record in any form or format requested by the person if the record is readily reproducible by the agency in that form or format.”). “Readily-accessible” means text-searchable and OCR-formatted. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). Please provide all records in a readily-accessible, electronic .pdf format. Additionally, please provide the records either in (1) load-ready format with a CSV file index or excel spreadsheet, or if that is not possible; (2) in .pdf format, without any “portfolios” or “embedded files.” Portfolios and embedded files within files are not readily-accessible. Please do not provide the records in a single, or “batched,” .pdf file. We appreciate the inclusion of an index.

If you should seek to withhold or redact any responsive records, we request that you: (1) identify each such record with specificity (including date, author, recipient, and parties copied); (2) explain in full the basis for withholding responsive material; and (3) provide all segregable portions of the

records for which you claim a specific exemption. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Please correlate any redactions with specific exemptions under FOIA.

RECORD DELIVERY

We appreciate your help in expeditiously obtaining a determination on the requested records. As mandated in FOIA, we anticipate a reply within 20 working days. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). Failure to comply within the statutory timeframe may result in the Center taking additional steps to ensure timely receipt of the requested materials. Please provide a complete reply as expeditiously as possible. You may email or mail copies of the requested records to:

Amy Atwood
Center for Biological Diversity
P.O. Box 11374
Portland, OR 97211
atwood@biologicaldiversity.org

If you find that this request is unclear, or if the responsive records are voluminous, please call me at (971) 717-6401 to discuss the scope of this request.

REQUEST FOR FEE WAIVER

FOIA was designed to provide citizens a broad right to access government records. FOIA's basic purpose is to "open agency action to the light of public scrutiny," with a focus on the public's "right to be informed about what their government is up to." *U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 773-74 (1989) (internal quotation and citations omitted). In order to provide public access to this information, FOIA's fee waiver provision requires that "[d]ocuments shall be furnished without any charge or at a [reduced] charge," if the request satisfies the standard. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). FOIA's fee waiver requirement is "liberally construed." *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossotti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 2003); *Forest Guardians v. U.S. Dept. of Interior*, 416 F.3d 1173, 1178 (10th Cir. 2005).

The 1986 fee waiver amendments were designed specifically to provide non-profit organizations such as the Center access to government records without the payment of fees. Indeed, FOIA's fee waiver provision was intended "to prevent government agencies from using high fees to discourage certain types of requesters and requests," which are "consistently associated with requests from journalists, scholars, and *non-profit public interest groups*." *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F.Supp. 867, 872 (D. Mass. 1984) (emphasis added). As one Senator stated, "[a]gencies should not be allowed to use fees as an offensive weapon against requesters seeking access to Government information" 132 Cong. Rec. S. 14298 (statement of Senator Leahy).

I. The Center Qualifies for a Fee Waiver.

Under FOIA, a party is entitled to a fee waiver when "disclosure of the information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the [Federal] government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester." 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). The Department of the Interior FOIA regulations at 43 C.F.R. § 2.48(a)(1)-(4) establish the same standard.

Thus, DOI and the Office of the Secretary must consider four factors to determine whether a request is in the public interest: (1) whether the subject of the requested records concerns “the operations or activities of the Federal government,” (2) whether the disclosure is “likely to contribute” to an understanding of government operations or activities, (3) whether the disclosure “will contribute to public understanding” of a reasonably-broad audience of persons interested in the subject, and (4) whether the disclosure is likely to contribute “significantly” to public understanding of government operations or activities. 22 C.F.R. § 171.16(a)(1)(i) – (iv). As shown below, the Center meets each of these factors.

A. The Subject of This Request Concerns “The Operations and Activities of the Government.”

The subject matter of this request concerns the operations and activities of DOI and the Office of the Secretary. This request asks for all of the following records from DOI and the Office of the Secretary since January 23, 2017: all schedules, including but not limited to travel and/or meeting schedules, of the Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke.

This FOIA request will provide the Center and the public with crucial insight into the Secretary’s schedules and priorities. It is clear that the Secretary’s meetings and scheduling are specifically identifiable activities of the government, in this case, DOI and the Office of the Secretary. *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1313 (“[R]easonable specificity is all that FOIA requires with regard to this factor”) (internal quotations omitted). Thus, the Center meets this factor.

B. Disclosure is “Likely to Contribute” to an Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The requested records are meaningfully informative about government operations or activities and will contribute to an increased understanding of those operations and activities by the public.

Disclosure of the requested records will allow the Center to convey information to the public about the Secretary’s schedules, and the direction Mr. Zinke’s leadership is taking as Secretary of the Interior. Once the information is made available, the Center will analyze it and present it to its 1.2 million members and online activists and the general public in a manner that will meaningfully enhance the public’s understanding of how the new Secretary is operating as the new head of DOI.

Thus, the requested records are likely to contribute to an understanding of DOI’s operations and activities.

C. Disclosure of the Requested Records Will Contribute to a Reasonably-Broad Audience of Interested Persons’ Understanding of the Secretary’s Schedules and Course of Action.

The requested records will contribute to public understanding of how DOI and the Secretary’s operations and activities are consistent with DOI’s constitutionally mandated duties. As explained above, the records will contribute to public understanding of the Secretary’s schedules and course of action as the new Secretary of the Interior.

How DOI fulfills its mission and manages its priorities, generally, and specifically who the Secretary is meeting with, are areas of interest to a reasonably-broad segment of the public. The Center will use the information it obtains from the disclosed records to educate the public at large about the

Secretary's meeting schedule, who the Secretary is meeting with, and what that demonstrates about the future direction of the DOI. *See W. Watersheds Proj. v. Brown*, 318 F.Supp.2d 1036, 1040 (D. Idaho 2004) ("... find[ing] that WWP adequately specified the public interest to be served, that is, educating the public about the ecological conditions of the land managed by the BLM and also how ... management strategies employed by the BLM may adversely affect the environment.").

Through the Center's synthesis and dissemination (by means discussed in Section II, below), disclosure of information contained and gleaned from the requested records will contribute to a broad audience of persons who are interested in the subject matter. *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F.Supp. at 876 (benefit to a population group of some size distinct from the requester alone is sufficient); *Carney v. Dep't of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807, 815 (2d Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 823 (1994) (applying "public" to require a sufficient "breadth of benefit" beyond the requester's own interests); *Cnty. Legal Servs. v. Dep't of Hous. & Urban Dev.*, 405 F.Supp.2d 553, 557 (E.D. Pa. 2005) (in granting fee waiver to community legal group, court noted that while the requester's "work by its nature is unlikely to reach a very general audience," "there is a segment of the public that is interested in its work").

Indeed, the public does not currently have an ability to easily evaluate the requested records, which concern the Secretary's meetings and schedules that are not currently in the public domain – *e.g.*, in the docket on regulations.gov. *See Cnty. Legal Servs. v. HUD*, 405 F.Supp.2d 553, 560 (D. Pa. 2005) (because requested documents "clarify important facts" about agency policy, "the CLS request would likely shed light on information that is new to the interested public."). As the Ninth Circuit observed in *McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Carlucci*, 835 F.2d 1282, 1286 (9th Cir. 1987), "[FOIA] legislative history suggests that information [has more potential to contribute to public understanding] to the degree that the information is new and supports public oversight of agency operations... ."¹

Disclosure of these records is not only "likely to contribute," but is certain to contribute, to public understanding of the Secretary's schedules, and also his course of action for the DOI. The public is always well served when it knows how the government conducts its activities, particularly matters touching on legal questions. Hence, there can be no dispute that disclosure of the requested records to the public will educate the public about the operations and activities of the DOI.

D. Disclosure is Likely to Contribute Significantly to Public Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The Center is not requesting these records merely for their intrinsic informational value. Disclosure of the requested records will significantly enhance the public's understanding of the operations and activities of the DOI, as compared to the level of public understanding that exists prior to disclosure. Indeed, public understanding will be *significantly* increased as a result of disclosure because the requested records will help reveal more about the Secretary's schedules, meetings, and priorities under the new administration.

¹ In this connection, it is immaterial whether any portion of the Center's request may currently be in the public domain because the Center requests considerably more than any piece of information that may currently be available to other individuals. *See Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1315.

The records are also certain to shed light on DOI and the Office of the Secretary's compliance with agency duties. Such public oversight of agency action is vital to our democratic system and clearly envisioned by the drafters of the FOIA. Thus, the Center meets this factor as well.

II. The Center has a Demonstrated Ability to Disseminate the Requested Information Broadly.

The Center is a non-profit organization that informs, educates, and counsels the public regarding environmental issues, policies, and laws relating to environmental issues. The Center has been substantially involved in the activities of numerous government agencies for over 25 years, and has consistently displayed its ability to disseminate information granted to it through FOIA.

In consistently granting the Center's fee-waivers, agencies have recognized: (1) that the information requested by the Center contributes significantly to the public's understanding of the government's operations or activities; (2) that the information enhances the public's understanding to a greater degree than currently exists; (3) that the Center possesses the expertise to explain the requested information to the public; (4) that the Center possesses the ability to disseminate the requested information to the general public; (5) and that the news media recognizes the Center as an established expert in the field of imperiled species, biodiversity, and impacts on protected species. The Center's track record of active participation in oversight of governmental activities and decision-making, and its consistent contribution to the public's understanding of those activities as compared to the level of public understanding prior to disclosure are well established.

The Center intends to use the records requested here similarly. The Center's work appears in more than 2,500 news stories online and in print, radio and TV per month, including regular reporting in such important outlets as *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Los Angeles Times*. Many media outlets have reported on the changing priorities under the Trump Administration, utilizing information obtained by the Center from federal agencies. In 2016, more than 2 million people visited the Center's extensive website, viewing a total of more than 5.2 million pages. The Center sends out more than 277 email newsletters and action alerts per year to more than 1.2 million members and supporters. Three times a year, the Center sends printed newsletters to more than 52,343 members. More than 199,000 people have "liked" the Center on Facebook, and there are regular postings regarding the incoming Secretary of the Interior and the impact his leadership may have on environmental policy. The Center also regularly tweets to more than 49,700 followers on Twitter. The Center intends to use any or all of these far-reaching media outlets to share with the public information obtained as a result of this request.

Public oversight and enhanced understanding of the Secretary's schedules and priorities are absolutely necessary. In determining whether disclosure of requested information will contribute significantly to public understanding, a guiding test is whether the requester will disseminate the information to a reasonably-broad audience of persons interested in the subject. *Carney v U.S. Dept. of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807 (2nd Cir. 1994). The Center need not show how it intends to distribute the information, because "[n]othing in FOIA, the [agency] regulation, or our case law require[s] such pointless specificity." *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1314. It is sufficient for the Center to show how it distributes information to the public generally. *Id.*

III. Obtaining the Requested Records is of No Commercial Interest to the Center.

Access to government records, disclosure forms, and similar materials through FOIA requests is essential to the Center's role of educating the general public. Founded in 1994, the Center is a

501(c)(3) nonprofit conservation organization (EIN: 27-3943866) with more than 1.2 million members and online activists dedicated to the protection of endangered and threatened species and wild places. The Center has no commercial interest and will realize no commercial benefit from the release of the requested records.

IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Center qualifies for a full fee-waiver. We hope that DOI will immediately grant this fee waiver request and begin to search and disclose the requested records without any unnecessary delays.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (971) 717-6401 or foia@biologicaldiversity.org. All records and any related correspondence should be sent to my attention at the address below.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Atwood', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Amy Atwood
Endangered Species Legal Director
Senior Attorney
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
P.O. Box 11374
Portland, OR 97211-0374
foia@biologicaldiversity.org