April 27, 2017

VIA FOIAONLINE.REGULATIONS.GOV
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Pesticides

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request: Biological Evaluations for Chlorpyrifos

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 from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Headquarters ("EPA"): the Memorandum sent by CropLife International to the EPA Office of Pesticides ("OPP") on April 19, 2017 regarding Dow Chemical's request to withdraw the Biological Evaluations for chlorpyrifos. *See* Attachment A (Endangered Species Act: Section 7 Consultations and Next Steps PPDC Meeting, May 3, 2017, Session 4e).

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 EPA's possession and control. If such records are no longer under the control of EPA but were at any time, please refer this request to the relevant federal agency or agencies. This request is being sent to the headquarters for EPA with the understanding that it will be forwarded to any other agency offices where responsive records may be located.

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).

If 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).

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

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.

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:

Margaret E. Townsend

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

If you find that this request is unclear, or if the responsive records are voluminous, please call me at (971) 717-6409 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 fee waiver amendments of 1986 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 EPA's regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(1)(2) and (3) establish the same standard.

Thus, the EPA 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. 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(1)(2). 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 EPA. This request asks for the Memorandum sent by CropLife International to the EPA OPP on April 19, 2017 regarding Dow Chemical's request to withdraw the Biological Evaluations for chlorpyrifos. *See* Attachment A.

This FOIA will provide the Center and the public with crucial insight into EPA's consideration of Dow Chemical's request to withdraw the Biological Evaluations for chlorpyrifos. It is clear that reviewing biological evaluations of pesticides is a specific and identifiable activity of the government, in this case the executive branch agency, the EPA. *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 to the public information about the collusion between CropLife International and the EPA to undermine critical protections for endangered species in violation of the law. 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 EPA's Biological Evaluations of chlorpyrifos in light of its complicity with Dow Chemical and CropLife International to challenge environmental regulations.

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

C. Disclosure of the Requested Records Will Contribute to a Reasonably Broad Audience of Interested Persons' Understanding of Biological Evaluations for Chlorpyrifos.

The requested records will contribute to public understanding of how EPA's decision to review Biological Evaluations for chlorpyrifos are consistent with the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1531-1544 ("ESA") and its own mission to "protect human health and the environment."[1] As explained above, the records will contribute to public understanding of the corruption between CropLife International and the EPA to undermine critical protections for endangered species in violation of the law.

[1] *See* https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/our-mission-and-what-we-do, website last visited April 27, 2017.

Managing the safety of pesticides generally, and specifically attempts to circulate dangerous pesticides for public use 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 illicit relationships between the EPA, CropLife International, and Dow Chemical with respect to Biological Evaluations on chlorpyrifos. *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 in 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); *Cmty. 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 EPA's review of Biological Evaluations for chlorpyrifos that are not currently in the public domain. *See Cmty. 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… ."[2]

Disclosure of these records is not only "likely to contribute," but is certain to contribute, to public understanding of the EPA's assessment of the Biological Evaluations for chlorpyrifos. 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 EPA's involvement with CropLife International and Dow Chemical to introduce a dangerous pesticide into the public domain.

---

[2] 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 EPA's evaluation of the Biological Evaluations for chlorpyrifos 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 the corrupt relationship between the EPA, CropLife International, and Dow Chemical to approve a dangerous pesticide into the public domain.

The records are also certain to shed light on EPA's compliance with the ESA and its own mission.[3] 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 Dow Chemical's illicit relationship with the EPA. 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 225,100 people have "liked" the Center on Facebook, and there are regular postings regarding pesticides and the threat they

[3] *See supra* note at 1.

pose to environmental health. The Center also regularly tweets to more than 51,400 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 EPA'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 1.2 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 the EPA 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

Attachments:

Attachment A (Endangered Species Act: Section 7 Consultations and Next Steps PPDC Meeting, May 3, 2017, Session 4e).

Attachment A

Endangered Species Act: Section 7 Consultations and Next Steps
PPDC Meeting, May 3, 2017, Session 4e

- The EPA has continued to work closely with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (collectively referred to as the Services) to develop shared interim scientific methods for use in pesticide consultations, based on recommendations from the 2013 National Academy of Sciences' report "Assessing Risks to Endangered and Threatened Species from Pesticides".

- Given consultation deadlines and existing resources, the EPA will continue to address stakeholder recommendations in a phased and iterative approach.

- EPA released final Biological Evaluations (BEs) for three pilot chemicals including chlorpyrifos, diazinon, and malathion in January 2017.
    - Revisions to the final BEs based on stakeholder feedback include refined aquatic modeling, error corrections, improved transparency specifically related to the Terrestrial Effects Determination (TED) tool and the Weight of Evidence (WoE) matrices, and additions/deletions to the list of endangered and threatened species.
    - Posted documents include Response to Comments received during the 60-day public comment period for the draft BEs.
    - On April 13, 2017, Dow AgroSciences, LLC; Makhteshim Agan of North America, Inc.; and FMC Corporation sent letters to the political leadership of EPA, FWS, and the NMFS making a number of requests. The letter requested that EPA withdraw the BEs for chlorpyrifos, diazinon, and malathion; that the Services stop work on their Biological Opinions (BiOps) for these pesticides; and that the Services modify various ESA-related settlement agreements to allow more time for the agencies to complete pesticide consultation. CropLife America voiced support for the request in a subsequent April 19, 2017, memorandum to EPA, FWS, and NMFS. EPA is considering the request.

- Draft BEs for carbaryl and methomyl are expected to be released soon for 60-day public comment.

- Based on previous public comments, the EPA is exploring the following additional revisions for future BEs:
    - reducing the size and complexity of the BEs;
    - a move toward more probabilistic approaches;
    - refinements in geospatial data used to define species ranges and potential use sites;
    - use of watershed-level aquatic exposure models;
    - improved methods for estimating exposures in riverine and estuarine/marine habitats;
    - improved characterization and consideration of magnitude of effects; and
    - a consideration in the timing and duration of potential pesticide exposures (e.g., linking exposure with life-history variables).

- EPA is also exploring ways to use species-specific toxicity data earlier in the first step of the BE process to refine, and still maintain a protective screening process.

- The EPA continues to work with the Services on interim methods for Step 3 (i.e., the Services' determination of "jeopardy/adverse modification" or "no jeopardy/no adverse modification") in the Biological Opinion (BiOp).

- The EPA expects to release the Services' draft BiOps for chlorpyrifos, diazinon, and malathion for a 60-day public comment period in late May or early June 2017 with final BiOps by December 2017. The EPA expects to release final BiOps for methomyl and carbaryl by December 2018.