

**Kristin Davis**

---

**From:** Katherine Coffey  
**Sent:** Monday, April 1, 2024 12:02 PM  
**To:** kevin.kyle@usda.gov; Martin, Jay - FS, VA  
**Cc:** Kristin Davis  
**Subject:** Dunlap Creek FOIA Request  
**Attachments:** 2024.04.01 Dunlap Creek FS FOIA Request.pdf

Hi Kevin and Jay,

Please see attached a request for materials relating to the Dunlap Creek Vegetation Management Project pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act. Let me know if you have any questions or would like clarification on the request.

Best,  
Katherine

**Katherine Coffey**  
Associate Attorney

Southern Environmental Law Center  
120 Garrett Street  
Suite 400  
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Office (434) 977-4090

[southernenvironment.org](https://southernenvironment.org)

April 1, 2024

*Via Electronic Mail*

Kevin Kyle, District Ranger  
George Washington and Jefferson National Forests  
422 Forestry Road  
Hot Springs, VA 24445  
[kevin.kyle@usda.gov](mailto:kevin.kyle@usda.gov)

Jay Martin, North Zone NEPA Planner  
George Washington and Jefferson National Forests  
401 Oakwood Drive  
Harrisonburg, VA 22801  
[jay.martin2@usda.gov](mailto:jay.martin2@usda.gov)

**Re: Freedom of Information Act Request Regarding the Dunlap Creek Vegetation  
Management Project**

Dear Kevin and Jay,

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552 and 7 C.F.R. Part 1, Subpart A, the Southern Environmental Law Center (“SELC”) requests access to the following documents or other public records regarding the Dunlap Creek Vegetation Management Project (“Project”), excluding any records which are already publicly available on the Forest Service web pages:

1. All records and communications in the possession of the Forest Service relating to the Project. This request includes but is not limited to:
  - a. Communications with any other federal or state agency related to the Project;
  - b. Authorizations for survey or other work on Forest Service lands in any way related to the Project;
  - c. Any data or reports related to field investigations or surveys associated with the Project;
  - d. Reports, summaries, tables, or other discussions of impacts associated with the Project on national forest lands;
  - e. Analyses, reports, or other records discussing alternatives to the Project as proposed; and
  - f. Records related to the Project’s compatibility or consistency with the George Washington National Forest’s land management plan;

This request for documents or other records includes, but is not limited to, all reports, studies, correspondence, memoranda, e-mails, analyses, meeting notes or other notes of any kind,

drafts and working papers, and every other document, recorded communication, or record of any kind (including records which exist electronically). In addition, we request access to each version of a record or document, whether it is a draft, has been electronically deleted, has attachments, bears annotations, etc. Please include records up to the date that the agency commences its search for responsive records. To reduce costs and expedite delivery, we request that information be delivered electronically, by a file-sharing service, removable storage, or email, to the extent possible. Upon request, SELC will provide a file-sharing link for easy transfer of the requested documents.

If the Forest Service takes the position that any of the above-described public records are not open to public inspection under the FOIA, please explain the basis for your position and identify any statute, rule of law, or other authority upon which you rely. Please note that claims of exemption under 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(5) must not only qualify for the exemption technically; they must also be accompanied by a determination that withholding the records is necessary to accomplish the purpose of that exemption. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(8)(i).

FOIA requires a responding agency to make a determination on any request within twenty (20) working days of receipt. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). FOIA also requires the release of all reasonably segregable portions of a document that are themselves not exempt. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). The Forest Service “shall withhold information under this section only if the agency reasonably foresees that disclosure would harm an interest protected by” a statutory exemption. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(8)(A)(i).

SELC requests that any fees associated with this request be waived because disclosure of information in the requested records would be in the public interest. The FOIA provides that “[d]ocuments *shall* be furnished without any charge or at a charge reduced below the fees established . . . if 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 government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii) (emphasis added); *see also* 7 C.F.R. § 1.12(p) (fees should be waived because this disclosure is in the public interest and SELC has no “commercial interest” in the disclosure). Congress’ stated main purpose in amending the FOIA in 1986 was “to remove any roadblocks and technicalities which have been used by various Federal agencies to deny waivers or reductions of fees under FOIA.” 132 Cong. Rec. S16,496 (Oct. 15, 1986) (statement of Sen. Leahy). Congress intended the amendment to the FOIA’s public interest provision “to be liberally construed in favor of waivers for noncommercial requesters.” *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossotti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1312 (D.C. Cir. 2003); *McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Carlucci*, 853 F.2d 1282, 1284 (9th Cir. 1987) (both quoting 132 Cong. Rec. S14,298 (Sept. 20, 1986) (statement of Sen. Leahy)).

Fee waiver is appropriate in this case because disclosure of this information “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii); 7 C.F.R. § 1.12(p)(1)(i). The regulations identify four factors to be considered under this public interest requirement:

- (i) The subject of the request must concern identifiable operations or activities of the Federal government, with a connection that is direct and clear, not remote or attenuated.
- (ii) Disclosure of the requested records must be meaningfully informative about government operations or activities to be “likely to contribute” to an increased public understanding of those operations or activities. The disclosure of information that already is in the public domain, in either the same or a substantially identical form, would not contribute to such understanding where nothing new would be added to the public’s understanding.
- (iii) The disclosure must contribute to the understanding of a reasonably broad audience of persons interested in the subject, as opposed to the requester’s individual understanding. A requester’s expertise in the subject area as well as his or her ability and intention to effectively convey information to the public will be considered. It will be presumed that a representative of the news media, as defined in appendix A of this subpart, will satisfy this consideration.
- (iv) The public’s understanding of the subject in question must be enhanced by the disclosure to a significant degree. However, components will not make value judgments about whether the information at issue is “important” enough to be made public.

7 C.F.R. § 1.12(p)(3).


The first regulatory factor for fee waiver is clearly met, as the above requests are directly related to “identifiable operations or activities of the Federal government.” The Forest Service is a federal government agency, and the requested records concern a Forest Service “activity”: the Dunlap Creek Vegetation Management Project. As to the second factor, our requests seek information that would increase public understanding of a forest management project on Forest Service lands. The Dunlap Creek Vegetation Management Project is highly significant to the public, and we are not seeking records that are already in the public domain. As a result, the requested information will lead to greater public understanding of the operations of the federal government. The third factor is also met, as the requested disclosure would benefit not only SELC, but also our partner groups, our collective members and constituents, and the public at large. As a nonprofit environmental protection organization, a large part of our work consists of keeping citizens informed about government activities, like management of public lands, that affect natural resources and public health. We disclose information through our website, newsletters, by speaking at events, through the press, and through numerous other channels. Thus, we are not seeking this information solely for any “individual understanding,” and we have significant experience conveying information to the public. Finally, there is no doubt that this disclosure would enhance public understanding of the Dunlap Creek Vegetation Management Project, and how the Forest Service reaches decisions about management projects on national forest lands. This disclosure would be “significant,” in part, because there is little publicly available information on this issue at this stage of project assessment.

In addition to the demonstrated public interest in the information sought here, SELC has no commercial interest in the disclosures. 7 C.F.R. § 1.12(p)(4). SELC is a nonprofit organization with a public interest mission and, by definition, no commercial interests. SELC seeks the disclosure solely in the public interest of obtaining information about activities and operations of the Forest Service related to the Dunlap Creek Vegetation Management Project. Although SELC is a legal organization, SELC does not profit, or otherwise have a commercial interest, in litigation. SELC does not charge its clients for attorney time or enter into contingency agreements. Further, the abstract possibility of some future litigation does not create a commercial interest, since any such possibility is not itself a commercial interest. *See McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Carlucci*, 835 F.2d 1282, 1287 n.4 (9th Cir. 1987).

Should SELC's request for reduced or waived fees be denied, SELC is prepared to bear the reasonable duplication and search costs necessary to fulfill this request. However, I request you contact me before processing this request if the fee is expected to be in excess of \$100.00. SELC reserves its right to appeal a fee waiver or reduction denial.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. I am happy to work with you to clarify the scope of our request and to facilitate the production of the requested public records. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Katherine Coffey". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name and last name clearly distinguishable.

Katherine Coffey  
Associate Attorney  
Southern Environmental Law Center  
120 Garrett Street, Suite 400  
Charlottesville, VA 22902  
[kcoffey@selcva.org](mailto:kcoffey@selcva.org)  
(434) 977-4090