

PUBLIC **Metcalf annotations, 4/6/14**

COMMENT

DRAFT

3

-

14

-

2014

Resolving FOIA Disputes Through Targeted ADR Strategies  
Committee on Collaborative Governance – Draft Recommendation  
The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)

1

makes available to any person, upon request, any reasonably described agency record that is not exempt under nine specified categories. Congress has stated: “disclosure, not secrecy, is the dominant objective of the Act.”

2

FOIA provides a two-level agency process for decisions on requests for access to agency records: (1) an initial determination that is ordinarily made by the component of the agency with primary responsibility for the subject matter of the request; and (2) an appeal to an authority under the head of the agency in the case of an adverse initial determination. A requester’s formal recourse following an adverse determination on appeal (or the agency’s failure to meet the statutory time limits for making a determination) is a suit in federal district court to challenge the agency action or inaction. Attaining the highest level of compliance at the agency level, without the need for resort to litigation, has long been recognized as a critical

ical FOIA policy objective. A series of amendments to the Act over the years has provided for more detailed monitoring of agency compliance and established agency mechanisms to promote compliance. Despite these efforts, several hundred agency FOIA determinations adverse to requesters are challenged annually in federal courts,

3

and it is widely assumed that a substantial number of other non-compliant agency FOIA determinations are not taken to court by requesters, primarily for reasons of cost and delay that inhere in federal court litigation.

1

5 U.S.C. § 552, as amended.

2

Openness Promotes Effectiveness in our National [OPEN] Government Act of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-175, 121

Stat. 2524 (codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552), § 2(4).

3

The year 2012 saw the highest number of FOIA requests in the history of the law: a striking 650,000 requests were filed with agencies throughout the Executive Branch by individuals and organizations seeking government information. Data from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts indicate that the number of FOIA

cases has varied within a range of 280 to 388 over **fiscal years [I don't think these were fiscal years, as the report from which these figures are derived is a calendar-year one]** 2007 through 2013. Annual agency FOIA litigation costs hover around \$23 million—a conservative estimate by some accounts.

2

PUBLIC  
COMMENT  
DRAFT

3

-

14

-

2014

The Administrative Conference considered th

the potential value of “alternative dispute resolution” (ADR) in relation to FOIA disputes in 1987, at a time when federal agency use of ADR processes was not as common as today, and concluded that the data then available did not clearly establish the need for either an independent administrative tribunal to resolve FOIA disputes or the appointment of a FOIA ombudsman within the Department of Justice. However, the Conference noted that greater reliance on informal approaches to FOIA dispute resolution could result in more effective handling of some FOIA disputes without resort to court litigation.

4

The OPEN Government Act of 2007 reflected concerns that some agencies, as a whole, were not implementing FOIA as Congress intended. Significantly, the 2007 legislation included, for the first time in FOIA’s history, provisions that directed agency FOIA officers to “assist in the resolution of disputes” between the agency and a FOIA requester.

5

This legislation created in each agency the positions of a Chief FOIA Officer and FOIA Public Liaisons, and established the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) in the National Archives and Records Administration, to perform a broad range of functions aimed at improving FOIA compliance and providing assistance to requesters. Those two developments are the only government-wide FOIA dispute resolution process changes subsequent to the earlier Administrative Conference study.

The Role of the Office of Government Information Services

OGIS has been in operation since September 2009. Acting, in effect, as a “FOIA ombudsman,” OGIS has a hybrid mission that includes: identifying and resolving individual FOIA disputes between requesters and agencies through mediation services; reviewing agency FOIA policies, procedures and compliance with FOIA; and making recommendations to Congress and the President to improve the administration of FOIA. The Administrative Conference undertook a study in 2013 to examine the issues and other case characteristics that most commonly lead to litigated FOIA disputes, and to consider

4

See

ACUS Statement #12, 52 FR 23636 (June 24, 1987).

5

OPEN Government Act of 2007,

supra

note 2, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(B)(ii).

3

PUBLIC

COMMENT

DRAFT

3

-

14

-

2014

whether particular types of ADR approaches are likely to be especially effective in resolving identified types of FOIA cases or issues in an efficient and effective manner short of litigation.

The current study reviewed FOIA cases closed in federal district courts

in **fiscal years [same note as above]** 2010

through 2013 in order to categorize the bases for the most common types of FOIA lawsuits.

Review of cases was supplemented by other case data and interviews with individuals whose experience with the FOIA process could give an

understanding of the varying dimensions and perspectives of that process.

The Conference's study found wide variation in the form and substance of FOIA disputes between requesters and agencies, in the motivation, resources, and sophistication of requesters, and in the missions and the level of interest in agency records. The interplay of these variables has led to the conclusion that no simple formula for linking a particular set of case characteristics with particular ADR approaches is likely to be very fruitful. Instead, it appears that the most important targeting should be directed toward the dispute resolution mechanism itself. It is vital that OGIS, a mechanism external to the agencies that is open to all issues, all requesters, and all agencies, have appropriate FOIA dispute resolution authority, expertise, and resources. In practice, OGIS's caseload is determined by whoever happens to contact OGIS, typically by telephone or e-mail inquiries, some of which come from individuals who have never filed a FOIA request. Often such individuals seek only modest help, such as where to file or what form to use to obtain the desired records or information. Many of these inquiries are handled routinely on the day they are received. OGIS classifies such contacts as "Quick Hits." This service, along with the informational resources on the OGIS website, is frequently sufficient to assist the least sophisticated users of FOIA and should be continued. This is a low cost/high value function that has instant payoff for a broad constituency.

#### OGIS Caseload

Although many inquiries to OGIS are routine in nature, others are not. Also, the issues involved in an inquiry sometimes turn out to be more complicated than initially realized. In such cases, OGIS will gather information from th

e requester and make a preliminary assessment of the case, to decide whether it seems appropriate for an OGIS contact with the relevant agency

4

PUBLIC

COMMENT

DRAFT

3

-

14

-

2014

to find out the status of the case and whether the agency has taken a position. Since the statute does not place any duty on the agency to participate in the OGIS mediation process, OGIS depends on agency cooperation. The relatively small fraction of agency denials that are appealed to the courts, together with agency success rates in FOIA litigation, may serve as a disincentive to agencies to participate meaningfully in a dispute resolution process at this point.

Although the Office of Information Policy (OIP) in the Department of Justice (DOJ) historically considered itself to have a role as “FOIA ombudsman,” the legislation that created OGIS clearly assigned a mediation role to OGIS **as?**, in effect, a “FOIA ombudsman” responsibility.

6

Underlying this policy decision was the fact that DOJ, including OIP, **historically has [“previously” is not entirely accurate]** had both a FOIA compliance promotion function and a responsibility to represent agencies in lawsuits arising under FOIA. Under the OPEN Government Act of 2007, OGIS has statutory responsibility to promote compliance but possesses no agency representation

tation responses  
ibilities.  
OGIS has implemented its ombudsman responsibility through facilitating communications between a requester and the agency, helping the parties address factors contributing to delay, or actually engaging in a mediating process to achieve a resolution satisfactory to both sides. The recommendations addressed to OGIS that follow are intended to optimize the use of its resources. OGIS encourages requesters to complete the agency administrative appeal process prior to significant OGIS engagement, so as to give the agency an opportunity to reconsider its initial decision to deny a request. Whether or not a requester has exhausted the agency appeal process, **however**, if the unresolved issues appear meritorious, OGIS assistance should focus on enabling the requester and the agency to engage in a discussion that resolves those issues or deters litigation, either through reconsideration of the agency position or through the agency providing a fuller, more informative explanation for its position. The OPEN Government Act of 2007, in addition to authorizing OGIS to provide mediation services to resolve FOIA disputes, provided that OGIS, at its discretion, may offer

6

However, the legislation (OPEN Government Act of 2007, *supra* note 2) does not use the term “FOIA ombudsman.”

5

PUBLIC  
COMMENT  
DRAFT

3

-

14

-

2014

advisory opinions if mediation has not resolved the dispute.

7

However, OGIS has not yet chosen to exercise this authority.

8

The statutory linkage of OGIS advisory opinions to its mediation function is not ideal, because a requester's or an agency's anticipation of OGIS's taking a public position in a particular case in which OGIS seeks to serve as a neutral mediator may discourage parties from participating in mediation. It therefore is important for OGIS to distinguish between expressing views on systemic issues or identifying broad trends or patterns and issuing advisory opinions that address the facts of individual cases it has sought to mediate. In appropriate cases, issuance of an advisory opinion may forestall potential litigation, and OGIS should make the parties aware of this authority.

9

Factors such as potential breadth of application and frequency of occurrence of an issue, along with consideration of caseload manageability, should be among the primary, though not the exclusive, determinants for OGIS in deciding whether or not to initiate the advisory opinion process.

An OGIS advisory opinion might receive judicial deference under established standards of judicial review in a FOIA suit in which the advisory opinion is before a court, whether in the dispute which led to the opinion or another in which that issue is raised.

10

Role of FOIA Public Liaisons



The FOIA Public Liaison role in each agency was created by the OPEN Government Act of 2007 specifically to foster assistance to FOIA requesters. Preventing or resolving FOIA disputes within agencies through the work of Public Liaisons advances the goals of the Act and can relieve the dispute resolution burden of both OGIS and the courts. These agency officials

7

5 U.S.C. § 552(h)(3).

8

Although either the requester or the agency could ask OGIS for an advisory opinion, OGIS should have discretion

to determine whether to initiate the advisory opinion process. An OGIS decision whether or not to issue an advisory opinion would likely not be subject to judicial review.

See

Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985). The statute expressly uses the phrase, "at the discretion of the Office."

9

OGIS has described its advisory opinion authority as follows: "OGIS also is authorized to issue advisory opinions, formal or informal. By issuing advisory opinions, OGIS does not intend to undertake a policymaking or an adjudicative role within the FOIA process, but instead will illuminate novel issues and promote sound practices with regard to compliance with FOIA."

Available at

<https://ogis.archives.gov/about-ogis/ogis-reports/the-first-year/the-ogis-mission.htm>.

10

See United States v. Mead Corp., 533 U.S. 218 (2001).

6

PUBLIC  
COMMENT  
DRAFT

3

-

14

-

2014

should be given adequate authority and support from agency leadership

ership for carrying out their statutory dispute resolution function, including appropriate training. Agency FOIA Public Liaisons, under the direction of their Chief FOIA Officers, should be encouraged to seek OGIS mediation or facilitation services at any stage in the processing of a request when it appears to the agency that OGIS engagement may aid in the resolution of a request. In such cases, if the requester agrees to participate, OGIS should make its services available whether or not the appeals process has been exhausted or any applicable time limit has expired. This opportunity for agency engagement of OGIS recognizes that (a) once an agency has made a final determination on a request it is less likely than a requester to seek OGIS assistance, and (b) agency-sought OGIS engagement may provide one of the most fruitful settings in which to obtain an informal resolution.

11

Whether or not an agency chooses to request OGIS assistance, each agency, in any appeal determination letter in which a request is denied in whole or in part, should notify the requester of the availability of OGIS mediation or facilitation services as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation.

12

Congress and the Executive Branch should recognize the largely distinct dispute resolution and compliance promotion roles of OGIS, agency Chief FOIA Officers, and the Department of Justice, as a collective set of administrative mechanisms sharing the goal of avoiding unnecessary FOIA litigation.

11

OGIS has described its relationship with agency FOIA Public Liaisons as follows: While the OPEN Government Act's definition of a [FOIA Public Liaison (FPL)] is simple and

straightforward, we know that the reality of their positions is anything but. Some agencies have created

new FPL positions that are completely dedicated to assisting requesters and resolving disputes.

Other

agencies — many of them smaller agencies — added

the FPL tasks listed in the Act to the already-full

plate of someone within the FOIA shop. We've also found that FPLs have a variety of

approaches to their

job, including everything from agitating for change

within agencies to reiterating the party line.

<http://blogs.archives.gov/foiablog/2011>

[/06/09/whats-a-foia-public-liaison](http://blogs.archives.gov/foiablog/2011/06/09/whats-a-foia-public-liaison).

12

OGIS itself has recommended such notice in the following form:

As part of the 2007 FOIA amendments, the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS)

was

created to offer mediation services

to resolve disputes between FOIA requesters and Federal agencies as a

non-exclusive alternative to litigation. Using OGIS servi

ces does not affect your right to pursue litigation.

Available at

[https://ogis.archives.gov/about-ogis/working-wi](https://ogis.archives.gov/about-ogis/working-with-ogis/Standard-OGIS-Language-for-Agencies.htm)

[th-ogis/Standard-OGIS-Language-for-Agencies.htm](https://ogis.archives.gov/about-ogis/working-with-ogis/Standard-OGIS-Language-for-Agencies.htm).

OIP also has encouraged agenci

es to follow this practice.

Available at

[http://www.justice.gov/oip/](http://www.justice.gov/oip/foiapost/2010foiapost21.htm)

[foiapost/2010foiapost21.htm](http://www.justice.gov/oip/foiapost/2010foiapost21.htm).

7

PUBLIC

COMMENT

DRAFT

3

-

14

-

2014

RECOMMENDATION

Recommendations to the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS)

1. OGIS, a part of the National Archives and

Records Administration, should continue to

provide its “Quick Hit” servi

ce and the informational resources on its website, as principal

means of assisting the least sophisticated users

of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

2. Requesters may appropriately seek assist

ance from OGIS at a  
ny stage of the FOIA  
process. However, because the  
opportunity for a FOIA a  
ppeal within the agen  
cy is an important  
component of the process, OGIS should continue to  
encourage requesters to complete that step  
prior to significant OGIS engagement **whenever in its judgment that would be most  
appropriate.**

3. OGIS should continue to provide both  
facilitation and mediation assistance to  
requesters and agencies, depending on the na  
ture of the issues in dispute.

(a) For delay issues, OGIS assi  
stance should focus on practica  
l steps that, with agency  
cooperation, might facilitate  
processing of the request.

(b) For substantive issues, whether or not th  
e requester has exhausted the agency appeal  
process, if the unresolved issues in the reque  
st appear **to merit it**, OGIS assistance **[to the  
requester][delete]** should focus on enabling the requester a  
nd the agency to engage  
in a discussion that  
deters litigation, either through agency reconsid  
eration of its position or through provision of a  
more informative explan  
ation of the **agency's decision(s).**

4. In appropriate situations, OGIS should ma  
ke use of its statut  
ory, discretionary  
authority to issue advisory opinions. In im  
plementing this authority, OGIS should distinguish  
between issuance of an advisory opinion in connec  
tion with (a) a systemic issue or identification  
of a broad trend or pattern, and (b) an indivi  
dual case, for which OGIS taking a position on an  
issue may undercut its ability to act as a neutral  
mediator. Factors such  
as potential breadth of  
application and frequency of occurrence of an  
issue, along with consideration of caseload 8

PUBLIC  
COMMENT

DRAFT

3

-

14

-

2014

manageability, should be among the primary, though not the exclusive, determinants for OGIS in deciding whether or not to initiate

the advisory opinion process. **Toward that end, OGIS also should consider the existence of significant gaps currently in guidance provided by OIP. [Note: This is a new suggestion, but unfortunately it is entirely apt. See. e.g., OIP testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 11, 2014.]**

5. To the extent that resources permit, OGIS should consider ways **in which?** to acquire better data from both agencies and litigants on the kinds of issues that have led to FOIA litigation. Such efforts may include working with agencies to create a **[consistent database for][sounds odd; say “database of” instead?]** information on litigated issues and contacting former litigants to gain a better understanding of their awareness and usage of OGIS or other sources of dispute resolution services.

Recommendations to Agencies

6. All agencies, through their FOIA Public Liaisons under the direction of their Chief FOIA Officers, should seek OGIS mediation or facilitation services at any stage in the processing of a request when it appears to the agency that OGIS engagement may aid in the resolution of **that** request.

7. All agencies, in any appeal determination letter in which a request is denied in whole or in part, should notify the requester of availability of OGIS mediation or facilitation services as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation.

8. All agencies should take steps to maximize the effectiveness of their FOIA Public Liaisons in fulfilling the dispute resolution function **that?** the Act assigns to Public Liaisons. Agency websites, as well as initial response letters to FOIA requests, should call attention to the problem resolution assistance available from Public Liaisons. In addition, agency leadership should provide adequate authority and

support to Public Liaisons **by ensuring?** that they receive necessary training, including in dispute resolution, and are made aware of the services offered by OGIS.

9. Upon request by the Director of OGIS, all agencies should cooperate fully with **OGIS** efforts to mediate **or otherwise facilitate the resolution of** individual FOIA disputes. Similarly, agencies should cooperate with efforts by OGIS to obtain consistent and comparable data relating to FOIA litigation, to the extent permitted by law.

**10. In conjunction with its consideration of current legislative proposals to amend the FOIA, Congress should also consider amendment of subsection (h) of the Act in light of recent experience.**