1 2 3 4 5 6	WAYNE K. LEMIEUX (SBN 43501) LEMIEUX & O'NEILL 4165 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd., Suite 350 Westlake Village, California 91362-3852 Telephone: (805) 495-4770 Facsimile: (805) 495-2787  Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
7	LEMIEUX & O'NEILL, EX REL. LAS VIRGENES-TRIUNFO JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY	
8		
9		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12		
13	LEMIEUX & O'NEILL, EX REL. LAS ) (VIRGENES - TRIUNFO JOINT POWERS )	CASE NO.:
14	AUTHORITY,	EXHIBIT 5
15		TO COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
16	v. }	
17	GINA McCARTHY, Administrator of the	
18 19	UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL {	
20	PROTECTION AGENCY, and DOES 1-10,) inclusive,	
20	Defendants.	
22	<u></u>	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	EXHIBIT 5 to Complaint for Injunctive Police	
	to Complaint for Injunctive Relief	

## Christine Han

From:

Moffatt, Brett < Moffatt.Brett@epa.gov>

Sent:

Thursday, July 9, 2015 9:07 AM

To:

Christine Han

Subject:

RE: FOIA Request No. EPA-R9-2015-003385

Christine, We will provide you with an index or other description of the withheld documents.

Brett

Brett Moffatt US EPA, Region 9 (415) 972-3946

From: Christine Han [mailto:C.Han@lemieux-oneill.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 3:45 PM

To: Moffatt, Brett

Subject: RE: FOIA Request No. EPA-R9-2015-003385

Brett -

While I understand that the emails were withheld because they allegedly contained information related to the deliberative process, the EPA bears the burden of showing the emails fall within the exemption. *Vaughn v. Rosen,* 523 F.2d 1136, 1144 (D.C. Cir. 1975). As such, I would like to request a privilege log or index of the 260 emails that have been withheld. See *Vaughn v. Rosen,* 484 F.2d 820, 827-28 (D.C. Cir. 1973). Please provide the dates, authors and recipients of the emails, a description of each email, etc., to ensure that the emails were predecisional and deliberative. See, e.g., *Hussain v. U.S. Dept. of Homeland Sec.,* 674 F.Supp.2d 260, 270-71 (D.C. 2009); *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Food & Drug Admin.,* 449 F.3d 141, 147-48 (D.C. Cir. 2006).

Thanks! Christine

Christine N. Han Associate Attorney LEMIEUX & O'NEILL 4165 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd., Suite 350 Westlake Village, CA 91362

Tel: 805.495,4770 Fax: 805.495.2787

<u>CONFIDENTIALITY WARNING</u>: This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, dissemination or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify this office immediately. Thank you.

EXHIBIT \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_

## Case 2:16-cv-00570 Document 1-5 Filed 01/26/16 Page 3 of 4 Page ID #:23

From: Moffatt, Brett [mailto:Moffatt.Brett@epa.gov]

Sent: Monday, July 6, 2015 9:51 PM

To: Christine Han

Subject: RE: FOIA Request No. EPA-R9-2015-003385

Christine,

Thank you for contacting me first. We released all of the responsive emails to and from outside entities. All of the 260 withheld emails are communications between EPA staff and the staff of EPA's consultant, Tetra Tech, and pertain to the development of the TMDL and/or contracting matters. For the purpose of 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(5), consultant assistance is treated the same as internal agency staff work. See, e.g., DOI v. Klamath Water Users Protective Ass'n, 532 U.S. 1, 10-11. We released the Tetra Tech communications pertaining to the development of the TMDL which did not contain deliberative information.

Please contact me if you have any further questions.

Brett

Brett Moffatt US EPA, Region 9 (415) 972-3946

From: Christine Han [mailto:C.Han@lemieux-oneill.com]

Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 2:32 PM

To: Moffatt, Brett

Subject: FOIA Request No. EPA-R9-2015-003385

Brett,

After reviewing the partial denial letter, I have a question about the exemption that is cited in support of the EPA's inability to provide us with 260 emails sent between EPA and a contractor. The letter, which I attached hereto, cites 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(5), which exempts from disclosure "inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letter which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency." As you may or may not be aware, we represent Las Virgenes Municipal Water District and are currently involved in litigation against the EPA. We expect to be involved in said litigation for some time. Therefore, we don't believe this particular exemption applies to the 260 emails that were not provided to us.

Please let me know whether you will provide these emails or whether we need to go through a formal appeals process.

Thanks for your time and attention.

Christine

Christine N. Han Associate Attorney LEMIEUX & O'NEILL 4165 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd., Suite 350 Westlake Village, CA 91362

Tel: 805.495.4770 Fax: 805.495.2787

## Case 2:16-cv-00570 Document 1-5 Filed 01/26/16 Page 4 of 4 Page ID #:24

CONFIDENTIALITY WARNING: This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, dissemination or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify this office immediately. Thank you.