VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL & ONLINE PORTAL

Sam Kaplan
Chief FOIA Officer
The Privacy Office
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
245 Murray Lane SW
STOP 0655
Washington, DC 20528-0655
foia@hq.dhs.gov

Sabrina Burroughs
FOIA Officer
U.S. Customs & Border Protection
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Room 3.3D
Washington, DC 20229
Online Request at FOIAonline

Re: Expedited Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Mr. Kaplan and Ms. Burroughs:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, and your agency’s implementing regulations, 6 C.F.R. Part 5 and 19 C.F.R. § 103.2, American Oversight makes the following request for records.

Building a “wall” along the entire U.S.–Mexico border was a central promise of President Donald Trump’s 2016 campaign.¹ On February 8, 2017, Mr. Trump told law enforcement officials that

design of the wall was already underway. In prepared remarks for his joint address to Congress on February 28, Mr. Trump indicated that a schedule had been established for starting and completing the wall, and stated, “We will soon begin the construction of a great wall along our southern border. It will be started ahead of schedule and, when finished, it will be a very effective weapon against drugs and crime.” Despite repeatedly pledging that he would make Mexico pay for the wall, it appears American taxpayers will be footing the bill for the construction. Moreover, Mr. Trump has evidenced a lack of familiarity with U.S. procurement laws as well as a propensity for inside deals with his friends in the construction industry. Mr. Trump has insisted that he will be personally involved in the wall’s “design and negotiations” to ensure it comes in under budget.

More than nine months into this administration, there are still a number of unknowns regarding Mr. Trump’s wall—including its cost, which has been estimated anywhere from $8 billion to $22 billion to $70 billion. American Oversight submits this FOIA to keep the public informed about the project’s progress.

Requested Records

American Oversight requests that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and its component U.S. Customs & Border Protection (CBP) produce the following within twenty business days and seeks expedited review of this request for the reasons identified below:

1. All email communications regarding or discussing the construction of a wall, fence, or other physical barrier along the U.S.-Mexico border between (a) any political appointee or career employee detailed to a position eligible to be filled by a non-career member of the SES and (b) any Member of Congress or congressional staff.

2. All email communications regarding or discussing the construction of a wall, fence, or other physical barrier along the U.S.-Mexico border between (a) any political appointee or career employee detailed to a position eligible to be filled by a non-career member of the SES and (b) any employee or representative of the entities listed below:

   a) American Action Network (@americanactionnetwork.org)
   b) American Enterprise Institute (@aei.org)
   c) Americans for Prosperity (@americansforprosperity.org)
   d) Americans for Tax Reform (@atr.org)
   e) Breitbart News Network (@breitbart.com)
   f) Business Roundtable (@businessroundtable.org)
   g) ByteCubed (@bytecubed.com)
   h) Cato Institute (@cato.org)
   i) Center for Immigration Studies (@cis.org)
   j) Columbia Group (@columbiagroup.com)
   k) Competitive Enterprise Institute (@cei.org)
   l) Elaine Duke & Associates (@edukeassociates.com)
   m) Federalist Society (@fed-soc.org)
   n) Federation for American Immigration Reform (@fairus.org)
   o) Fox News Network (@foxnews.com)
   p) Heritage Action for America (@heritageaction.com)
   q) Heritage Foundation (@heritage.org)
   r) Hoover Institution (@hoover.org)
   s) Lexington Institute (@lexingtoninstitute.org)
   t) MAGA Coalition (@magacoalition.com)
   u) Manhattan Institute (@manhattan-institute.org)
   v) National Taxpayers Union (@ntu.org)
   w) Sunesis Consulting (@sunesisconsultingllc.com)
   x) U.S. Chamber of Commerce (@uschamber.org)
   y) Wexler Walker (@wexlerwalker.com)

For DHS, the search for responsive records can be limited to: the Office of the Secretary; the Office of the Deputy Secretary; the Office of the Under Secretary for Management; the Office of Public Affairs; and the Office of Legislative Affairs.

For CBP, the search for responsive records can be limited to: the Office of the Commissioner; the Office of the Assistant Commissioner for Public Affairs; and the Office of the Assistant Commissioner for Congressional Affairs.
Please provide all responsive records from January 20, 2017, through the date of the search.

In addition to the records requested above, American Oversight also requests records describing the processing of this request, including records sufficient to identify search terms used and locations and custodians searched and any tracking sheets used to track the processing of this request. If DHS uses FOIA questionnaires or certifications completed by individual custodians or components to determine whether they possess responsive materials or to describe how they conducted searches, we also request any such records prepared in connection with the processing of this request.

American Oversight seeks all responsive records regardless of format, medium, or physical characteristics. In conducting your search, please understand the terms “record,” “document,” and “information” in their broadest sense, to include any written, typed, recorded, graphic, printed, or audio material of any kind. We seek records of any kind, including electronic records, audiotapes, videotapes, and photographs, as well as letters, emails, facsimiles, telephone messages, voice mail messages and transcripts, notes, or minutes of any meetings, telephone conversations or discussions. Our request includes any attachments to these records. No category of material should be omitted from search, collection, and production.

Please search all records regarding agency business. You may not exclude searches of files or emails in the personal custody of your officials, such as personal email accounts. Records of official business conducted using unofficial systems or stored outside of official files is subject to the Federal Records Act and FOIA. It is not adequate to rely on policies and procedures that require officials to move such information to official systems within a certain period of time; American Oversight has a right to records contained in those files even if material has not yet been moved to official systems or if officials have, through negligence or willfulness, failed to meet their obligations. In addition, please note that in conducting a “reasonable search” as required by law, you must employ the most up-to-date technologies and tools available, in addition to searches by individual custodians likely to have responsive information. Recent technology may have rendered DHS’s prior FOIA practices unreasonable. In light of the government-wide requirements to manage information electronically by the end of 2016, it is no longer reasonable to rely exclusively on

---


9 See Competitive Enter. Inst. v. Office of Sci. & Tech. Policy, No. 14-cv-765, slip op. at 8 (D.D.C. Dec. 12, 2016) (“The Government argues that because the agency had a policy requiring [the official] to forward all of his emails from his [personal] account to his business email, the [personal] account only contains duplicate agency records at best. Therefore, the Government claims that any hypothetical deletion of the [personal account] emails would still leave a copy of those records intact in [the official’s] work email. However, policies are rarely followed to perfection by anyone. At this stage of the case, the Court cannot assume that each and every work related email in the [personal] account was duplicated in [the official’s] work email account.” (citations omitted)).
custodian-driven searches. Furthermore, agencies that have adopted the National Archives and Records Agency (NARA) Capstone program, or similar policies, now maintain emails in a form that is reasonably likely to be more complete than individual custodians’ files. For example, a custodian may have deleted a responsive email from his or her email program, but DHS’s archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone. Accordingly, American Oversight insists that DHS use the most up-to-date technologies to search for responsive information and take steps to ensure that the most complete repositories of information are searched. American Oversight is available to work with you to craft appropriate search terms. However, custodian searches are still required; agencies may not have direct access to files stored in .PST files, outside of network drives, in paper format, or in personal email accounts.

Under the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, agencies must adopt a presumption of disclosure, withholding information “only if . . . disclosure would harm an interest protected by an exemption” or “disclosure is prohibited by law.” If it is your position that any portion of the requested records is exempt from disclosure, American Oversight requests that you provide an index of those documents as required under Vaughn v. Rosen, 484 F.2d 820 (D.C. Cir. 1973), cert. denied, 415 U.S. 977 (1974). As you are aware, a Vaughn index must describe each document claimed as exempt with sufficient specificity “to permit a reasoned judgment as to whether the material is actually exempt under FOIA.” Moreover, the Vaughn index “must describe each document or portion thereof withheld, and for each withholding it must discuss the consequences of disclosing the sought-after information.” Further, “the withholding agency must supply a relatively detailed justification, specifically identifying the reasons why a particular exemption is relevant and correlating those claims with the particular part of a withheld document to which they apply.”

In the event some portions of the requested records are properly exempt from disclosure, please disclose any reasonably segregable non-exempt portions of the requested records. If it is your position that a document contains non-exempt segments, but that those non-exempt segments are so dispersed throughout the document as to make segregation impossible, please state what portion of the document is non-exempt, and how the material is dispersed throughout the document. Claims of nonsegregability must be made with the same degree of detail as required for claims of exemptions in a Vaughn index. If a request is denied in whole, please state specifically that it is not reasonable to segregate portions of the record for release.

12 Founding Church of Scientology v. Bell, 603 F.2d 945, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1979).
14 Id. at 224 (citing Mead Data Central, Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of the Air Force, 566 F.2d 242, 251 (D.C. Cir. 1977)).
15 Mead Data Central, 566 F.2d at 261.
**You should institute a preservation hold on information responsive to this request.** American Oversight intends to pursue all legal avenues to enforce its right of access under FOIA, including litigation if necessary. Accordingly, DHS is on notice that litigation is reasonably foreseeable.

To ensure that this request is properly construed, that searches are conducted in an adequate but efficient manner, and that extraneous costs are not incurred, American Oversight welcomes an opportunity to discuss its request with you before you undertake your search or incur search or duplication costs. By working together at the outset, American Oversight and DHS can decrease the likelihood of costly and time-consuming litigation in the future.

Where possible, please provide responsive material in electronic format by email or in PDF or TIF format on a USB drive. Please send any responsive material being sent by mail to American Oversight, 1030 15th Street NW, Suite B255, Washington, DC 20005. If it will accelerate release of responsive records to American Oversight, please also provide responsive material on a rolling basis.

**Fee Waiver Request**

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii) and 6 C.F.R. § 5.11(k), American Oversight requests a waiver of fees associated with processing this request for records. The subject of this request concerns the operations of the federal government, and the disclosures will likely contribute to a better understanding of relevant government procedures by the general public in a significant way. Moreover, the request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.

American Oversight requests a waiver of fees because disclosure of the requested information is “in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government.” The requested records will help American Oversight and the general public understand the progress of this mammoth government project. An infrastructure project of this size—and the contracting procedure underlying such a project—are clear government activities. As noted above, Mr. Trump has previously evidenced a lack of familiarity with U.S. procurement laws as well as a propensity for inside deals with his friends in the construction industry. He has also insisted that he will be personally involved in the wall’s “design and negotiations” to ensure it comes in under budget. With his promise to make Mexico pay for

---

16 6 C.F.R. § 5.11(k)(1)(i).
17 6 C.F.R. § 5.11(k)(1)(ii).
18 6 C.F.R. § 5.11(k)(1)(i), (2)(i)-(iv).
20 Donald J. Trump (@realdonaldtrump), TWITTER (Feb. 11, 2017, 9:18 AM), [https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/830405706255912960](https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/830405706255912960); Donald J. Trump
the wall seemingly failing, Mr. Trump offhandedly mentioned that perhaps solar panels could be installed to pay for the wall.\footnote{Donald Trump Talks Up Solar Panel Plan for Mexico Wall, BBC, June 22, 2017, http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-40363390.} These statements make it all the more important for the public to understand whether and to what extent the White House is playing a role in procurement decisions by career employees at DHS and CBP.

This request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.\footnote{6 C.F.R. § 5.11(k)(1)(ii), (3)(i)- (ii).} As a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, American Oversight does not have a commercial purpose and the release of the information requested is not in American Oversight’s financial interest. American Oversight’s mission is to promote transparency in government, to educate the public about government activities, and to ensure the accountability of government officials. American Oversight uses the information gathered, and its analysis of it, to educate the public through reports, press releases, or other media. American Oversight also makes materials it gathers available on our public website and promote their availability on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter.\footnote{American Oversight currently has approximately 11,600 page likes on Facebook, and 35,100 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/ (last visited Sept. 29, 2017); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, https://twitter.com/weareoversight (last visited Sept. 29, 2017).} American Oversight has demonstrated its commitment to the public disclosure of documents and creation of editorial content. For example, after receiving records regarding an ethics waiver received by a senior DOJ attorney, American Oversight promptly posted the records to its website\footnote{DOJ Civil Division Response Noel Francisco Compliance, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doi-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance.} and published an analysis of what the records reflected about DOJ’s process for ethics waivers.\footnote{Francisco & the Travel Ban: What We Learned from the DOJ Documents, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, https://www.americanoversight.org/francisco-the-travel-ban-what-we-learned-from-the-doi-documents.} Additionally, this particular FOIA request is part of a public project conducted by American Oversight called “Audit the Wall,” where the organization is gathering and analyzing information and commenting on public releases of information related to the administration’s proposed construction of a barrier along the U.S.-Mexico border.\footnote{Audit the Wall, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, www.auditthewall.org.}

Accordingly, American Oversight qualifies for a fee waiver.

**Application for Expedited Processing**

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E) and 6 C.F.R. § 5.5(e)(1)(ii), (iv), American Oversight requests that DHS expedite the processing of this request.

\footnote{(@realdonaldtrump), TWITTER (Feb. 11, 2017, 9:24 AM), https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/830407172747988992.}
I certify to be true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief that there is widespread and exceptional media interest and there exist possible questions about the government’s integrity that affect public confidence. News stories about the wall are published regularly,\(^7\) including numerous stories about the progress of contracting efforts and CBP’s recent completion of the wall prototypes.\(^8\) As noted above in our fee waiver request, the requested records will help American


Oversight and the general public understand the progress of this mammoth government project. An infrastructure project of this size—and the contracting procedure underlying such a project—are clear government activities. Mr. Trump has previously evidenced a lack of familiarity with U.S. procurement laws as well as a propensity for inside deals with his friends in the construction industry. He has also insisted that he will be personally involved in the wall’s “design and negotiations” to ensure it comes in under budget. These statements make it all the more important for the public to understand whether procurement procedures are being followed, what institutional knowledge is being considered, how environmental concerns are factored into the construction, and how concerns from the border states are being addressed or remedied. In short, a multi-billion-dollar construction project directed and financed by the federal government using tax dollars on an accelerated timeline is a quintessential example of “[a] matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions about the government’s integrity that affect public confidence.”

Moreover, I certify to be true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, that there is an urgent need to inform the public about the federal government activity that is the subject of this request. The information American Oversight seeks concerns “a matter of a current exigency to the American public.” News stories about the wall are published regularly, including numerous


6 C.F.R. § 5.5(e)(1)(iv).


stories about the progress of contracting efforts and the prototypes.\textsuperscript{36} Depending on one’s source, the project is either ahead of or behind schedule.\textsuperscript{36} In order to participate meaningfully in the debate over the wall’s budget and creation,\textsuperscript{36} it is essential for the American public to understand the status of the government’s research, procurement, and policy development.


I further certify that American Oversight is primarily engaged in disseminating information to the public. American Oversight’s mission is to promote transparency in government, to educate the public about government activities, and to ensure the accountability of government officials. Similar to other organizations that have been found to satisfy the criteria necessary to qualify for expedition, American Oversight “gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn the raw material into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience.” American Oversight uses the information gathered, and its analysis of it, to educate the public through reports, press releases, and other media. American Oversight also makes materials it gathers available on its public website and promote their availability on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter. American Oversight has demonstrated its commitment to the public disclosure of documents and creation of editorial content. For example, after receiving records regarding an ethics waiver received by a senior DOJ attorney, American Oversight promptly posted the records to its website and published an analysis of what the records reflected about DOJ’s process for ethics waivers. Additionally, this particular FOIA request is part of a public project conducted by American Oversight called “Audit the Wall,” where the organization is gathering and analyzing information and commenting on public releases of information related to the administration’s proposed construction of a barrier along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Accordingly, American Oversight’s request satisfies the criteria for expedition.

**Conclusion**

We share a common mission to promote transparency in government. American Oversight looks forward to working with DHS on this request. If you do not understand any part of this request, have any questions, or foresee any problems in fully releasing the requested records, please contact Cerissa Cafasso at foia@americanoversight.org or 202.869.5246. Also, if American Oversight’s

---


42 *Audit the Wall, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT*, [www.auditthewall.org](http://www.auditthewall.org).
request for a fee waiver is not granted in full, please contact us immediately upon making such a determination.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Austin R. Evers
Executive Director
American Oversight