



January 31, 2018

VIA ONLINE PORTAL & ELECTRONIC MAIL

Laurie Day
Chief, Initial Request Staff
Office of Information Policy
U.S. Department of Justice
1425 New York Avenue NW, Suite 11050
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Via FOIAOnline

Karen McFadden
FOIA Contact
Justice Management Division
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Room 1111 RFK
Washington, DC 20530-0001
JMDFOIA@usdoj.gov

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Ms. Day and Ms. McFadden:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, and the implementing regulations of the Department of Justice (DOJ), 28 C.F.R. Part 16, American Oversight makes the following request for records.

On January 29, 2018, news reports surfaced that White House Chief of Staff John Kelly has been contacting senior DOJ officials “to convey [President] Trump’s displeasure and lecture them on the White House’s expectations.”¹ Such contacts between the White House and DOJ run counter to established practices of how communications are to flow between the White House and DOJ. In May 2009, then-Attorney General Eric Holder issued a memorandum to the heads of all DOJ components entitled, “Communications with the White House and Congress.” The memo reads in relevant part: “Initial communications between the Department and the White House concerning pending or contemplated criminal investigations or cases will involve **only** the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General, from the side of the Department, and **the Counsel to the President, the Principal Deputy Counsel to the President, the President or the Vice President, from the side of the White House.**”² There have been no reports that the memo has been rescinded or revised. This is also not the first time allegations have surfaced that the Trump White House is attempting to inappropriately influence DOJ investigations.³ The public has a right to

¹ Jennifer Jacobs, *On Flight to Davos, Trump Erupted over DOJ Role in Russia Probe*, BLOOMBERG POLITICS (Jan. 29, 2018, 3:07 PM), <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-01-29/on-flight-to-davos-trump-erupted-over-doj-role-in-russia-probe>.

² Office of the Attorney General, Memorandum for Heads of Department Components & All United States Attorneys, *Communications with the White House and Congress* (May 11, 2009), <https://lawfare.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/staging/2017/2009%20Eric%20Holder%20memo.pdf> (emphasis added).

³ Jane Chong, *White House Interference with Justice Department Investigations? That 2009 Holder Memo*, LAWFARE (Feb. 22, 2017, 4:12 PM), <https://www.lawfareblog.com/white-house->



know whether the White House Chief of Staff is acting consistent with long-standing DOJ protocol. Moreover, the public deserves information regarding whether and to what extent the FBI may have agreed or acquiesced to disregarding DOJ protocol.

Requested Records

American Oversight requests that the Office of the Attorney General and the Justice Management Division produce the following within twenty business days:

A copy of the policy currently in effect that governs communications between DOJ and the White House.

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 DOJ 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.⁴ **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.**⁵

[interference-justice-department-investigations-2009-holder-memo](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/19/trump-administration-russia-reince-priebus); Edward Helmore, *White House Denies Reports of Russian Contacts Amid Search to Replace Flynn*, THE GUARDIAN, Feb. 19, 2017, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/19/trump-administration-russia-reince-priebus>.

⁴ See *Competitive Enter. Inst. v. Office of Sci. & Tech. Policy*, 827 F.3d 145, 149–50 (D.C. Cir. 2016); cf. *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Kerry*, 844 F.3d 952, 955–56 (D.C. Cir. 2016).

⁵ 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

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 DOJ’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 custodian-driven searches.**⁶ 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 DOJ’s archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone. Accordingly, American Oversight insists that DOJ 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.”⁷ 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.”⁸ 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.”⁹ Further, “the withholding agency must supply ‘a relatively detailed

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)).

⁶ Presidential Memorandum—Managing Government Records, 76 Fed. Reg. 75,423 (Nov. 28, 2011), <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/11/28/presidential-memorandum-managing-government-records>; Office of Mgmt. & Budget, Exec. Office of the President, Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments & Independent Agencies, “Managing Government Records Directive,” M-12-18 (Aug. 24, 2012), <https://www.archives.gov/files/records-mgmt/m-12-18.pdf>.

⁷ FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 § 2 (Pub. L. No. 114-185).

⁸ *Founding Church of Scientology v. Bell*, 603 F.2d 945, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

⁹ *King v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 830 F.2d 210, 223–24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (emphasis in original).

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.”¹⁰

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.¹¹ 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.

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, DOJ 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 DOJ 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 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(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.¹² Moreover, the request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.¹³

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

¹⁰ *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)).

¹¹ *Mead Data Central*, 566 F.2d at 261.

¹² 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(2).

¹³ *Id.*

operations or activities of the government.”¹⁴ The requested records are directly related to the work of the highest levels of leadership at DOJ. There is significant interest in the subject of these records, both from the American people at large as well as the U.S. Congress.¹⁵ The requested records will help American Oversight and the general public understand whether and to what extent political considerations are influencing or outweighing legal principles as DOJ sets its investigative priorities. American Oversight is committed to transparency and makes the responses agencies provide to FOIA requests publicly available. As noted, the subject of this request is a matter of public interest, and the public’s understanding of the government’s activities would be enhanced through American Oversight’s analysis and publication of these records.

This request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.¹⁶ 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 its public website and promotes their availability on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter.¹⁷ 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,¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ As another example, American Oversight has a project called “Audit the Wall,” where the organization is gathering and analyzing information and commenting on public releases of

¹⁴ 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(2)(i), (ii)(A)–(B).

¹⁵ See Spencer Ackerman, *House Republicans Declare War on FBI, Vote to Spill Its Secrets and Investigate It*, DAILY BEAST (Jan. 29, 2018, 7:10 PM), <https://www.thedailybeast.com/fbi-scrambling-to-get-more-info-on-explosive-nunes-memo-ahead-of-vote-to-release-it>; Jeremy Herb & Manu Raju, *House Intel Committee Votes to Release Nunes Memo on FBI*, CNN (Jan 30, 2018, 1:01 PM), <https://www.cnn.com/2018/01/29/politics/house-intelligence-committee-devin-nunes-memo/index.html>; Jacobs, *supra* note 1; Laura Jarrett, *Justice Dept.: ‘Reckless’ to Release Nunes Memo Without Review*, CNN (Jan. 24, 2018, 9:11 PM), <https://www.cnn.com/2018/01/24/politics/nunes-memo-fbi/index.html>.

¹⁶ 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(iii)(A)–(B).

¹⁷ American Oversight currently has approximately 11,800 page likes on Facebook, and 39,200 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, <https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/> (last visited Jan. 24, 2018); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <https://twitter.com/weareoversight> (last visited Jan. 30, 2018).

¹⁸ *DOJ Civil Division Response Noel Francisco Compliance*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance>.

¹⁹ *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-doj-documents>.

information related to the administration's proposed construction of a barrier along the U.S.-Mexico border.²⁰

Accordingly, American Oversight qualifies for a fee waiver.

Conclusion

We share a common mission to promote transparency in government. American Oversight looks forward to working with DOJ on this request. If you do not understand any part of this request, Cerissa Cafasso at foia@americanoversight.org or 202.869.5244. Also, if American Oversight's request for a fee waiver is not granted in full, please contact us immediately upon making such a determination.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Austin R. Evers". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

Austin R. Evers
Executive Director
American Oversight

²⁰ *Audit the Wall*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, www.auditthewall.org.