July 24, 2017

VIA ONLINE PORTAL

Laura Magere  
Chief, Freedom of Information/Privacy Acts Office  
U.S. Small Business Administration  
409 3rd Street SW, 8th Floor  
Washington, DC 20416  
Online Request at FOIAonline

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Ms. Magere:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552 et seq. and the implementing regulations of the Small Business Administration (SBA), 13 C.F.R. Part 102, American Oversight makes the following request for records.

President Donald Trump has not eliminated his financial ties to the Trump Organization—a subject of significant media interest¹—and the head of your agency, Administrator Linda McMahon, is reported to have spent many nights at the Trump International Hotel Washington, DC.² The Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch prohibit employees from “[d]irectly or indirectly, giv[ing] a gift to or mak[ing] a donation toward a gift for an official superior.”³ Although this provision does not directly apply to Ms. McMahon because her superior is the president,⁴ ethical considerations are certainly implicated. American Oversight submits this request to understand how often Ms. McMahon stayed at the Trump property and how that decision was made.

Requested Records

American Oversight requests that SBA produce the following within twenty business days:

³ 5 C.F.R. § 2635.302(a)(1).  
⁴ 5 C.F.R. § 2635.303(d).
1. All calendar entries reflecting visits by Ms. McMahon to Trump International Hotel Washington, DC. “Visits” include meetings, meals/restaurant visits, and overnight stays. For calendar entries created in Outlook or similar programs, the documents should be produced in “memo” form to include all invitees, any notes, and all attachments. Please do not limit your search to Outlook calendars—we request the production of any calendar—paper or electronic, whether on government-issued or personal devices—used to track or coordinate how these individuals allocate their time on agency business.

2. All communications to, from, or within the Office of the Administrator regarding Ms. McMahon’s visits to the Trump International Hotel Washington, DC.

3. Records sufficient to demonstrate total costs reimbursed or paid directly by SBA for the Ms. McMahon’s visits to Trump International Hotel Washington, DC.

Please provide all responsive records from January 20, 2017, to the date the search is conducted.

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.

---

2 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-
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 SBA’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. 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 SBA’s archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone. Accordingly, American Oversight insists that SBA 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

related email in the [personal] account was duplicated in [the official’s] work email account.” (citations omitted)).


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


11 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)).
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.12 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, SBA 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 SBA 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 TIFF 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 rolling basis.

**Fee Waiver Request**

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii) and 13 C.F.R. § 102.6(e), 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.13 Moreover, the request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.14

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 government operations or activities.” Mr. Trump continues to benefit financially from the Trump Organization, including its for-profit clubs and hotels,16 and the head of your agency, Ms. McMahon, is reported to have spent many nights at one of those properties in Washington, DC—the Trump International Hotel.17 The subject of this request concerns the operations or activities of the government. American Oversight seeks agency records regarding where the agency

---

12 *Mead Data Central*, 566 F.2d at 261.
13 13 C.F.R. § 102.6(e).
14 *Id.*
15 *Id.*
16 Dan Alexander et al., *supra* note 1; Craig & Lipton, *supra* note 1.
head is having meetings and how taxpayer dollars may be used to reimburse costs of such meetings and, by extension, used to financially benefit the president. The disclosure of these records is likely to contribute to an understanding of government operations or activities. The records will evidence how the agency head analyzed her decision to select a lodging accommodation or meeting venue that financially benefits Mr. Trump and how and to what extent taxpayer dollars are being used to the president’s personal financial benefit. Disclosure of the requested information will contribute to public understanding. As discussed below American Oversight has both the ability and the intention to effectively convey the information it receives to the public. American Oversight does not have a commercial interest in the requested information. Disclosure of the requested information will contribute significantly to public understanding of government operations or activities. The use of taxpayer dollars to financially benefit the president is of serious concern, as are the ethical implications of agency heads making lodging decisions that inure to the benefit of the president. The requested records will fill in certain information gaps that presently exist in the public reporting of how agency heads came to stay at Trump International Hotel.

This request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes. 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. 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. 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 information related to the administration’s proposed construction of a barrier along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Accordingly, American Oversight qualifies for a fee waiver.

---

18 13 C.F.R. § 102.6(e).
Conclusion

We share a common mission to promote transparency in government. American Oversight looks forward to working with SBA 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 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