VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

FOIA/PA Request
FOIA and Transparency
Department of the Treasury
Washington, DC 20220
treasoia@treasury.gov

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request (Expedited Processing Requested)

Dear FOIA Officer:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, and the implementing regulations of the Department of the Treasury (Treasury), 31 C.F.R. Part 1, American Oversight makes the following request for records.

Congress is currently attempting to pass tax reform legislation containing significant tax cuts, with a bill already passed in the House of Representatives, and another bill pending before the Senate. Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin has repeatedly claimed that the tax cuts in the proposed legislation would stimulate enough economic growth to more than pay for the cuts themselves.\(^1\) Recent reports, however, indicate that Treasury may not, in fact, have conducted any analysis to support that claim.\(^2\) American Oversight submits this request to shed light on the actual economic impact of the proposed tax reform legislation.

Requested Records

American Oversight requests that the Office of the Secretary and the Office of Legislative Affairs produce the following records on an expedited basis for the reasons identified below:

Any report, modeling, analysis, assessment, or other estimate regarding the economic impact of proposed tax reform legislation, including its impact on fiscal revenues. This request includes any analysis of tax reform legislation using so-called “dynamic scoring.” American Oversight seeks only any such analyses that were sent, given, or otherwise made available to anyone outside the Department of the Treasury, including to other agencies,


such as the White House Council of Economic Advisers, or to anyone outside the Executive Branch of the federal government, such as to Congress or any outside think tank or advocacy group.

Please provide all responsive records from August 1, 2017, to the date the search is conducted.

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 Treasury 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.

---


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-related email in the [personal] account was duplicated in [the official’s] work email account.”) (citations omitted)).
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 Treasury’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 Treasury’s archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone. Accordingly, American Oversight insists that Treasury 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

---

3 Founding Church of Scientology v. Bell, 603 F.2d 945, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1979).
5 Id. at 224 (citing Mead Data Central, Inc. v. U.S. Dept 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. 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, Treasury 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 Treasury 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 31 C.F.R. § 1.7(d)(1), 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 disclosure of the information sought under this request will document and reveal the operations of the federal government, including the role executive branch officials are playing and have played in evaluating and promoting proposals to overhaul the federal tax code. In particular, this report will shed light on whether and to what extent the Department of the Treasury has conducted analysis regarding the impact of major

---

10 *Mead Data Central*, 566 F.2d at 261.
11 31 C.F.R. § 1.7(d)(1).
12 *Id.*
13 *Id.*
financial legislation, and whether any such analysis matches public rhetoric about the bill. Because the information sought is not currently public and bears on a substantive area of federal policy that affects all Americans, disclosure will contribute significantly to the public’s understanding of key Treasury operations and activities. And as described in more detail below, American Oversight will contribute to the general public’s understanding of Treasury’s role in federal tax reform by sharing the records it receives on its website and social media accounts.

This request is primarily and fundamentally not for 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.

Notwithstanding its fee waiver request, pursuant to 31 C.F.R. § 1.5(b)(7), American Oversight hereby states that it is willing to pay fees in an amount not more than $25.00.

14 Id.
Application for Expedited Processing

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(i) and 31 C.F.R. § 1.5(e)(2), American Oversight requests that Treasury expedite the processing of this request.

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.\(^\text{19}\) The records requested “pertain to a matter of current exigency to the American public” and “delaying a response to [this] request for records would compromise a significant recognized interest to and throughout the American general public.”\(^\text{20}\) Specifically, the tax code affects every American person and corporation, both by determining how much money individuals and businesses pay in taxes and by determining the revenue available for federal functions and programs. The public has a strong interest in understanding and participating in the national debate over major changes to federal tax policy, including any evaluations of the likely economic impact of such changes. The public further has a strong interest in understanding whether the executive branch’s internal analyses of the economic impact of tax reform legislation matches public rhetoric about the effect of any such bill. Delaying disclosure of the requested records would deprive Americans of their right to participate meaningfully in that debate, including by timely expressing their informed opinions to their members of Congress. Because the House of Representatives has already passed its version of the bill and the Senate is moving quickly to do the same,\(^\text{21}\) the American people simply cannot wait for disclosure of documents critical to their full participation in the democratic process.

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,\(^\text{22}\) 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.’”\(^\text{23}\) American Oversight uses the information it gathers, 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 promotes their availability on social

\(^{19}\) 31 C.F.R. § 1.5(e)(2)(ii).

\(^{20}\) Id.


media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter.\textsuperscript{24} 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,\textsuperscript{25} 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.\textsuperscript{26} 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.\textsuperscript{27}

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

\textbf{Conclusion}

We share a common mission to promote transparency in government. American Oversight looks forward to working with your agency 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 Sara Creighton 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,

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textbf{Austin R. Evers} \\
Executive Director \\
American Oversight
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{24} American Oversight currently has approximately 11,700 page likes on Facebook and 37,400 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, \url{https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/} (last visited Nov. 28, 2017); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, \url{https://twitter.com/weareoversight} (last visited Nov. 28, 2017).

\textsuperscript{25} DOJ Civil Division Response Noel Francisco Compliance, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, \url{https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance}.

\textsuperscript{26} Francisco & the Travel Ban: What We Learned from the DOJ Documents, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, \url{https://www.americanoversight.org/francisco-the-travel-ban-what-we-learned-from-the-doj-documents}.

\textsuperscript{27} Audit the Wall, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, \url{wwwauditthewall.org}.