



August 31, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Michael Marquis
Freedom of Information Officer
Department of Health and Human Services
Hubert H. Humphrey Building, Room 729H
200 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20201
FOIARequest@hhs.gov

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Freedom of Information Act Officer:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, and the implementing regulations for the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), 45 C.F.R. Part 5, American Oversight makes the following request for records from HHS.

In May 2018, HHS announced its plans to “update the regulations governing the Title X family planning program,”¹ and on June 1, 2018, released its proposed rule entitled “Compliance with Statutory Program Integrity Requirements,” purportedly intended to “ensure compliance with, and enhance implementation of, the statutory requirement that none of the funds appropriated for Title X may be used in programs where abortion is a method of family planning and related statutory requirements.”² Critics have referred to the rule as a “gag rule,” and expressed concerns that it would significantly curtail women’s rights to obtain reproductive healthcare from certain

¹ Press Release, *HHS Announces Proposed Update to Title X Family Planning Grant Program*, DEP’T OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS. (May 22, 2018), <https://www.hhs.gov/about/news/2018/05/22/hhs-announces-proposed-update-to-title-x-family-planning-grant-program.html>; see also Press Release, *Statement from the Press Secretary Regarding the Proposed Title X Family Planning Program Rule from the Department of Health and Human Services*, THE WHITE HOUSE (May 18, 2018), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-press-secretary-regarding-proposed-title-x-family-planning-program-rule-department-health-human-services/>.

² Compliance with Statutory Program Integrity Requirements, 83 Fed. Reg. 25,502 (June 1, 2018), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/06/01/2018-11673/compliance-with-statutory-program-integrity-requirements>.



providers, obtain safe, legal abortions, and receive full and accurate information from their healthcare providers.³

Senate Democrats, echoing these concerns and referring to prior attempts by the administration “to curtail the reproductive rights of women and their access to information”—that may have been influenced by nongovernmental anti-choice groups—have sought records related to the proposed rule.⁴

American Oversight seeks records to shed light on the process surrounding HHS policymaking, and whether and to what extent external organizations have exerted influence over HHS policy decisions.

Requested Records

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

1. All records reflecting communications and meetings (including emails, email attachments, text messages, messages on messaging platforms (such as Slack, GChat or Google Hangouts, Lync, Skype, WhatsApp, Facebook Messenger, Twitter Direct Messages, or Signal), telephone call logs, calendar invitations/entries, meeting notices, meeting agendas, informational material, draft legislation, draft letters, talking points, any handwritten or electronic notes taken during any oral communications, summaries of any oral communications, or other materials) between any HHS political appointees* and any state government officials referring or related to HHS’s proposed rule entitled “Compliance with Statutory Program Integrity Requirements,” released for comment on June 1, 2018, 83 Fed. Reg. 25,502 (June 1, 2018).

³ See, e.g., *What Is the Trump-Pence Administration’s “Gag Rule?”*, PLANNED PARENTHOOD (May 18, 2018, 3:24 PM), <https://www.plannedparenthoodaction.org/blog/what-is-the-domestic-gag-rule>; Osub Ahmed, *What the Domestic Gag Rule Means for Title X Providers*, Ctr. for Am. Progress (July 20, 2018, 9:00 AM), <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/women/news/2018/07/20/453831/domestic-gag-rule-means-title-x-providers/>; Kinsey Hasstedt, *A Domestic Gag Rule and More: The Administration’s Proposed Changes to Title X*, GUTTMACHER INST. (June 18, 2018), <https://www.guttmacher.org/article/2018/06/domestic-gag-rule-and-more-administrations-proposed-changes-title-x>; see also Press Release, *AMA Opposes Proposed Rule on Title X Family Planning Program*, AM. MED. ASSOC. (July 31, 2018), <https://www.ama-assn.org/ama-opposes-proposed-rule-title-x-family-planning-program>.

⁴ Letter from Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Minority Member, U.S. House of Reps. Comm. on Oversight & Gov’t Reform, to Alex M. Azar II, Secretary, Dep’t of Health & Human Servs. (June 20, 2018), https://democrats-oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/documents/2471-Sharp%20Color%20Copier%40mail.house.gov_20180619_151309.pdf.

2. To the extent not responsive to part 1, any documents sent, exchanged, or otherwise made available for review between any HHS political appointees* and any state government officials referring or related to HHS's proposed rule entitled "Compliance with Statutory Program Integrity Requirements," released for comment on June 1, 2018, 83 Fed. Reg. 25,502 (June 1, 2018).

Please provide all responsive records from January 1, 2018, to the date the search is conducted.

HHS is in the best position to determine the components and offices that have records responsive to this request. However, American Oversight requests that HHS search, at a minimum, current and former political appointees* in the following components and offices: (i) the immediate Office of the Secretary; (ii) the immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary; (iii) the Executive Secretariat; (iv) the immediate office of the Assistant Secretary for Health; (v) the Office of Population Affairs; and (vi) the immediate office of the Director of the Office of Intergovernmental and External Affairs (IEA); and (vii) IEA Regional Offices 1-10.

*"Political appointee" should be understood as any person who is a Presidential Appointee with Senate Confirmation (PAS), a Presidential Appointee (PA), a non-career SES, any Schedule C employees, or any persons hired under Temporary Non-Career SES Appointments, Limited Term SES Appointments, or Temporary Transitional Schedule C Appointments.

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 you 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.⁵ **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.**⁶

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 HHS’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.**⁷ Furthermore, agencies that have adopted the National Archives and Records Administration (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 HHS’s archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone. Accordingly, American Oversight insists that HHS 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.”⁸ 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

⁵ 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).

⁶ 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)).

⁷ 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>.

⁸ FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 § 2 (Pub. L. No. 114-185).

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.”⁹ 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.”¹⁰ 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.’”¹¹

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.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, HHS 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 HHS 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 45 C.F.R. § 5.54, 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

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

¹⁰ *King v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 830 F.2d 210, 223–24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (emphases in original).

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)).

¹² *Mead Data Central*, 566 F.2d at 261.

better understanding of government operations 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 the operations or activities of the government.”¹⁵ The disclosure of the information sought under this request will document and reveal the activities of the federal government, including the process by which HHS policy decisions with national implications are reached, implemented, and overseen. The American people deserve to know the extent to which nongovernmental organizations are influencing internal HHS policymaking, and whether policy decisions are being made and implemented pursuant to a sound process. The records requested relate directly to the administration’s ongoing efforts to limit access to fulsome healthcare options, a subject of substantial public and media interest.¹⁶ In this case, disclosure of the requested information would contribute to the understanding of a reasonably broad audience of persons interested in the subject. And, as described in more detail below, American Oversight’s website and social media accounts demonstrate its ability and intention to effectively convey information to the public.

This request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.¹⁷ 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

¹³ 45 C.F.R. § 5.54(a).

¹⁴ 45 C.F.R. § 5.54(a).

¹⁵ 45 C.F.R. § 5.54(b)(1), (2)(i)-(ii).

¹⁶ See, e.g., *supra* note 3; Jessica Ravitz, *Trump Move to Defund Planned Parenthood Fulfills a Promise—And Promises a Battle*, CNN (May 22, 2018, 5:29 AM), <https://www.cnn.com/2018/05/22/health/title-x-planned-parenthood-defunding-reax-bn/index.html>; Christina Cauterucci, *New Trump Administration Rule Will Force Doctors to Stop Saying “Abortion”*, SLATE (May 18, 2018, 4:38 PM), <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2018/05/taking-aim-at-planned-parenthood-this-trump-administration-rule-will-force-doctors-to-stop-saying-abortion.html>; Katelyn Burns, *As Comment Period Closes, Doctors and Advocates Warn Title X ‘Gag Rule’ Will Cause ‘Unthinkable Harm’*, REWIRE NEWS (Aug. 2, 2018, 6:32 PM), <https://rewire.news/article/2018/08/02/as-comment-period-closes-doctors-and-advocates-warn-title-x-gag-rule-will-cause-unthinkable-harm/>; Jessie Hellmann & Peter Sullivan, *Washington’s Fall Agenda: Pre-existing Conditions Fight Takes Center Stage in Midterms*, THE HILL (Aug. 30, 2018, 6:00 AM), <http://thehill.com/policy/healthcare/404263-washingtons-fall-agenda-pre-existing-conditions-fight-takes-center-stage-in>; https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/to-your-health/wp/2018/01/19/hhs-releases-new-rule-on-health-workers-religious-moral-objections/?utm_term=.d725864c183d.

¹⁷ 45 C.F.R. § 5.54(b)(3)(i)-(ii).

promotes their availability on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter.¹⁸ 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,¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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.²¹

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 HHS 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 Katherine Anthony at foia@americanoversight.org or 202-897-3918. 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,



Austin R. Evers
Executive Director
American Oversight

¹⁸ American Oversight currently has over 11,800 page likes on Facebook, and 45,000 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, <https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/> (last visited Aug. 31, 2018); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <https://twitter.com/weareoversight> (last visited Aug. 31, 2018).

¹⁹ *DOJ Civil Division Response Noel Francisco Compliance*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance>.

²⁰ *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>.

²¹ *Audit the Wall*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/investigation/audit-the-wall>.