



January 23, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

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

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Freedom of Information 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.

At least four people responsible for raising funds for President Donald Trump's 2016 campaign or his 2017 inaugural festivities now hold influential positions at the Department of the Treasury. Secretary Steven Mnuchin was the finance chairman for Trump's 2016 campaign and himself a campaign donor¹; Chief of Staff Eli Miller was the Chief Operating Officer of Finance for Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.²; Deputy Chief of Staff Alden Wood served in the finance department of the Republican National Committee and as finance director for the president's inaugural committee³; and White House Liaison J. Baylor Myers served as regional finance director for the Trump campaign, based in New York.⁴ American Oversight seeks records with the potential to shed light on whether and to what extent top donors to the Trump campaign and outside organizations supporting his candidacy, along with top financial supporters of his inaugural committee, have gained access to top Treasury officials or influenced policy at Treasury.

Requested Records

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

¹ See THE WHITE HOUSE, *Biography of Stephen T. Mnuchin*, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/people/stephen-mnuchin/>; Ashley Balcerzak, *Following the Money of Trump's Treasury Hopefuls*, OPENSECRETS.ORG, Nov. 14, 2016, <https://www.opensecrets.org/news/2016/11/following-the-money-of-trumps-treasury-hopefuls/>.

² See DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, *Biography of Eli Miller*, <https://home.treasury.gov/about/general-information/officials/eli-h-miller>.

³ See DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, *Biography of Alden Wood*, <https://www.treasury.gov/about/organizational-structure/Pages/alden-wood.aspx>.

⁴ See Personal Financial Disclosure of John Baylor Myers, <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/4388287-John-Baylor-Myers-Financial-Disclosure.html>.



All records reflecting communications (including emails, email attachments, text messages, messages on messaging platforms (such as Slack, GChat or Google Hangouts, Lync, Skype, or WhatsApp), telephone call logs, calendar invitations, calendar entries, meeting notices, meeting agendas, informational material, talking points, any handwritten or electronic notes taken during any oral communications, summaries of any oral communications, or other materials) between (a) Secretary Steven Mnuchin, (b) Chief of Staff Eli Miller, (c) Deputy Chief of Staff Alden Wood, or (d) White House Liaison Baylor Myers and any of the individuals or entities listed below or any person acting on their behalves.

1. Robert, Diana & Rebekah Mercer
2. Bernard & Billi Marcus
3. Isaac & Laura Perlmutter
4. Andrew & Simona Beal
5. Ronald & Nina Cameron
6. Robert & Janice McNair
7. Stephen & Gisella Feinberg
8. Cerberus Capital Management
9. Peter & Maria Zieve
10. Peter Thiel
11. Irving & Cherna Moskowitz
12. Walter & Marjorie Buckley
13. Sheldon & Miriam Adelson
14. Hushang & Shahla Ansary
15. Phillip & Olesandra Ruffin
16. Roderick & Leslie Aycox
17. Scott Bessent
18. Christopher Cline
19. Steven A. Cohen
20. Clifford Forrest
21. John B. Hess
22. Bradley Wayne Hughes Jr.
23. Robert W. Johnson IV
24. Joseph Craft III
25. Shahid R. Kahn
26. Henry R. Kravis
27. Stanley E. Kroenke
28. Shalabh "Shalli" Kumar
29. Howard W. Lutnick
30. Robert C. McNair
31. Ronnie J. Ory
32. Doug Manchester
33. Robert R. Parsons
34. Claudine Revere
35. Joe & Marlene Ricketts
36. Charles Schwab
37. Alexander Shustorovich

38. Herbert J. & Jeanne Sorenson Siegel
39. Paul E. Singer
40. Daniel M. Snyder

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 are 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 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.**⁷ Furthermore, agencies that have adopted the National Archives and

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

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 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.”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 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, Treasury is on notice that litigation is reasonably foreseeable.

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).

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.

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 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 government operations or activities.¹³ Specifically, the requested records have the potential to shed light on whether and to what extent financial supporters of President Trump are given special access to agency officials. The requested records also have the potential to shed light on whether and to what extent financial supporters of the president’s campaign have influenced the policy decisions of Treasury officials who were also previously involved in raising money for the president’s campaign. 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. Specifically, the use of taxpayer dollars to financially benefit the president is a matter of serious public concern and interest, and the public deserves access to the requested information as there are ethical implications if agency officials have made decisions that inure to the private benefit of the president or his financial supporters.

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

¹³ 31 C.F.R. § 1.7(d)(1).

promotes their availability on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter.¹⁴ 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,¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷

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.

Conclusion

We share a common mission to promote transparency in government. American Oversight looks forward to working with Treasury 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 Dan McGrath at foia@americanoversight.org or 202.897.4213. 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

¹⁴ American Oversight currently has approximately 12,100 page likes on Facebook and 49,700 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, <https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/> (last visited Jan. 23, 2019); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <https://twitter.com/weareoversight> (last visited Jan. 23, 2019).

¹⁵ *DOJ Records Relating to Solicitor General Noel Francisco's Recusal*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance>.

¹⁶ *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>.

¹⁷ *Audit the Wall*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/investigation/audit-the-wall>.