

April 9, 2019

## **VIA ONLINE PORTAL**

NHTSA Executive Secretariat 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE West Building, 41-304 Washington, D.C. 20590 via Online Portal

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 Transportation (DOT), 49 C.F.R. Part 7, American Oversight makes the following request for records from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

American Oversight promotes accountability in government through transparency, informing the public's right to know what the government is up to. Since the president took office in January 2017, the administration has experienced a revolving door of senior personnel. With scores of new individuals joining the government in key, senior positions, it is essential to understand who they are and the backgrounds they bring to their work. Without such transparency, the public cannot have confidence that government decisions are shaped by the interests of the American people, not personal or professional allegiances.

## Requested Records

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

1. Records sufficient to identify all employees who entered into a position at NHTSA as "political appointees" since January 20, 2017, and the title or position of each employee (to the extent that such individuals have held multiple titles or positions since January 20, 2017, identify each title or position). For purposes of this request, please consider any employee in a PAS position, a presidentially-appointed position, a non-career SES position, or a Schedule C position a "political appointee."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Politico Staff, The Revolving Door of Trump's Cabinet, POLITICO (Nov. 16, 2018, 4:00PM), <a href="https://www.politico.com/interactives/2018/interactive\_trump-cabinet-departures/">https://www.politico.com/interactives/2018/interactive\_trump-cabinet-departures/</a>.



- 2. Records sufficient to identify all career employees who have been detailed into a leadership office or component front office since January 20, 2017; the title or position of each employee while on detail (to the extent that such individuals have held multiple titles or positions since January 20, 2017, identify each title or position); and each employee's originating agency or component, and title.
- 3. Records sufficient to identify the members of any "beachhead teams" who joined the agency at the beginning of the Trump administration, and the title or position of each employee (to the extent that such individuals have held multiple titles or positions since January 20, 2017, identify each title or position).
- 4. For each individual identified in response to requests 1 to 3:
  - a. The resume provided by the individual to the agency in connection with determining the appropriate salary for the individual, or, if that is not available, a recent resume contained within the agency's records. We have no objection to the redaction of contact information (addresses, telephone numbers, e-mail addresses) for the employee or references, or to the redaction of past salary information. Employment, education, and professional association information is not exempt, and we object to any redactions of such information.
  - b. Any conflicts or ethics waivers or authorizations issued for the individual, including authorizations pursuant to 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502.
  - c. Records sufficient to identify the members of the "landing teams" or "transition teams" who were embedded with the agency for transition purposes by the Trump transition organization between the November 2016 election and the Trump administration.

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 your agency 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 are subject to the Federal Records Act and FOIA.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

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 your agency'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 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 your agency's archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone. Accordingly, American Oversight insists that your agency 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

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> 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)).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Presidential Memorandum—Managing Government Records, 76 Fed. Reg. 75,423 (Nov. 28, 2011), <a href="https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/11/28/presidential-memorandum-managing-government-records">https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/11/28/presidential-memorandum-managing-government-records</a>; 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), <a href="https://www.archives.gov/files/records-mgmt/m-12-18.pdf">https://www.archives.gov/files/records-mgmt/m-12-18.pdf</a>.

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 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, your agency 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 your agency 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

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 § 2 (Pub. L. No. 114–185).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Founding Church of Scientology v. Bell, 603 F.2d 945, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> King v. U.S. Dep't of Justice, 830 F.2d 210, 223–24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (emphases in original).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> *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)).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Mead Data Central, 566 F.2d at 261.

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 49 C.F.R. §§ 7.42(i), 7.43(c), 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. Durposes.

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 and activities.<sup>12</sup> The requested records directly concern identifiable operations or activities of the government—namely, the background and qualifications of appointed and career employees working for the agency. Since January 20, 2017, the Trump administration has been appointing or assigning individuals to play significant roles in shaping the agenda of every federal agency, with frequent changes along the way.<sup>13</sup> Identifying who these people are, and the background and perspectives that they bring to their jobs as federal employees, is essential to informing the public regarding the operations and decisionmaking of the federal government. In particular, only with clarity regarding the identity and background of these appointees can the public make informed assessments regarding whether decisions might have been influenced by conflicts of interest among the decisionmakers and whether those employees have personal or private interests affected by their policy actions. 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. 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> 49 C.F.R. § 7.43(c).

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> 49 C.F.R. § 7.43(c)(1)-(4).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> See, e.g., Politico Staff, supra note 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Id.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> American Oversight currently has approximately 12,200 page likes on Facebook and 54,200 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, <a href="https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/">https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/</a>

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, <sup>16</sup> 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. <sup>17</sup> 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. <sup>18</sup>

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 NHTSA 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 Hart Wood at <a href="mailto:foia@americanoversight.org">foia@americanoversight.org</a> or (202) 873-1743. 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

Austr Peus

American Oversight

(last visited Apr. 8, 2019); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <a href="https://twitter.com/weareoversight">https://twitter.com/weareoversight</a> (last visited Apr. 8, 2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> DOJ Civil Division Response Noel Francisco Compliance, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <a href="https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance">https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance</a>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Francisco & the Travel Ban: What We Learned from the DOJ Documents, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <a href="https://www.americanoversight.org/francisco-the-travel-ban-what-we-learned-from-the-doj-documents">https://www.americanoversight.org/francisco-the-travel-ban-what-we-learned-from-the-doj-documents</a>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Audit the Wall, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <a href="https://www.americanoversight.org/investigation/audit-the-wall">https://www.americanoversight.org/investigation/audit-the-wall</a>.