



April 26, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Chief, Freedom of Information/Privacy Acts Office
U.S. Small Business Administration
409 Third St. SW, Eighth Floor
Washington, DC 20416
FOIA@sba.gov

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear FOIA Officer:

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

Former SBA Administrator Linda McMahon's ethics agreement included the following passage: "Upon confirmation, I will resign from my positions as managing member of the following entities: McMahon Ventures, LLC; and Women's Leadership LIVE, LLC. . . . During my appointment, I will not manage these entities or provide any other services to them."¹ Despite pledging not to provide any services to Women's Leadership LIVE, LLC, Administrator McMahon continued to be featured on the Women's Leadership LIVE website,² social media posts,³ and events⁴ while she served as SBA administrator.

American Oversight seeks records to shed light on whether and to what extent former Administrator McMahon fulfilled her ethics commitments with respect to Women's Leadership LIVE.

¹ *OGE Communications About Trump Cabinet Member Ethics Agreements*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/5683590-OGE-Communications-About-Trump-Cabinet-Member.html#document/p62> at 59 (last visited Apr. 24, 2019).

² *Our Team*, WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP LIVE, <http://womensleadershiplive.com/about/our-team/> (last visited Apr. 24, 2019).

³ See, e.g., Women's Leadership LIVE (@womensleadershiplive), INSTAGRAM (Feb. 15, 2019), https://www.instagram.com/p/Bt536mIAPVo/?utm_source=ig_share_sheet&igshid=ije8qjroblss.

⁴ See, e.g., *Women's Leadership LIVE Tour Stops in DC*, Women's Leadership LIVE, YOUTUBE (Feb. 27, 2019), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8E93oeJwaoU&feature=youtu.be&inf_contact_key=dfd7c069fdb242fa64b56a44693a3aa.



Requested Records

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

All email communications (including email messages, attachments, and calendar invitations) between (1) any current or former political appointees* in the Office of the Administrator (including former Administrator McMahon) or the Office of Entrepreneurial Development and (2) any of the following individuals or any employee or representative of the following entities:

- a) Stacey Schieffelin
- b) Debbie Saviano
- c) Jo Packham
- d) David Schieffelin
- e) Sharon Tochterman
- f) Brian Glenn
- g) Kimberly Pitts
- h) Women's Leadership Live (@womensleadershiplive.com)
- i) ybf (your best friend) beauty (@ybfbeauty.com)
- j) Models Prefer Beauty
- k) Debbie Saviano LLC (@debbiesaviano.com)
- l) Mothers with Hope
- m) Where Women Create (@wherewomencreate.net)

Please provide all responsive records from February 14, 2017, through April 12, 2019.

*"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 an effort to accommodate SBA and reduce the number of potentially responsive records, American Oversight agrees that the search for responsive email communications may be limited to messages sent by the relevant SBA personnel. Despite this search accommodation, American Oversight still requests that complete email chains be produced, displaying both sent and received messages.

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.

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 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.**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 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**

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>.

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, 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

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.

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 your agency's implementing regulations, 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 public understanding of those operations. 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."¹³ The requested records directly concern identifiable operations or activities of the government—namely, communications of senior SBA personnel with a non-governmental organization ostensibly representing a network of small businesses. Given former Administrator McMahon's ties to Women's Leadership LIVE and the ambiguity as to her involvement during her official service at SBA, it is in the public interest to learn more about SBA's communications with this organization, whether and to what extent SBA allocated resources to it, and whether and to what extent this organization influenced SBA policy decisions. The requested records would thus "contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations and activities" of officials leading your agency.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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

¹³ 5 U.S.C. § 552a(4)(A)(iii).

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ American Oversight currently has approximately 12,200 page likes on Facebook and 54,100 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, <https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/> (last visited Apr. 26, 2019); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <https://twitter.com/weareoversight> (last visited Apr. 26, 2019).

senior DOJ attorney,¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹

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 you 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

¹⁷ *DOJ Records Relating to Solicitor General Noel Francisco's Recusal*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance>.

¹⁸ *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>.

¹⁹ *Audit the Wall*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/investigation/audit-the-wall>.