



June 12, 2018

**VIA ONLINE PORTAL**

National Freedom of Information Officer  
Office of Environmental Information  
Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW (2822T)  
Washington, DC 20460  
Via FOIAOnline

**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 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 40 C.F.R. Part 2, American Oversight makes the following request for records.

Yesterday, Rep. Elijah Cummings, Ranking Member of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, sent EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt a letter regarding the concerning statements former EPA employees have made to that committee with respect to EPA's handling of FOIA requests.<sup>1</sup> Ranking Member Cummings's letter reported that Administrator Pruitt has sought to delay the release of records created during his tenure partly through the implementation of a "first in, first out" FOIA request processing policy which may contradict EPA regulations and Department of Justice guidance.<sup>2</sup> The letter further reported that EPA documents show that the agency has instituted a new process requiring that FOIA responses undergo a review by senior political appointees before being released.<sup>3</sup>

American Oversight seeks records to determine whether EPA has improperly instituted FOIA request processing policies with the aim or effect of restricting the release of records responsive to FOIA requests and reducing transparency.

**Requested Records**

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter from Rep. Elijah Cummings, Ranking Mem., Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, U.S. House of Representatives, to Scott Pruitt, EPA Administrator (June 11, 2018), <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/4501188/Rep-Elijah-Cummings-D-Md-Letter-on-EPA-s-FOIA.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*



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), any handwritten or electronic notes taken during any oral communications, summaries of any oral communications, or other materials) concerning the involvement of the individuals below in the processing of FOIA requests, including these individuals' involvement in the processing of specific FOIA requests:

- 1) Scott Pruitt
- 2) Andrew Wheeler
- 3) Ryan Jackson
- 4) Kevin Chmielewski
- 5) Millan Hupp
- 6) Liz Bowman
- 7) Amy Graham
- 8) Sarah Greenwalt

Please provide all responsive records from January 20, 2017, to the date the search is conducted.

This request seeks communications concerning the involvement of these individuals in the development of FOIA practices and policies including, but not limited to, the order in which EPA FOIA requests are processed, EPA's processes for prioritizing the processing of FOIA requests, EPA's process for determining whether a FOIA request is "reasonably described," EPA's processes for responding to requests directed at the Office of the Administrator, and EPA's processes for the review of FOIA requests or responses by political appointees or White House staff. The request also seeks records reflecting communications concerning the involvement of the individuals listed above in processing and responding to specific FOIA requests. To be clear, this request seeks all records reflecting communications concerning these individuals' involvement in FOIA processing and is not limited to the specific topics described here.

In addition to the records requested above, we also request 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 EPA 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.<sup>4</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; we have 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>5</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 EPA’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.**<sup>6</sup> 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 EPA’s archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone. Accordingly, American Oversight insist that EPA 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. We are 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.”<sup>7</sup> If it is your position that any portion of the requested records is exempt from disclosure, we request 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

---

<sup>4</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>5</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>6</sup> 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>.

<sup>7</sup> FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 § 2 (Pub. L. No. 114–185).

specificity “to permit a reasoned judgment as to whether the material is actually exempt under FOIA.”<sup>8</sup> 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.”<sup>9</sup> 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.’”<sup>10</sup>

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.<sup>11</sup> 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, EPA 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, we welcome 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, we 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, 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 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l), 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.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, the request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> *Founding Church of Scientology v. Bell*, 603 F.2d 945, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

<sup>9</sup> *King v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 830 F.2d 210, 223–24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (emphasis in original).

<sup>10</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>11</sup> *Mead Data Central*, 566 F.2d at 261.

<sup>12</sup> 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(1).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

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>14</sup> As discussed above, this request seeks records with the potential to shed light on EPA's processing of FOIA requests. The American public deserves to know if EPA has taken action to restrict the public's access to information about EPA's activities through potentially improper FOIA processing practices and policies. The serious issues Ranking Member Cummings has raised<sup>15</sup> regarding EPA's potential manipulation of FOIA processing have garnered significant public attention and substantial media coverage.<sup>16</sup>

This request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup> 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,<sup>19</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>20</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

---

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*; see also 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(2)(i)-(iv).

<sup>15</sup> Letter from Rep. Cummings, *supra* note 1.

<sup>16</sup> Valerie Volcovici, *Top House Democrat Presses EPA's Scott Pruitt on Records Request Delays*, REUTERS (June 11, 2018, 12:39 PM), <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-epa-foia/top-house-democrat-presses-epas-pruitt-on-records-request-delays-idUSKBN1J7233>; Benjamin Siegel, *Dem: Pruitt's EPA Has Stalled Production of Public Records*, ABC NEWS (June 11, 2018, 12:11 PM), <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/dem-pruitts-epa-stalled-production-public-records/story?id=55809253>; Maegan Vazquez & Sara Ganim, *House Dem Accuses EPA of Dodging Public Records Requests*, CNN (June 11, 2018, 2:30 PM), <https://www.cnn.com/2018/06/11/politics/scott-pruitt-elijah-cummings-avoiding-foias/index.html>; Lorraine Chow, *Pruitt Ordered Staff to Delay FOIA Requests, Top House Dem Says*, ECOWATCH (June 11, 2018, 1:35 PM), <https://www.ecowatch.com/scott-pruitt-scandall-foia-2577200099.html>.

<sup>17</sup> 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(1); 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(3)(i)-(ii).

<sup>18</sup> American Oversight currently has over 11,900 page likes on Facebook, and nearly 43,900 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, <https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/> (last visited June 11, 2018); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <https://twitter.com/weareoversight> (last visited June 11, 2018).

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

<sup>20</sup> *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>.

information related to the administration's proposed construction of a barrier along the U.S.-Mexico border.<sup>21</sup>

Accordingly, this request qualifies for a fee waiver.

### **Conclusion**

We share a common mission to promote transparency in government. We look forward to working with EPA 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](mailto:foia@americanoversight.org) or 202.897.4213. Also, if our request for a fee waiver is not granted in full, please contact us immediately upon making such a determination.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Austin R. Evers". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

Austin R. Evers  
Executive Director  
American Oversight

---

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