



December 3, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Freedom of Information Officer
Department of Health & Human Services
Hubert H. Humphrey Building, Room 729H
200 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20201
FOIARequest@hhs.gov

Freedom of Information Officer
Administration for Children & Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
330 C Street SW
Washington, DC 20201
FOIA@acf.hhs.gov

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Freedom of Information Officers:

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 and its component, the Administration for Children & Families (ACF).

On November 13, 2018, *Politico* reported that Scott Lloyd—the former Director of ACF’s Office of Refugee Resettlement with controversial anti-abortion views¹—has been working on a book about his anti-abortion beliefs during his employment with HHS.² Ethics laws and regulations generally

¹ See, e.g., Roque Planas & Elise Foley, *Anti-Abortion Crusader Scott Lloyd Out at Refugee Resettlement Agency*, HUFFINGTON POST (Nov. 19, 2018, 6:35 PM), https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/anti-abortion-crusader-scott-lloyd-pushed-out-of-refugee-resettlement-agency_us_5bf34051e4b0d9e7283c4652; Rachel Siegel, *The Trump Official Who Tried to Stop a Detained Immigrant From Getting an Abortion*, WASH. POST, Oct. 26, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-nation/wp/2017/10/26/the-trump-official-who-tried-to-stop-a-detained-immigrant-from-getting-an-abortion/?utm_term=.b04c722b9e97.

² Dan Diamond, *Trump’s Refugee Director Planning Anti-Abortion Book*, POLITICO (Nov. 13, 2018, 3:21 PM), <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/11/13/scott-lloyd-anti-abortion-book-961552>.



prohibit federal employees from participating in matters outside of their official work in which they have a financial interest or where the subject matter overlaps with their official responsibilities such that a conflict or appearance of a conflict could arise.³ As *Político* reports, “[g]overnment employees typically are discouraged from writing books about subjects that overlap with their official responsibilities,” and so, “HHS lawyers have been involved in the matter” of Lloyd’s book.⁴

American Oversight seeks records with the potential to shed light on whether and to what extent Scott Lloyd has complied with his ethics obligations.

Requested Records

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

All communications (including emails, email attachments, calendar invitations, calendar entries, meeting notices, meeting agendas, any handwritten or electronic notes taken during any oral communications, or summaries of any oral communications) concerning any book or similar publication written or planned by Scott Lloyd, any related publishing agreement, and/or any related ethical obligations and/or determinations.

HHS and ACF are in the best position to determine the components and offices that are likely to have records responsive to this request. However, American Oversight requests that HHS search, at a minimum, the following agency personnel and offices for responsive records:

1. Former Secretary Tom Price
2. Secretary Alex Azar
3. Deputy Secretary Eric Hargan
4. Political appointees* in the Immediate Office of the General Counsel
5. Office of the General Counsel, Ethics Division, including but not limited to:
 - a. Elizabeth J. Fischmann or anyone else acting in the role of Designated Agency Ethics Official
 - b. Kathleen Silbaugh
 - c. Mary McPhail

³ See 18 U.S.C. § 208(a); 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502(a).

⁴ See Diamond, *supra* note 2; see also, e.g., Letter from James N. Mattis, then-nominee for Secretary of Defense, to Hon. Jennifer M. O’Connor, General Counsel and Designated Agency Ethics Official, Department of Defense (Jan. 5, 2017), [https://extapps2.oge.gov/201/Presiden.nsf/PAS+Index/2EB12A932B2A7958852580A1002C7CAB/\\$FILE/MATTIS%20James%20%20Ethics%20Agreement.pdf](https://extapps2.oge.gov/201/Presiden.nsf/PAS+Index/2EB12A932B2A7958852580A1002C7CAB/$FILE/MATTIS%20James%20%20Ethics%20Agreement.pdf) (ethics agreement for appointment as Secretary of Defense, including, among other items, agreement not to “engage in any writing, editing, or promotional activities associated with [a book previously written and subject to a Random House publishing agreement] and [not to] provide any other services under the publishing agreement” during appointment).

In addition, American Oversight requests that ACF search, at a minimum the following agency personnel and offices for responsive records:

1. Political appointees* in the Immediate Offices of the Assistant Secretary, Chief of Staff, and Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary
2. Immediate Office of the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement
3. Immediate Office of Administration, including but not limited to:
 - a. Ben Goldhaber or anyone else acting in the role of Deputy Ethics Counselor
 - b. Donnell Savage or anyone else acting in the role of Ethics Coordinator or Ethics Officer

*“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.

Please provide all responsive records from March 1, 2017, through the date of search.

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 HHS 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.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**

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).

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 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

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).

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

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 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

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.

¹³ 45 C.F.R. § 5.54(a).

¹⁴ *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 the operations or activities of the government.”¹⁵ There has been extensive media coverage of and public attention on Scott Lloyd’s activities as the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, including his anti-abortion actions and his role in the migrant family separation crisis, as well as his recently reported book.¹⁶ There is also substantial public interest in ethical concerns related to the administration, generally.¹⁷ This request goes directly to federal government operations and activities related to such concerns, and the requested records will significantly increase the general public’s understanding of the government’s efforts, if any, to address ethics concerns related to Scott Lloyd.

This request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ American

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

¹⁶ See Planas & Foley, *supra* note 1; Siegel, *supra* note 1; Diamond, *supra* note 2; Adam Cancryn & Renuka Rayasam, *Meet the Anti-Abortion Trump Appointee Taking Care of Separated Kids*, POLITICO (June 21, 2018, 12:32 PM), <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/06/21/scott-lloyd-anti-abortion-separated-kids-642094>; Jeremy W. Peters, *Under Trump, an Office Meant to Help Refugees Enters the Abortion Wars*, N.Y. TIMES, Apr. 5, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/05/us/politics/refugee-office-abortion-trump.html>; Donna Liberman & Paige Austin, *The 1,500 ‘Missing’ Kids Are the Lucky Ones*, N.Y. TIMES, May 31, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/31/opinion/missing-immigrant-children.html>; Hannah Levintova, *The Trump Official Who Failed to Reunify Dozens of Separated Children Is Getting a New Role*, MOTHER JONES, Jan./Feb. 2019, <https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2018/11/scott-lloyd-abortion-child-migrants-office-of-refugee-resettlement/>; Tessa Stuart, *Trump’s Refugee Appointee Is Reportedly Writing an Anti-Abortion Book*, ROLLING STONE (Nov. 14, 2018, 1:50 PM), <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-news/scott-lloyd-anti-abortion-book-756103/>.

¹⁷ See, e.g., Larry Buchanan & Karen Yourish, *From Criminal Convictions to Ethical Lapses: The Range of Misconduct in Trump’s Orbit*, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 1, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/09/01/us/politics/trump-officials-crimes-and-ethical-violations.html?mtrref=www.google.com&gwh=C6E88FBE3EFA2E57347F37887175C6F7&gwt=pay>; Scott Simon, *Government Ethics in the Trump Administration*, NPR (Aug. 11, 2018, 8:19 AM), <https://www.npr.org/2018/08/11/637780576/government-ethics-in-the-trump-administration>; Jeffrey M. Jones, *Trump Administration Officials get Low Marks on Ethics*, GALLUP, May 24, 2018, <https://news.gallup.com/poll/234974/trump-administration-officials-low-marks-ethics.aspx>.

¹⁸ 45 C.F.R. § 5.54(b)(3)(i)-(ii).

¹⁹ American Oversight currently has approximately 12,100 page likes on Facebook, and 49,200 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, <https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/>

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,²⁰ 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.²¹ 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.²²

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 and ACF 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 202.873.3918. 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

(last visited Dec. 3, 2018); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <https://twitter.com/weareoversight> (last visited Dec. 3, 2018).

²⁰ *DOJ Civil Division Response Noel Francisco Compliance*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance>.

²¹ *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>.

²² *Audit the Wall*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/investigation/audit-the-wall>.