



April 23, 2019

VIA EMAIL

Alexis R. Graves
Departmental FOIA Officer
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1400 Independence Avenue SW
South Building, Room 4104
Washington, DC 20250-0706
USDAFOIA@ocio.usda.gov

USDA Forest Service
FOIA Service Center
1400 Independence Avenue SW
Mail Stop: 1143
Washington, DC 20250-1143
wo_foia@fs.fed.us

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 of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), 7 C.F.R. Part 1, American Oversight makes the following request for records.

In and around December 2018, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) scaled back and ultimately halted studies of mining in the area surrounding the mining leases of Twin Metals in Minnesota, near the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. During this time, the Bureau of Land Management also renewed Twin Metals's mining leases, following two years of the Trump administration working to reverse prior decisions that would ban new mining developments in the Boundary Canoe Area Wilderness and that denied Twin Metals's application for renewal.¹

Twin Metals is a subsidiary of the Chilean mining giant Antofagasta PLC, which is run by the family of billionaire Andronico Luksic. Mr. Luksic is also the landlord of Ivanka Trump and Jared Kushner in Washington, D.C.²

American Oversight seeks records to shed light on any outside influence shaping the decision to allow Twin Metals to renew its mining leases in Minnesota.

¹ Dan Kraker, *Trump Administration Gives Twin Metals New Lease on Copper-Nickel Mining*, MPR NEWS, Dec. 20, 2018, <https://www.mprnews.org/story/2018/12/20/feds-move-to-formally-renew-leases-for-twin-metals-mine>.

² Juliet Eilperin, *Trump Administration Renews Mining Leases Near Minnesota Wilderness, Reversing Obama*, WASH. POST, Dec. 23, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/12/23/trump-administration-renews-mining-leases-near-minnesota-wilderness-area/?utm_term=.e7275c8d93d7.



Requested Records

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

All communications (including email messages, email attachments, calendar invitations or entries, and any handwritten or typed notes from meetings) between the custodians listed below and the following individuals and entities, regarding the mining leases of Twin Metals in Minnesota:

- a. Representative Tom Emmer, and anyone acting on his behalf or serving on his staff, including but not limited to Christopher Maneval (Christopher.Maneval@mail.house.gov), David Fitzsimmons (David.fitzsimmons@mail.house.gov), Alyssa Anderson (alyssa.anderson@mail.house.gov), Landon Zinda (landon.zinda@mail.house.gov), and Catherine Lenz (Catherine.lenz@mail.house.gov).
- b. Representative Paul Gosar, and anyone acting on his behalf or serving on his staff, including but not limited to Thomas Van Flein (tom.vanflein@mail.house.gov), Leslie Foti (leslie.foti@mail.house.gov), Rory Burke (rory.burke@mail.house.gov), and Jeff Small (jeff.small@mail.house.gov).

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

We request that USDA's search include the records of the following custodians:

- i. The Secretary, Deputy Secretary, anyone serving as a Chief of Staff or Deputy Chief of Staff, and anyone serving on behalf of the aforementioned individuals such as an executive assistant or scheduler;
- ii. The General Counsel, Deputy General Counsel, and anyone serving as a Chief of Staff or Deputy Chief of Staff;
- iii. The Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, the Chief of Staff to the Assistant Secretary, Senior Congressional Advisor for the U.S. Forest Service, and any other political appointees* in the Office of Congressional Relations.

We request that USFS's search include the records of the following custodians:

- i. The Chief Forester;
- ii. The Associate Chief Forester;
- iii. The Chief of Staff to the Chief Forester;
- iv. The Director, Deputy Director, Chief of Staff, and anyone serving in an acting role in these positions in the Office of Legislative Affairs;
- v. The Deputy Chief and Associate Deputy Chief, Research and Development;
- vi. The Deputy Chief and Associate Deputy Chief, National Forest System;
- vii. The Deputy Chief and Associate Deputy Chief, State and Private Forestry; and
- viii. The Deputy Chief and Associate Deputy Chief, Business Operations and Policy

*"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 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, 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.³ **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.**⁴

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**

³ 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).

⁴ 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)).

manage information electronically by the end of 2016, it is no longer reasonable to rely exclusively on custodian-driven searches.⁵ 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 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."⁶ 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."⁷ 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."⁸ 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.'"⁹

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.¹⁰ 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.

⁵ 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>.

⁶ FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 § 2 (Pub. L. No. 114-185).

⁷ *Founding Church of Scientology v. Bell*, 603 F.2d 945, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

⁸ *King v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, 830 F.2d 210, 223-24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (emphases in original).

⁹ *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)).

¹⁰ *Mead Data Central*, 566 F.2d at 261.

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, you are 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 your agency undertakes a search or incurs 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 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 7 C.F.R. Part 1, Subpart A, Appendix A, Section 6, American Oversight requests a waiver of fees associated with processing this request for records. Disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest as it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of government operations and activities.¹¹ 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 federal government. The records squarely concern the operations or activities of the federal government and will reveal whether and to what extent outside interests improperly influenced decisions surrounding studies and other issues relating to mining near the Boundary Canoe Area Wilderness. American taxpayers have a significant interest in ensuring that the public servants act free from inappropriate influence. And, as described in more detail below, American Oversight will disseminate the information to a reasonably broad audience of persons through its social media accounts and its website.

This request is primarily and fundamentally not for commercial purposes, but rather the primary interest is in public disclosure of responsive records.¹² 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

¹¹ 7 C.F.R. Part 1, Subpart A, Appendix A, Section 6(a)(1)(i)-(iv); *see, e.g., McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Carlucci*, 835 F.2d 1282, 1285 (9th Cir. 1987).

¹² 7 C.F.R. Part 1, Subpart A, Appendix A, Section 6(a)(1)(v)-(vi).

availability on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter.¹³ 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,¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶

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 your agency 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 foia@americanoversight.org 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
American Oversight

¹³ 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. 22, 2019); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <https://twitter.com/weareoversight> (last visited Apr. 22, 2019).

¹⁴ *DOJ Records Relating to Solicitor General Noel Francisco's Recusal*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance>.

¹⁵ *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>.

¹⁶ *Audit the Wall*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/investigation/audit-the-wall>.