



June 21, 2019

VIA ONLINE PORTAL

Douglas Hibbard  
Chief, Initial Request Staff  
Office of Information Policy  
U.S. Department of Justice  
1425 New York Avenue NW  
Suite 11050  
Washington, DC 20530-0001  
Via FOIAOnline

Kevin Krebs  
Assistant Director, FOIA/Privacy Staff  
Executive Office for United States Attorneys  
U.S. Department of Justice  
175 N Street NE  
Suite 5.400  
Washington, DC 20530-0001  
Via FOIAOnline

**Re: Freedom of Information Act Request**

Dear Freedom of Information Act Officers:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, and the implementing regulations of the Department of Justice (DOJ), 28 C.F.R. Part 16, American Oversight makes the following request for records.

Attorney General William Barr has reportedly directed U.S. Attorney for the District of Connecticut John Durham to examine the origins of investigations of now-President Trump and his campaign.<sup>1</sup> In light of the Attorney General's incredible characterization of aspects of these investigations—referring to them as “spying”<sup>2</sup>—there is substantial public concern about the parameters of this investigation. U.S. Attorney for the District of Utah John Huber was previously directed to review and evaluate related and overlapping matters.<sup>3</sup> American Oversight seeks records with the potential to shed light on this matter.

---

<sup>1</sup> Adam Goldman et al., *Barr Assigns U.S. Attorney in Connecticut to Review Origins of Russia Inquiry*, N.Y. TIMES, May 13, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/13/us/politics/russia-investigation-justice-department-review.html>; Ltr. From Stephen E. Boyd, Assistant Attorney General, Dep't of Justice, Office of Legislative Affairs to Rep. Jerrold Nadler, Chair, U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, June 10, 2019, <http://cdn.cnn.com/cnn/2019/images/06/10/2019-6-10.doj.review.of.intelligence.activities.-nadler.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> Goldman, *supra* note 1.

<sup>3</sup> See AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, *DOJ Letter from Jeff Sessions to John Huber Directing Clinton Inquiry*, Mar. 8, 2019, <https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-letter-from-jeff-sessions>.



## Requested Records

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

1. 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), telephone call logs, calendar invitations, calendar entries, meeting notices, meeting agendas, informational material, talking points, any handwritten or electronic notes taken during any oral communications, summaries of any oral communications, or other materials) between (1) the Office of the Attorney General, the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, the U.S. Attorney for the District of Connecticut John Durham, or Mr. Durham's first assistant Leonard C. Boyle, or anyone communicating on their behalf, and (2) the White House Office (including, but not limited to, email communications with email addresses ending in @who.eop.gov), regarding the investigation or review Attorney General Barr has directed Mr. Durham to undertake into matters outside his ordinary remit, including matters related to the origins of investigations of the president and his campaign for the presidency.<sup>4</sup>
2. 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), telephone call logs, calendar invitations, calendar entries, meeting notices, meeting agendas, informational material, talking points, any handwritten or electronic notes taken during any oral communications, summaries of any oral communications, or other materials) between (1) the Office of the Attorney General, the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, the U.S. Attorney for the District of Connecticut John Durham, or Mr. Durham's first assistant Leonard C. Boyle, or anyone communicating on their behalf, and (2) any member of Congress or staffer employed by any member of congress (including, but not limited to, communications with email addresses ending in @mail.house.gov or senate.gov), regarding the investigation or review Attorney General Barr has directed Mr. Durham to undertake into matters outside his ordinary remit, including matters related to the origins of investigations of the president and his campaign for the presidency.<sup>5</sup>

Please provide all responsive records from February 14, 2019, through the date the search is conducted.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Ltr. From Stephen E. Boyd, Assistant Attorney General, Dep't of Justice, Office of Legislative Affairs to Rep. Jerrold Nadler, Chair, U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, June 10, 2019, <http://cdn.cnn.com/cnn/2019/images/06/10/2019-6-10.doj.review.of.intelligence.activities.-nadler.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

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>6</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>7</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 DOJ’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>8</sup> 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

---

<sup>6</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>7</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>8</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>.

custodian may have deleted a responsive email from his or her email program, but DOJ's archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone. Accordingly, American Oversight insists that DOJ 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.”<sup>9</sup> 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.”<sup>10</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>11</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>12</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>13</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, DOJ 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

---

<sup>9</sup> FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 § 2 (Pub. L. No. 114-185).

<sup>10</sup> *Founding Church of Scientology v. Bell*, 603 F.2d 945, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

<sup>11</sup> *King v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, 830 F.2d 210, 223-24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (emphases in original).

<sup>12</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>13</sup> *Mead Data Central*, 566 F.2d at 261.

duplication costs. By working together at the outset, American Oversight and DOJ 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 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k), 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>14</sup> Moreover, the request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.<sup>15</sup>

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>16</sup> The disclosure of the information sought under this request will document and reveal the operations of the federal government, including potentially improper influences on a very controversial and sensitive review or investigation into matters that the Attorney General has characterized as “spying”—a statement which seemed to indicate his prejudgment of the results of the investigation.<sup>17</sup> The requested records also have the potential to shed light on whether the White House has directed or influenced this review of investigations that concerned the president. As discussed below, American Oversight has the capacity and intention to inform a broad audience about government activities that are the subject of these records.

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

---

<sup>14</sup> 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(1).

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*

<sup>16</sup> 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(1), (2)(i)–(ii).

<sup>17</sup> *See* Goldman et al., *supra* note 1.

<sup>18</sup> 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(1), (2)(iii).

promotes their availability on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter.<sup>19</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>20</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>21</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>22</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 DOJ 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 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

---

<sup>19</sup> American Oversight currently has approximately 12,300 page likes on Facebook and 54,200 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, <https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/> (last visited June 20, 2019); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <https://twitter.com/weareoversight> (last visited June 20, 2019).

<sup>20</sup> *DOJ Records Relating to Solicitor General Noel Francisco's Recusal*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/document/doj-civil-division-response-noel-francisco-compliance>.

<sup>21</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>.

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