



August 23, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

U.S. Department of State  
Office of Information Programs and Services  
A/GIS/IPS/RL  
SA-2, Suite 8100  
Washington, DC 20522-0208  
[FOIArequest@state.gov](mailto:FOIArequest@state.gov)

**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 Department of State (State), 22 C.F.R. Part 171, American Oversight makes the following request for records.

On May 9, 2019, President Trump’s personal lawyer, Rudolph Giuliani, announced that he would travel to Ukraine to meet with the country’s president-elect to urge the Ukrainian government to pursue an investigation related to the son of former Vice President Biden—a potential electoral opponent of the president.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Giuliani, reportedly aided by the president’s former attorneys Victoria Toensing and Joseph E. diGenova, defended his planned trip by stating that “[w]e’re not meddling in an election, we’re meddling in an investigation.”<sup>2</sup> After facing widespread criticism for this effort to influence a foreign government’s law enforcement efforts for political gain, Mr. Giuliani canceled his trip to Ukraine.<sup>3</sup>

It is more troubling that, shortly before Mr. Giuliani announced his plan to attempt to “meddl[e]” in a Ukrainian investigation related to one of the president’s potential political opponents, State recalled U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine Marie Yovanovitch, a career foreign service officer who has served under Democratic and Republican presidents.<sup>4</sup> Ambassador Yovanovitch had faced criticism

---

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth P. Vogel, *Rudy Giuliani Plans Ukraine Trip to Push for Inquiries That Could Help Trump*, N.Y. TIMES, May 9, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/09/us/politics/giuliani-ukraine-trump.html>.

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

<sup>3</sup> Kenneth P. Vogel, *Rudy Giuliani Cancels His Trip to Ukraine, Blaming Democrats’ ‘Spin,’* N.Y. TIMES, May 11, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/11/us/politics/rudy-giuliani-ukraine.html>.

<sup>4</sup> Robbie Grammer & Amy MacKinnon, *U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine Recalled in ‘Political Hit Job,’ Lawmakers Say*, FOREIGN POLICY (May 7, 2019, 12:09 PM), <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/05/07/us-ambassador-to-ukraine-recalled-in-political-hit-job->



from conservative media for purportedly criticizing the president in private conversations.<sup>5</sup> Senator Chris Murphy has, further, expressed concern that Ambassador Yovanovitch’s recall may be related to Mr. Giuliani’s efforts to influence Ukrainian investigations.<sup>6</sup>

Recent reports suggest that Mr. Giuliani engaged a State Department official—U.S. Special Representative for Ukraine Negotiations Kurt D. Volker—in his efforts.<sup>7</sup> The State Department has acknowledged that Mr. Volker helped arrange talks between Mr. Giuliani and a Ukrainian official.<sup>8</sup>

American Oversight seeks records with the potential to shed light on whether and to what extent the political interests of the president have influenced State Department policies and actions in Ukraine, including actions related to the efforts of the president’s personal attorney to persuade the Ukrainian government to conduct an investigation connected to a potential political opponent of the president.

### **Requested Records**

American Oversight requests that State produce the following records 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, draft legislation, talking points, any handwritten or electronic notes taken during any oral communications, summaries of any oral communications, or other materials) between (1) U.S. Special Representative for Ukraine Negotiations Kurt D. Volker, or anyone serving as a Chief of Staff, deputy, confidential assistant, or executive assistant to Mr. Volker, and (2) Rudolph Giuliani, Victoria Toensing, or Joseph diGenova.
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, draft legislation, talking

---

[lawmakers-say-marie-yovanovitch-lutsenko-right-wing-media-accusations-congress-diplomats-diplomacy/](#).

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

<sup>6</sup> Letter from Sen. Chris Murphy to Sen. Jim Risch, Chairman, Comm. on Foreign Relations, May 10, 2019, <https://www.murphy.senate.gov/download/ukraine-giuliani-letter>.

<sup>7</sup> Kenneth P. Vogel & Andrew E. Kramer, *Giuliani Renews Push for Ukraine to Investigate Trump’s Political Opponents*, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 21, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/21/us/politics/giuliani-ukraine.html?smid=nytcore-ios-share>.

<sup>8</sup> Kenneth P. Vogel (@kenvogel), TWITTER (Aug. 22, 2019, 6:30 PM), <https://twitter.com/kenvogel/status/1164666081501470727?s=20>.

points, any handwritten or electronic notes taken during any oral communications, summaries of any oral communications, or other materials) of the U.S. Special Representative for Ukraine Negotiations Kurt D. Volker, or anyone serving as a Chief of Staff or deputy to Mr. Volker regarding (1) any plan by Rudolph Giuliani, Victoria Toensing, and/or Joseph diGenova to travel to Ukraine or to communicate with Ukrainian government officials or future Ukrainian government officials or (2) any other effort to encourage the Ukrainian government to investigate any matter related to former Vice President Joseph Biden or his son Hunter Biden.

Please provide all responsive records from March 1, 2019, through the date the search is conducted.

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 State 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.<sup>9</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>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</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>10</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

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 State’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>11</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 custodian may have deleted a responsive email from his or her email program, but State’s archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone. Accordingly, American Oversight insists that State 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>12</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>13</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>14</sup> Further, “the withholding agency must supply ‘a relatively detailed

---

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>11</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>12</sup> FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 § 2 (Pub. L. No. 114–185).

<sup>13</sup> *Founding Church of Scientology v. Bell*, 603 F.2d 945, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

<sup>14</sup> *King v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 830 F.2d 210, 223–24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (emphases in original).

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>15</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>16</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, State 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 State 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 22 C.F.R. § 171.16(a), American Oversight requests a waiver of fees associated with processing this request for records. First, 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>17</sup> Second, the request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</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>16</sup> *Mead Data Central*, 566 F.2d at 261.

<sup>17</sup> 22 C.F.R. § 171.16(a)(1).

<sup>18</sup> 22 C.F.R. § 171.16(a)(2).

Under the public interest requirement, FOIA requesters must satisfy four factors.<sup>19</sup> American Oversight has met these four factors for the reasons set forth below. The subject matter of the requested records specifically relates to the operations or activities of the government, including communications surrounding an effort by the personal attorney to the president to persuade the Ukrainian government to investigate a family member of one of the president’s potential political opponents just after the chief U.S. diplomat to Ukraine was recalled.<sup>20</sup> There is significant public interest in understanding whether and to what extent the perceived political interests of the president are influencing U.S. foreign policy toward Ukraine, including whether a career diplomat was displaced in connection with an effort to use the president’s private attorney to lobby Ukrainian officials.<sup>21</sup> The subject of this request is a matter of public interest, and the public’s understanding of the government’s activities and use of resources would be enhanced through American Oversight’s analysis and publication of these records.

Increasing the likelihood that disclosure of these records will contribute significantly to public understanding, American Oversight’s objective is to reveal to the public at large any information it receives related to this FOIA request, and little information is currently available regarding the subject matter of this request—specifically, whether high-ranking State officials have coordinated with political allies of the president to displace a career diplomat in Ukraine for a perceived lack of political loyalty in conjunction with the efforts of the president’s attorney to pressure the Ukrainian government to undertake investigations to benefit the president’s perceived political interests.<sup>22</sup> American Oversight has the capacity to disseminate this information as it posts all records to its public websites and publishes analyses of its records. In the past, the organization has successfully informed the public of specific government activities and operations. As an example, American Oversight obtained Education Secretary DeVos’s calendar entries, which revealed Secretary DeVos’s frequent absences from office and the influence of charter schools and for-profit colleges on the Education Department.<sup>23</sup> The *New York Times* and CNN relied on American Oversight’s analyses to report on Secretary DeVos’s priorities within the Department of Education.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> *D.C. Technical Assistance Org. Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of Hous. and Urban Dev. (D.C. Technical Assistance)*, 85 F.Supp.2d 46, 48–49 (D.D.C. 2000) (requested documents will contribute to “greater understanding of government activities”).

<sup>20</sup> See Vogel *supra* note 1; Vogel *supra* note 3; Grammer & Mackinnon *supra* note 4.

<sup>21</sup> See Letter from Sen. Murphy, *supra* note 6.

<sup>22</sup> See Vogel *supra* note 1; Vogel *supra* note 3; Grammer & Mackinnon *supra* note 4.

<sup>23</sup> See *Influence & Access at the Department of Education*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT (Oct. 27, 2017), <https://www.americanoversight.org/investigation/influence-access-at-the-department-of-education>; *Unexcused Absences: DeVos Calendars Show Frequent Days Off*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT (Oct. 27, 2017), <https://www.americanoversight.org/unexcused-absences-devos>.

<sup>24</sup> Eric Lipton, *Betsy DeVos’s School Schedule Shows Focus on Religious and Nontraditional Schools*, N.Y. TIMES, Oct. 27, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/27/us/politics/betsy-devos-work-schedule-education.html>; Gregory Wallace et. al., *What Betsy DeVos’s Schedule Tells Us About Her Agenda*, CNN (Oct. 29, 2017, 12:22 PM), <http://www.cnn.com/2017/10/28/politics/devos-schedules-education/index.html>.

American Oversight's request is also primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.<sup>25</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 our public website and promotes their availability on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter.<sup>26</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, American Oversight promptly posted the records to its website<sup>27</sup> and published an analysis of what the records reflected about DOJ's process for ethics waivers.<sup>28</sup> As an additional 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>29</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 State 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

---

<sup>25</sup> 22 C.F.R. § 171.16(a)(2)(i)-(iii).

<sup>26</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 May 20, 2019); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <https://twitter.com/weareoversight> (last visited May 20, 2019).

<sup>27</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>28</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>29</sup> *Audit the Wall*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/investigation/audit-the-wall>.

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, appearing to read 'MS', is positioned above the typed name.

Melanie Sloan  
Senior Advisor  
American Oversight