

Exhibit B



December 13, 2017

VIA ONLINE PORTAL AND ELECTRONIC MAIL

Laurie Day
Chief, Initial Request Staff
Office of Information Policy
Department of Justice
Suite 11050
1425 New York Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
Via FOIAOnline

Deborah Waller
Government Information Specialist
Office of the Inspector General
Department of Justice
Room 4726
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
oigfoia@usdoj.gov

David M. Hardy, Chief
Record/Information Dissemination Section
Records Management Division
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Department of Justice
170 Marcel Drive
Winchester, VA 22602-4843
Via Online Portal

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear FOIA 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.

Earlier this year, the DOJ's inspector general began an investigation into the FBI's handling of its inquiry into the use of a private email server by former secretary of State Hillary Clinton and



related matters.¹ As part of that investigation, the IG reportedly obtained private text messages exchanged between Peter Strzok (a member of the team investigating Secretary Clinton's email use) and Lisa Page (an FBI lawyer) that were critical of then-candidate Donald Trump.²

Recent news reports indicate that on the evening of Tuesday, December 12, DOJ invited reporters to its offices to view approximately 10,000 of those private text messages.³ Prior to that exchange, DOJ had reportedly disclosed roughly 375 text messages to Congress in anticipation of testimony by Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein before the House Judiciary Committee on December 13.⁴

American Oversight seeks to understand the process by which the DOJ undertook the highly unusual step of distributing materials that were part of an ongoing OIG investigation to reporters.

Requested Records

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

1. All communications relating to the decision to share text messages between DOJ employees Peter Strzok and Lisa Page with Congress notwithstanding the fact that OIG's investigation is ongoing.
2. All communications arranging to share text messages between DOJ employees Peter Strzok and Lisa Page with any member of Congress or congressional staff member.
3. Any records reflecting any discussion, evaluation, consideration, or opinion regarding whether it was appropriate under the Privacy Act to share text messages between DOJ employees Peter Strzok and Lisa Page with Congress.

¹ See Matt Zapposky & Sari Horwitz, *Justice Department Inspector General to Investigate Pre-Election Actions by Department and FBI*, WASH. POST, Jan. 12, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-nation/wp/2017/01/12/justice-department-inspector-general-to-investigate-pre-election-actions-by-department-and-fbi/?utm_term=.6fa061c759b7.

² See Sonam Sheth, *Mueller Reportedly Ousted an Investigator on His Team Over Possible Anti-Trump Texts*, BUS. INSIDER (Dec. 2, 2017, 12:34 PM), <http://www.businessinsider.com/mueller-peter-strzok-trump-russia-texts-2017-12>; Josh Gerstein, *In Texts, FBI Agents on Russia Probe Called Trump an 'Idiot,' POLITICO* (Dec. 12, 2017, 11:00 PM), https://www.politico.com/story/2017/12/12/fbi-agents-trump-mueller-texts-294156?lo=ap_e1.

³ See Natasha Bertrand, *In 'Highly Unusual' Move, DOJ Secretly Invited Reporters to View Texts Sent By Ousted FBI Agents*, BUS. INSIDER, Dec. 13, 2017, <http://www.businessinsider.com/peter-strzok-page-texts-mueller-russia-trump-2017-12>; Shannon Bream (@ShannonBream), TWITTER (Dec. 12, 2017, 6:29 PM), <https://twitter.com/ShannonBream/status/940770703317585921> ("Our @FoxNews producer @JakeBGibson has obtained 10K texts between Peter Strzok and Lisa Page").

⁴ See Gerstein, *supra* note 2.

4. All communications with any attorneys representing DOJ employees Peter Strzok or Lisa Page regarding the decision to share text messages exchanged between Mr. Strzok and Ms. Page with Congress.

Please provide all responsive records from November 15, 2017, to the date the search is conducted. The search for responsive records should include all individuals and locations where responsive records are likely to exist, including at least the following offices:

- Office of Public Affairs
- Office of Legislative Affairs
- Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties
- Office of the Inspector General
- Office of the Deputy Attorney General
- Office of the Attorney General
- FBI (including at least the front office, the Office of Public Affairs, the Office of Congressional Affairs, and the Office of the General Counsel)

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 DOJ 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.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 moved to**

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).

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 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.**⁷ 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 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.”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

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).

actually exempt under FOIA.”⁹ 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.”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, 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 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

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

¹⁰ *King v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 830 F.2d 210, 223–24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (emphasis 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.

significant way.¹³ Moreover, the request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.¹⁴

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.¹⁵ There is significant public interest in the numerous ongoing governmental investigations: the investigation by the DOJ IG of the FBI’s handling of its investigation into Secretary Clinton’s use of a private email server; the Special Counsel’s investigation of potential Russian interference in the 2016 election; and the numerous congressional investigations into those and other related matters. The records sought by this request sit at the intersection of several of those investigations. These records would shed significant light on the way that the DOJ views its role in what are supposed to be apolitical investigations. They will further shed light on how the DOJ has interacted with Congress in regard to these issues, as well as how the DOJ views its obligations under the Privacy Act.

This request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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,¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ 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

¹³ 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(1).

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(1), (2)(i)-(ii).

¹⁶ 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(1), (2)(iii).

¹⁷ American Oversight currently has approximately 11,700 page likes on Facebook and 37,400 followers on Twitter. American Oversight, FACEBOOK, <https://www.facebook.com/weareoversight/> (last visited Dec. 12, 2017); American Oversight (@weareoversight), TWITTER, <https://twitter.com/weareoversight> (last visited Dec. 12, 2017).

¹⁸ *Vetting the Nominees: Solicitor General Nominee Noel Francisco*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/our-actions/vetting-nominees-solicitor-general-nominee-noel-francisco>.

¹⁹ *Francisco & the Travel Ban: What We Learned from the DOJ Documents*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, <https://www.americanoversight.org/news/francisco-travel-ban-learned-doj-documents>.

information related to the administration's proposed construction of a barrier along the U.S.-Mexico border.²⁰

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 Sara Creighton at foia@americanoversight.org or 202.869.5246. 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,

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

²⁰ *Audit the Wall*, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, www.auditthewall.org.