September 27, 2017

By Electronic Submission
(https://foiaonline.regulations.gov/foia/action/public/request/publicPreCreate)

U.S. General Services Administration
FOIA Requester Service Center (H1F)
1800 F Street, NW, Room 7308
Washington, DC 20405

RE: Freedom of Information Act Request

To whom it may concern:

The Campaign Legal Center (“CLC”) submits this request pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552 et seq., for Senior Federal Travel Reports submitted to the U.S. General Services Administration (“GSA”).

I. Background

To date, media outlets have reported that at least three U.S. Cabinet members have traveled via military or chartered aircraft at the public’s expense during this calendar year. On September 21, 2017, for example, Politico reported that Secretary Tom Price had accumulated at least $300,000 in travel expenses from more than 20 trips via chartered aircrafts.\(^1\) The following day, ABC News reported that Secretaries Elaine Chao and Steven Mnuchin had traveled on a U.S. Air Force C-37 jet between New York City and Washington, D.C. in August.\(^2\) ABC News estimated that this trip alone cost taxpayers at least $25,000.\(^3\)

---


3. *Id.*
Moreover, these reports had followed other reports revealing that Secretary Mnuchin had requested the use of non-commercial aircraft on multiple previous occasions. The series of revelations about Cabinet members’ travel practices attracted significant attention among the broader press and the public.

As codified in 41 C.F.R. § 301-70.907, federal agencies must submit reports to the GSA on a semi-annual basis with “information about Senior Federal officials and non-Federal travelers who fly aboard their aircraft,” including details about the trips’ purposes and the costs incurred.

Records likely to be disclosed in response to this request will thus contribute significantly to the public’s understanding of how decisions regarding taxpayer funded-travel are being used in the federal government, among other matters of public interest.

II. Requested Records

This request is for all Senior Federal Travel Reports submitted to the General Services Administration in calendar year 2017 pursuant to 41 C.F.R. § 301-70.907.

This request encompasses both digital and physical records and includes the reports that agencies submit through the GSA’s online reporting tool, http://www.gsa.gov/sftr.


If some portions of the requested records are exempt from disclosure, please disclose any reasonably segregable non-exempt portions of the requested records. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). If any portion of the requested records is exempt from disclosure, please provide an index of the withheld materials as required under Vaughn v. Rosen, 484 F.2d 820 (D.C. Cir. 1973), cert. denied, 415 U.S. 977 (1972).

III. Application for Fee Waiver or Limitation of Fees

A. The request is made for non-commercial purposes and will contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of government.

FOIA provides that the agency shall furnish requested records without or at reduced charge if “disclosure of the information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii).

As described above in Part I, the requested materials involve matters of significant public interest. Records likely to be disclosed in response to this request will contribute significantly to the public’s understanding of the government’s use of their resources. These details are not already publicly available and the records would provide a more thorough public understanding of the operations of the federal government.

CLC will use records responsive to this request in the creation of widely disseminated materials and analysis that will educate the public about these matters and the operations of the government. CLC anticipates analyzing the materials gathered through this FOIA request to develop reports, write blogs, and author op-eds. CLC’s research and reports are widely disseminated on its blog.

---

7 See, e.g., Lawrence M. Noble and Brendan M. Fischer, Funding the Presidential Nominating Conventions: How a Trickle of Money Turned Into a Flood, Campaign Legal Center (July 26, 2016), http://www.campaignlegalcenter.org/sites/default/files/Funding%20the%20Presidential%20Nominating%20Conventions%20Report.pdf.
through its own website, through social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter, and regular emails to its supporters, among other communications outlets.

CLC staff have significant knowledge in ethics and government accountability, and news media regularly rely upon CLC’s analysis and expertise. In addition to its own blogs and reports, CLC anticipates analyzing the requested records and disseminating the materials among traditional news outlets.

Requester CLC is a non-profit public interest organization organized under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and this request is made for non-commercial purposes.

As such, we request that any applicable fees associated with this request be waived pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). A fee waiver in this instance would fulfill Congress’ intent in amending the FOIA. See Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossotti, 326 F.3d 1309, 1312 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (“Congress amended FOIA to ensure that it be liberally construed in favor of waivers for noncommercial requesters.” (quotation marks omitted)).

B. CLC qualifies for a fee waiver as a “representative of the news media.”

CLC additionally requests that it not be charged search or review fees for this request because the organization meets the definition of a “representative of the news media” for purposes of the FOIA, since CLC “gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn the raw materials into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II)-(III).

---

12 https://www.facebook.com/CampaignLegalCenter/
13 https://twitter.com/CampaignLegal
As the D.C. Circuit has held, the “representative of the news media” test is focused on the requestor rather than the specific FOIA request. Cause of Action v. F.T.C., 799 F.3d 1108, 1121 (D.C. Cir. 2015). CLC satisfies this test because (as noted in Part III(A)) CLC applies its expertise and editorial skills to turn raw materials into reports, articles, and op-eds that are widely disseminated on its blog, through its own website, through social media platforms and regular emails to its supporters, and through other communications outlets. CLC additionally applies editorial skill to analyze and disseminate materials to other news media outlets, which regularly cite and rely upon CLC’s work. The D.C. Circuit has held that an requester may qualify as a news media entity if it “‘distribute[s] [its] work’ by issuing press releases to media outlets in order to reach the public indirectly” 799 F.3d. at 1125-26.

Courts have found that other organizations with functionally similar missions and engaged in similar public education activities qualify as “representatives of the news media,” even if engaged in litigation or other advocacy beyond educating the public about the operations of government. See e.g. Cause of Action v. F.T.C., 799 F.3d 1108, 1121-25 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (finding a public interest advocacy organization that comments to other media outlets about documents it obtains under FOIA a news media requester); Judicial Watch, Inc. v. DOJ, 133 F. Supp. 2d 52, 53-54 (D.D.C. 2000) (finding “public interest law firm” Judicial Watch a news media requester); Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. V. DOD, 241 F. Supp. 2d 5, 10-15 (D.D.C. 2003) (finding nonprofit public interest group that published a biweekly email newsletter a news media requester).

“It is critical that the phrase ‘representative of the news media’ be interpreted broadly if the act is work as expected, . . . In fact, any person or organization which regularly publishes or disseminates information to the public . . . should qualify for waivers as a ‘representative of the news media.’” 132 Cong. Rec. S14298 (daily ed. Sept. 30, 1986), cited in Nat’l Sec. Archive v. U.S. Dep’t of Def., 880 F.2d 1381, 1386 (D.C. Cir. 1989).

In the event the fee waiver is not granted, I may not be charged for the first two hours of search time, or for the first hundred pages of duplication. Please contact me and advise me of the cost of this request if processing costs exceed $100.

IV. Application for Expedited Processing

I request that the processing of this request be expedited pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e)(1)(iv).

---

As described in Part I, the subject of the request involves a matter of exceptional media interest, and the initial revelations about federal officials’ travel practices raise questions about the government’s integrity that can affect public confidence.

I certify that my statements concerning the need for expedited processing are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

* * *

In order to expedite delivery of these requested documents and in order to reduce possible fees incurred, I am requesting that these documents be delivered to me either digitally via email (in PDF format), or on a data disk via the U.S. Postal Service.

Please email copies of responsive documents to:

mchrist@campaignlegalcenter.org

Or, please mail copies of responsive documents to:

Maggie Christ
Campaign Legal Center
1411 K St NW, Suite 1400
Washington, D.C. 20005

Should you elect, for any reason, to withhold, redact, or deny the release of any record responsive to this request, I request that you provide me with an explanation for each withholding/redaction, along with pertinent legal citations.

Please confirm the receipt of this request and provide me with an estimate of processing time.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

/s/ Maggie Christ

Maggie Christ
Researcher/Investigator
Campaign Legal Center
mchrist@campaignlegalcenter.org
(202) 736-2200, ext.260

---
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