

# Exhibit 1

## TSA Request

The James Madison Project  
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 498-0011  
(202) 330-5610 fax

E-Mail: [FOIA@JamesMadisonProject.org](mailto:FOIA@JamesMadisonProject.org)  
<http://www.JamesMadisonProject.org>

January 31, 2017

VIA E-MAIL

Regina McCoy  
FOIA Officer  
Transportation Security Administration  
11th Floor, East Tower, TSA-20  
601 S. 12th Street  
Arlington, VA 22202-4220

Re: FOIA Request – Guidance For Immigration Executive Order

Dear Ms. McCoy:

This is a request on behalf of The James Madison Project (“JMP”), Ken Vogel (“Mr. Vogel”), and Josh Gerstein (“Mr. Gerstein”)(hereinafter referred to jointly as “the Requesters”) under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, *et seq.* This request seeks copies of Transportation Security Administration (“TSA”) records, including cross-references, memorializing the following:

- 1) Guidance provided by TSA to private and commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to admission, denial of admission, and/or deportation of individuals subject to President Trump’s Executive Order, signed on January 27, 2017;
- 2) Communications (that are not encompassed by category #1) between TSA and private and/or commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to implementation of President Trump’s Executive Order, signed January 27, 2017; and
- 3) Communications (that are not encompassed by categories #1 or #2) between TSA and private and/or commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to the judicial rulings imposing emergency stays and/or restraining orders enjoining President Trump’s Executive Order, signed January 27, 2017.

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

---

For context, President Trump issued an Executive Order on January 27, 2017, entitled “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States”. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/27/us/politics/refugee-muslim-executive-order-trump.html?mtrref=www.nytimes.com&gwh=B456165D1D10E39DE6FBC6134CD77963&gwt=pay> (last accessed January 30, 2017). The Executive Order suspended the U.S. Government refugee program, indefinitely barred Syrian refugees, and temporarily barred entry into the United States foreign nationals from seven countries. [https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/trump-refugee-ban-muslim-executive-order.html?\\_r=0](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/trump-refugee-ban-muslim-executive-order.html?_r=0) (last accessed January 30, 2017).

In the aftermath of the issuance of the Executive Order, chaos erupted at U.S. airports on January 28, 2017, as hundreds of individuals were detained and prevented from entering the United States despite holding valid entry paperwork. By the evening of January 29, 2017, at least four different U.S. district court judges had issued emergency injunctions preventing the U.S. Government from deporting individuals who had been detained pursuant to the Executive Order. <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/28/politics/donald-trump-executive-order-immigration-reaction/index.html> (last accessed January 30, 2017).

To be clear, the scope of the information sought in this request should encompass communications that occurred both prior and subsequent to President Trump’s signing of the Executive Order on January 27, 2017. TSA can limit the timeframe of its search from January 20, 2017, up until the date the agency begins conducting actual searches for responsive records. The scope of the searches should not be limited to TSA-originated records and should be construed to include records that are currently in the possession of a U.S. Government contractor for purposes of records management.

The Requesters are pre-emptively waiving any objection to the redaction of the names of any U.S. Government officials below a GS-14 position or whom otherwise were not acting in a supervisory position. The Requesters similarly waive any objection to redactions of the names of any U.S. Government contractors in a position of authority similar to that of a GS-13 series civilian employee or below.

In terms of all other third parties who work or worked for the U.S. Government and whose names appear in records responsive to this request, the Requesters submit that the privacy interests of those individuals have been diminished by virtue of their involvement in one or more of the U.S. Government functions described above as falling within the scope of this request. There is a recognized inverse relationship between the position of authority that a government employee holds and the strength of that employee’s privacy interests. See Stern v. FBI, 737 F.2d 84, 92 (D.C. Cir. 1984); Jefferson v. Dep’t of Justice, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26782, \*11 (D.D.C. Nov. 14, 2003); see also Perlman v. Dep’t of Justice, 312 F.3d 100, 107-109 (2d. Cir. 2002)(setting forth five factors to consider in weighing government employee’s privacy interests

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

---

against public interest in disclosure, including employee's rank and whether information sheds light on a government activity).

The work performed by these third parties (whether they be U.S. Government officials or contractors) was part of their official responsibilities on behalf of the U.S. Government and was not of a personal nature. They served in a position of trust and authority to, among other things, provide airlines with guidance and instructions on the impact of President Trump's Executive Order so that those airlines could incorporate that new information into their own standard operating procedures. Given that responsive records memorializing the work they performed will shed light on government activity, particularly by revealing how TSA described the restrictions imposed by the Executive Order, it would be reasonable to conclude that the relevant third parties' respective (and diminished) privacy interests are outweighed by the public interest in disclosure of the information indexed to their name.<sup>1</sup>

We are also requesting a waiver of or, at a minimum, a reduction in fees. JMP, Mr. Vogel, and Mr. Gerstein qualify – in their own respective rights – for designation as representatives of the news media.

JMP is a non-partisan organization dedicating to promoting government accountability and the reduction of secrecy. <http://jamesmadisonproject.org/> (last accessed August 7, 2015). The organization is a frequent FOIA requester and litigator and Federal agencies routinely and regularly grant JMP fee waivers. Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein are the chief investigative reporter and senior reporter, respectively, for Politico. <http://www.politico.com/staff/kenneth-p-vogel> (last accessed December 22, 2016); <http://www.politico.com/staff/josh-gerstein> (last accessed December 22, 2016).

The Requesters have the ability to disseminate information on a wide scale and intend to use information obtained through this FOIA request in an original work, particularly through news articles published by Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein. According to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii),

the term 'a representative of the news media' means any person or entity that 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.

The Requesters can demonstrate their intent and ability to publish or otherwise disseminate information to the public. See Nat'l Security Archive v. Dep't of Defense, 880 F.2d 1381, 1386 (D.C. Cir. 1989). Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein maintain the ability to produce news articles that

---

<sup>1</sup> We acknowledge, of course, that some redactions or narrowly focused withholdings might ultimately be appropriate as TSA processes the responsive records.

---

*"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives."*

*James Madison, 1822*

---

will be published by Politico. In the event that fees are ultimately assessed, please do not incur expenses beyond \$25 without first contacting our office for explicit authorization.

There is considerable public interest in disclosure of the requested records. Countless lawyers raced to the various U.S. airports to prove pro bono legal services to those who were impacted by the new entry restrictions. <https://www.yahoo.com/news/trump-travel-ban-galvanizes-young-lawyers-action-023327562.html> (last accessed January 30, 2017). Despite the issuance of the emergency stays by the different federal judges, reports emerged of CBP officials refusing to comply with the court orders. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2017/01/29/trump-s-border-patrol-defies-judge-u-s-senator-at-dulles-airport-at-his-first-constitutional-crisis-unfolds.html> (last accessed January 31, 2017); [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/dulles-airport-feds-violated-court-order\\_us\\_588d7274e4b08a14f7e67bcf](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/dulles-airport-feds-violated-court-order_us_588d7274e4b08a14f7e67bcf) (last accessed January 31, 2017). Disclosure of records responsive to this request would, among other things, shed light on how TSA was explaining to the airlines the impact of the court rulings.

Finally, and again in reliance upon the same public interest reasons outlined above, the Requesters are seeking expedited processing of their FOIA request. FOIA permits expedited processing when a “compelling need” exists. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v). Specifically, “compelling need” means “with respect to a request made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information, urgency to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity.” *Id.* at § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II).

The records responsive to this FOIA request clearly qualify as information regarding U.S. Government activity that the public has an urgent and active need to know. The bureaucratic dysfunction surrounding the implementation of the Executive Order has impacted hundreds of individuals who had valid paperwork authorizing entry into the United States, and remains an ongoing legal dispute to this day. This more than sufficiently satisfies the statutory requirement to demonstrate a “compelling need”.

If TSA denies all or part of this request, please cite the specific exemptions you believe justify your refusal to release the information or permit the review and notify us of your appeal procedures available under the law. We request that any documents or records produced in response to this request be provided in electronic (soft-copy) form wherever possible. Acceptable formats are .pdf, .jpg, .gif, .tif. Please provide soft-copy records by email or on a CD if email is not feasible. However, the Requesters do not agree to pay an additional fee to receive records on a CD, and in the instance that such a fee is required, the Requesters will accept a paper copy of responsive records.

Your cooperation in this matter would be appreciated. If you wish to discuss this request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 907-7945 or via e-mail at [brad@jamesmadisonproject.org](mailto:brad@jamesmadisonproject.org).

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

Sincerely,

/s/

Bradley P. Moss

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

# Exhibit 2

## CBP Request

The James Madison Project  
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 498-0011  
(202) 330-5610 fax

E-Mail: [FOIA@JamesMadisonProject.org](mailto:FOIA@JamesMadisonProject.org)  
<http://www.JamesMadisonProject.org>

January 31, 2017

VIA ONLINE PORTAL

Sabrina Burroughs  
FOIA Officer  
U.S. Customs & Border Protection  
MS 1181  
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20229-1181

Re: FOIA Request – Guidance For Immigration Executive Order

Dear Ms. Burroughs:

This is a request on behalf of The James Madison Project (“JMP”), Ken Vogel (“Mr. Vogel”), and Josh Gerstein (“Mr. Gerstein”)(hereinafter referred to jointly as “the Requesters”) under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, *et seq.* This request seeks copies of Customs & Border Protection (“CBP”) records, including cross-references, memorializing the following:

- 1) Guidance provided by CBP to private and commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to admission, denial of admission, and/or deportation of individuals subject to President Trump’s Executive Order, signed on January 27, 2017;
- 2) Communications (that are not encompassed by category #1) between CBP and private and/or commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to implementation of President Trump’s Executive Order, signed January 27, 2017; and
- 3) Communications (that are not encompassed by categories #1 or #2) between CBP and private and/or commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to the judicial rulings imposing emergency stays and/or restraining orders enjoining President Trump’s Executive Order, signed January 27, 2017.

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*



---

For context, President Trump issued an Executive Order on January 27, 2017, entitled “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States”. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/27/us/politics/refugee-muslim-executive-order-trump.html?mtrref=www.nytimes.com&gwh=B456165D1D10E39DE6FBC6134CD77963&gwt=pay> (last accessed January 30, 2017). The Executive Order suspended the U.S. Government refugee program, indefinitely barred Syrian refugees, and temporarily barred entry into the United States foreign nationals from seven countries. [https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/trump-refugee-ban-muslim-executive-order.html?\\_r=0](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/trump-refugee-ban-muslim-executive-order.html?_r=0) (last accessed January 30, 2017).

In the aftermath of the issuance of the Executive Order, chaos erupted at U.S. airports on January 28, 2017, as hundreds of individuals were detained and prevented from entering the United States despite holding valid entry paperwork. By the evening of January 29, 2017, at least four different U.S. district court judges had issued emergency injunctions preventing the U.S. Government from deporting individuals who had been detained pursuant to the Executive Order. <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/28/politics/donald-trump-executive-order-immigration-reaction/index.html> (last accessed January 30, 2017).

To be clear, the scope of the information sought in this request should encompass communications that occurred both prior and subsequent to President Trump’s signing of the Executive Order on January 27, 2017. CBP can limit the timeframe of its search from January 20, 2017, up until the date the agency begins conducting actual searches for responsive records. The scope of the searches should not be limited to CBP-originated records and should be construed to include records that are currently in the possession of a U.S. Government contractor for purposes of records management.

The Requesters are pre-emptively waiving any objection to the redaction of the names of any U.S. Government officials below a GS-14 position or whom otherwise were not acting in a supervisory position. The Requesters similarly waive any objection to redactions of the names of any U.S. Government contractors in a position of authority similar to that of a GS-13 series civilian employee or below.

In terms of all other third parties who work or worked for the U.S. Government and whose names appear in records responsive to this request, the Requesters submit that the privacy interests of those individuals have been diminished by virtue of their involvement in one or more of the U.S. Government functions described above as falling within the scope of this request. There is a recognized inverse relationship between the position of authority that a government employee holds and the strength of that employee’s privacy interests. See Stern v. FBI, 737 F.2d 84, 92 (D.C. Cir. 1984); Jefferson v. Dep’t of Justice, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26782, \*11 (D.D.C. Nov. 14, 2003); see also Perlman v. Dep’t of Justice, 312 F.3d 100, 107-109 (2d. Cir. 2002)(setting forth five factors to consider in weighing government employee’s privacy interests

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

---

against public interest in disclosure, including employee's rank and whether information sheds light on a government activity).

The work performed by these third parties (whether they be U.S. Government officials or contractors) was part of their official responsibilities on behalf of the U.S. Government and was not of a personal nature. They served in a position of trust and authority to, among other things, provide airlines with guidance and instructions on the impact of President Trump's Executive Order so that those airlines could incorporate that new information into their own standard operating procedures. Given that responsive records memorializing the work they performed will shed light on government activity, particularly by revealing how CBP described the restrictions imposed by the Executive Order, it would be reasonable to conclude that the relevant third parties' respective (and diminished) privacy interests are outweighed by the public interest in disclosure of the information indexed to their name.<sup>1</sup>

We are also requesting a waiver of or, at a minimum, a reduction in fees. JMP, Mr. Vogel, and Mr. Gerstein qualify – in their own respective rights – for designation as representatives of the news media.

JMP is a non-partisan organization dedicating to promoting government accountability and the reduction of secrecy. <http://jamesmadisonproject.org/> (last accessed August 7, 2015). The organization is a frequent FOIA requester and litigator and Federal agencies routinely and regularly grant JMP fee waivers. Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein are the chief investigative reporter and senior reporter, respectively, for Politico. <http://www.politico.com/staff/kenneth-p-vogel> (last accessed December 22, 2016); <http://www.politico.com/staff/josh-gerstein> (last accessed December 22, 2016).

The Requesters have the ability to disseminate information on a wide scale and intend to use information obtained through this FOIA request in an original work, particularly through news articles published by Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein. According to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii),

the term 'a representative of the news media' means any person or entity that 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.

The Requesters can demonstrate their intent and ability to publish or otherwise disseminate information to the public. See Nat'l Security Archive v. Dep't of Defense, 880 F.2d 1381, 1386 (D.C. Cir. 1989). Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein maintain the ability to produce news articles that

---

<sup>1</sup> We acknowledge, of course, that some redactions or narrowly focused withholdings might ultimately be appropriate as CBP processes the responsive records.

---

*"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives."*

*James Madison, 1822*

---

will be published by Politico. In the event that fees are ultimately assessed, please do not incur expenses beyond \$25 without first contacting our office for explicit authorization.

There is considerable public interest in disclosure of the requested records. Countless lawyers raced to the various U.S. airports to prove pro bono legal services to those who were impacted by the new entry restrictions. <https://www.yahoo.com/news/trump-travel-ban-galvanizes-young-lawyers-action-023327562.html> (last accessed January 30, 2017). Despite the issuance of the emergency stays by the different federal judges, reports emerged of CBP officials refusing to comply with the court orders. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2017/01/29/trump-s-border-patrol-defies-judge-u-s-senator-at-dulles-airport-at-his-first-constitutional-crisis-unfolds.html> (last accessed January 31, 2017); [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/dulles-airport-feds-violated-court-order\\_us\\_588d7274e4b08a14f7e67bcf](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/dulles-airport-feds-violated-court-order_us_588d7274e4b08a14f7e67bcf) (last accessed January 31, 2017). Disclosure of records responsive to this request would, among other things, shed light on how CBP was explaining to the airlines the impact of the court rulings.

Finally, and again in reliance upon the same public interest reasons outlined above, the Requesters are seeking expedited processing of their FOIA request. FOIA permits expedited processing when a “compelling need” exists. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v). Specifically, “compelling need” means “with respect to a request made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information, urgency to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity.” *Id.* at § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II).

The records responsive to this FOIA request clearly qualify as information regarding U.S. Government activity that the public has an urgent and active need to know. The bureaucratic dysfunction surrounding the implementation of the Executive Order has impacted hundreds of individuals who had valid paperwork authorizing entry into the United States, and remains an ongoing legal dispute to this day. This more than sufficiently satisfies the statutory requirement to demonstrate a “compelling need”.

If CBP denies all or part of this request, please cite the specific exemptions you believe justify your refusal to release the information or permit the review and notify us of your appeal procedures available under the law. We request that any documents or records produced in response to this request be provided in electronic (soft-copy) form wherever possible. Acceptable formats are .pdf, .jpg, .gif, .tif. Please provide soft-copy records by email or on a CD if email is not feasible. However, the Requesters do not agree to pay an additional fee to receive records on a CD, and in the instance that such a fee is required, the Requesters will accept a paper copy of responsive records.

Your cooperation in this matter would be appreciated. If you wish to discuss this request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 907-7945 or via e-mail at [brad@jamesmadisonproject.org](mailto:brad@jamesmadisonproject.org).

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

Sincerely,

/s/

Bradley P. Moss

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

# Exhibit 3

## ICE Request

The James Madison Project  
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 498-0011  
(202) 330-5610 fax

E-Mail: [FOIA@JamesMadisonProject.org](mailto:FOIA@JamesMadisonProject.org)  
<http://www.JamesMadisonProject.org>

January 31, 2017

VIA E-MAIL

Catrina Pavlick-Keenan  
FOIA Officer  
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement  
Mail Stop 5009  
500 12th Street, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20536-5009

Re: FOIA Request – Guidance For Immigration Executive Order

Dear Ms. Keenan:

This is a request on behalf of The James Madison Project (“JMP”), Ken Vogel (“Mr. Vogel”), and Josh Gerstein (“Mr. Gerstein”)(hereinafter referred to jointly as “the Requesters”) under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, *et seq.* This request seeks copies of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) records, including cross-references, memorializing the following:

- 1) Guidance provided by ICE to private and commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to admission, denial of admission, and/or deportation of individuals subject to President Trump’s Executive Order, signed on January 27, 2017;
- 2) Communications (that are not encompassed by category #1) between ICE and private and/or commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to implementation of President Trump’s Executive Order, signed January 27, 2017; and
- 3) Communications (that are not encompassed by categories #1 or #2) between ICE and private and/or commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to the judicial rulings imposing emergency stays and/or restraining orders enjoining President Trump’s Executive Order, signed January 27, 2017.

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

---

For context, President Trump issued an Executive Order on January 27, 2017, entitled “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States”. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/27/us/politics/refugee-muslim-executive-order-trump.html?mtrref=www.nytimes.com&gwh=B456165D1D10E39DE6FBC6134CD77963&gwt=pay> (last accessed January 30, 2017). The Executive Order suspended the U.S. Government refugee program, indefinitely barred Syrian refugees, and temporarily barred entry into the United States foreign nationals from seven countries. [https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/trump-refugee-ban-muslim-executive-order.html?\\_r=0](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/trump-refugee-ban-muslim-executive-order.html?_r=0) (last accessed January 30, 2017).

In the aftermath of the issuance of the Executive Order, chaos erupted at U.S. airports on January 28, 2017, as hundreds of individuals were detained and prevented from entering the United States despite holding valid entry paperwork. By the evening of January 29, 2017, at least four different U.S. district court judges had issued emergency injunctions preventing the U.S. Government from deporting individuals who had been detained pursuant to the Executive Order. <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/28/politics/donald-trump-executive-order-immigration-reaction/index.html> (last accessed January 30, 2017).

To be clear, the scope of the information sought in this request should encompass communications that occurred both prior and subsequent to President Trump’s signing of the Executive Order on January 27, 2017. ICE can limit the timeframe of its search from January 20, 2017, up until the date the agency begins conducting actual searches for responsive records. The scope of the searches should not be limited to ICE-originated records and should be construed to include records that are currently in the possession of a U.S. Government contractor for purposes of records management.

The Requesters are pre-emptively waiving any objection to the redaction of the names of any U.S. Government officials below a GS-14 position or whom otherwise were not acting in a supervisory position. The Requesters similarly waive any objection to redactions of the names of any U.S. Government contractors in a position of authority similar to that of a GS-13 series civilian employee or below.

In terms of all other third parties who work or worked for the U.S. Government and whose names appear in records responsive to this request, the Requesters submit that the privacy interests of those individuals have been diminished by virtue of their involvement in one or more of the U.S. Government functions described above as falling within the scope of this request. There is a recognized inverse relationship between the position of authority that a government employee holds and the strength of that employee’s privacy interests. See Stern v. FBI, 737 F.2d 84, 92 (D.C. Cir. 1984); Jefferson v. Dep’t of Justice, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26782, \*11 (D.D.C. Nov. 14, 2003); see also Perlman v. Dep’t of Justice, 312 F.3d 100, 107-109 (2d. Cir. 2002)(setting forth five factors to consider in weighing government employee’s privacy interests

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

---

against public interest in disclosure, including employee's rank and whether information sheds light on a government activity).

The work performed by these third parties (whether they be U.S. Government officials or contractors) was part of their official responsibilities on behalf of the U.S. Government and was not of a personal nature. They served in a position of trust and authority to, among other things, provide airlines with guidance and instructions on the impact of President Trump's Executive Order so that those airlines could incorporate that new information into their own standard operating procedures. Given that responsive records memorializing the work they performed will shed light on government activity, particularly by revealing how ICE described the restrictions imposed by the Executive Order, it would be reasonable to conclude that the relevant third parties' respective (and diminished) privacy interests are outweighed by the public interest in disclosure of the information indexed to their name.<sup>1</sup>

We are also requesting a waiver of or, at a minimum, a reduction in fees. JMP, Mr. Vogel, and Mr. Gerstein qualify – in their own respective rights – for designation as representatives of the news media.

JMP is a non-partisan organization dedicating to promoting government accountability and the reduction of secrecy. <http://jamesmadisonproject.org/> (last accessed August 7, 2015). The organization is a frequent FOIA requester and litigator and Federal agencies routinely and regularly grant JMP fee waivers. Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein are the chief investigative reporter and senior reporter, respectively, for Politico. <http://www.politico.com/staff/kenneth-p-vogel> (last accessed December 22, 2016); <http://www.politico.com/staff/josh-gerstein> (last accessed December 22, 2016).

The Requesters have the ability to disseminate information on a wide scale and intend to use information obtained through this FOIA request in an original work, particularly through news articles published by Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein. According to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii),

the term 'a representative of the news media' means any person or entity that 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.

The Requesters can demonstrate their intent and ability to publish or otherwise disseminate information to the public. See Nat'l Security Archive v. Dep't of Defense, 880 F.2d 1381, 1386 (D.C. Cir. 1989). Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein maintain the ability to produce news articles that

---

<sup>1</sup> We acknowledge, of course, that some redactions or narrowly focused withholdings might ultimately be appropriate as ICE processes the responsive records.

---

*"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives."*

*James Madison, 1822*



---

will be published by Politico. In the event that fees are ultimately assessed, please do not incur expenses beyond \$25 without first contacting our office for explicit authorization.

There is considerable public interest in disclosure of the requested records. Countless lawyers raced to the various U.S. airports to prove pro bono legal services to those who were impacted by the new entry restrictions. <https://www.yahoo.com/news/trump-travel-ban-galvanizes-young-lawyers-action-023327562.html> (last accessed January 30, 2017). Despite the issuance of the emergency stays by the different federal judges, reports emerged of CBP officials refusing to comply with the court orders. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2017/01/29/trump-s-border-patrol-defies-judge-u-s-senator-at-dulles-airport-at-his-first-constitutional-crisis-unfolds.html> (last accessed January 31, 2017); [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/dulles-airport-feds-violated-court-order\\_us\\_588d7274e4b08a14f7e67bcf](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/dulles-airport-feds-violated-court-order_us_588d7274e4b08a14f7e67bcf) (last accessed January 31, 2017). Disclosure of records responsive to this request would, among other things, shed light on how ICE was explaining to the airlines the impact of the court rulings.

Finally, and again in reliance upon the same public interest reasons outlined above, the Requesters are seeking expedited processing of their FOIA request. FOIA permits expedited processing when a “compelling need” exists. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v). Specifically, “compelling need” means “with respect to a request made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information, urgency to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity.” *Id.* at § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II).

The records responsive to this FOIA request clearly qualify as information regarding U.S. Government activity that the public has an urgent and active need to know. The bureaucratic dysfunction surrounding the implementation of the Executive Order has impacted hundreds of individuals who had valid paperwork authorizing entry into the United States, and remains an ongoing legal dispute to this day. This more than sufficiently satisfies the statutory requirement to demonstrate a “compelling need”.

If ICE denies all or part of this request, please cite the specific exemptions you believe justify your refusal to release the information or permit the review and notify us of your appeal procedures available under the law. We request that any documents or records produced in response to this request be provided in electronic (soft-copy) form wherever possible. Acceptable formats are .pdf, .jpg, .gif, .tif. Please provide soft-copy records by email or on a CD if email is not feasible. However, the Requesters do not agree to pay an additional fee to receive records on a CD, and in the instance that such a fee is required, the Requesters will accept a paper copy of responsive records.

Your cooperation in this matter would be appreciated. If you wish to discuss this request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 907-7945 or via e-mail at [brad@jamesmadisonproject.org](mailto:brad@jamesmadisonproject.org).

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

Sincerely,

/s/

Bradley P. Moss

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

# Exhibit 4

## USCIS Request

The James Madison Project  
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 498-0011  
(202) 330-5610 fax

E-Mail: [FOIA@JamesMadisonProject.org](mailto:FOIA@JamesMadisonProject.org)  
<http://www.JamesMadisonProject.org>

January 31, 2017

VIA E-MAIL

Jill Eggleston  
FOIA Officer  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
National Records Center  
FOIA/PA Office  
P.O. Box 648010  
Lee's Summit, MO 64064-8010

Re: FOIA Request – Guidance For Immigration Executive Order

Dear Ms. Eggleston:

This is a request on behalf of The James Madison Project (“JMP”), Ken Vogel (“Mr. Vogel”), and Josh Gerstein (“Mr. Gerstein”)(hereinafter referred to jointly as “the Requesters”) under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, *et seq.* This request seeks copies of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”) records, including cross-references, memorializing the following:

- 1) Guidance provided by USCIS to private and commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to admission, denial of admission, and/or deportation of individuals subject to President Trump’s Executive Order, signed on January 27, 2017;
- 2) Communications (that are not encompassed by category #1) between USCIS and private and/or commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to implementation of President Trump’s Executive Order, signed January 27, 2017; and
- 3) Communications (that are not encompassed by categories #1 or #2) between USCIS and private and/or commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to the judicial rulings imposing emergency stays and/or restraining orders enjoining President Trump’s Executive Order, signed January 27, 2017.

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

---

For context, President Trump issued an Executive Order on January 27, 2017, entitled “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States”. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/27/us/politics/refugee-muslim-executive-order-trump.html?mtrref=www.nytimes.com&gwh=B456165D1D10E39DE6FBC6134CD77963&gwt=pay> (last accessed January 30, 2017). The Executive Order suspended the U.S. Government refugee program, indefinitely barred Syrian refugees, and temporarily barred entry into the United States foreign nationals from seven countries. [https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/trump-refugee-ban-muslim-executive-order.html?\\_r=0](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/trump-refugee-ban-muslim-executive-order.html?_r=0) (last accessed January 30, 2017).

In the aftermath of the issuance of the Executive Order, chaos erupted at U.S. airports on January 28, 2017, as hundreds of individuals were detained and prevented from entering the United States despite holding valid entry paperwork. By the evening of January 29, 2017, at least four different U.S. district court judges had issued emergency injunctions preventing the U.S. Government from deporting individuals who had been detained pursuant to the Executive Order. <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/28/politics/donald-trump-executive-order-immigration-reaction/index.html> (last accessed January 30, 2017).

To be clear, the scope of the information sought in this request should encompass communications that occurred both prior and subsequent to President Trump’s signing of the Executive Order on January 27, 2017. USCIS can limit the timeframe of its search from January 20, 2017, up until the date the agency begins conducting actual searches for responsive records. The scope of the searches should not be limited to USCIS-originated records and should be construed to include records that are currently in the possession of a U.S. Government contractor for purposes of records management.

The Requesters are pre-emptively waiving any objection to the redaction of the names of any U.S. Government officials below a GS-14 position or whom otherwise were not acting in a supervisory position. The Requesters similarly waive any objection to redactions of the names of any U.S. Government contractors in a position of authority similar to that of a GS-13 series civilian employee or below.

In terms of all other third parties who work or worked for the U.S. Government and whose names appear in records responsive to this request, the Requesters submit that the privacy interests of those individuals have been diminished by virtue of their involvement in one or more of the U.S. Government functions described above as falling within the scope of this request. There is a recognized inverse relationship between the position of authority that a government employee holds and the strength of that employee’s privacy interests. See Stern v. FBI, 737 F.2d 84, 92 (D.C. Cir. 1984); Jefferson v. Dep’t of Justice, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26782, \*11 (D.D.C. Nov. 14, 2003); see also Perlman v. Dep’t of Justice, 312 F.3d 100, 107-109 (2d. Cir. 2002)(setting forth five factors to consider in weighing government employee’s privacy interests

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

---

against public interest in disclosure, including employee's rank and whether information sheds light on a government activity).

The work performed by these third parties (whether they be U.S. Government officials or contractors) was part of their official responsibilities on behalf of the U.S. Government and was not of a personal nature. They served in a position of trust and authority to, among other things, provide airlines with guidance and instructions on the impact of President Trump's Executive Order so that those airlines could incorporate that new information into their own standard operating procedures. Given that responsive records memorializing the work they performed will shed light on government activity, particularly by revealing how USCIS described the restrictions imposed by the Executive Order, it would be reasonable to conclude that the relevant third parties' respective (and diminished) privacy interests are outweighed by the public interest in disclosure of the information indexed to their name.<sup>1</sup>

We are also requesting a waiver of or, at a minimum, a reduction in fees. JMP, Mr. Vogel, and Mr. Gerstein qualify – in their own respective rights – for designation as representatives of the news media.

JMP is a non-partisan organization dedicating to promoting government accountability and the reduction of secrecy. <http://jamesmadisonproject.org/> (last accessed August 7, 2015). The organization is a frequent FOIA requester and litigator and Federal agencies routinely and regularly grant JMP fee waivers. Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein are the chief investigative reporter and senior reporter, respectively, for Politico. <http://www.politico.com/staff/kenneth-p-vogel> (last accessed December 22, 2016); <http://www.politico.com/staff/josh-gerstein> (last accessed December 22, 2016).

The Requesters have the ability to disseminate information on a wide scale and intend to use information obtained through this FOIA request in an original work, particularly through news articles published by Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein. According to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii),

the term 'a representative of the news media' means any person or entity that 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.

The Requesters can demonstrate their intent and ability to publish or otherwise disseminate information to the public. See Nat'l Security Archive v. Dep't of Defense, 880 F.2d 1381, 1386 (D.C. Cir. 1989). Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein maintain the ability to produce news articles that

---

<sup>1</sup> We acknowledge, of course, that some redactions or narrowly focused withholdings might ultimately be appropriate as USCIS processes the responsive records.

---

*"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives."*

*James Madison, 1822*

---

will be published by Politico. In the event that fees are ultimately assessed, please do not incur expenses beyond \$25 without first contacting our office for explicit authorization.

There is considerable public interest in disclosure of the requested records. Countless lawyers raced to the various U.S. airports to prove pro bono legal services to those who were impacted by the new entry restrictions. <https://www.yahoo.com/news/trump-travel-ban-galvanizes-young-lawyers-action-023327562.html> (last accessed January 30, 2017). Despite the issuance of the emergency stays by the different federal judges, reports emerged of CBP officials refusing to comply with the court orders. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2017/01/29/trump-s-border-patrol-defies-judge-u-s-senator-at-dulles-airport-at-his-first-constitutional-crisis-unfolds.html> (last accessed January 31, 2017); [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/dulles-airport-feds-violated-court-order\\_us\\_588d7274e4b08a14f7e67bcf](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/dulles-airport-feds-violated-court-order_us_588d7274e4b08a14f7e67bcf) (last accessed January 31, 2017). Disclosure of records responsive to this request would, among other things, shed light on how USCIS was explaining to the airlines the impact of the court rulings.

Finally, and again in reliance upon the same public interest reasons outlined above, the Requesters are seeking expedited processing of their FOIA request. FOIA permits expedited processing when a “compelling need” exists. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v). Specifically, “compelling need” means “with respect to a request made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information, urgency to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity.” *Id.* at § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II).

The records responsive to this FOIA request clearly qualify as information regarding U.S. Government activity that the public has an urgent and active need to know. The bureaucratic dysfunction surrounding the implementation of the Executive Order has impacted hundreds of individuals who had valid paperwork authorizing entry into the United States, and remains an ongoing legal dispute to this day. This more than sufficiently satisfies the statutory requirement to demonstrate a “compelling need”.

If USCIS denies all or part of this request, please cite the specific exemptions you believe justify your refusal to release the information or permit the review and notify us of your appeal procedures available under the law. We request that any documents or records produced in response to this request be provided in electronic (soft-copy) form wherever possible. Acceptable formats are .pdf, .jpg, .gif, .tif. Please provide soft-copy records by email or on a CD if email is not feasible. However, the Requesters do not agree to pay an additional fee to receive records on a CD, and in the instance that such a fee is required, the Requesters will accept a paper copy of responsive records.

Your cooperation in this matter would be appreciated. If you wish to discuss this request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 907-7945 or via e-mail at [brad@jamesmadisonproject.org](mailto:brad@jamesmadisonproject.org).

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*

Sincerely,

/s/

Bradley P. Moss

---

*“Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives.”*

*James Madison, 1822*



# Exhibit 5

## DHS Request

**From:** Bradley P. Moss, Esq.  
**To:** [FOIA](#)  
**Subject:** RE: FOIA request  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 31, 2017 10:38:14 PM

---

Karen Neuman  
FOIA Officer  
Department of Homeland Security  
Headquarters  
STOP-0655  
245 Murray Lane, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20528-0655

Re: FOIA Request – Guidance For Immigration Executive Order

Dear Ms. Neuman:

This is a request on behalf of The James Madison Project (“JMP”), Ken Vogel (“Mr. Vogel”), and Josh Gerstein (“Mr. Gerstein”)(hereinafter referred to jointly as “the Requesters”) under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, *et seq.* This request seeks copies of Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) records, including cross-references, memorializing the following:

- 1) Guidance provided by DHS to private and commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to admission, denial of admission, and/or deportation of individuals subject to President Trump’s Executive Order, signed on January 27, 2017;
- 2) Communications (that are not encompassed by category #1) between DHS and private and/or commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to implementation of President Trump’s Executive Order, signed January 27, 2017; and
- 3) Communications (that are not encompassed by categories #1 or #2) between DHS and private and/or commercial airlines operating at U.S. airports with respect to the judicial rulings imposing emergency stays and/or restraining orders enjoining President Trump’s Executive Order, signed January 27, 2017.

For context, President Trump issued an Executive Order on January 27, 2017, entitled “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States”. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/27/us/politics/refugee-muslim-executive-order-trump.html?mtrref=www.nytimes.com&gwh=B456165D1D10E39DE6FBC6134CD77963&gwt=pay> (last accessed January 30, 2017). The Executive Order suspended the U.S. Government refugee program, indefinitely barred Syrian refugees, and temporarily barred entry into the United States foreign nationals from seven countries. [https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/trump-refugee-ban-muslim-executive-order.html?\\_r=0](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/29/us/trump-refugee-ban-muslim-executive-order.html?_r=0) (last accessed January 30, 2017).

In the aftermath of the issuance of the Executive Order, chaos erupted at U.S. airports on January 28, 2017, as hundreds of individuals were detained and prevented from entering the United States despite holding valid entry paperwork. By the evening of January 29, 2017, at least four

different U.S. district court judges had issued emergency injunctions preventing the U.S. Government from deporting individuals who had been detained pursuant to the Executive Order. <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/28/politics/donald-trump-executive-order-immigration-reaction/index.html> (last accessed January 30, 2017).

To be clear, the scope of the information sought in this request should encompass communications that occurred both prior and subsequent to President Trump's signing of the Executive Order on January 27, 2017. DHS can limit the timeframe of its search from January 20, 2017, up until the date the agency begins conducting actual searches for responsive records. The scope of the searches should not be limited to DHS-originated records and should be construed to include records that are currently in the possession of a U.S. Government contractor for purposes of records management.

The Requesters are pre-emptively waiving any objection to the redaction of the names of any U.S. Government officials below a GS-14 position or whom otherwise were not acting in a supervisory position. The Requesters similarly waive any objection to redactions of the names of any U.S. Government contractors in a position of authority similar to that of a GS-13 series civilian employee or below.

In terms of all other third parties who work or worked for the U.S. Government and whose names appear in records responsive to this request, the Requesters submit that the privacy interests of those individuals have been diminished by virtue of their involvement in one or more of the U.S. Government functions described above as falling within the scope of this request. There is a recognized inverse relationship between the position of authority that a government employee holds and the strength of that employee's privacy interests. See Stern v. FBI, 737 F.2d 84, 92 (D.C. Cir. 1984); Jefferson v. Dep't of Justice, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26782, \*11 (D.D.C. Nov. 14, 2003); see also Perlman v. Dep't of Justice, 312 F.3d 100, 107-109 (2d. Cir. 2002)(setting forth five factors to consider in weighing government employee's privacy interests against public interest in disclosure, including employee's rank and whether information sheds light on a government activity).

The work performed by these third parties (whether they be U.S. Government officials or contractors) was part of their official responsibilities on behalf of the U.S. Government and was not of a personal nature. They served in a position of trust and authority to, among other things, provide airlines with guidance and instructions on the impact of President Trump's Executive Order so that those airlines could incorporate that new information into their own standard operating procedures. Given that responsive records memorializing the work they performed will shed light on government activity, particularly by revealing how DHS described the restrictions imposed by the Executive Order, it would be reasonable to conclude that the relevant third parties' respective (and diminished) privacy interests are outweighed by the public interest in disclosure of the information indexed to their name. <sup>[1]</sup>

We are also requesting a waiver of or, at a minimum, a reduction in fees. JMP, Mr. Vogel, and Mr. Gerstein qualify – in their own respective rights – for designation as representatives of the news media.

JMP is a non-partisan organization dedicating to promoting government accountability and the reduction of secrecy. <http://jamesmadisonproject.org/> (last accessed August 7, 2015). The organization is a frequent FOIA requester and litigator and Federal agencies routinely and regularly grant JMP fee waivers. Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein are the chief investigative reporter and senior reporter, respectively, for Politico. <http://www.politico.com/staff/kenneth-p-vogel> (last accessed December 22, 2016); <http://www.politico.com/staff/josh-gerstein> (last accessed December 22, 2016).

The Requesters have the ability to disseminate information on a wide scale and intend to use information obtained through this FOIA request in an original work, particularly through news articles published by Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein. According to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii),

the term ‘a representative of the news media’ means any person or entity that 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.

The Requesters can demonstrate their intent and ability to publish or otherwise disseminate information to the public. See Nat’l Security Archive v. Dep’t of Defense, 880 F.2d 1381, 1386 (D.C. Cir. 1989). Mr. Vogel and Mr. Gerstein maintain the ability to produce news articles that will be published by Politico. In the event that fees are ultimately assessed, please do not incur expenses beyond \$25 without first contacting our office for explicit authorization.

There is considerable public interest in disclosure of the requested records. Countless lawyers raced to the various U.S. airports to prove pro bono legal services to those who were impacted by the new entry restrictions. <https://www.yahoo.com/news/trump-travel-ban-galvanizes-young-lawyers-action-023327562.html> (last accessed January 30, 2017). Despite the issuance of the emergency stays by the different federal judges, reports emerged of CBP officials refusing to comply with the court orders. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2017/01/29/trump-s-border-patrol-defies-judge-u-s-senator-at-dulles-airport-at-his-first-constitutional-crisis-unfolds.html> (last accessed January 31, 2017); [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/dulles-airport-feds-violated-court-order\\_us\\_588d7274e4b08a14f7e67bcf](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/dulles-airport-feds-violated-court-order_us_588d7274e4b08a14f7e67bcf) (last accessed January 31, 2017). Disclosure of records responsive to this request would, among other things, shed light on how DHS was explaining to the airlines the impact of the court rulings.

Finally, and again in reliance upon the same public interest reasons outlined above, the Requesters are seeking expedited processing of their FOIA request. FOIA permits expedited processing when a “compelling need” exists. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v). Specifically, “compelling need” means “with respect to a request made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information, urgency to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity.” Id. at § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II).

The records responsive to this FOIA request clearly qualify as information regarding U.S. Government activity that the public has an urgent and active need to know. The bureaucratic dysfunction surrounding the implementation of the Executive Order has impacted hundreds of

individuals who had valid paperwork authorizing entry into the United States, and remains an ongoing legal dispute to this day. This more than sufficiently satisfies the statutory requirement to demonstrate a “compelling need”.

If DHS denies all or part of this request, please cite the specific exemptions you believe justify your refusal to release the information or permit the review and notify us of your appeal procedures available under the law. We request that any documents or records produced in response to this request be provided in electronic (soft-copy) form wherever possible. Acceptable formats are .pdf, .jpg, .gif, .tif. Please provide soft-copy records by email or on a CD if email is not feasible. However, the Requesters do not agree to pay an additional fee to receive records on a CD, and in the instance that such a fee is required, the Requesters will accept a paper copy of responsive records.

Your cooperation in this matter would be appreciated. If you wish to discuss this request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (202) 907-7945 or via e-mail at [brad@jamesmadisonproject.org](mailto:brad@jamesmadisonproject.org).

Sincerely,

/s/

Bradley P. Moss

---

**From:** Bradley P. Moss, Esq. [mailto:[brad@markzaid.com](mailto:brad@markzaid.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 31, 2017 10:35 PM  
**To:** [foia@hq.dhs.gov](mailto:foia@hq.dhs.gov)  
**Cc:** 'Mark Zaid' <[mark@markzaid.com](mailto:mark@markzaid.com)>  
**Subject:** FOIA request

Ms. Neuman –

Please find attached a FOIA request submitted on behalf of The James Madison Project, Ken Vogel, and Josh Gerstein.

Regards,

Brad Moss

---

This electronic mail (e-mail) transmission is meant solely for the person(s) to whom it is addressed. It contains confidential information that may also be legally privileged. Any copying, dissemination or distribution of the contents of this e-mail by anyone other than the addressee or his or her agent for such purposes is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me immediately by telephone or e-mail and purge the original and all copies thereof. Thank you.

Bradley Prescott Moss, Esq.  
Partner  
Mark S. Zaid, P.C.

1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20036  
C: (202) 907-7945  
F: (202) 558-4432

---

[\[1\]](#) We acknowledge, of course, that some redactions or narrowly focused withholdings might ultimately be appropriate as DHS processes the responsive records.