



January 5, 2017

**VIA REGULATIONS.GOV**

Office of the Secretariat  
Consumer Product Safety Commission  
4330 East West Highway  
Room 820  
Bethesda, MD 20814

**Re: Comment on Proposed FOIA Regulations, Docket ID: CPSC-2016-0030**

**I. Introduction**

Pursuant to Section 553(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), Cause of Action Institute (“CoA Institute”) hereby comments on the Consumer Product Safety Commission’s (“CPSC”) proposed Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) regulations.<sup>1</sup>

CoA Institute is a nonprofit strategic oversight group committed to ensuring that government decision-making is open, honest, and fair.<sup>2</sup> In carrying out its mission, CoA Institute uses various investigative and legal tools to educate the public about the importance of government transparency and accountability. CoA Institute routinely requests records under the FOIA and disseminates its analysis of those records to the interested public by various means, including a frequently visited website, newsletters, press releases, news articles, Twitter, and Facebook. CoA Institute engages in extensive FOIA litigation and its lawyers have expertise with respect to the history, purpose, and application of the FOIA. CoA Institute routinely confronts the issues addressed in the following comments. It therefore respectfully requests that CPSC consider these comments and amend its proposed rule accordingly.

**II. Comments**

a. 16 C.F.R. § 1015.9(c)(8) – Representative of the News Media

CPSC has failed to address its outdated definition of “representative of the news media,”<sup>3</sup> which is in conflict with the statute, as amended.<sup>4</sup> In 2015, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Consumer Prod. Safety Comm’n, Procedures for Disclosure or Production of Information Under the Freedom of Information Act; Amendments, 82 Fed. Reg. 59 (proposed rule issued Jan. 3, 2017) (to be codified at 16 C.F.R. pt. 1015).

<sup>2</sup> See CAUSE OF ACTION INST., *About*, <http://www.causeofaction.org/about> (last accessed Jan. 5, 2017).

<sup>3</sup> 16 C.F.R. § 1015.9(c)(8).

<sup>4</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A) (“[T]he 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.”).

District of Columbia Circuit issued an opinion in *Cause of Action v. Federal Trade Commission* that clarified the application of this statutory definition.<sup>5</sup> CPSC should take this opportunity to amend its FOIA regulations to bring its definitions into conformance with statutory and judicial authorities. CoA Institute accordingly requests that CPSC include the following definition, which tracks the FOIA definition:

**§ 1015.9 Fees for production of records**

[. . .]

(c)(8) “Representative of the news media” or “news media requester” 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.

b. Additional Matters

There are other elements of the DC Circuit’s *Cause of Action v. FTC* decision that also should be considered with respect to the news media requester fee category. First, CPSC should incorporate the direction that the news media requester fee category determination focus “on the nature of the *requester*, not its request.”<sup>6</sup> To illustrate, “[a] newspaper reporter . . . is a representative of the news media regardless of how much interest there is in the story for which he or she is requesting information.”<sup>7</sup> Although a case-by-case inquiry into the articulated purpose of a request, the potential public interest in the requested material, or even the ability of a requester to disseminate the sought-after records rather than information in general may be appropriate in determining the eligibility of a nascent news media requester (*i.e.*, a new entity that lacks a track record), it is necessary to remember that “the [FOIA] statute’s focus [is] on requesters, rather than [their] requests.”<sup>8</sup> CPSC’s new regulations should reflect this focus.

Second, with respect to the requirement that a news media requester use “editorial skills” to turn “raw materials” into a “distinct work,” CoA Institute directs CPSC to the *Cause of Action* court’s clarification that “[a] substantive press release or editorial comment can be a distinct work based on the underlying material, just as a newspaper article about the same document would be—and its composition can involve ‘a significant degree of editorial discretion.’”<sup>9</sup> Although the mere dissemination of raw records would not meet the “distinct work” standard, even a simple press release commenting on records would satisfy this criterion. CPSC’s regulations should embrace this standard.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> 799 F.3d 1108 (D.C. Cir. 2015).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 1121.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 1122.

<sup>10</sup> The *Cause of Action* court also addressed three related issues. First, the court articulated that the FOIA does not “require that a requester gather[] information ‘from a range of sources’ or a ‘wide variety of sources.’” *Id.* at 1122. “[N]othing in principle prevents a journalist from producing ‘distinct work’ that is based exclusively on documents obtained through FOIA.” *Id.* Second, with respect to the news media requester category dissemination requirement, the court provided a non-exhaustive list of the methods an agency must consider, including: “newsletters, press releases, press contacts, a website, and planned reports.” *Id.* at 1124. Finally, the court addressed the so-called “middleman standard,” rejecting the government argument that “a public interest advocacy organization cannot

Third, the *Cause of Action* court insisted that the statutory definition of “representative of the news media” captures “alternative media” and evolving news media formats.<sup>11</sup> The court thereby provided a useful clarification about the interplay between evolving media and the news media dissemination requirement when it affirmed the *National Security Archive v. Department of Defense* rule that “posting content to a public website can qualify as a means of distributing it[.]”<sup>12</sup> Although “[t]here is no doubt that the requirement that a requester distribute its work to ‘an audience’ contemplates that the work is distributed to more than a single person,” “the statute does not specify what size the audience must be.”<sup>13</sup> With this in mind, CPSC should indicate that the examples of news media entities it may include in its regulations are non-exhaustive.

### III. Conclusion

Thank you for your consideration of the foregoing comments and proposed changes.



---

R. JAMES VALVO, III  
COUNSEL & SENIOR POLICY ADVISOR

---

satisfy the [FOIA] statute’s distribution criterion because it is ‘more like a middleman for dissemination to the media than a representative of the media itself[.]’” *Id.* at 1125. The *Cause of Action* court rejected that argument because “there is no indication that Congress meant to distinguish between those who reach their ultimate audiences and those who partner with others to do so[.]” *Id.* CPSC should consider incorporating these important clarifications. <sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 1123; *see also* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A) (“These examples [of news-media entities] are not all-inclusive. Moreover, as methods of news delivery evolve (for example, the adoption of the electronic dissemination of newspapers through telecommunications services), such alternative media shall be considered to be news-media entities.”).

<sup>12</sup> *Cause of Action v. FTC*, 799 F.3d at 1123.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 1124.