

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,)
and AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES)
UNION FOUNDATION,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, et)
al.)

Defendants.)

Civil Action No. 1:13-cv-01870 (JEB)

**DECLARATION OF PETER J. KADZIK
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

I, PETER J. KADZIK, hereby declare and state:

1. I have served as the Assistant Attorney General for Legislative Affairs at the Department of Justice (DOJ or Department) since I was confirmed by the Senate in June 2014. In the year prior to that, I was a Deputy Assistant Attorney General and then the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Legislative Affairs. Prior to joining DOJ, I was in private practice at Dickstein Shapiro LLP. Earlier in my career, I served as an Assistant United States Attorney in the District of Columbia. As Assistant Attorney General for Legislative Affairs, I head the DOJ's Office of Legislative Affairs (OLA), which is responsible for managing the Department's relationship with Congress. OLA represents the Department in communications to Congress and articulates congressional interests and priorities to Department leadership. This involves communications about legislative, oversight, and other matters of interest to Members

of Congress. In particular, I interact regularly with Members and staff of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) about legislative and oversight matters.

2. Through the exercise of my official duties, I am familiar with this civil action and the underlying Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) request. The purpose of this declaration is to explain DOJ’s receipt and treatment of the document at issue in this litigation – the current version of the full report authored by SSCI concerning the CIA’s former detention and interrogation program (the “Full Report”).

3. The statements in this declaration are based on my personal knowledge and information made available to me in my official capacity.

PLAINTIFF’S FOIA REQUEST

4. By letter dated May 6, 2014, the plaintiffs in this case submitted a FOIA request to DOJ, seeking “the updated version of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence’s Report.” A true and correct copy of this letter is attached hereto as Exhibit A. On May 22, 2014, Vanessa Brinkmann, Senior Counsel in the Office of Information Policy, responded on behalf of OLA that, “the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) is the agency best suited to respond to your request. I understand that you have already submitted your request to the CIA. That agency will respond to you directly if it has not done so already.” A true and correct copy of this letter is attached hereto as Exhibit B. On June 5, 2014, the plaintiffs amended their prior complaint in this lawsuit to seek the release of the “Updated SSCI Report,” and added DOJ as a defendant on that claim. DOJ has interpreted this to refer to the most current version of the Full Report – the December 2014 version, which is the only updated version of the Full Report that DOJ has received since DOJ was added as a defendant in this lawsuit.

DOJ'S RECEIPT AND TREATMENT OF THE FULL REPORT

5. I am informed that on December 12, 2014, a former member of my staff received two copies of the Full Report by hand delivery from a SSCI Security Officer. One copy was for DOJ; the other copy was for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Each copy was accompanied by a December 10, 2014 letter from SSCI Chairman Dianne Feinstein to the President. The package is classified as "Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information ("TS/SCI") with additional classification markings for the applicable codeword. SCI is classified information concerning, or derived from, intelligence sources, methods, or analytical processes requiring handling within formal access control systems. SCI is sometimes referred to as "codeword" information, and its sensitivity requires that it be protected in a much more controlled environment than other classified information.

6. The two copies of the Full Report were delivered in a single package containing two discs. The same former staff member, who was the only member of the OLA staff other than I who – because of the classification level of the Full Report – had the clearances required to handle that document, signed for the copies for both DOJ and the FBI, and took the package to the OLA Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility ("SCIF") where he opened it and retrieved the DOJ copy of the Full Report with the accompanying letter. He rewrapped the copy for the FBI in the original wrapping, the interior of which was marked TS/SCI with the applicable codeword, placed the DOJ copy in another envelope, marked it with the same classification markings, as well as "Senate Intel RDI Report," and immediately placed both copies into OLA's SCIF. The CDs themselves were also marked TS/SCI, with the applicable codeword marking.

7. The copies of the Full Report that OLA received were not distributed further, and I am advised that the member of OLA's staff who signed for the documents and placed them in the SCIF did not open either of the CD cases, and has not reviewed the documents.

8. I have not reviewed the Full Report, and the FBI has neither retrieved nor reviewed its copy of the Full Report, which remains in the OLA SCIF. The DOJ copy of the Full Report also remains unopened in the OLA SCIF, and has exterior markings that state: "Senate Intel RDI Report," "Congressional Record," and is marked "TS/SCI" with the applicable codeword marking.

9. The disc itself has not been integrated into any agency records system, although the cover letter that accompanied it, a copy of a letter from Senator Feinstein to the President, was separated from the disc and assigned an agency tracking number. The disc itself is referenced as a classified attachment to the letter.

* * *

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 21st day of January 2015.



PETER J. KADZIK
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legislative Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice

Exhibit A

05-07-2014 12:17pm From-ACLU
LEGAL DEPARTMENT

2125492675

T-936 P.002/011 F-614



14-F-0803

RECEIVED

MAY 12 2014

Office of Information Policy

May 6, 2014

OLA
FOIA
SBT
DRH Reviewer

Information and Privacy Coordinator
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D.C. 20505

OSD/JS FOIA Requester Service Center
Office of Freedom of Information
1155 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-1155

Office of Information Programs and Services, A/GIS/IPS/RL
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20522-8100

Carmen L. Mallon, Chief of Staff
Office of Information Policy
U.S. Department of Justice
1425 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 11050
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION FOUNDATION
LEGAL DEPARTMENT
NATIONAL OFFICE
125 BROAD STREET, 18TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10004 2400
T/212 549.2500
F/212 549.2651
WWW.ACLU.ORG

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS
SUSAN N. BERMAN
PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RICHARD ZACKS
TREASURER

Re: Request Under Freedom of Information Act /
Expedited Processing Requested

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter constitutes a request ("Request") pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), 5 U.S.C. § 552 *et seq.*, and various relevant implementing regulations, *see* 32 C.F.R. § 1900 (Central Intelligence Agency); 28 C.F.R. § 16.1 (Department of Justice); 32 C.F.R. § 286 (Department of Defense); and 22 C.F.R. § 171.10 *et seq.* (Department of State). The Request is submitted by the American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the "ACLU" or the "Requesters").¹

¹ The American Civil Liberties Union is a non-profit, 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(4) membership organization that educates the public about the civil liberties implications of pending and proposed state and federal legislation, provides analysis of pending and proposed legislation, directly lobbies legislators, and mobilizes its members to lobby their legislators. The American Civil Liberties Union Foundation is a separate 26 U.S.C.

Requesters seek the disclosure of the updated version of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence's report, *Study of the CIA's Detention and Interrogation Program* (the "Revised Report"). See Letter from Sen. Dianne Feinstein to President Barack Obama (Apr. 7, 2014), <http://bit.ly/OKXyvw> (describing the Revised Report).

* * *

In March 2009, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence ("SSCI" or "Committee") began an investigation into the CIA's post-9/11 program of rendition, secret detention, torture, and other cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment of detainees. In the course of its investigation, the SSCI reviewed six million pages of government records documenting the treatment of detainees in CIA custody. The SSCI's intent was to produce "a detailed, factual description of how interrogation techniques were used, the conditions under which detainees were held, and the intelligence that was—or wasn't—gained from the program." Joint Statement from Senator Dianne Feinstein, Chairman, Senate Intelligence Committee, and Senator Carl Levin, Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee (Apr. 27, 2012), <http://1.usa.gov/IKjkq0>.

At the end of 2012, the SSCI completed its *Study of the CIA's Detention and Interrogation Program*, which spans more than 6,000 pages, includes 35,000 footnotes, and cost \$40 million to produce (the "Initial Report"). On December 13, 2012, the SSCI formally adopted the Initial Report. See S. Rep. No. 113-7, at 13 (Mar. 22, 2013). The SSCI subsequently disseminated the Initial Report to Executive Branch agencies. After reviewing comments by the CIA and minority views of Committee Republicans, the SSCI made changes to the Initial Report, which led to the SSCI's adoption of the Revised Report.

On April 3, 2014, the SSCI voted to send the "Findings and Conclusions" and "Executive Summary" of the Revised Report to the Executive Branch for declassification review. See Press Release, Sen. Feinstein, Intelligence Committee Votes to Declassify Portions of CIA Study (Apr. 3, 2014), <http://1.usa.gov/1hlYOk>. In her transmittal letter to President Obama, SSCI Chairman Senator Feinstein stated that the Revised Report should be viewed as "the authoritative report on the CIA's actions," and that she would be transmitting the Revised Report to appropriate Executive Branch agencies. See Letter from Sen. Feinstein to President Obama, <http://bit.ly/OKXyvw>.

§ 501(c)(3) organization that provides legal representation free of charge to individuals and organizations in civil rights and civil liberties cases, educates the public about civil rights and civil liberties issues across the country, and provides analyses of pending and proposed legislation.

The Revised Report is of clear and enormous public importance. The American public has a right to know the full truth, based on a comprehensive government investigation, about the torture and other abusive treatment of detainees authorized by officials at the highest levels of our government. The Revised Report is a crucial part of the historical record on the United States' abusive interrogation practices, as well as current and future public discussion about the CIA's treatment of detainees during the administration of President George W. Bush. Indeed, President Obama urged the Committee to complete the Revised Report and send it to the Executive Branch for declassification, "so that the American people can understand what happened in the past, and that can help guide us as we move forward." Jennifer Epstein, *Barack Obama Weighs in on Senate-CIA Flap*, Politico, Mar. 12, 2014, <http://politi.co/1eproSL>.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION FOUNDATION

According to Senator Feinstein, the Revised Report "exposes brutality that stands in stark contrast to our values as a nation. It chronicles a stain on our history that must never again be allowed to happen." Press Release, Sen. Feinstein, Intelligence Committee Votes to Declassify Portions of CIA Study, <http://1.usa.gov/1hlYOKt>. In addition to chronicling the CIA's detention and torture of detainees, the Revised Report "raises serious concerns about the CIA's management" of its detention and torture program. Press Release, Sens. Susan Collins and Angus King, Collins, King Announce Support for Declassification of Intelligence Committee Report on CIA Detention & Interrogation Program (Apr. 2, 2014), <http://1.usa.gov/1kws9vI>. Specifically, the Revised Report "concludes that the spy agency repeatedly misled Congress, the White House, and the public about the benefits" of the CIA's torture program. David S. Joachim, *Senate Panel Votes to Reveal Report on C.I.A. Interrogations*, N.Y. Times, Apr. 3, 2014, <http://nyti.ms/1eejlaR>; see also Letter from Sen. Mark Udall to President Barack Obama, Mar. 4, 2014, <http://bit.ly/1hwpU9p> (noting that "much of what has been declassified and released about the operation, management and effectiveness of the CIA's Detention and Interrogation Program is simply wrong. These inaccuracies are detailed in the 6,300 page Committee Study[.]").

Release of the Revised Report is therefore critical to ensure timely public access to a congressional investigative report of historic significance. For much of the last decade, the legality and wisdom of the CIA's practices, as well as the resulting harm to individuals' human rights, our nation's values, and our national security, have been matters of intense and ongoing public debate. A fair public debate of these issues must be informed by the Revised Report. Other official investigative reports have been made available to the public; for example, the Senate Armed Services Committee Report, which concerned the Department of

Defense's involvement in detainee abuses, was released in full in April 2009. The SSCI's Revised Report likewise ought to be released.

I. Record Requested

Requesters seek disclosure of the SSCI's recently revised report on the CIA's rendition, detention, and interrogation program in the years following 9/11.

With respect to the form of production, *see* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B), we request that the Revised Report be provided electronically in a text-searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best image quality in the agency's possession.

II. Application for Expedited Processing

We request expedited processing pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E) and 32 C.F.R. § 1900.34(c); 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d); 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3); and 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b). There is a "compelling need" for these records, as defined in the statute and regulations, because the information requested is urgently needed by an organization primarily engaged in disseminating information in order to inform the public about actual or alleged government activity. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v); *see also* 32 C.F.R. § 1900.34(c)(2); 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(ii); 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3)(ii); 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b)(2). In addition, the records sought relate to a "breaking news story of general public interest." 32 C.F.R. § 1900.34(c)(2) (providing for expedited processing when "the information is relevant to a subject of public urgency concerning an actual or alleged Federal government activity"); *see also* 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3)(ii)(A); 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b)(2)(i); 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(iv).

A. *The ACLU is an organization primarily engaged in disseminating information in order to inform the public about actual or alleged government activity.*

The ACLU is "primarily engaged in disseminating information" within the meaning of the statute and relevant regulations. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II); 32 C.F.R. § 1900.34(c)(2); 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(ii); 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3)(ii); 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b)(2). *See ACLU v. Dep't of Justice*, 321 F. Supp. 2d 24, 30 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding that a non-profit, public-interest group that "gathers information of potential interest to a segment of the public, uses its editorial skills to turn the raw material into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience" is "primarily engaged in disseminating information" (internal citation omitted)); *see also Leadership Conference on Civil Rights v. Gonzales*, 404 F. Supp. 2d 246, 260 (D.D.C. 2005) (finding Leadership

Conference—whose mission is “to serve as the site of record for relevant and up-to-the-minute civil rights news and information” and to “disseminate[] information regarding civil rights and voting rights to educate the public [and] promote effective civil rights laws”—to be “primarily engaged in the dissemination of information”).

Dissemination of information about actual or alleged government activity is a critical and substantial component of the ACLU’s mission and work. The ACLU disseminates this information to educate the public and promote the protection of civil liberties. The ACLU’s regular means of disseminating and editorializing information obtained through FOIA requests include: a paper newsletter distributed to approximately 450,000 people; a bi-weekly electronic newsletter distributed to approximately 300,000 subscribers; published reports, books, pamphlets, and fact sheets; a widely read blog; heavily visited websites, including an accountability microsite, <http://www.aclu.org/accountability>; and a video series.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION FOUNDATION

The ACLU also regularly issues press releases to call attention to documents obtained through FOIA requests, as well as other breaking news.² ACLU attorneys are interviewed frequently for news stories about documents released through ACLU FOIA requests.³

² See, e.g., Release, American Civil Liberties Union, *Documents Show FBI Monitored Bay Area Occupy Movement*, Sept. 14, 2012, <http://www.aclu.org/node/36742>; Press Release, American Civil Liberties Union, *FOIA Documents Show FBI Using “Mosque Outreach” for Intelligence Gathering*, Mar. 27, 2012, <http://www.aclu.org/national-security/foia-documents-show-fbi-using-mosque-outreach-intelligence-gathering>; Press Release, American Civil Liberties Union, *FOIA Documents Show FBI Illegally Collecting Intelligence Under Guise of “Community Outreach,”* Dec. 1, 2011, <http://www.aclu.org/national-security/foia-documents-show-fbi-illegally-collecting-intelligence-under-guise-community>; Press Release, American Civil Liberties Union, *FOIA Documents from FBI Show Unconstitutional Racial Profiling*, Oct. 20, 2011, <http://www.aclu.org/national-security/foia-documents-fbi-show-unconstitutional-racial-profiling>; Press Release, American Civil Liberties Union, *Documents Obtained by ACLU Show Sexual Abuse of Immigration Detainees is Widespread National Problem*, Oct. 19, 2011, <http://www.aclu.org/immigrants-rights-prisoners-rights-prisoners-rights/documents-obtained-aclu-show-sexual-abuse>; Press Release, American Civil Liberties Union, *New Evidence of Abuse at Bagram Underscores Need for Full Disclosure About Prison. Says ACLU*, June 24, 2009, <http://www.aclu.org/national-security/new-evidence-abuse-bagram-underscores-need-full-disclosure-about-prison-says-aclu>.

³ See, e.g., Carrie Johnson, *Delay in Releasing CIA Report Is Sought; Justice Dep’t Wants More Time to Review IG’s Findings on Detainee Treatment*, Wash. Post, June 20, 2009 (quoting ACLU staff attorney Amrit Singh); Peter Finn & Julie Tate, *CIA Mistaken on ‘High-Value’ Detainee, Document Shows*, Wash. Post, June 16, 2009 (quoting ACLU staff attorney Ben Wizner); Scott Shane, *Lawsuits Force Disclosures by C.I.A.*, N.Y. Times, June 10, 2009 (quoting ACLU National Security Project director Jameel Jaffer); Joby Warrick, *Like FBI, CIA Has Used Secret ‘Letters,’* Wash. Post, Jan. 25, 2008 (quoting ACLU staff attorney Melissa Goodman).

The ACLU website specifically includes features on information about actual or alleged government activity obtained through FOIA.⁴ For example, the ACLU maintains an online "Torture Database," a compilation of over 100,000 FOIA documents that allows researchers and the public to conduct sophisticated searches of FOIA documents relating to government policies on rendition, detention, and interrogation.⁵ Another example is the ACLU's "Mapping the FBI" portal, which analyzes, compiles, and makes available to the public records obtained through the ACLU's FOIA requests for information about the FBI's racial and ethnic "mapping" of American communities. From the Mapping the FBI portal, users can search the FOIA documents by state and subject matter in addition to accessing detailed commentary and analysis about the records and government activities. Beyond websites, the ACLU has produced an in-depth television series on civil liberties, which has included analyses and explanation of information the ACLU has obtained through FOIA.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION FOUNDATION

The ACLU plans to analyze and disseminate to the public the information gathered through this Request. The record requested is not sought for commercial use, and the Requesters plan to disseminate the information disclosed as a result of this Request to the public at no cost.⁶

B. The record sought is urgently needed to inform the public about actual or alleged government activity.

The Revised Report is urgently needed to inform the public about actual or alleged government activity; moreover, this document relates to a breaking news story of general public interest, specifically, the CIA's rendition, detention and interrogation program and its authorization of abusive techniques after September 11, 2001. *See* 32 C.F.R. § 1900.34(c)(2); 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(ii); 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3)(ii)(A); 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b)(2).

⁴ *See, e.g.*, <http://www.aclu.org/national-security/predator-drone-foia>; <http://www.aclu.org/national-security/anwar-al-awlaki-foia-request>; <http://www.aclu.org/mappingthefbi>; <http://www.aclu.org/national-security/bagram-foia>; <http://www.aclu.org/safefree/torture/csrtfoia.html>; <http://www.aclu.org/safefree/nsaspying/30022res20060207.html>; <http://www.aclu.org/patriotfoia>; <http://www.aclu.org/spyfiles>; and <http://www.aclu.org/safefree/nationalsecurityletters/32140res20071011.html>.

⁵ <http://www.torturedatabase.org>.

⁶ In addition to the national ACLU offices, there are 53 ACLU affiliate and national chapter offices located throughout the United States and Puerto Rico. These offices further disseminate ACLU material to local residents, schools, and organizations through a variety of means, including their own websites, publications, and newsletters. Further, the ACLU makes archived materials available at the American Civil Liberties Union Archives at Princeton University Library.

We make this Request to further the public's understanding of the CIA's program and the role of senior officials in conceiving of and authorizing the use of abusive interrogation techniques in the wake of September 11, 2001. The public has and continues to manifest an abiding interest in the conduct of the CIA and other executive agencies with respect to individuals seized, detained, and interrogated for counterterrorism purposes. While U.S. intelligence officials have acknowledged that the CIA used harsh and coercive interrogation techniques, Congress's investigation sets forth the most comprehensive account to date of what happened and why, and it is imperative that its findings be made public.

Over the past eighteen months, national news stories have highlighted the significance of the SSCI investigation for the public record. In the run-up to the Committee vote on the Initial Report in December 2012, a host of articles and editorials were published emphasizing how important it is for the results of the SSCI's investigation to be made public. See, e.g., Ed Pilkington, *Senate Under Pressure to Release Mammoth Report on CIA Interrogation*, The Guardian (U.K.), Dec. 13, 2012, <http://bit.ly/VECh2J>; Carolyn Lochhead, *Dianne Feinstein Torture Report May Conflict with Bin Laden Movie*, SFGate Blog, Dec. 11, 2012, <http://bit.ly/USwxpI>; Matt Bewig, *Senate Report on CIA Torture Techniques May Remain Secret*, AllGov, Dec. 10, 2012, <http://bit.ly/VLaXWE>; Jim Kouri, *Senate Democrats Urge Probe of CIA Interrogations During Bush Years*, Examiner, Dec. 7, 2012, <http://exm.nr/TZTQuk>; Mark Hosenball, *Senators to Vote on Probe of CIA Interrogation Program*, Reuters, Dec. 6, 2012, <http://reut.rs/RbuL3T>; Editorial, *Our View: Snowe, Committee Should Release Torture Report*, Portland Press Herald, Nov. 23, 2012, <http://bit.ly/RYpVnf>.

Similarly, during the weeks leading up to and following the Committee's declassification vote, nationwide media outlets have continued to emphasize the critical importance of the Revised Report. See, e.g., Bradley Klapper, *Feinstein Asks White House to Edit Torture Report*, Associated Press, Apr. 8, 2014, <http://bit.ly/1kwLrB1>; David S. Joachim, *Senate Panel Votes to Reveal Report on C.I.A. Interrogations*, N.Y. Times, Apr. 3, 2014, <http://nyti.ms/1eejlaR>; Ali Watkins, Marisa Taylor, & David Lightman, *Senate Panel Finds CIA Illegally Interrogated Terror Suspects After 9-11*, McClatchy, Apr. 3, 2014, <http://bit.ly/1qzYEXj>; David Ignatius, *A Tortured Debate Between Congress and the CIA*, Wash. Post, Apr. 1, 2014, <http://wapo.st/1hEjftEg>; Marisa Taylor & David Lightman, *CIA's Harsh Interrogation Tactics More Widespread Than Thought, Senate Investigators Found*, McClatchy, Apr. 1, 2014, <http://bit.ly/1hmoXPY>; Greg Miller, Adam Goldman, & Ellen Nakashima, *CIA Misled on Interrogation Program, Senate Report*

Says, Wash. Post, Mar. 31, 2014, <http://wapo.st/1eeujNM>; Bradley Klapper, *Senate Report: Torture Didn't Lead to Bin Laden*, Associated Press, Mar. 31, 2014, <http://bit.ly/1i5ZD0t>; Mark Mazzetti, *Senate Asks C.I.A. to Share Its Report on Interrogations*, N.Y. Times, Dec. 17, 2013, <http://nyti.ms/1eetXqk>.

The contents of the Revised Report will inform urgent and ongoing debate about the CIA interrogation program. The Revised Report provides "the public with a comprehensive narrative of how torture insinuated itself into U.S. policy," a narrative that "is of more than historical interest" as the nation's lawmakers move forward. Editorial, *Free the Torture Report*, L.A. Times, Apr. 27, 2012, <http://lat.ms/1mBMZ9>.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION FOUNDATION

Expedited processing should be granted.

III. Application for Waiver or Limitation of Fees

A. Release of the record is in the public interest.

We request a waiver of search, review, and reproduction fees on the grounds that disclosure of the requested record is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to the public understanding of the United States government's operations or activities and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii); 32 C.F.R. § 1900.13(b)(2); 28 C.F.R. § 16.11(k); 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(d); and 22 C.F.R. § 171.17.

The Revised Report will significantly contribute to public understanding of the government's operations or activities. Moreover, disclosure is not in the ACLU's commercial interest. Any information obtained by the ACLU as a result of this FOIA request will be available to the public at no cost. *See* 32 C.F.R. § 1900.13(b)(2); 28 C.F.R. § 16.11(k); 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(d); 22 C.F.R. § 171.17.

Thus, a fee waiver would fulfill Congress's legislative intent in amending 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," (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)); OPEN Government Act of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-175, § 2, 121 Stat. 2524 (finding that "disclosure, not secrecy, is the dominant objective of the Act," quoting *Dep't of Air Force v. Rose*, 425 U.S. 352, 361 (1992)).

B. *The ACLU qualifies as a representative of the news media.*

A waiver of search and review fees is warranted because the ACLU qualifies as a “representative of the news media” and the Revised Report is not sought for commercial use. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii); *see also* 32 C.F.R. § 1900.02(h)(3); 28 C.F.R. § 16.11(k); 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(d); 22 C.F.R. § 171.17. Accordingly, fees associated with the processing of this request should be “limited to reasonable standard charges for document duplication.”

The ACLU meets the statutory and regulatory definitions of a “representative of the news media” because it is an “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.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II); *see also Nat’l Sec. Archive v. Dep’t of Def.*, 880 F.2d 1381, 1387 (D.C. Cir. 1989); *cf. Am. Civil Liberties Union v. Dep’t of Justice*, 321 F. Supp. 2d 24, 30 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). The ACLU is a “representative of the news media” for the same reasons that it is “primarily engaged in the dissemination of information.” *See Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. v. Dep’t of Def.*, 241 F. Supp. 2d 5, 10–15 (D.D.C. 2003) (finding non-profit public interest group that disseminated an electronic newsletter and published books was a “representative of the news media” for FOIA purposes).⁷ Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, No. 3:11CV1534 (MRK), 2012 WL 3683399, at *3 (D. Conn. May 14, 2012); *see also Am. Civil Liberties Union of Wash. v. Dep’t of Justice*, No. C09-0642RSL, 2011 WL 887731, at *10 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 10, 2011) (finding ACLU of Washington to be a “representative of the news media”), *reconsidered in part on other grounds*, 2011 WL 1900140 (W.D. Wash. May 19, 2011).

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION FOUNDATION

* * *

Pursuant to applicable statute and regulations, we expect a determination regarding expedited processing within ten (10) calendar days. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(ii)(I); 32 C.F.R. § 1900.21(d); 28

⁷ On account of these factors, fees associated with responding to FOIA requests are regularly waived for the ACLU. For example, in October 2013, the State Department granted a fee waiver to the ACLU with respect to a request for documents concerning the United States’ targeting killing program. In June 2013, the National Security Division of the Department of Justice granted a fee waiver to the ACLU with respect to a request for documents relating to standards governing intelligence collection and the Division’s interpretation of an executive order. Since at least 2002, government agencies ranging from the Department of the Navy to the Department of Commerce have granted the ACLU fee waivers in connection with its FOIA requests.

C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(4); 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3); 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b).

If the request is denied in whole or in part, we ask that you justify all withholdings by reference to specific exemptions to the FOIA. We also ask that you release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material.

We reserve the right to appeal a decision to withhold any information or to deny a waiver of fees.

Please furnish the applicable records to:

Ashley Gorski
American Civil Liberties Union
125 Broad Street
18th Floor
New York, NY 10004

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION FOUNDATION

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(vi).



Ashley Gorski
American Civil Liberties Union
Foundation
125 Broad Street
18th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel: 212.284.7305
Fax: 212.549.2654
Email: agorski@aclu.org

Exhibit B



U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Information Policy
Suite 11050
1425 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Telephone: (202) 514-3642

May 22, 2014

Ms. Ashley Gorski
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
18th Floor
125 Broad Street
New York, NY 10004
agorski@aclu.org

Re: OLA/14-02816 (F)
VRB:DRH:SBT

Dear Ms. Gorski:

This responds to your Freedom of Information Act request dated May 6, 2014, and received in this Office on May 12, 2014, seeking the updated version of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence's report *Study of the Central Intelligence Agency's Detention and Interrogation Program* cited in an April 7, 2014 letter from Committee Chair Dianne Feinstein to President Barack Obama. This response is made on behalf of the Office of Legislative Affairs.

I have determined that the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) is the agency best suited to respond to your request. I understand that you have already submitted your request to the CIA. That agency will respond to you directly if it has not done so already.

If you are not satisfied with my response to this request, you may administratively appeal by writing to the Director, Office of Information Policy, United States Department of Justice, Suite 11050, 1425 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530-0001, or you may submit an appeal through this Office's eFOIA portal at <http://www.justice.gov/oip/efoia-portal.html>. Your appeal must be received within sixty days from the date of this letter. If you submit your appeal by mail, both the letter and the envelope should be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Act Appeal."

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "V-R-B", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Vanessa R. Brinkmann
Senior Counsel