April 17, 2012

Information Officer
Office of Freedom of Information and Security Review
Directorate for Executive Services and Communications
FOIA/Privacy Branch
1155 Defense Pentagon, Room 2C757
Washington, D.C. 20301-1155

HQ USSOCOM
ATTN: SOCS-SJS-I/FOIA Requester Service Center
7701 Tampa Point Blvd
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5323

Department of the Navy
720 Kennon Street, SE
Blg. 36, Rm. 135
Washington, DC 20374

United States Central Command CCJ6-RDF (FOIA)
7115 South Boundary Boulevard
MacDill AFB, FL 33621-5101

Robert Dickerson
Chief, Freedom of Information Act Office, ATTN: AAHS-RDF
Suite 150
7701 Telegraph Road
Alexandria, VA 22315-3905

Defense Intelligence Agency
ATTN: DAN-1A (FOIA)
200 MacDill Blvd
Washington, DC 20340-5100

Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI)
ATTN: FOIA Office
Washington, D.C. 20511

Office of Information Programs and Services
A/GIS/IPS/RL
Re: REQUEST UNDER FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT/ Expedited Processing Requested

To Whom It May Concern:


---

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. § 501(c)(3) organization that provides legal representation free of charge to individuals and organizations in civil rights and civil liberties cases, and educates the public about the civil liberties implications of pending and proposed state and federal legislation, provides analyses of pending and proposed legislation, directly lobbies legislators, and mobilizes its members to lobby their legislators.

2 The Center for Constitutional Rights is a non-profit, public interest, legal and public education organization that engages in litigation, public advocacy, and the production of publications in the fields of civil and international human rights.

3 Al-Majalah is a transliteration from Arabic, and has been represented with different English spellings, including “al-Majala” and “al-Ma’jalah.” This Request seeks records using any spelling or transliteration of the region’s name.

We seek information about the U.S. government’s legal basis in domestic, foreign, and international law for the U.S. military strike on the al-Majalah community, information about the U.S. government’s decision-making process and factual basis for ordering that strike, and information concerning any investigations or assessments of the strike by or at the behest of the U.S. government. We specifically seek records concerning the U.S. government’s knowledge that civilians, including women and children, were present in the al-Majalah community, the measures taken to fulfill the United States’ legal obligation to limit civilian casualties, and any measures taken by or at the behest of the United States to compensate victims’ surviving family members for the loss of civilian life and property caused by the strike. Finally, we request information concerning U.S. government efforts to conceal its responsibility for the al-Majalah strike.


civilians.”). On November 30, 2010, Wikileaks released a State Department cable discussing a January 2010 meeting between General Petraeus and President Saleh, which confirmed that the United States was responsible for the strike on al-Majalah (this cable is discussed in further detail below).

On November 30, 2010, Wikileaks released a State Department cable discussing a January 2010 meeting between General Petraeus and President Saleh, which confirmed that the United States was responsible for the strike on al-Majalah (this cable is discussed in further detail below).


This Request therefore seeks records concerning the United States’ legal and factual basis for the al-Majalah strike, its decision-making process for ordering the strike, its efforts to minimize civilian deaths, and its investigations into civilian deaths and efforts to compensate civilian victims.

This Request also seeks information about diplomatic efforts to cover up the United States’ responsibility for the strike. A January 2010 U.S. State Department diplomatic cable obtained by WikiLeaks, published on the internet, and widely discussed in the press confirmed that the United States was responsible for the attack. The cable recounted a conversation between General David Petraeus, Yemeni President Ali Abdullah Saleh and other senior Yemeni officials, during which they discussed an apparent agreement that Yemen would help conceal U.S. involvement in missile strikes in Yemen by publicly taking responsibility for the al-Majalah attack and other American missile strikes. The cable is titled, “General Petraeus’ Meeting with Saleh on Security Assistance, AQAP Strikes,” and states:

Saleh lamented the use of cruise missiles that are “not very accurate” and welcomed the use of aircraft-deployed precision-guided bombs instead. “We’ll

---

continue saying the bombs are ours, not yours,” Saleh said, prompting Deputy Prime Minister Alimi to joke that he had just “lied” by telling Parliament that the bombs in Arhab, Abyan, and Shebwa were American-made but deployed by the ROYG.


Without information about the legal and factual basis for the United States’ involvement in the al-Majalah strike the public is unable to make an informed judgment about the government’s use of lethal force in a country with which the United States is not at war. The strike also raises serious questions about whether the government is abiding by its international and domestic law obligations in its counter-terrorism operations abroad, particularly with respect to its duty to minimize the loss of civilian lives when it uses lethal force. The public also has an interest in knowing whether and how the United States sought to cover up its responsibility for the al-Majalah strike and the resulting loss of civilian life.

I. Requested Records

The ACLU and CCR request all records by any or all persons or entities, including all persons acting on behalf of the United States, that in any way relate or pertain to or mention the al-Majalah community, including but not limited to the following:

1. All records pertaining to the legal basis in domestic, foreign and international law upon which the United States launched the December 17, 2009 cruise missile strike against al-Majalah.

2. All records pertaining to the process by which the al-Majalah strike was planned and authorized, including the individuals who recommended, approved or authorized the strike, and what information was relied on to support the decision.

3. All records pertaining to the intended target(s) of the strike, including the identity and location of the intended target(s) and the proximity of the intended target(s) to civilians, including women and children.

To the extent the information requested here overlaps with information the ACLU or CCR have sought through other, previously filed FOIA requests, please process responsive records in connection with the already-filed requests.
4. All records pertaining to civilian casualty assessments made in advance of the al-Majalah strike, including measures taken to determine the likelihood of civilian casualties and injuries, including those of minors, measures to limit civilian casualties and injuries, and the determination to carry out the strike despite a likelihood of civilian casualties and injuries.

5. All records pertaining to the assessment or evaluation of the al-Majalah strike on or after December 17, 2009, including but not limited to records regarding:

   a. Any investigation into or after-action assessment after the strike, including the number of casualties and injuries and identities and ages of the individuals killed and injured, as well as how the number of casualties and injuries and identity and ages of individuals killed and injured in the strike were determined;

   b. How the status and affiliation of individuals killed and injured was determined, i.e. whether individuals killed and injured were members of al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, “supporters” of this group, members or supporters of other groups, innocent civilians, or any other status or affiliation.

   c. Any measures taken to revise legal, intelligence or operational standards, processes or procedures on the basis of any deficiencies identified in the al-Majalah operation.

6. All records regarding the compensation by or at the behest of the U.S. government of al-Majalah strike survivors and victims’ family members, including any compensation claims process made available to such individuals, or any explanation why such claims process was not made available.

7. All records pertaining to agreements, understandings, cooperation or coordination between the United States and the government of Yemen regarding the strike on al-Majalah, including but not limited to records regarding:

   a. The process and reasons by which al-Majalah was selected as a target;

   b. The limits on the use of American military force in Yemen, including geographical or territorial limitations, measures that must be taken to limit civilian casualties and injuries, or measures that must be taken to assess the number of casualties and injuries and to determine the identity and status or affiliation of the individuals killed and injured;

   c. The agreement that the government of Yemen would take public responsibility for the al-Majalah strike; and
d. The extent to which and manner in which survivors and family members of victims would be compensated for their loss.

With respect to the form of production, see 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B), we request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. Alternatively, we request that the records be provided electronically in a text-searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best image quality in the agency’s possession, and that the records be provided in separate, bates-stamped files.

II. Application for Expedited Processing

The ACLU and CCR request expedited processing of this FOIA request pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E); 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3); 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b); 32 C.F.R. § 1700.12. There is a “compelling need” for the requested records because the information requested is urgently needed by organizations primarily engaged in disseminating information to inform the public about actual or alleged Federal government activity. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II); 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3)(ii); 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b)(2); 32 C.F.R. § 1700.12(c)(2). In addition, the records sought relate to a “breaking news story of general public interest.” 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3)(ii)(A); 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b)(2)(i). There is a compelling public interest in fully understanding the extent to which the United States is conducting military operations in countries where it is not at war, in understanding the extent of civilian casualties caused by such operations and details of the United States’ continuing military presence in Yemen, and in understanding whether the United States’ actions comply with its domestic and international legal obligations. Without the requested information, the public is unable to assess the government’s determinations to use lethal force in situations involving high probabilities of killing innocent civilians. Indeed, the United States’ efforts to cover up its involvement and shield itself from accountability significantly increase the importance and urgency of the requested records.

CCR and the ACLU are “primarily engaged in disseminating information” within the meaning of the statute and regulations. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II); 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3)(ii); 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b)(2); 32 C.F.R. § 1700.2(h)(4). Obtaining information about government activity, analyzing that information, and publishing and widely disseminating that information (in both its raw and analyzed form) to the press and public is a critical and substantial component of the ACLU’s work and one of its primary activities. See, e.g., 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 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” to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information” (internal citation omitted)).

Specifically, the ACLU publishes newsletters, news briefings, right-to-know documents, and other educational and informational materials that are broadly circulated to the public. Such material is widely available to everyone, including individuals, tax-exempt organizations, not-for-profit groups, law students and faculty, for no cost or for a nominal fee. The ACLU also disseminates information through its heavily visited website,
www.aclu.org. The website addresses civil rights and civil liberties issues in depth, provides features on civil rights and civil liberties issues in the news, and contains many thousands of documents relating to the issues on which the ACLU is focused.

The ACLU website specifically includes features on information obtained through FOIA. See, for example: http://www.aclu.org/national-security/predator-drone-foia; http://www.aclu.org/national-security/anwar-al-awlaki-foia-request; http://www.aclu.org/torturefoia; http://www.aclu.org/olcmemos/; 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/olcmemos/; http://www.aclu.org/national-security/bagram-foia; http://www.aclu.org/safefree/nsaspying/30022res20060207.html; http://www.aclu.org/patriotfoia; www.aclu.org/spyfiles; http://www.aclu.org/safefree/nationalsecurityletters/32140res20071011.html; and http://www.aclu.org/exclusion. For example, the ACLU’s “Torture FOIA” webpage, http://www.aclu.org/torturefoia, contains commentary about the ACLU’s FOIA request for documents related to the treatment of detainees, press releases, analysis of the FOIA documents disclosed, and an advanced search engine permitting webpage visitors to search the documents obtained through the FOIA, and advises that the ACLU in collaboration with Columbia University Press has published a book about the documents obtained through the FOIA. Similarly, the ACLU’s webpage about the Office of Legal Counsel (“OLC”) torture memos it obtained through FOIA, http://www.aclu.org/safefree/general/olc_memos.html, contains commentary and analysis of the memos; an original comprehensive chart about OLC memos (see below); links to web features created by ProPublica—an independent, non-profit, investigative-journalism organization—based on information gathering, research, and analysis conducted by the ACLU; and ACLU videos created about the memos. See Nat’l Sec. Archive, 880 F.2d at 1386 (finding the National Security Archive to be a news-media requester because it intended to publish “document sets” whereby its staff would “cull those of particular interest . . . supplement the chosen documents with ‘detailed cross-referenced indices, other finding aids, and a sophisticated computerized retrieval system’ in order to make it more accessible to potential users”); Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Dep’t of Justice, 133 F. Supp. 2d 52, 53–54 (D.D.C. 2005) (finding Judicial Watch to be a news-media requester because it posted documents obtained through FOIA on its website).

Dissemination of information to the public is a crucial component of CCR’s work. CCR regularly publishes reports and factsheets about civil and international human rights issues, newsletters and press releases about its work, know-your-rights handbooks, and other educational materials for public consumption. These and other materials are actively disseminated and freely available to the public, including through CCR’s heavily visited website, www.ccrjustice.org. CCR also operates a listserv of over 60,000 members through which it communicates information and developments pertaining to CCR’s work and issues of concern, and organizes public education programs within the United States and internationally.
Furthermore, the records requested here are urgently needed to inform the national debate about actual or alleged Federal Government activity; specifically, the records sought relate to the United States’ use of lethal force in Yemen, a country in which it is not at war, civilian casualties that result from “anti-terrorism” operations conducted by the U.S. military in foreign countries, and the attack on al-Majalah in particular, which resulted in the greatest loss of civilian life in a single reported U.S. attack in Yemen to date. The significant civilian casualties caused by the al-Majalah attack as well as the United States’ efforts to conceal its responsibility are a matter of considerable public interest and widespread media attention. For these reasons, the records sought also relate to a “breaking news story of general public interest.” 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3)(ii)(A); 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b)(2)(i).


III. Application for Waiver or Limitation of Fees

We request a waiver of search, review, and duplication fees on the grounds that disclosure of the requested records is in the public interest because it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii); see also 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(d); 22 C.F.R. § 171.17(a); 32 C.F.R. § 1700.6(b).

Given the ongoing media attention to this issue, the records sought by this request will significantly contribute to public understanding of the operations and activities of the government. Moreover, disclosure is not in the ACLU’s or CCR’s commercial interest.
Any information disclosed by the Requesters as a result of this FOIA request will be available to the public at no cost. 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.’” (citation and internal quotations omitted)); OPEN Government Act of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-175, 121 Stat. 2524, § 2 (Dec. 31, 2007) (finding that “disclosure, not secrecy, is the dominant objective of the Act,” but that “in practice, the Freedom of Information Act has not always lived up to the ideals of that Act”).

A waiver of search and review fees is warranted because the Requesters qualify as “representative[s] of the news media” and the records are not sought for commercial use. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii); 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(e)(7); 22 C.F.R. § 171.15(c); 32 C.F.R. § 1700.6(i)(2). Accordingly, fees associated with the processing of this request should be “limited to reasonable standard charges for document duplication.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(II); see also 32 C.F.R. § 286.28(e)(7); 22 C.F.R. § 171.15(c); 32 C.F.R. § 1700.6(i)(2).

CCR and the ACLU meet the statutory and regulatory definitions of a “representative of the news media” because they are “entit[ies] that gather[,] information of potential interest to a segment of the public, use[ their] editorial skills to turn the raw materials into a distinct work, and distribute[] that work to an audience.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii); see also Nat’l Sec. Archive, 880 F.2d at 1387 (finding that an organization that “gathers information from a variety of sources,” exercises editorial discretion in selecting and organizing documents, “devises indices and finding aids,” and “distributes the resulting work to the public” is a “representative of the news media” for the purposes of FOIA); cf. Am. Civil Liberties Union v. Dep’t of Justice, 321 F. Supp. 2d at 30 n.5 (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). The Requesters are “representative[s] of the news media” for the same reasons they are “primarily engaged in the dissemination of information.” See Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr., 241 F. Supp. 2d at 10–15 (finding non-profit public interest group that disseminated an electronic newsletter and published books was a “representative of the news media” for purposes of FOIA); see supra.° Indeed, the

° On account of these factors, fees associated with responding to FOIA requests are regularly waived for the ACLU. In June 2011, 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 the interpretation and implementation of a section of the PATRIOT Act. In October 2010, the Department of the Navy granted a fee waiver to the ACLU with respect to a request for documents regarding the deaths of detainees in U.S. custody. In January 2009, the CIA granted a fee waiver with respect to the same request. In March 2009, the State Department granted a fee waiver to the ACLU with regard to a FOIA request submitted in December 2008. The Department of Justice granted a fee waiver to the ACLU with regard to the same FOIA request. In November 2006, the Department of Health and Human Services granted a fee waiver to the ACLU with regard to a FOIA request submitted in November of 2006. In May 2005, the U.S. Department of Commerce granted a fee waiver to the ACLU with respect to its request for information regarding the radio-frequency identification chips in United States passports. In March 2005, the Department of State granted a fee waiver to the ACLU with regard to a request regarding the use of immigration laws to exclude prominent non-citizen scholars and intellectuals from the country because of their political views, statements, or associations. In addition, the Department of Defense did not charge the
Pursuant to applicable statute and regulations, we expect a determination regarding expedited processing within 10 calendar days. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(ii)(I); 32 C.F.R. § 286.4(d)(3); 22 C.F.R. § 171.12(b); 32 C.F.R. § 1700.12(b).

If the Request is denied in whole or in part, we ask that you justify all deletions by reference to specific exemptions to FOIA. We expect the release of 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.

We also request that you provide an estimated date on which you will complete processing of this request. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(7)(B).

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. Please furnish all responsive records to: Nathan Freed Wessler, American Civil Liberties Union, 125 Broad Street, 18th Floor, New York, NY 10004.

I affirm that the information provided supporting the request for expedited processing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(vi).

Sincerely,

NATHAN FREED WESSLER
American Civil Liberties Union
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel: (212) 519-7847
Fax: (212) 549-2654

ACLU fees associated with FOIA requests submitted by the ACLU in April 2007, June 2006, February 2006, and October 2003. The Department of Justice did not charge the ACLU fees associated with FOIA requests submitted by the ACLU in November 2007, December 2005, and December 2004. Finally, three separate agencies—the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Intelligence Policy and Review, and the Office of Information and Privacy in the Department of Justice—did not charge the ACLU fees associated with a FOIA request submitted by the ACLU in August 2002. In prior FOIA requests to the Department of Defense, DOD has also found CCR to qualify as an organization entitled to a fee waiver. For example, in December 2004, DOD granted a fee waiver for a CCR request for information pertaining to the secret detention of individuals in U.S. facilities overseas.