

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

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

Plaintiffs,

v.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY,  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, and  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Defendants.

No. 13-cv-09198 (AT)  
**ECF Case**

**JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER**

WHEREAS Plaintiffs American Civil Liberties Union and American Civil Liberties Union Foundation seek to further amend their Complaint for disclosure of records from Defendants pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552; and

WHEREAS Defendants consent to Plaintiffs’ request to file a Second Amended Complaint; now therefore,


IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between the undersigned counsel, subject to the approval of the Court, that:

1. Plaintiffs may file a Second Amended Complaint in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A.
2. Within two weeks of the date of this Joint Stipulation, the parties will submit to the

Court an agreed-upon schedule for the search and processing of records responsive to the FOIA request submitted by Plaintiffs on July 29, 2014 to the National Security Division of the Department of Justice. In the event that that the parties cannot reach an agreement as to the search and processing schedule, they will each submit their respective proposed schedules to the Court for a decision.

3. Defendants will file their Answer to the Second Amended Complaint no later than thirty days after it is filed.
4. Nothing in this Stipulation shall affect existing orders of the Court setting certain deadlines for Defendants' search, review, and processing of potentially responsive documents.

Dated: October 30, 2014




Ashley Gorski  
Patrick Toomey  
Alexander Abdo  
American Civil Liberties Union  
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor  
New York, NY 10005  
Phone: (212) 549-2500  
Fax: (212) 549-2654

David A. Schulz  
Jonathan M. Manes  
Conor Clarke (law student intern)  
Ajay Ravichandran (law student intern)  
Nicholas Handler (law student intern)  
Media Freedom and Information Access  
Clinic  
Yale Law School

PREET BHARARA  
United States Attorney  
Southern District of New York

By:



David Jones  
Jean-David Barnea  
Assistant United States Attorneys  
Southern District of New York  
86 Chambers Street, Third Floor  
New York, NY 10007

*Counsel for the Defendants*

P.O. Box 208215  
New Haven, CT 06520  
(212) 850-6103

*Counsel for the Plaintiffs*

SO ORDERED.

---

HON. ANALISA TORRES  
United States District Judge

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

# Exhibit A

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

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

Plaintiffs,

v.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY,  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, and  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Defendants.

No. 13-cv-09198 (AT)

**ECF Case**

**SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

**Introduction**

1. This is an action under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552 (“FOIA”), seeking the release of records that describe the government’s understanding of its surveillance authority under Executive Order 12,333 (“EO 12,333”) as well as the rules that regulate the government’s acquisition, retention, use, and dissemination of the communications of Americans swept up in that surveillance.

2. During the last sixteen months, the true breadth of many of the government’s post-9/11 surveillance activities has been exposed to the light of day. The media has revealed that, for example, the National Security Agency (“NSA”) keeps a record of virtually every phone call made or received in the United States every day for the last five years. Reports have also disclosed that the NSA conducts sweeping surveillance of Americans’ international communications—by, for example, searching the contents of essentially all text-based

communications entering or leaving the country for specific keywords.

3. The discussion surrounding these disclosures has concentrated on the limitations imposed on the government's surveillance by several statutes—specifically, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (“FISA”), Section 215 of the Patriot Act (which amended the so-called “business records” provision of FISA), and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008. Considerably less attention has focused on surveillance undertaken pursuant to EO 12,333 and the protections in place under that executive order for Americans' communications.

4. EO 12,333, signed on December 4, 1981 and modified numerous times since, is the principal source of authority for electronic surveillance that does not fall within the scope of FISA. Whereas FISA applies primarily to surveillance conducted on American soil or to surveillance abroad that targets Americans, EO 12,333 appears to be the sole authority for and limitation on government surveillance abroad that targets foreigners. Unlike surveillance conducted pursuant to FISA, surveillance undertaken solely pursuant to EO 12,333 is not overseen by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

5. Although EO 12,333 permits the government to target foreigners abroad for surveillance, recent revelations have confirmed that the government interprets that authority to permit sweeping monitoring of Americans' international communications. How the government conducts this surveillance, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great public significance and concern. While the government has released several documents describing the rules that govern its collection and use of Americans' international communications under statutory authorities regulating surveillance on U.S. soil, little information is publicly available regarding the rules that apply to surveillance of

Americans' international calls and emails under EO 12,333.

6. That gap in public knowledge is particularly troubling in light of recent revelations, which make clear that the NSA is collecting vast quantities of data worldwide pursuant to EO 12,333. For instance, recent news reports indicate that, relying on the executive order, the NSA is collecting: nearly 5 billion records per day on the location of cell phones, including Americans' cell phones; hundreds of millions of contact lists or address books from personal email and instant messaging accounts; and information from Google and Yahoo user accounts as that information travels between those companies' data centers located abroad.

7. Surveillance under EO 12,333 inevitably sweeps up the communications of U.S. persons. This FOIA suit seeks, in part, to determine what protections are afforded to those U.S. persons and whether those protections are consistent with the Constitution.

8. Disclosure of the records Plaintiffs seek through this action would greatly benefit the public and cause no harm to sensitive intelligence gathering. Plaintiffs seek legal standards and limitations, not operational details. The legal standards that govern surveillance, and the question of whether the government appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens, are matters of enormous national significance and ongoing public concern.

### **Jurisdiction and Venue**

9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B).

10. Venue is proper in this district under 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B) because Plaintiffs' principal place of business is in Manhattan, New York, within this district.

### **Parties**

11. Plaintiff American Civil Liberties Union ("ACLU") is a nationwide, non-profit,

nonpartisan 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(4) organization with more than 500,000 members dedicated to the constitutional principles of liberty and equality. The ACLU is committed to ensuring that the American government complies with the Constitution and laws, including its international legal obligations, in matters that affect civil liberties and human rights. The ACLU is also committed to principles of transparency and accountability in government, and seeks to ensure that the American public is informed about the conduct of its government in matters that affect civil liberties and human rights. The ACLU is incorporated in New York State and has its principal place of business in New York City.

12. Plaintiff American Civil Liberties Union Foundation is a separate 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(3) organization that educates the public about civil liberties and employs lawyers who provide legal representation free of charge in cases involving civil liberties. It is incorporated in New York State and has its principal place of business in New York City.

13. Defendant National Security Agency (“NSA”) is an intelligence agency established within the executive branch of the U.S. government and administered through the Department of Defense. The NSA is an agency within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 552(f)(1).

14. Defendant Central Intelligence Agency (“CIA”) is an intelligence agency established within the executive branch of the U.S. government and is an agency within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 552(f)(1).

15. Defendant Department of Defense is a department of the executive branch of the U.S. government and is an agency within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 552(f)(1). The Defense Intelligence Agency (“DIA”), from which the ACLU has requested records, is a component of the Department of Defense.

16. Defendant Department of Justice is a department of the executive branch of the

U.S. government and is an agency within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 552(f)(1). The Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”), National Security Division (“NSD”), and Office of Legal Counsel (“OLC”) are all components of the Department of Justice from which the ACLU has requested records.

17. Defendant Department of State (“DOS”) is a department of the executive branch of the U.S. government and is an agency within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 552(f)(1).

### **Facts**

#### **The First Requests for Records**

18. By letter dated May 13, 2013, Plaintiffs filed substantially similar FOIA requests with the CIA, DIA, NSA, FBI, NSD, OLC, and DOS (the “First Requests”). (True and correct copies of the First Requests are collectively annexed hereto as Exhibit A.)

19. Each of the ACLU’s First Requests sought, in substance:

- a. any records construing or interpreting the scope of Defendants’ authority to act under EO 12,333, and any regulations issued thereunder;
- b. any records describing the minimization procedures used by Defendants with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to Defendants’ authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
- c. any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as Defendants define these terms, pursuant to authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

20. Plaintiffs also sought a waiver of search, review, and duplication fees because the

requested records were not sought for commercial use, because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media” under 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II), and because the requested information is in the public interest as defined under 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii).

Agency Responses

21. Four of the agencies—DIA, FBI, NSD, and DOS—acknowledged receipt of the First Request and indicated its placement in their FOIA processing queues, but provided no substantive response prior to the filing of this action.

22. By email dated June 28, 2013, the NSA memorialized an agreed-upon modification to the scope of Plaintiffs’ First Request, and by letter dated July 1, 2013, it disclosed two documents responsive to Plaintiffs’ First Request that were already publicly available. By email dated August 21, 2013, the NSA indicated that additional potentially responsive documents were to be posted on IContheRecord.tumblr.com, and indicated that a further response was forthcoming. By letter dated November 18, 2013, the NSA released two additional documents: a more recent version of U.S. Signals Intelligence Directive SP0018 than had been previously released and its annex, both with redactions. This letter also indicated that the review of additional documents responsive to the request was ongoing, though the NSA provided no further information prior to the filing of this action. (True and correct copies of these responses from the NSA are collectively annexed hereto as Exhibit B.)

23. By email and phone communications between June 25 and July 10, 2013, Plaintiffs and the OLC agreed upon a modification to the scope of Plaintiffs’ First Request, but the OLC did not release any responsive documents prior to the filing of this action. (True and correct copies of the communications between Plaintiffs and the OLC are collectively annexed hereto as Exhibit C.)

24. By letter dated July 26, 2013, the CIA denied Plaintiffs' First Request as requiring an "unreasonably burdensome search." (A true and correct copy of this denial from the CIA is annexed hereto as Exhibit D.)

25. Five of the agencies—CIA, DIA, FBI, NSA, and OLC—communicated no decision in response to Plaintiffs' requests for fee waivers or limitations of fees. Defendant DOS granted the fee waiver by letter dated June 5, 2013, as did NSD, by letter dated June 11, 2013.

#### Administrative Appeals

26. By letter dated November 1, 2013, Plaintiffs administratively appealed the CIA's denial of their First Request. (A true and correct copy of this appeal is annexed hereto as Exhibit E.)

27. Having received no further responsive records, Plaintiffs administratively appealed the constructive denials of their First Requests by the DIA, NSA, FBI, NSD, OLC, and DOS by letter dated November 8, 2013. (True and correct copies of these constructive denial appeals are collectively annexed hereto as Exhibit F.)

28. The NSA, FBI, DOJ, and DOS acknowledged receipt of Plaintiffs' administrative appeals. Plaintiffs received no determinations from any of the Defendants in connection with these appeals.

29. More than twenty working days have elapsed since Plaintiffs filed their administrative appeals of the Defendants' constructive denials. Plaintiffs have therefore exhausted their administrative remedies.

30. Separately, by letter dated January 9, 2014, Plaintiffs timely appealed the NSA's decision to redact the four documents it had released to date. That appeal concerned only the NSA's decision to redact and not its failure to produce additional responsive records, which was

the subject of the prior appeal filed on November 8, 2013.

31. By letter dated January 24, 2014, the NSA acknowledged that it received the appeal on January 17, 2014. Plaintiffs have received no further response from the NSA in connection with this appeal. More than twenty working days have elapsed since the NSA received the appeal. Plaintiffs have therefore exhausted their administrative remedies.

The Second Request for NSD Records

32. On May 15, 2014, after the conclusion of the parties' negotiations over the scope of each Defendant's search, NSD responded by letter to Plaintiffs' First Request and stated that it had no responsive records.

33. Shortly thereafter, on July 29, 2014, Plaintiffs filed a revised FOIA request with NSD (the "Second NSD Request") (together, with Plaintiffs' First Requests, the "Requests"). (A true and correct copy of the Second NSD Request is annexed hereto as Exhibit G.)

34. The Second NSD Request sought, in summary:

- a. Formal regulations or policies, legal opinions, training materials or reference materials relating to any agency's authority under EO 12,333 to undertake electronic surveillance that implicates U.S. persons.
- b. Records that officially authorize or modify under EO 12,333 any agency's use of specific programs, techniques, or types of electronic surveillance that implicate U.S. persons.
- c. Formal reports relating to electronic surveillance under EO 12,333 implicating U.S. persons that contain any meaningful discussion of (1) any agency's compliance, in undertaking such surveillance, with EO 12,333, its implementing regulations, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or the Fourth

Amendment; or (2) any agency's interception, acquisition, scanning, or collection of the communications of U.S. persons, whether "incidental" or otherwise, in undertaking such surveillance.

35. The categories of documents sought in the Second NSD Request are similar in scope and substance to the categories that the parties negotiated in May 2014 as part of the search stipulation in this action. In keeping with that stipulation, NSA, CIA, DIA, FBI, and DOS have searched for and are currently processing documents within these categories. *See* Stipulation and Order Regarding Document Searches (May 9, 2014) (ECF No. 30) (so-ordering the parties' agreement concerning the scope of the agencies' searches).

36. Plaintiffs also sought a waiver of search, review, and duplication fees because the requested records were not sought for commercial use, because the ACLU is a "representative of the news media" under 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II), and because disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest, as defined under 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii).

37. Additionally, Plaintiffs sought expedited processing because the ACLU is "primarily engaged in disseminating information" within the meaning of the FOIA statute and regulations, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II), 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(ii); and because the requested records relate to a matter "of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions about the government's integrity which affect public confidence," 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(iv), and to a matter where there is "urgency to inform the public about an actual or alleged federal government activity." 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(ii).

38. By letter dated September 2, 2014, NSD acknowledged receipt of the Second NSD Request and indicated its placement in the agency's FOIA processing queue, but it provided no substantive response. The twenty-day statutory period for NSD to make a

determination with respect to the Second NSD Request has elapsed with no determination. Plaintiffs have therefore constructively exhausted their administrative remedies. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(C)(i).

**Causes of Action**

39. Defendants' failure to timely respond to the Requests violates the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A), and Defendants' corresponding regulations.

40. Defendants' failure to make promptly available the records sought by the Requests violates the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(A), and Defendants' corresponding regulations.

41. Defendants' wrongful withholdings of specific responsive records, or portions thereof, violates the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(A), (6)(A), and Defendants' corresponding regulations.

42. Defendants' failure to make a reasonable effort to search for records responsive to the Requests violates the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(C), and Defendants' corresponding regulations.

43. The failure of CIA, DIA, NSA, FBI, and OLC to grant a public interest fee waiver for the First Request, and the failure of NSD to grant a public interest fee waiver for the Second NSD Request, violates the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii), and Defendants' corresponding regulations.

44. The failure of CIA, DIA, NSA, FBI, and OLC to grant a limitation of fees for the First Request, and the failure of NSD to grant a limitation of fees for the Second NSD Request, violates the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II), and Defendants' corresponding regulations.

45. The failure of NSD to grant expedited processing for the Second NSD Request

violates the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E), and Defendant's corresponding regulations.

**Prayer for Relief**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court:

1. Order Defendants to conduct a thorough search for all responsive records;
2. Order Defendants to immediately process and release all records responsive to the Requests;
3. Enjoin Defendants from charging Plaintiffs search, review, or duplication fees for processing the Requests;
4. Award Plaintiffs their costs and reasonable attorney's fees incurred in this action; and
5. Grant such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,



Ashley Gorski  
Patrick Toomey  
Alex Abdo

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION  
125 Broad Street, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10005  
Phone: (212) 549-2500  
Fax: (212) 549-2654

David A. Schulz  
Jonathan M. Manes  
Conor Clarke (law student intern)  
Nicholas Handler (law student intern)  
Ajay Ravichandran (law student intern)  
MEDIA FREEDOM AND INFORMATION ACCESS  
CLINIC, YALE LAW SCHOOL  
P.O. Box 208215  
New Haven, CT 06520  
(212) 850-6103

Dated: October 30, 2014

*American Civil Liberties Union v. National Security Agency*  
No. 1:13-cv-09198-AT

---

*Index of Exhibits to Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint*

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Document</b>
A	Plaintiffs' FOIA requests submitted to the CIA, DIA, NSA, FBI, NSD, OLC, and DOS on May 13, 2013
B	Responses from the NSA to Plaintiffs' FOIA request
C	Communications between Plaintiffs and the OLC in response to Plaintiffs' FOIA request
D	CIA's denial of Plaintiffs' FOIA request
E	Plaintiffs' administrative appeal from the CIA's denial of their FOIA request
F	Plaintiffs' administrative appeals from the denials of their FOIA request by the DIA, NSA, FBI, NSD, OLC, and DOS
G	Plaintiffs' FOIA request submitted to NSD on July 29, 2014

# Exhibit A



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Information and Privacy Coordinator  
 Central Intelligence Agency  
 Washington, DC 20505

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

To Whom It May Concern:

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the Central Intelligence Agency (“Agency”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the Agency with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the Agency defines these terms, pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

---

1 Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

2 Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
 UNION FOUNDATION  
 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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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.

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the Agency. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the Agency, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

recent case before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the Agency's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.,* Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(1) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g., United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). Alternatively, we request that the records be provided electronically in a text-searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR


image quality in the agency's possession, and in separate, Bates-stamped files.

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Margaret A. Bestrain, Chief, FOIA and Declassification Services Branch  
 Defense Intelligence Agency  
 U.S. Department of Defense  
 ATTN: DAN-1A (FOIA)  
 200 MacDill Blvd.  
 Washington, DC 20340-5100

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

Dear Ms. Bestrain,

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the Defense Intelligence Agency (“Agency”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the Agency with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the Agency defines these terms, pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

---

1 Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

2 Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
 UNION FOUNDATION  
 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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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.

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the Agency. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the Agency, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

recent case before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the Agency's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.,* Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(1) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g., United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). Alternatively, we request that the records be provided electronically in a text-searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR


image quality in the agency's possession, and in separate, Bates-stamped files.

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Attn: Cindy Blacker  
NSA FOIA Requester Service Center/DJ4  
9800 Savage Road, Suite 6248  
Ft. George G. Meade, MD 20744-6248

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

Dear Ms. Blacker,

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the National Security Agency (“Agency”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the Agency with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the Agency defines these terms, pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

---

1 Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

2 Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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.

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the Agency. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the Agency, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

recent case before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the Agency's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.,* Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(1) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g., United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). Alternatively, we request that the records be provided

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR


electronically in a text-searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best image quality in the agency's possession, and in separate, Bates-stamped files.

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Abdo', is written over a horizontal line.

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Federal Bureau of Investigation  
 Attn: FOI/PA Request  
 Record/Information Dissemination Section  
 170 Marcel Drive  
 Winchester, VA 22602-4843

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

To Whom It May Concern:

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the FBI with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the FBI’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the FBI defines these terms, pursuant to the FBI’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

---

1 Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

2 Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
 UNION FOUNDATION  
 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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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.

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the FBI. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the FBI, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a recent case

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the FBI's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.,* Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(1) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g., United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). 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 in separate, Bates-stamped files.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT


ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Arnetta Mallory, FOIA Initiatives Coordinator  
 National Security Division  
 U.S. Department of Justice  
 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
 Room 6150  
 Washington, DC 20530-0001

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

Dear Ms. Mallory,

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the National Security Division (“NSD”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the NSD with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the NSD’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the NSD defines these terms, pursuant to the NSD’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

---

1 Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

2 Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
 UNION FOUNDATION  
 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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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.

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the NSD. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the NSD, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a recent case

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the NSD's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.,* Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(1) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g., United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). 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 in separate, Bates-stamped files.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT


ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Elizabeth Farris, Supervisory Paralegal  
Office of Legal Counsel  
Room 5515, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Department of Justice  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

Dear Ms. Farris,

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records in which the Office of Legal Counsel (“OLC”) construes or interprets the authority of the Department of Justice (“DOJ”) or any executive agencies under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the government with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as those terms are defined in EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

---

1 Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

2 Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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.

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the OLC. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the OLC, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a recent case

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the intelligence community's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.,* Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(1) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g., United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). 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 in separate, Bates-stamped files.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT


ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Office of Informational Programs and Services  
A/GIS/IPS/RL  
Department of State, SA-2  
Washington, DC 20522-8100

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

To Whom It May Concern:

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the United States Department of State (“Department”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the Department with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Department’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the Department defines these terms, pursuant to the Department’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

---

1 Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

2 Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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.

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the Department. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the Department, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

recent case before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the Department's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.*, Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(1) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). Alternatively, we request that the records be provided electronically in a text-searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR


image quality in the agency's possession, and in separate, Bates-stamped files.

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

# Exhibit B

"Phillips, Pamela" <pnphill@nsa.gov>  
NSA FOIA Clarification  
June 28, 2013 10:29 AM

---

Mr. Abdo,

Thank you for speaking to me this morning about your FOIA request and helping us to scope it into a manageable search. We will continue to work with the organizations conducting the searches, and if we need any additional information to further clarify as we proceed, I will give you another call or email you. For the record, here is what we decided about your request today:

Case 70809 – for records construing or interpreting the authority of NSA under O.E. 12333; records describing the minimization procedures used by the Agency; records describing the standards that must be satisfied for collection, acquisition, or interception of communications

You agreed to limit the request to formally issued guidance (of which I mentioned various types, such as DoD Directions, NSA USSID, NSA Policies, various issuances relating to FISA, compliance training, and advisories). You agreed to omit guidance that simply reiterates or includes pieces and excerpts from the formal guidance. You also agreed that you are not seeking emails. Finally, you indicated that you would want any separate legal opinions that interpret the standards or define terms collection, acquisition, or interception to the extent that that opinion/interpretation is not included in the formal guidance.

Please let me know if I have mischaracterized or misunderstood our conversation in any way. You will be receiving a formal interim response from us soon with two previously released documents. Thanks again.

Pamela

Pamela N. Phillips  
Chief, FOIA/PA Office (DJ4)  
FOIA Public Liaison Officer  
National Security Agency  
(301) 688-6527  
pnphill@nsa.gov



NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY  
CENTRAL SECURITY SERVICE  
FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MARYLAND 20755-6000

FOIA Case: 70809  
1 July 2013

American Civil Liberties Union  
ATTN: Mr. Alexander Abdo  
National Office  
125 Broad Street, 18<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
New York, NY 10004-2400

Dear Mr. Abdo:

This is an initial response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request dated 13 May 2013, which was received by this office on 30 May 2013, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12333, 3 C.F.R. 200, specially the following records:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the National Security Agency ("Agency") under Executive 12333 or any regulations issues thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures used by the Agency with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Agency's authority under EO 12333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the "collection," "acquisition," or "interception" of communications, as the Agency defines these terms, pursuant to the Agency's authority under EO 12333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

In a telephone conversation on 28 June 2013, you agreed to narrow your request to allow us to process it more quickly and to avoid search fees, since we have already begun processing several requests for similar information. You agree to limit your request (as relates to the above three items) to formally issued guidance, omitting emails and omitting guidance that reiterates or includes excerpts from the formal guidance. In addition, you indicated that you still desire any separate legal opinions that interpret the

FOIA Case: 70809

standards or define the terms in item 3 above, to the extent that it is not included in the formal guidance.

Your request has been assigned Case Number 70809. This letter indicates that we have begun to process your request. There is certain information relating to this processing about which the FOIA and applicable Department of Defense (DoD) and NSA/CSS regulations require we inform you. For purposes of this request, you are considered an "all other" requester. However, as we already indicated, the search is being conducted in response to other requests, so there will be no search fees assessed for this request. In addition, we do not plan to charge the duplication fees for the responsive material for any of the requesters. Therefore, we have not addressed your request for a waiver of fees.

With this response, we enclose two documents (USSID 18 and NSA/CSS Policy 1-23, 81 pages in total) that were previously released under the FOIA. We are continuing our search for responsive materials and will contact you again as information becomes available.

Correspondence related to your request should include the case number assigned to your request, which is included in the first paragraph of this letter. Your letter should be addressed to National Security Agency, FOIA Office (DJ4), 9800 Savage Road STE 6248, Ft. George G. Meade, MD 20755-6248 or may be sent by facsimile to 443-479-3612. If sent by fax, it should be marked for the attention of the FOIA office. The telephone number of the FOIA office is 301-688-6527.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Pamela N. Phillips". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

PAMELA N. PHILLIPS  
Chief  
FOIA/PA Office

Encls:  
a/s

"Phillips, Pamela" <pnphill@nsa.gov>  
NSA FOIA 70809  
August 21, 2013 4:40 PM

---

Mr. Abdo,

You may already be already aware, but my understanding is that the ODNI is going to post several documents this afternoon related to Section 702 were released today in a FOIA litigation case, some of which may also be responsive to your FOIA request to this agency for minimization procedures. They are to be posted to the ODNI website, and then later to the IContheRecord.tumblr.com website. We are continuing the processing of your request to this Agency and will respond further when documents are complete.

Pamela

Pamela N. Phillips  
Chief, FOIA/PA Office (DJ4)  
FOIA Public Liaison Officer  
National Security Agency  
(240) 373-1434  
pnphill@nsa.gov  
pnphill@nsa.smil.mil



NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY  
CENTRAL SECURITY SERVICE  
FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MARYLAND 20755-6000

FOIA Case: 70809A  
18 November 2013

American Civil Liberties Union  
ATTN: Mr. Alexander Abdo  
National Office  
125 Broad Street, 18<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
New York, NY 10004-2400

Dear Mr. Abdo:

This further responds to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request dated 13 May 2013 for access to documents relating to Executive Order (EO) 12333, 3 C.F.R. 200, specifically the following records:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the National Security Agency ("Agency") under EO 12333 or any regulations issues thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures used by the Agency with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Agency's authority under EO 12333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the "collection," "acquisition," or "interception" of communications, as the Agency defines these terms, pursuant to the Agency's authority under EO 12333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

You agreed to narrow your request (as relates to the above three items) to formally issued guidance, omitting emails and omitting guidance that reiterates or includes excerpts from the formal guidance. In addition, you indicated that you still desire any separate legal opinions that interpret the standards or define the terms in item 3 above, to the extent that it is not included in the formal guidance.

FOIA Case: 70809A

Two additional documents responsive to your request (USSID SP0018 and Annex J) have been processed under the FOIA and are enclosed. Certain information, however, has been deleted from the enclosures.

Some of the information deleted from the documents was found to be currently and properly classified in accordance with Executive Order 13526. This information meets the criteria for classification as set forth in Subparagraphs (c) and/or (d) of Section 1.4 and remains classified SECRET as provided in Section 1.2 of the Executive Order. The information is classified because its disclosure could reasonably be expected to cause serious damage to the national security. Because the information is currently and properly classified, it is exempt from disclosure pursuant to the first exemption of the FOIA (5 U.S.C. Section 552(b)(1)).

In addition, this Agency is authorized by various statutes to protect certain information concerning its activities. We have determined that such information exists in these documents. Accordingly, those portions are exempt from disclosure pursuant to the third exemption of the FOIA which provides for the withholding of information specifically protected from disclosure by statute. The specific statutes applicable in this case are Title 18 U.S. Code 798; Title 50 U.S. Code 3024(i) (formerly Title 50 U.S. Code 403-1(i)); and Section 6, Public Law 86-36 (50 U.S. Code 3605, formerly 50 U.S. Code 402 note).

The Initial Denial Authority for NSA information is the Associate Director for Policy and Records, David J. Sherman. Since these deletions may be construed as a partial denial of your request, you are hereby advised of this Agency's appeal procedures. Any person denied access to information may file an appeal to the NSA/CSS Freedom of Information Act Appeal Authority. The appeal must be postmarked no later than 60 calendar days from the date of the initial denial letter. The appeal shall be in writing addressed to the NSA/CSS FOIA Appeal Authority (DJ4), National Security Agency, 9800 Savage Road STE 6248, Fort George G. Meade, MD 20755-6248. The appeal shall reference the initial denial of access and shall contain, in sufficient detail and particularity, the grounds upon which the requester believes release of the information is required. The NSA/CSS Appeal Authority will endeavor to respond to the appeal within 20 working days after receipt, absent any unusual circumstances.

The State Department has also asked that we protect information pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(1). We will coordinate any appeal of the denial of that information with the State Department.

FOIA Case: 70809A

Review of additional documents responsive to your request continues; they will be provided to you as they are completed. In addition, documents related to NSA collection activities and procedures continue to be released in litigation on behalf of the Intelligence Community (IC) by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI). You will find those documents posted on the ODNI web page, as well as on IC on the Record (IContheRecord.tumblr.com).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Pamela N. Phillips". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being the most prominent.

PAMELA N. PHILLIPS  
Chief  
FOIA/PA Office

Encls:  
a/s

# Exhibit C



**U.S. Department of Justice**

Office of Legal Counsel

---

*Washington, D.C. 20530*

June 25, 2013

Alexander Abdo  
National Security Project  
ACLU  
125 Broad St.  
18<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
New York NY 10004-2400

**Re: FOIA Tracking No. FY13-051**

Dear Mr. Abdo:

This letter acknowledges receipt of your Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") request to the Office of Legal Counsel ("OLC"), dated May 13, 2013. We received your request on May 29, 2013, and assigned it FOIA tracking number **FY13-051**.

We have not yet made a decision on your request for a fee waiver. We will do so after we determine whether fees will be assessed for this request.

Finally, pursuant to your conversation with my colleague David Lehn on June 20, 2013, we propose that your request be revised as follows:

- 1) All OLC final legal advice concerning the scope and application of the authority of the United States Government to conduct electronic surveillance of the communications of United States persons pursuant to Executive Order 12333 or its implementing regulations, regardless of whether the United States person is the target of the electronic surveillance or is in the United States at the time of the electronic surveillance, except to the extent that the electronic surveillance is conducted pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. For purposes of this request, "electronic surveillance" and "United States person" have the meaning given in Executive Order 12333.
- 2) All OLC final legal advice concerning the meaning of the terms "collection", "acquisition", and "interception" as applied to electronic surveillance conducted pursuant to Executive Order 12333 or its implementing regulations. For purposes of this request, "electronic surveillance" has the meaning given in Executive Order 12333.

Please let us know whether you agree to this proposal, so that the processing of your request may proceed, consistent with its position in OLC's FOIA queue. To do so, or to discuss any other aspect of your request, you may contact Elizabeth Farris, our Supervisory Paralegal and FOIA contact, at [usdoj-officeoflegalcounsel@usdoj.gov](mailto:usdoj-officeoflegalcounsel@usdoj.gov), (202) 514-2038, or Office of Legal

Counsel, United States Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20530.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul P. Colborn". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

Paul P. Colborn  
Special Counsel

"Lehn, David (OLC)" <David.Lehn@usdoj.gov>  
RE: OLC FOIA Request 13-051  
July 10, 2013 12:34 PM

---

Great - thanks, Alex.

---

From: Alexander Abdo [mailto:aabdo@aclu.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2013 12:23 PM  
To: Lehn, David (OLC)  
Subject: RE: OLC FOIA Request 13-051

David, this looks great. Thanks so much.

---

From: Lehn, David (OLC) [mailto:David.Lehn@usdoj.gov]  
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 3:27 PM  
To: Alexander Abdo  
Subject: RE: OLC FOIA Request 13-051

Hi, Alex. Thanks for getting back to me. I carved out FISA in light of my understanding of what you were seeking based on our conversation. But we can eliminate the carve-out given that the application of EO 12333 to elsur under FISA is fairly within the scope of your original request. So, how about this?

- 1) All OLC final legal advice concerning Executive Order 12333 or its implementing regulations with respect to electronic surveillance by the United States Government of communications of United States persons, regardless of whether the United States person is the target of the electronic surveillance or is in the United States at the time of the electronic surveillance. For purposes of this request, "electronic surveillance" and "United States person" have the meaning given in Executive Order 12333.
- 2) All OLC final legal advice concerning the meaning of the terms "collection", "acquisition", and "interception" as used in Executive Order 12333 or its implementing regulations with respect to electronic surveillance by the United States Government of communications of United States persons. For purposes of this request, "electronic surveillance" has the meaning given in Executive Order 12333.

---

From: Alexander Abdo [mailto:aabdo@aclu.org]  
Sent: Saturday, June 29, 2013 1:18 PM  
To: Lehn, David (OLC)  
Subject: Re: OLC FOIA Request 13-051

David,

Thanks so much for memorializing this. I have a few modifications I'd like to make, just to make sure the request is targeted at what we're interested in.

In the first bullet point, can we change "pursuant to Executive Order 12,333" to "governed by Executive Order 12,333," and can we delete the phrase "except to the extent that the electronic surveillance is conducted pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act"? My understanding is that the executive order often imposes additional requirements on surveillance conducted pursuant to other authorities (such as FISA or the FISA Amendments Act). I think the language you proposed would cover those situations as well, but I just want to make sure it's clear.

For the same reason and in the second bullet point, can we change "pursuant to" to "governed by"?

Thanks so much,

Alex

On Jun 25, 2013, at 3:42 PM, "Lehn, David (OLC)" <David.Lehn@usdoj.gov> wrote:

Alex, following up on our call last week, please see the attached letter. Notwithstanding what the letter says, you can respond directly to me. Thanks

---

David Lehn  
Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
U.S. Department of Justice  
202-514-5572

<13-051 ack 2013-06-25.pdf>

# Exhibit D

Central Intelligence Agency



Washington, D.C. 20505

26 July 2013

Mr. Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union  
125 Broad Street, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10004-2400

Reference: F-2013-01775

Dear Mr. Abdo:

This is a final response to your 13 May 2013 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, submitted on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, received in the office of the Information and Privacy Coordinator on 23 May 2013, for:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the Central Intelligence Agency ("Agency") under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures used by the Agency with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Agency's authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the "collection," "acquisition," or "interception" of communications, as the agency defines these terms, pursuant to the Agency's authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

We cannot accept your FOIA request in its current form because it would require the Agency to perform an unreasonably burdensome search. The FOIA requires requesters to "reasonably describe" the information they seek so that professional employees familiar with the subject matter can locate responsive information with a reasonable amount of effort. Commonly this equates to a requirement that the documents must be locatable through the indexing of our various systems. Extremely broad or vague requests or requests requiring research do not satisfy this requirement.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Michele Meeks".

Michele Meeks  
Information and Privacy Coordinator

# Exhibit E



November 1, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Agency Release Panel (ARP)  
c/o Coordinator  
Information and Privacy Coordinator  
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)  
Washington, DC 20505

**Re: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT APPEAL – NO. F-2013-01775**

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
125 BROAD STREET, 18TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10004-2400  
T/212.549.2500  
WWW.ACLU.ORG

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS  
SUSAN N. HERMAN  
PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dear Panelists:

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Foundation (collectively “ACLU”) write to appeal from the response of the Central Intelligence Agency (“CIA”) to FOIA Request No. F-2013-01775, in which the ACLU seeks the following records:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the Central Intelligence Agency (“Agency”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures used by the Agency with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the Agency defines these terms, pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder. *See* FOIA Request of May 13, 2013 (“Request”) (Exhibit 1, attached).

In a letter dated July 26, 2013 (“Response Letter”) (Exhibit 2, attached), Information and Privacy Coordinator Michele Meeks of the CIA denied the ACLU’s Request in its entirety stating, that “The FOIA requires requesters to ‘reasonably describe’ the information they seek so that professional employees [sic] can locate responsive documents with a reasonable amount of effort. Commonly this equates to a requirement that the documents must be locatable through the indexing of our various systems.”


The CIA's denial of the ACLU's Request was premised entirely on its determination that the records sought exceed what is required by the FOIA—i.e., that the Request is “extremely broad or vague” and “would require the Agency to perform an unreasonably burdensome search.” *See* Response Letter. This determination is inaccurate and without basis.

The Request is specific in what it seeks. The second and third paragraphs of the request seek discrete categories of records: those describing the Agency's minimization procedures under EO 12,333 and those articulating the standards that the Agency must satisfy before collecting, acquiring, or intercepting communications under EO 12,333. The first paragraph of the request, though comprehensive, nonetheless specifies a discrete category of records for processing: those construing or interpreting the Agency's authority under EO 12,333. Although the ACLU is not in a position to be more specific without additional information from the Agency, the first paragraph of the request includes, at a minimum, rules, policies, or legal opinions describing the Agency's authority to conduct—or analyze, use, retain, and disseminate the fruits of—electronic surveillance under EO 12,333.

These specific categories of documents must be processed by the CIA under FOIA. Indeed, at least four other government agencies—the United States Air Force, the Department of the Army, the Department of Homeland Security, and the National Security Agency—have already processed and produced documents in response to identical FOIA requests. In addition, at least three other government agencies—the Department of State, the Department of the Army, and the Department of Justice National Security Division—have already granted fee waivers to the ACLU with respect to identical FOIA requests.

For the reasons stated above, the CIA's determination to deny the Request was erroneous and should be reversed.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
American Civil Liberties Union  
Foundation  
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor  
New York, NY 10004  
Tel: 212 549 2517  
Fax: 212 549 2629  
E-mail: aabdo@aclu.org

# Exhibit 1

LEGAL DEPARTMENT



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Information and Privacy Coordinator  
Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington, DC 20505

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

To Whom It May Concern:

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the Central Intelligence Agency (“Agency”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the Agency with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the Agency defines these terms, pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

---

<sup>1</sup> Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

<sup>2</sup> Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the Agency. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the Agency, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a

recent case before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the Agency's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.*, Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(l) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). Alternatively, we request that the records be provided electronically in a text-searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR


image quality in the agency's possession, and in separate, Bates-stamped files.

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

# Exhibit 2

Central Intelligence Agency



Washington, D.C. 20505

26 July 2013

Mr. Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union  
125 Broad Street, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10004-2400

Reference: F-2013-01775

Dear Mr. Abdo:

This is a final response to your 13 May 2013 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, submitted on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, received in the office of the Information and Privacy Coordinator on 23 May 2013, for:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the Central Intelligence Agency ("Agency") under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures used by the Agency with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Agency's authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the "collection," "acquisition," or "interception" of communications, as the agency defines these terms, pursuant to the Agency's authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

We cannot accept your FOIA request in its current form because it would require the Agency to perform an unreasonably burdensome search. The FOIA requires requesters to "reasonably describe" the information they seek so that professional employees familiar with the subject matter can locate responsive information with a reasonable amount of effort. Commonly this equates to a requirement that the documents must be locatable through the indexing of our various systems. Extremely broad or vague requests or requests requiring research do not satisfy this requirement.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Michele Meeks".

Michele Meeks  
Information and Privacy Coordinator

# Exhibit F

NATIONAL SECURITY  
PROJECT



November 8, 2013

**BY UPS**

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

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
125 BROAD STREET, 18TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10004-2400  
T/212.549.2500  
WWW.ACLU.ORG

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT APPEAL**

Dear Sir or Madam,

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS  
SUSAN N. HERMAN  
PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) write to appeal from the constructive denial of their Freedom of Information Act request, submitted on May 13, 2013, for documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). A copy of the request is attached here for reference. The ACLU received an acknowledgement of receipt dated June 6, 2013 in a letter signed by Alesia Y. Williams. The request was assigned the following identification number: F-2013-09022.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, determinations about whether an agency will produce documents must be made within 20 business days. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i); 28 C.F.R. § 16.6(b). Where an agency cannot meet the statutory time limit due to unusual circumstances, the agency may extend the time limit by ten working days with written notice to the requester. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(B). An agency denying a request in any respect must send the requester a signed letter including, among other things, a brief statement of the reasons for denial. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i).

Because the twenty-day statutory time and the ten-day extension have elapsed without a substantive response, the Defense Intelligence Agency has constructively failed to meet its legal obligation to disclose the information requested. By this appeal, we ask you to direct the timely disclosure of all records responsive to our request.

We thank you for your consideration of this appeal. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(ii), we expect a response regarding this appeal within twenty days. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the email address or telephone number indicated below.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union  
Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: [aabdo@aclu.org](mailto:aabdo@aclu.org)

LEGAL DEPARTMENT



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Margaret A. Bestrain, Chief, FOIA and Declassification Services Branch  
Defense Intelligence Agency  
U.S. Department of Defense  
ATTN: DAN-1A (FOIA)  
200 MacDill Blvd.  
Washington, DC 20340-5100

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

Dear Ms. Bestrain,

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the "ACLU") submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) ("EO 12,333"). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the Defense Intelligence Agency ("Agency") under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the Agency with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Agency's authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the "collection," "acquisition," or "interception" of communications, as the Agency defines these terms, pursuant to the Agency's authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

<sup>1</sup> Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

<sup>2</sup> Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
325 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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the Agency. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the Agency, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a

recent case before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the Agency's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.*, Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(1) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). Alternatively, we request that the records be provided electronically in a text-searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION

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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

image quality in the agency's possession, and in separate, Bates-stamped files.

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Abdo', is written over a horizontal line.

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: [aabdo@aclu.org](mailto:aabdo@aclu.org)

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

NATIONAL SECURITY  
PROJECT



November 8, 2013

**BY UPS**

NSA/CSS FOIA Appeal Authority (DJ4)  
National Security Agency  
9800 Savage Road, Suite 6248  
Ft. George G. Meade, MD 20755-6248

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
125 BROAD STREET, 18TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10004-2400  
T/212.549.2500  
WWW.ACLU.ORG

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT APPEAL**

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS  
SUSAN N. HERMAN  
PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dear Sir or Madam,


The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) write to appeal from the constructive denial of their Freedom of Information Act request, submitted on May 13, 2013, for documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). A copy of the request is attached here for reference. The ACLU received an acknowledgement of receipt dated July 1, 2013 in a letter signed by Pamela N. Philips. The request was assigned the following identification number: 70809.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, determinations about whether an agency will produce documents must be made within 20 business days. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i); 28 C.F.R. § 16.6(b). Where an agency cannot meet the statutory time limit due to unusual circumstances, the agency may extend the time limit by ten working days with written notice to the requester. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(B). An agency denying a request in any respect must send the requester a signed letter including, among other things, a brief statement of the reasons for denial. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i).

Because the twenty-day statutory time has elapsed without a substantive response, the National Security Agency has constructively failed to meet its legal obligation to disclose the information requested. By this appeal, we ask you to direct the timely disclosure of all records responsive to our request.

We thank you for your consideration of this appeal. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(ii), we expect a response regarding this appeal within twenty days. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the email address or telephone number indicated below.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Abdo', written over a horizontal line.

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union  
Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

LEGAL DEPARTMENT



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Attn: Cindy Blacker  
NSA FOIA Requester Service Center/DJ4  
9800 Savage Road, Suite 6248  
Ft. George G. Meade, MD 20744-6248

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

Dear Ms. Blacker,

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the National Security Agency (“Agency”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the Agency with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the Agency defines these terms, pursuant to the Agency’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

1 Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

2 Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the Agency. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the Agency, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a

recent case before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the Agency's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.*, Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(i) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). Alternatively, we request that the records be provided

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR


electronically in a text-searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best image quality in the agency's possession, and in separate, Bates-stamped files.

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

NATIONAL SECURITY  
PROJECT



November 8, 2013

**BY UPS**

Office of Information Policy  
U.S. Department of Justice, Suite 11050  
1425 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
125 BROAD STREET, 18TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10004-2400  
T/212.549.2500  
WWW.ACLU.ORG

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT APPEAL**  
**FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION**

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS  
SUSAN N. HERMAN  
PRESIDENT

Dear Sir or Madam,

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) write to appeal from the constructive denial of their Freedom of Information Act request, submitted on May 13, 2013, for documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). A copy of the request is attached here for reference. The ACLU received an acknowledgement of receipt dated June 7, 2013 in a letter signed by David M. Hardy. The request was assigned the following identification number: 1216886-000.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, determinations about whether an agency will produce documents must be made within 20 business days. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i); 28 C.F.R. § 16.6(b). Where an agency cannot meet the statutory time limit due to unusual circumstances, the agency may extend the time limit by ten working days with written notice to the requester. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(B). An agency denying a request in any respect must send the requester a signed letter including, among other things, a brief statement of the reasons for denial. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i).

Because the twenty-day statutory time has elapsed without a substantive response, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has constructively failed to meet its legal obligation to disclose the information requested. By this appeal, we ask you to direct the timely disclosure of all records responsive to our request.

We thank you for your consideration of this appeal. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(ii), we expect a response regarding this appeal within twenty days. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the email address or telephone number indicated below.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alexander Abdo', written over a horizontal line.

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union  
Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: [aabdo@aclu.org](mailto:aabdo@aclu.org)

LEGAL DEPARTMENT



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Federal Bureau of Investigation  
Attn: FOI/PA Request  
Record/Information Dissemination Section  
170 Marcel Drive  
Winchester, VA 22602-4843

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

To Whom It May Concern:

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the FBI with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the FBI’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the FBI defines these terms, pursuant to the FBI’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

---

1 Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

2 Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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.

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the FBI. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the FBI, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a recent case

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the FBI's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.,* Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(l) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g., United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). 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 in separate, Bates-stamped files.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: [aabdo@aclu.org](mailto:aabdo@aclu.org)

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

NATIONAL SECURITY  
PROJECT



November 8, 2013

BY UPS

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

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
125 BROAD STREET, 18TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10004-2400  
T/212.549.2500  
WWW.ACLU.ORG

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT APPEAL**  
**[NATIONAL SECURITY DIVISION]**

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS  
SUSAN N. HERMAN  
PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dear Sir or Madam,

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) write to appeal from the constructive denial of their Freedom of Information Act request, submitted on May 13, 2013, for documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). A copy of the request is attached here for reference. The ACLU received an acknowledgement of receipt dated June 11, 2013 in a letter signed by Arnetta Mallory. The request was assigned the following identification number: 13-175.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, determinations about whether an agency will produce documents must be made within 20 business days. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i); 28 C.F.R. § 16.6(b). Where an agency cannot meet the statutory time limit due to unusual circumstances, the agency may extend the time limit by ten working days with written notice to the requester. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(B). An agency denying a request in any respect must send the requester a signed letter including, among other things, a brief statement of the reasons for denial. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i).

Because the twenty-day statutory time has elapsed without a substantive response, the Department of Justice, National Security Division has constructively failed to meet its legal obligation to disclose the information requested. By this appeal, we ask you to direct the timely disclosure of all records responsive to our request.

We thank you for your consideration of this appeal. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(ii), we expect a response regarding this appeal within twenty days. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the email address or telephone number indicated below.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union  
Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

LEGAL DEPARTMENT



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Arnetta Mallory, FOIA Initiatives Coordinator  
National Security Division  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Room 6150  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
135 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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

Dear Ms. Mallory,

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the National Security Division (“NSD”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the NSD with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the NSD’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the NSD defines these terms, pursuant to the NSD’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

<sup>1</sup> Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

<sup>2</sup> Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the NSD. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the NSD, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a recent case

before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the NSD's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. See Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. See, e.g., Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(l) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. See, e.g., *United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). 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 in separate, Bates-stamped files.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
225 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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR



November 8, 2013

**BY UPS**

Office of Information Policy  
U.S. Department of Justice  
1425 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20530 0001

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
125 BROAD STREET, 18TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10004-2400  
T/212.549.2500  
WWW.ACLU.ORG

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT APPEAL**  
**OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL**

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS  
SUSAN N. HERMAN  
PRESIDENT

Dear Sir or Madam,

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR


The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) write to appeal from the constructive denial of their Freedom of Information Act request, submitted on May 13, 2013, for documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). A copy of the request is attached here for reference. The ACLU received an acknowledgement of receipt dated June 25, 2013 in a letter signed by Paul P. Colborn. The request was assigned the following identification number: FYI13-051.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, determinations about whether an agency will produce documents must be made within 20 business days. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i); 28 C.F.R. § 16.6(b). Where an agency cannot meet the statutory time limit due to unusual circumstances, the agency may extend the time limit by ten working days with written notice to the requester. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(B). An agency denying a request in any respect must send the requester a signed letter including, among other things, a brief statement of the reasons for denial. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i).

Because the twenty-day statutory time has elapsed without a substantive response, the Office of Legal Counsel has constructively failed to meet its legal obligation to disclose the information requested. By this appeal, we ask you to direct the timely disclosure of all records responsive to our request.

We thank you for your consideration of this appeal. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(ii), we expect a response regarding this appeal within twenty days. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the email address or telephone number indicated below.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Abdo', written over a horizontal line.

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union  
Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: [aabdo@aclu.org](mailto:aabdo@aclu.org)

LEGAL DEPARTMENT



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Elizabeth Farris, Supervisory Paralegal  
Office of Legal Counsel  
Room 5515, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Department of Justice  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
125 BROAD STREET,  
18TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10004-2400  
T/212.549.2500  
F/212.549.2652  
WWW.ACLU.ORG

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS  
SUSAN N. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

Dear Ms. Farris,

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records in which the Office of Legal Counsel (“OLC”) construes or interprets the authority of the Department of Justice (“DOJ”) or any executive agencies under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the government with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as those terms are defined in EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

---

<sup>1</sup> Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

<sup>2</sup> Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

### Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the OLC. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the OLC, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a recent case

before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the intelligence community's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.,* Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(l) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g., United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). 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 in separate, Bates-stamped files.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

NATIONAL SECURITY  
PROJECT



November 8, 2013

**BY CERTIFIED MAIL**

Chairman, Appeals Review Panel  
c/o Information and Privacy Coordinator/Appeals Officer  
U.S. Department of State  
A/GIS/IPS/PP, SA-2  
Washington, DC 20522-8100

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
125 BROAD STREET, 18TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10004-2400  
T/212.549.2500  
WWW.ACLU.ORG

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT APPEAL**

Dear Mr. Chairman,

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) write to appeal from the constructive denial of their Freedom of Information Act request, submitted on May 13, 2013, for documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). A copy of the request is attached here for reference. The ACLU received an acknowledgement of receipt dated June 5, 2013 in a letter signed by Mary Therese Casto. The request was assigned the following identification number: F-2013-09022.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, determinations about whether an agency will produce documents must be made within 20 business days. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i); 28 C.F.R. § 16.6(b). Where an agency cannot meet the statutory time limit due to unusual circumstances, the agency may extend the time limit by ten working days with written notice to the requester. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(B). An agency denying a request in any respect must send the requester a signed letter including, among other things, a brief statement of the reasons for denial. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i).

Because the twenty-day statutory time limit has elapsed without a substantive response, the Department of State has constructively failed to meet its legal obligation to disclose the information requested. By this appeal, we ask you to direct the timely disclosure of all records responsive to our request.

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS  
SUSAN N. HERMAN  
PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

We thank you for your consideration of this appeal. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(ii), we expect a response regarding this appeal within twenty days. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the email address or telephone number indicated below.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union  
Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

LEGAL DEPARTMENT



May 13, 2013

**BY USPS MAIL**

Office of Informational Programs and Services  
A/GIS/IPS/RL  
Department of State, SA-2  
Washington, DC 20522-8100

**RE: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST**

To Whom It May Concern:

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”). Specifically, we request the following records<sup>1</sup>:

1. Any records construing or interpreting the authority of the United States Department of State (“Department”) under Executive Order 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder;
2. Any records describing the minimization procedures<sup>2</sup> used by the Department with regard to both intelligence collection and intelligence interception conducted pursuant to the Department’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder; and
3. Any records describing the standards that must be satisfied for the “collection,” “acquisition,” or “interception” of communications, as the Department defines these terms, pursuant to the Department’s authority under EO 12,333 or any regulations issued thereunder.

1 Records include but are not limited to electronic records, letters, correspondence, tape recordings, notes, data, memoranda, reports, email, computer source and object code, technical manuals, technical specifications, legal opinions, policy statements, and any other materials.

2 Minimization procedures include but are not limited to rules, policies, or procedures addressing the collection, interception, handling, use, retention, and destruction of information relating to U.S. persons that is acquired in the course of intelligence activities.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the Department. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the intelligence community, including the Department, to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a

recent case before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans' foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the Government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance.

Moreover, the requested materials will "contribute significantly to the public understanding" of the Department's operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the American intelligence community construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government makes no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. *See* Brief for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45. Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333's limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. *See, e.g.*, Dep't of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982); Nat'l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive* 18 (July 1993); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(1) (2007). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\*\*\*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). Alternatively, we request that the records be provided electronically in a text-searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

image quality in the agency's possession, and in separate, Bates-stamped files.

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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty working-day statutory time limit.

Sincerely,



---

Alexander Abdo  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 549-2517  
Email: aabdo@aclu.org

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
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. HERMAN PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

# Exhibit G

NATIONAL SECURITY PROJECT



July 29, 2014

**BY CERTIFIED MAIL**

Arnetta Mallory, FOIA Initiatives Coordinator  
National Security Division  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Room 6150  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

**Re: REQUEST UNDER FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT /  
Expedited Processing Requested**

Dear Ms. Mallory,

The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation (together, the “ACLU”) submit this request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, for access to documents relating to Executive Order 12,333, 3 C.F.R. 200 (1981 Comp.) (“EO 12,333”).

**I. Requested Records**

Specifically, we request the following records:

1. Formal regulations or policies relating to any agency’s authority under EO 12,333 to undertake “Electronic Surveillance” (as that term is defined in EO 12,333) that implicates “United States Persons” (as that term is defined in EO 12,333), including regulations or policies relating to the acquisition, retention, dissemination, or use of information or communications to, from, or about United States Persons under such authority.<sup>1</sup>
2. Records that officially authorize or modify under EO 12,333 any agency’s use of specific programs, techniques, or types of Electronic Surveillance that implicate United States Persons, including official rules or procedures for the acquisition, retention, dissemination, or use of information or communications to, from, or about United States persons

---

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this Request, surveillance that “implicates” United States Persons means surveillance that is reasonably believed to involve the interception, acquisition, scanning, or collection of information or communications to, from, or about a United States Person or persons even if the target of such surveillance is not a United States Person.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL OFFICE  
125 BROAD STREET, 18TH FL.  
NEW YORK, NY 10004-2400  
T/212.549.2500  
WWW.ACLU.ORG

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS  
SUSAN N. HERMAN  
PRESIDENT

ANTHONY D. ROMERO  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RICHARD ZACKS  
TREASURER

under such authority generally or in the context of particular programs, techniques, or types of Electronic Surveillance.

3. Formal legal opinions addressing any agency's authority under EO 12,333 to undertake specific programs, techniques, or types of Electronic Surveillance that implicates United States Persons, including formal legal opinions relating to the acquisition, retention, dissemination, or use of information or communications to, from, or about United States Persons under such authority generally or in the context of particular programs, techniques, or types of Electronic Surveillance.
4. Formal training materials or reference materials (such as handbooks, presentations, or manuals) that expound on or explain how any agency implements its authority under EO 12,333 to undertake Electronic Surveillance that implicates United States Persons, including the acquisition, retention, dissemination, or use of information or communications to, from, or about United States Persons under such authority.
5. Formal reports relating to Electronic Surveillance under EO 12,333 implicating United States Persons that contain any meaningful discussion of (1) any agency's compliance, in undertaking such surveillance, with EO 12,333, its implementing regulations, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or the Fourth Amendment; or (2) any agency's interception, acquisition, scanning, or collection of the communications of United States Persons, whether "incidental" or otherwise, in undertaking such surveillance; and that are or were:
  - a. Authored by an inspector general or the functional equivalent thereof;
  - b. Submitted to Congress, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Attorney General, or the Deputy Attorney General; or
  - c. Maintained by the office of the Assistant Attorney General for National Security.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION

The Request is intended to supplement a FOIA request filed on May 13, 2013, which is the subject of *ACLU v. NSA*, No. 13 Civ. 9198 (AT) (S.D.N.Y.). To the extent that this Request involves records being processed in response to the ACLU's previous request, we are available to discuss ways of avoiding any unnecessary duplication of effort.

## **II. Request for Expedited Processing**

We request expedited processing pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E). *See also* 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d). There is a "compelling need" for these records 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 federal government activity. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v); *see also* 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(ii). In addition, the records sought relate to a “matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions about the government’s integrity which affect public confidence,” 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 regulations. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II); 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(ii). Obtaining information about government activity, analyzing that information, and widely publishing and disseminating that information to the press and public is a critical and substantial component of the ACLU’s work and one of its primary activities. *See ACLU 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)).<sup>2</sup>

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; and a widely read blog. The ACLU also regularly issues press releases to call attention to documents obtained through FOIA requests, as well as other breaking news.<sup>3</sup> ACLU attorneys are interviewed frequently for news stories about documents released through ACLU FOIA requests.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *See also Leadership Conference on Civil Rights v. Gonzales*, 404 F. Supp. 2d 246, 260 (D.D.C. 2005).

<sup>3</sup> *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>.

<sup>4</sup> *See, e.g.,* Peter Finn & Julie Tate, *CIA Mistaken on ‘High-Value’ Detainee, Document Shows*, Wash. Post, June 16, 2009 (quoting ACLU attorney Ben Wizner); Scott Shane, *Lawsuits Force Disclosures by C.I.A.*, N.Y. Times, June 10, 2009 (quoting ACLU attorney Jameel Jaffer).

In addition, the ACLU website includes features that provide information about actual or alleged government activity obtained through FOIA.<sup>5</sup> For example, the ACLU maintains an online “Torture Database,”<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, the ACLU’s webpage about the Office of Legal Counsel (“OLC”) torture memos obtained through FOIA contains commentary and analysis of the memos; an original, comprehensive chart summarizing the memos; links to web features created by ProPublica (an independent, non-profit, investigative-journalism organization) based on the ACLU’s information gathering, research, and analysis; and ACLU videos about the memos.<sup>8</sup> Beyond its website and online features, the ACLU has produced an in-depth television series on civil liberties, which has included analysis and explanation of information the ACLU has obtained through FOIA.

*B. The records sought are urgently needed to inform the public about actual or alleged government activity.*

The records sought are urgently needed to inform the public about actual or alleged federal government activity. In particular, the records sought pertain to the conduct and oversight of intelligence activities undertaken pursuant to EO 12,333. Recent reports in the media indicate that the scope of the government’s surveillance under EO 12,333 may be far broader than Americans currently understand, and may operate without the same privacy protections applied to surveillance conducted under other statutory authorities. *See, e.g.,* John Napier Tye, *Meet Executive Order 12333: The Reagan Rule that Lets the NSA Spy on Americans*, Wash. Post (July 18, 2014), <http://wapo.st/Ug0kLS>. Moreover, an independent report issued by the President’s Review Group last December suggested that information collected to, from, or about U.S. persons should receive greater protection—a recommendation that would apply to EO 12,333 surveillance. *See* President’s Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies, *Report and Recommendations 28-29* (Dec. 12, 2013), <http://bit.ly/1cBj5vG>. Despite these urgent calls for reform, the public has few details about the policies, rules, or procedures that currently govern the collection, use, and dissemination of Americans’ information under EO 12,333.

<sup>5</sup> *See, e.g.,* <http://www.aclu.org/national-security/predator-drone-foia>; <http://www.aclu.org/mappingthefbi>.

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.torturedatabase.org>.

<sup>7</sup> The ACLU also maintains a “Torture FOIA” webpage (<http://www.aclu.org/torturefoia>) containing commentary about the ACLU’s FOIA request, press releases, and analysis of the FOIA documents. That webpage also notes that the ACLU, in collaboration with Columbia University Press, has published a book about the documents obtained through FOIA. *See* Jameel Jaffer & Amrit Singh, *Administration of Torture: A Documentary Record from Washington to Abu Ghraib and Beyond* (Columbia Univ. Press 2007).

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.aclu.org/safefree/general/olc\\_memos.html](http://www.aclu.org/safefree/general/olc_memos.html).

The requested records also relate to a “matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions about the government’s integrity which affect public confidence,” 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(iv), and to a matter where there is “urgency to inform the public about an actual or alleged federal government activity.” 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(ii).

The government’s electronic surveillance powers have been a significant matter of public concern and media interest for many years, particularly after the revelation of the NSA’s warrantless wiretapping program. The legislation that emerged out of that controversy—the FAA—has been the subject of widespread interest and debate since the moment it was introduced in 2008. *See, e.g.*, Sean Lengell, *House Approves Update of Bipartisan Spy Laws*, Wash. Times, June 21, 2008; Editorial, *Mr. Bush v. the Bill of Rights*, N.Y. Times, June 18, 2008; Editorial, *Compromising the Constitution*, N.Y. Times, July 8, 2008 (stating that the FAA would “make it easier to spy on Americans at home, reduce the courts’ powers and grant immunity to the companies that turned over Americans’ private communications without warrant”); Editorial, *Election-Year Spying Deal is Flawed, Overly Broad*, USA Today, June 25, 2008.

This public debate has only grown with the disclosure of information about the scope and intrusiveness of government surveillance. Scores of articles published during the past year have addressed the government’s surveillance activities—including those under EO 12,333. *See, e.g.*, Zack Whittaker, *Legal Loopholes Could Allow Wider NSA Surveillance, Researchers Say*, CBS News (June 30, 2014), <http://cbsn.ws/1ticymy>; Mike Masnick, *Privacy Oversight Board Turns Its Sights on the Real Problem: Executive Order 12333*, Techdirt (July 23, 2014), <http://bit.ly/1rS7Ud8>; Naomi LaChance, *Should Executive Order 12333 Be Repealed?*, U.S. News (July 21, 2014), <http://bit.ly/1qav5Mz>; John Napier Tye, *Meet Executive Order 12333: The Reagan Rule that Lets the NSA Spy on Americans*, Wash. Post (July 18, 2014), <http://wapo.st/Ug0kLS>.

Many of these articles have highlighted pressing concerns about whether Americans’ privacy is adequately protected when the government engages in surveillance under EO 12,333. The Request seeks information bearing directly on this matter of public interest.

As the sustained media interest concerning the scope and privacy implications of the government’s electronic surveillance power clearly shows, the impact of EO 12,333 on Americans’ privacy constitutes a “matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions about the government’s integrity which affect public confidence,” 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(d)(1)(iv). The Request will inform urgent and ongoing debate about the government’s surveillance and wiretapping activities.

Accordingly, expedited processing should be granted.

### III. Request for a Fee Limitation and Public Interest Fee Waiver

The ACLU requests a waiver of search and review fees because the requested records are not sought for commercial use and because the ACLU is a “representative of the news media.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). 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. Its 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.

The ACLU therefore meets the statutory definition of a “representative of the news media” as 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); *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, 29 n.5 (D.D.C. 2004) (finding non-profit public interest group to be “primarily engaged in disseminating information”). Indeed, the ACLU recently was held to be a “representative of the news media.” *Serv. Women’s Action Network v. Dep’t of Defense*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 282, 287-88 (D. Conn. 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).

The ACLU also requests a waiver of all search, review, or duplication fees on the ground that disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because: (1) it “is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government,” and (2) it “is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). This request clearly satisfies these criteria.

First, as described in Part II.B, the requested material concerns “the operations or activities” of the Department of Justice. E.O. 12,333 is “intended to enhance human and technical collection techniques, especially those undertaken abroad, and the acquisition of significant foreign intelligence, as well as the detection and countering of international terrorist activities and espionage conducted by foreign powers.” EO 12,333 § 2.2. It authorizes the government to collect intelligence, and it sets forth certain limitations on intelligence-gathering activities relevant to civil liberties. In its brief in a recent case before the Supreme Court of the United States, the government emphasized its authority to conduct surveillance of Americans’ foreign contacts abroad under Executive Order No. 12,333, without conforming to various statutory restrictions. Br. for

Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949, at \*45 (U.S. 2012). How the government actually does this, and whether it appropriately accommodates the constitutional rights of American citizens and residents whose communications are intercepted in the course of that surveillance, are matters of great significance. This question is a matter of pressing public concern. See, e.g., John Napier Tye, *Meet Executive Order 12333: The Reagan Rule that Lets the NSA Spy on Americans*, Wash. Post (July 18, 2014), <http://wapo.st/Ug0kLS>.

Moreover, the requested materials will “contribute significantly to the public understanding” of the intelligence community’s operations or activities. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Though the subject of foreign-intelligence collection is a matter of great public interest and concern, little information on how the Department of Justice construes the authority conferred by EO 12,333 and its implementing regulations is currently publicly available.

For example, in the *Clapper* brief described above, the government made no argument beyond a handful of one-sentence assertions of its authority under EO 12,333. See Br. for Petitioners, *Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, No. 11-1025, 2012 WL 3090949 at \*4, \*33, \*41, \*45 (U.S. 2012). Likewise, the publicly available administrative agency materials typically do little more than restate EO 12,333’s limits on the intelligence community in slightly different ways or provide predictable definitions for terms left undefined in the executive order. See, e.g., Nat’l Sec. Agency, *United States Signals Intelligence Directive 18* (Jan. 2011); Army Regulation 381-10, *U.S. Army Intelligence Procedures* § 2-2(1) (2007); Dep’t of Def., DOD 5240 1-R, *Procedures Governing the Activities of DOD Intelligence Components that Affect United States Persons* § C2.3.12 (Dec. 1982). Judicial treatments of EO 12,333 contribute equally little to the public understanding of the limits of intelligence-gathering powers under EO 12,333. See, e.g., *United States v. Marzook*, 435 F. Supp. 2d 778 (N.D. Ill. 2006); *United States v. Poindexter*, 727 F. Supp. 1470 (D.D.C. 1989); *United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. v. Reagan*, 738 F.2d 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

For these reasons, we request that all fees related to the search, review, and duplication of the requested records be waived. If the search and review fees will not be waived, we ask that you contact us at the email address listed below should the estimated fees resulting from this request exceed \$100.

\* \* \*

We request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). 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 in separate, Bates-stamped files.


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

If this FOIA request is denied in whole or in part, please provide the reasons for the denial, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In addition, please release all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(b). Furthermore, if any documents responsive to this request are classified, please identify those documents, including a date and document number where possible, so we may begin the process of requesting a Mandatory Declassification Review under the terms of Executive Order 13,526 (2010).

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us at the email address listed below. Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response regarding this request within the twenty business-day statutory time limit.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
UNION FOUNDATION

Sincerely,



Patrick Toomey  
Staff Attorney  
National Security Project  
American Civil Liberties Union

Phone: (212) 519-7816  
Email: [ptoomey@aclu.org](mailto:ptoomey@aclu.org)