This document is made available through the declassification efforts and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages released by the U.S. Government & Military.

Discover the Truth at: http://www.theblackvault.com

USDA Whitten Bldg. Room 428W Washington, DC 20250 **Report Date**: 11/10/2016 **Time**: 9:57:13 AM

Requests Report Received between 01/01/2009 and 11/10/2016

2-Divi-00000-		Appeal	02/08/2012	Cottrell, Jeff
2-DM-00136-				
2-DM-00136-				
	Closed	Appeal	07/09/2012	Lewis, David
2-0010-	Closed	Appeal	03/23/2012	
88-A				Russell
0.0010	Classed	Anneal	04/22/2012	Matzaab
2-0010-	ciosed	Арреаг	04/23/2012	Lori
<u>96-A</u>				
<u>2-0CIO-</u>	Closed	Appeal	07/11/2012	
29-A				Lisette
2-0CIO-	Closed	Appeal	08/09/2012	Carollo,
				Russell
	Closed	Annoal	12/07/2012	Cook Edith
<u>3-0010-</u>	ciosed	Арреат	12/07/2012	COOK, EUIIN
<u>76-A</u>				
3-0010-	Closed	Appeal	08/15/2013	Stachewicz,
				Jeff
	2-OCIO- 2-OCIO- 26-A 2-OCIO- 29-A 2-OCIO- 56-A 3-OCIO- 76-A	$\frac{2 - OCIO}{29 - A}$	2-OCIO- 26-A Closed Appeal 2-OCIO- 29-A 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal	2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 04/23/2012 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 04/23/2012 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 07/11/2012 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 07/11/2012 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 08/09/2012 2-OCIO- Closed Appeal 08/09/2012 3-OCIO- Closed Appeal 12/07/2012 3-OCIO- Closed Appeal 08/15/2013

violation of the FOIA requirements and procedures set forth Presidential Executive Order #13392, issued by the President on December 14, 2005, and recent administration FOIA processing guidelines. If there is some					
and recent administration FOIA processing guidelines. If there is some					
unique difficulty with this request please contact me to discuss. We will be					
requesting assistance from OGIS to get this request processed. Thank you.					
request a copy of the following documents identified to AG3142C100024: 1. 2013	3-0CIO-	losed A	Appeal	08/15/2013	Stachewicz,
Contract Sections A. Land any attachment with labor category or labor rate	14-A				Jeff
	<u>14-A</u>				
a copy of the following documents identified to AG3142D100124 (under 2013	3-0CIO-	losed A	Appeal	08/15/2013	Stachewicz,
GS06F0219Z) awarded to Focus Mgt for Identity Management Support	15-A				Jeff
Services (see below). The contract, attachments (including SOW/TWS, and	<u>13-A</u>				
section B/Pricing/Labor Categories), and modifications. We will accept					
clearly releasable*)					
any submission from the Department of Agriculture to the Office of the 2014	4-0CIO-	losed A	Appeal	03/10/2014	Richelson,
Director of National Intelligence from 2011-2012specifically, records	97-A				Jeffrey
regarding Department of Agriculture intelligence requirements (Date Kange	<u>97-A</u>				
for Record Search: From 01/01/2011 To 12/31/2012)					
Mr. Smathers is appealing: 1) the withholding of records as non-responsive, 2012	4-0CIO-	ssigned A	Appeal	04/14/2014	Smathers,
and 2) all uses of exemption (b)(5). He requests that all 523 pages be	03-A				Jason
provided in full. He requested records containing the word Smathers and	<u>03-A</u>				
their attachments.					
This letter is a formal appeal to your FOIA response to FOIA # 2013-OCIO- 2014	4-0CIO-	losed A	Appeal	03/28/2014	
05360-f in the above-referenced case. In my original request, I sought	72-A				Mark
information on an agency employees who have used official time under	<u>12-A</u>				
any category of 5 USC 7131 or related statutes since January 1, 2009. In					
your response to my request, dated March 11, 2014, you provided a series					
of files from which virtually all information had been redacted under FOIA					
Exemption b6 dealing with "personal privacy." I am appealing this finding					
because the information I am seeking is clearly in the public interest and					
not "personal" in nature. Rather, it is an accounting of how public officials					
spend their time doing their official duties, for which they are compensated					
with public funds.					
Rebecca Watson is appealing the FOIA Service Center's Response to October 2014	4-0CIO- As	ssigned A	Appeal	05/02/2014	
22, 2013 FOIA Request for documents related to the Lake Ridge Unit. Ms.	10-A				Rebecca
watson Appeals. 1. Inducquate search to locate documents responsive to	<u>10-A</u>				
SG's FOIA request 2. Failure to disclose the requested material based on					_
Exemption 5		losed A	Appeal	OF /20 /201 /	Stewart
Exemption 5 Mr. Stewart is appealing USDA's response dated April 28, 2014 he is 2014	4-0CIO-	iuseu r	hhear	05/28/2014	
Exemption 5 Mr. Stewart is appealing USDA's response dated April 28, 2014 he is 2014 appealing: 1. Inadequate Search 2. Exemptions applied	4-0010-		чреаг		James
Exemption 5 Mr. Stewart is appealing USDA's response dated April 28, 2014 he is appealing: 1. Inadequate Search 2. Exemptions applied 0021	<u>11-A</u>				James
Exemption 5 Image: Constraint of the second sec	<u>11-A</u>			03/12/2014	James Horwitt,
Exemption 5 Image: Second	<u>4-0CIC-</u> <u>4-0SEC-</u> ^{CI}			03/12/2014	James
Exemption 5 Image: Second Stresson Str	<u>11-A</u>			03/12/2014	James Horwitt,

	1		1		
Robert Bonnie to Riley G. Nelson sent February 11, 2013 at 5:01p.m. says					
in part "good to meet with you" while a previous email from Riley G. Nelson					
to Robert Bonnie sent February 11, 2013 at 3:57p.m. says in part "thanks					
again for meeting with us this afternoon." We did not receive meeting					
minutes, notes or a sign-in sheet from the meeting. Please provide these					
records if they exist; and 2. An email from Robert Bonnie to Susan E. Carte	~				
sent September 24, 2013 at 4:56 p.m. says in part "it was a very useful					
discussion for me" while a previous email from Susan E. Carter to Robert					
Bonnie sent September 24, 2013 at 4:44p.m. says in part "thank you very					
much for the great discussion today." We did not receive meeting minutes,					
notes or a sign-in sheet from the meeting/phone call. Please provide these					
records if they exist.					
1. Page 131 of the PDF (marked control number 7243719) is a letter from	2015-OCIO-	Closed	Appeal	09/11/2014	Hodes, Scot
USDA with the signature of Lori Ross, but no other information released in					-
the body of the letter. No FOIA exemption is marked on the page. First, as	<u>00012-A</u>				
the page is not marked with an exemption (as required by the FOIA), CREW	,				
appeals this withholding. Furthermore, CREW appeals the failure of USDA to					
segregate non-exempt material for release. Please review this document,					
release the segregable information with the proper exemption markings on					
this page. Note that without any further information, CREW appeals the use					
of any FOIA exemptions on this page. 2. Page 354 of the PDF (e-mail from					
Sheryl Kunickis dated April14, 2014). Certain information on this page is					
withheld pursuant to Exemption 5. Because this email appears to have beer	1				
sent to individuals that are neither USDA nor federal government					
employees, it fails to meet the threshold of Exemption 5 and must be					
released. 3. Page 418 of the PDF (e-mail from Christi Palmer dated April 8,					
2014). Certain material on this page is withheld pursuant to Exemption 5.					
Ms. Palmer appears to be an employee of Rutgers and therefore the					
threshold of Exemption 5 has not been met and the withholding of this					
information is not appropriate. 4. Page 423 of the PDF (e-mail from Jean					
Reimers dated February 3, 2014). Certain material on this page is withheld					
pursuant to Exemption 5. Ms. Reimers is the Bayer government relations					
director and therefore the threshold of the exemption has not been met and					
the withholding of this information is not appropriate. 5. Pages 425-426 of					
the PDF (e-mail thread dated January 15, 2013). Certain material on this					
page is withheld pursuant to Exemption 5. Ms. Reimers is the Bayer					
government relations director and therefore the threshold of the exemption					
has not been met and the withholding of this information is not appropriate					
6. Page 430 of the PDF (e-mail thread dated December 19, 2011). This					
email from Laura Phelps of Bayer states there is a draft letter attached to					
the email, which has not been released or otherwise accounted for. CREW					
appeals the search USDA conducted as inadequate as it failed to uncover					
the attachment to this letter. CREW also appeals withholding this letter					
pursuant to exemption 5, given that it is from Bayer, and therefore, not					

within the threshold of Exemption 5. 7. Page 485 of the PDF (e-mail dated April 16, 2014). This email is from Charles Allen of Texas A & M University. Portions of the text of the e-mail were withheld pursuant to Exemption Mr. Allen is not employed by the federal government and therefore the document does not meet the threshold of Exemption 5 and should be released. 8. Page 487 of the PDF (e-mail dated April 14 2014). This email is from Mark Matocha of Texas A & M University. Portions of the text of the e-mail were withheld pursuant to Exemption 5. Mr. Matocha is not employed by the federal government, and therefore the document does not meet the threshold be released. 9. Page 500-513 of the PDF. These pages are withheld in full pursuant to Exemption 5. CREW appeals this withholding, based on USDA's failure to segregate and release all non-exempt information. Please review this document and release the segregable information. 10. Page 514 of the PDF (e-mail dated March 29, 2012). This email is from Erik Johanson from the State of Washington. Portions of the text of the e-mail were withheld pursuant to Exemption 5. Mr. Johnson is not employed by the federal government and therefore the document and therefore the segregable is not employed by the federal formation. 10. Page 514 of the PDF (e-mail dated March 29, 2012). This email is from Erik Johanson from the State of Washington.					
Natural Resources Defense Council fee waiver appeal for FOIA Request 2015-OCIO-00213-F.	<u>2015-OCIO-</u> 00046-A	Closed	Appeal	11/21/2014	DeMarco, Pater
Heimlich appeal challenging withholdings because the information, according to requester, is unquestionably a matter of significant public interest, and therefore should be provided without redactions.	2016-OSEC- 00257-A	Assigned	Appeal	07/18/2016	Heimlich, Peter
Appeal challenging the adequacy of a search which resulted in an initial "no records" response. Initial request was for a background check report used by USDA OCIO CTS as the basis for discontinuing requester's USDA elevated privilege account and terminating his contract position with the agency.	2017 0010	Assigned	Appeal	10/04/2016	Leonov, Viktor

Total No of Requests : 20

USDA Whitten Bldg. Room 428W Washington, DC 20250 **Report Date**: 11/10/2016 **Time**: 10: 48: 36 AM

Requests Report Received between 01/01/2009 and 11/10/2016

Request Description	Request ID	Request Status	Request Type	Requested Date	Requester Name
Appeal based upon two requests. 1.) 2012-OCIO-01913-F "Access to and copies of all records related in any way to the USDA's contract or potential contract with the Southwest Georgia Project for Community Education and/or Shirley Sherrod, including contracts, requests for proposals." 2.)2012-OCIO-0191 4-F "Access to and copies of all records related in any way to the attached FOIA request (identified as 11-232) filed with the USDA Office of the Secretary and remanded to the Rural Development FOIA Office." No responsive records were found for both requests.	<u>2013-OSEC-</u> 00004-A	Assigned	Appeal	03/23/2012	Carollo, Russell
Earthjustice hereby appeals two aspects of the USDA Response. First, there is a strong basis for concluding that USDA has not conducted a search that is reasonably calculated to uncover all relevant documents, and then produced those documents. Second, there is no justification for USDA's invocation of FOIA Exemptions 5 and 6. For that reason, EJ is seeking a Vaughn Index.	<u>2013-OSEC-</u> 00092-A	Closed	Appeal	02/28/2013	Gartner, Eve
Appeal the adequacy of the search	<u>2014-OSEC-</u> 00095-A	Closed	Appeal	03/10/2014	Richelson, Jeffrey
Appeal of denial of expedited processing. Ms. Debenedetti appeals the denial of her request for expedited processing. She is a member of news media, who needs to shed light on government spending in a time of increased focus on the federal budget. Ms. Debenedetti is requesting records relating to Secretary Tom Vilsack's trip to Beijing, China for the 24th session of the U.S China Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade in December 2013, including the total expense of the trip to the Department of Agriculture, the total expense of Secretary Tom Vilsack's travel and lodging while traveling to and from, and staying in, China, the total size and identity of the Department of Agriculture delegation to Beijing, and the itinerary for Secretary Tom Vilsack while traveling to and from, and staying in, China	<u>2014-OSEC-</u> <u>00102-A</u>	Closed	Appeal		Debenedetti, Gabriel

2015-OSEC-00289-F	2015-OSEC-	Closed	Appeal	10/21/2014	Debenedetti,
					Gabriel
I. USDA Improperly Withheld Records Under Exemption 5. USDA has relied exclusively upon the deliberative process privilege, in conjunction with Exemption 5, to withhold substantial amounts of information responsive to CoA's FOIA request. USDA's application of the deliberative process privilege is inappropriately broad. For example, on page 54 of the production, the agency withheld portions of an email chain between a lobbyist, Marshall Matz, and multiple USDA employees. For an agency to invoke Exemption 5, however, there is a threshold requirement for the record at issue to be an "inter-agency or intra-agency" communication.7 Therefore, unless the agency can establish that Mr. Martz was acting as a consultant for USDA, his communications with USDA cannot be withheld under Exemption 5.8 Along the same lines, a redacted communication on the same page between Mr. Matz and Chris Adamo, a congressional staffer, does not meet Exemption 5's threshold requirement.9 Given these two blatant errors, USDA should carefully re-review all of its Exemption 5 withholdings. Moreover, such withholdings violate 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). Indeed, as the Attorney General has exhorted, agencies "should always be mindful that the FOIA requires them to take reasonable steps to segregate and release nonexempt information. Even if some parts of a record must be withheld, other parts either may not be covered by a statutory exemption, or may be covered only in a technical sense unrelated to the actual impact of disclosure."10 Under the Attorney General's Guideline, agencies also are encouraged to make discretionary releases. 11 "There is no doubt," the Department of Justice has advised, "that records protected by Exemption 5 hold the greatest promise for increased discretionary release under the Attorney General's Guidelines Records covered by the deliberative process privilege in particular have significant release potential."12 In light of the foregoing, a line-byline review of USDA's Exemption 6 to withhold only "information regardin	00028-A 2015-OSEC- 00031-A	Closed	Appeal	11/14/2014	Gabriel
However, in at least once instance, USDA appears to have withheld the office email address and office telephone number of a government employee, namely Victoria Collins at the Office of Management and Budget (see p.4 of production). The disclosure of this business information is unlikely to result in a "clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy,"					
as Exemption 6 requires. Further, where USDA has purportedly withheld the private email addresses of other individuals pursuant to Exemption 6					

(see, e.g., pp.53, 56, 63, 66-68, 73-74, 77), the agency should disclose at least some identifying information because these individuals are the authors and recipients of communications pertaining to agency business. Accordingly, CoA appeals all of USDA's Exemption 6 withholdings. Moreover, such withholdings violate 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).					
Here, USDA's response falls short of satisfying its burden of establishing an adequate search. While USDA identified WCTS as the entity that performed the search, it has not explained what process was used to determine where responsive records were likely to be found, whether its own employees performed a search, or what systems were searched by WCTS. By way of example, other agencies responding to similar FOIA requests have indicated who was involved and/or what was searched. Indeed, it seems implausible that there was not a single "text message[], Blackberry messenger chat[], and/or SMS message[]" by or to the identified individuals during the requested time period, particularly given the wide-scale approach by federal officials of using such communication tools for business. 6 (Date Range for Record Search: From 11/02/2014 To 11/08/2014)	<u>00088-A</u>	Assigned	Appeal	01/30/2015	Schmidt, Kevin
Appeal of the fee category determination of "commercial " requester	2015-OSEC- 00202-A	Closed	Appeal	07/07/2015	Blutstein, Allan

Total No of Requests : 8