Subject:FOIADate:Friday, February 16, 2018 at 3:31:12 PM Central Standard TimeFrom:Zack KopplinTo:ice-foia@dhs.govAttachments:Hotels, etc.xlsx

Government Accountability Project

Zack Kopplin, GAP Investigator 832 Valence Street New Orleans, Louisiana 70115 225-715-5946

FOIA Request

Dear Freedom of Information Officer:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, I am requesting any and all documents related to the specific requests described below:

- 1. Any and all emails, memos, or other documents sent to or from staff ranking GS-15s or above in the Miami field office that reference, "Neighbor to Family Miami Gardens," a foster care center, where two detainees were recorded being held between the dates 10/17/16 and 12/10/16. (Use these dates as specified time frames for the request.)
- Any and all emails, memos, or other documents sent to or from staff ranking GS-15s or above in the San Antonio field office that reference, "Nix Home Care," a behavioral care center in San Antonio, Texas, where eight detainees are recorded to have been held between the dates 9/27/16 and 10/20/17.
- 3. Any and all emails, memos, or other documents sent to or from staff ranking GS-15s or above in the New York City field office that reference, "Queens House of Detention," a closed jail, where two detainees were held on the dates 8/3/16 and 8/1/17.
- 4. Any and all emails sent to or from the staff ranked GS-15 or above in the ICE field office in Buffalo, New York, and Compass House Shelter, a youth runaway and homeless shelter, where five detainees are recorded to have been held between on the dates 8/18/16 and 8/17/17.
- 5. Any and all emails, memos, or other documents sent to or from GS-15s or above in the Miami field office that reference, "Comfort Suites Hotel," where 129 detainees are recorded to have stayed between the dates 8/2/17 and 8/30/17.
- 6. Any and all emails, memos or other documents sent between the ICE field office in Miami and the Comfort Suites Hotel management about the assignment of detainees to the hotel.
- 7. Any and all emails, memos, or other documents sent to or from GS-15s or above in the Seattle field office that reference, "Red Roof Inn," where 26 detainees are recorded to have stayed between the dates 8/28/16 and 8/24/17.
- 8. Any and all emails, memos or other documents sent between the ICE field office in Seattle and the Red

Exhibit AC

Roof Inn management about the assignment of detainees to the hotel.

- 9. Any and all emails, memos, or other documents sent to or from GS-15s or above in the Denver field office that reference, "Drury Inn," where two detainees are recorded to have stayed between 2/19/17 and 4/3/17.
- 10. Any and all emails, memos or other documents sent between the ICE field office in Denver and the Drury Inn management about the assignment of detainees to the hotel.
- 11. Any and all emails, memos, or other documents sent to or from GS-15s or above in the Boston field office that reference, "Ramada Hotel," where one detainees are recorded to have stayed between 3/9/17 and 3/11/17.
- 12. Any and all emails, memos or other documents sent between the ICE field office in Boston and the Ramada Hotel management about the assignment of detainees to the hotel.
- 13. Any and all emails, memos or other documents sent to or from GS-15s or above in the ICE field office in San Diego referencing, "Best Western Marina," where 421 detainees are recorded to have stayed between the dates, 1/16/17 and 2/6/17.
- 14. Any and all emails, memos or other documents sent between the ICE field office in San Diego and the Best Wester Marina Hotel management about the assignment and stay of detainees to the hotel.
- 15. Any and all emails, memos or other documents sent to or from GS-15s or above in the ICE field office in San Diego referencing, "Quality Suites," where 6,657 refugees are recorded to have stayed between the dates 7/27/16 and 8/28/17.
- 16. Any and all emails, memos or other documents sent between the ICE field office in San Diego and the Quality Suites Hotel management about the assignment and stay of detainees to the hotel.
- 17. Any and all emails, memos or other documents sent to or from GS-15s or above in the ICE field office in Los Angeles referencing, "Best Western Dragon Gate Inn," where 34 detainees are recorded to have stayed between the dates, 8/18/16 and 7/10/17.
- 18. Any and all emails, memos or other documents sent between the ICE field office in Los Angeles and the Best Western Dragon Gate Inn management about the assignment and stay of detainees to the hotel.
- 19. Any and all contracts or agreements between Quality Suites Hotel and the Best Western Marina Hotel in San Diego, Comfort Suites Hotel in Miami, Best Western Dragon Gate Inn in Los Angeles, Red Roof Inn in Seattle, the Ramada Hotel in Boston, and the Drury Inn in Denver related to holding detainees for ICE.
- 20. Any and all spreadsheets of data or similar types of accounting documents showing how much ICE has paid to hotels to hold detainees in a hotel since 1/1/2015.

To be clear, I am not interested in any documents about ICE employees staying in a hotel themselves on ICE business, only in detainees who are held in hotels.

For all these requests, I am also only requesting emails from staff ranking GS-15 and up.

The time frame for each request is the time frame specified where i am aware detainees were held in these places. For requests concerning places that few detainees were held, for example the Queens House of Detention, you can search only for the time period surrounding dates detainees were actually held, and not

worry about the dead time in between cases where ICE was holding no detainees in that location.

I've attached a spreadsheet containing information about these detentions that you can use as a tool, if needed, to help visualize the appropriate time frames while processing this request.

Thanks.

If any of the material covered by this request has been destroyed or removed, please provide all surrounding documentation including, but not limited to, a description of the action taken regarding the materials and justification for those actions taken.

I am not interested in generic news clippings or newsletters that just happen to mention a keyword, so please do not include those as responsive documents.

For any documents or portions you deny due to a specific FOIA exemption, please provide a detailed justification of your grounds for claiming such exemption, explaining why the exemption is relevant to the document or portion of the document withheld.

I anticipate that any responsive documents will be unclassified. if any of the responsive documents contain classified information, please segregate all unclassified material within the classified documents and provide all unclassified information.

I consent to the deletion of any material that would violate an individual's rights under the Privacy Act. I will work with your office to prioritize responsive data for this request, further refine the request if you find any terms too imprecise, conduct searches for unclassified responsive records, or engage in any other reasonable activities that would lessen the agency's burden and costs.

Presumption of Disclosure

In the absence of guidance from the Trump Administration, the current presidential guidance comes from President Obama's 1/21/2009 memo, in which he declared the following policy for Executive Branch agencies:

The Freedom of Information Act should be administered with a clear presumption: In the face of doubt, openness prevails. ... All agencies should adopt a presumption in favor of disclosure, in order to renew their commitment to the principles embodied in FOIA, and to usher in a new era of open Government. The presumption of disclosure should be applied to all decisions involving FOIA.

The President's policy of openness was reiterated in guidelines issued on March 19, 2009 by Attorney General Eric Holder. Contained in those guidelines was the following direction:

First, an agency should not withhold information simply because it may do so legally. I strongly encourage agencies to make discretionary disclosures of information. An agency should not withhold records merely because it can demonstrate, as a technical matter, that the records fall within the scope of a FOIA exemption.

Because of these polices, all requested records should be released in their entirety, except in cases where release is explicitly prohibited by law.

Fee Waiver

I request that all fees incurred in connection with the attached request be waived, because "disclosure of the

information is in the public interest and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester." 5 U.S.C. 9552 (a)(4)(A)(iii).

If you disallow my fee-waiver request, I pledge to pay the price of the FOIA request up to \$25. Alert me if it exceeds this price.

I am a member of the media. I have published articles in a wide variety of news outlets including *The Atlantic, Slate Magazine, Politico Magazine, Science Magazine,* the *Daily Beast, Salon, ThinkProgress* and *The Guardian.* I have appeared on a wide variety of television, radio and digital news programs including HBO, MSNBC, NPR and PBS and I have helped create news segments for NowThis News.

My articles have been widely read, with many reaching hundreds of thousands of readers. Whatever I write has a reasonable expectation of publication. My editorial and writing skills are well established.

On top of this, the organization I work for, the Government Accountability Project, runs a news blog, where newsworthy information can be published.

My requests are made as part of my news gathering process.

While my research is not limited to this, a great deal of it, including this, focuses on the activities and attitudes of the government itself and disseminating it to the public.

It is unnecessary for me to demonstrate the relevance of this particular subject in advance. Additionally, despite my past record, case law states that "proof of the ability to disseminate the released information to a broad cross-section of the public is not required." Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Dep't of Justice, 365 F.3d 1108, 1126 (D.C. Cir. 2004); see Carney v. U.S. Dep't of Justice, 19 F.3d 807, 814-15 (2d Cir. 1994). Further, courts have held that "qualified because it also had "firm" plans to "publish a number of . . . 'document sets'" concerning United States foreign and national security policy." Under this criteria, as well, I qualify as a member of the news media. Additionally, courts have held that the news media status "focuses on the nature of the requester, not its request. The provision requires that the request be "made by" a representative of the news media. Id. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). A newspaper reporter, for example, is a representative of the news media regardless of how much interest there is in the story for which he or she is requesting information." As such, the details of the request itself are moot for the purposes of determining the appropriate fee category.

The disclosure is "likely to contribute" to an understanding of government operations or activities.

While I do not need to explain the specifics of why I make each individual request, these documents will help me to better inform the public about potential waste, fraud or abuse, gross negligence or abuse of authority, or threats to public health and safety or the environment. All of this will serve the American people and strengthen our country.

The Government Accountability Project's Public Interest Status and History

GAP is a non-profit, non-partisan, public interest organization chartered under IRS Code §501 (C)(3) as a nonprofit, educational and charitable organization. We seek to serve the public through achieving governmental accountability by protecting and encouraging federal and corporate employees who observe or are victimized by wrongdoing, gross waste of public funds, threats to public health and safety, environmental contamination, corruption, abuse of the public trust and other abuses of power.

GAP accomplishes these goals primarily by conducting advocacy campaigns before Congress, through the media, and for the general public and by providing legal representation to whistleblowers to combat the

retaliation they have suffered in exercising their right of occupational free speech. Our twin aims are to promote corporate and government accountability and to expose, investigate, and correct substantive problems that formed the basis of protected whistleblowing disclosures. GAP's role is well-recognized by the courts and, as an organization, has informational standing under the First Amendment protecting its receipt of disclosed information. Taylor v. RTC. 56 F.3d 1437 (D.C. 1995); United States v. Garde, 573 F. Supp. 604 (D.D.C. 1987); ~ Generally Virginia Pharmacy Bd. v. Virginia Consumer Council, 425 U.S. 748, 756-57 (1976).

GAP has a 20-year history of working in the public interest. GAP does not take individual cases based on the client's ability to pay, how much money GAP believes it can recover in legal fees through litigation or any other commercial interest.

GAP takes cases of legitimately harassed whistleblowers, often pro-bono (without charge), that further public policy or legislative changes that make the law stronger for workers who witness and choose to tell the truth about corporate and taxpayer-financed wrongdoing and to pursue exposure and resolution of the wrongdoing.

GAP has, among other things, pushed for enactment of several whistleblower protection statutes, exposed unhealthy food at supermarket chains, pushed for independent reviews of the safety of the Alaska pipeline, exposed the threat of explosion in waste tanks at the Hanford nuclear site, and pushed for policy reform within numerous executive agencies. All this activity is done primarily with the interest of the public in mind.

Non-commercial use of the Requested Information

Disclosure of this information by GAP is in no way connected with any commercial interest since GAP is a non-profit, tax-exempt organization under § 501 (c)(3) of the IRS Code. The information we are seeking is crucial to advance public knowledge and will not be put to any commercial use.

Reducing Request Workload

Please begin working on the request while processing the request for a fee waiver.

Please send me documents electronically.

Please be reminded that under the Freedom of Information Act, we are entitled to a response to this request within twenty working days. Should this request be denied for any reason, we ask that a detailed explanation be provided along with the name of the person to whom administrative appeals should be addressed.

If my request is taking a large amount of time, please process it in tranches so I may begin processing the documents while waiting for the request to be filled.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation,

Zack Kopplin, Investigator and Outreach Associate Government Accountability Project 225-715-5946