1	IAN GERSHENGORN			
1	Deputy Assistant Attorney General			
2	MELINDA L. HAAG United States Attorney			
3	United States Attorney VINCENT M. GARVEY			
3	Deputy Branch Director			
4	JOSHUA E. GARDNER			
5	District of Columbia Bar No. 478049			
	KIMBERLY L. HERB Illinois Bar No. 6296725			
6	LILY SARA FAREL			
7	North Carolina Bar No. 35273			
8	BRIGHAM JOHN BOWEN			
0	District of Columbia Bar No. 981555 JUDSON O. LITTLETON			
9	Texas Bar No. 24065635			
10	Trial Attorneys			
	Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch			
11	U.S. Department of Justice P.O. Box 883			
12	Washington, D.C. 20044			
10	Telephone: (202) 305-7583			
13	Facsimile: (202) 616-8202			
14	E-mail: joshua.e.gardner@usdoj.gov			
15	Attorneys for DEFENDANTS			
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	OAKLAND D	IVISION		
18	WEENAM WEETER AND OF AMERICA.	C N CV 00 0027 CW		
19	VIETNAM VETERANS OF AMERICA, et al., Plaintiffs,	Case No. CV 09-0037-CW		
20	V.			
	CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, et al.,	DECLARATION OF JOSHUA E.		
21	Defendants.	GARDNER IN SUPPORT OF		
22		DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL		
		TEAINTEES MOTION TO COMEEL		
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
۷٥		1		
	NO. C 09-37 CW	I		

DECL. OF JOSHUA E. GARDNER IN SUPPORT OF DEFS' OPP'N TO PLS' MOT. TO COMPEL

9 10

1112

13 14

15

17

16

18

1920

21

2223

24

25

2627

28

I, Joshua E. Gardner, declare as follows:

- 1. I am a Trial Attorney in the Federal Programs Branch, Civil Division of the United States Department of Justice. I represent Defendants in this case. I submit this declaration in support of Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel. This declaration is based on my personal knowledge and on information provided to me in my official capacity.
- 2. The parties have taken approximately 40 depositions in this case and Defendants have produced approximately 2 million pages of documents and have responded to hundreds of requests for admissions.
- 3. Defendants provided Plaintiffs with a privilege log on February 11, 2011, reflecting the privilege assertions made by the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army (collectively "DoD"), and the Central Intelligence Agency ("CIA").
- 4. On September 13, 2011, at the request of Plaintiffs, DoD provided Plaintiffs with a "consolidated" privilege log that separately identified the documents being withheld only by DoD.
- The September 13, 2011 privilege log included the two technical reports that were contained on the February 2011 privilege log, and also included an entry for the magnetic tapes.
- On November 8, 2011, DoD provided Plaintiffs with a supplemental privilege log that included a draft document withheld on work product grounds concerning Battelle Memorial Institute.
- 7. On January 10, 2012, less than one month after DoD produced responsive, non-privileged emails and attachments, DoD provided Plaintiffs with an updated, consolidated privilege log. The only additions to this privilege log were the responsive, privileged documents obtained by DoD during the recent additional search for emails and attachments.
- 8. On January 30, 2012, DoD provided an updated consolidated privilege log which revised several entries in response to questions raised by Plaintiffs and which indicated that, upon

1	further review, 13 previously logged documents would be produced either in full or in
2	part.
3	9. On December 16, 2011, DoD produced responsive, non-privileged emails and attachments
4	from Roy Finno and Arnold Dupuy.
5	10. On December 19, 2011, DoD produced the responsive, non-privileged documents from
6	Norma St. Claire.
7	11. On December 22, 2011, DoD produced responsive, non-privileged emails from Dee
8	Dodson Morris.
9	12. On December 23, 2011, DoD produced responsive, non-privileged documents from Dr.
10	Kelly Brix.
11	13. On January 17, 2012, based upon its continuing privilege review, DoD produced a small
12	number of additional documents from Dr. Brix and Roy Finno.
13	14. On January 23, 2012, based upon its continuing privilege review, DoD produced a small
14	number of additional emails and attachments concerning Dee Dodson Morris.
15	15. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a true and accurate copy of a May 18, 2010 letter from
16	former counsel for Defendants Caroline Lewis Wolverton to counsel for Plaintiffs Gordon
17	Erspamer.
18	16. Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a June 14, 2011 letter from Timothy W. Blakely to Joshua
19	E. Gardner.
20	17. Attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is an April 14, 2011 letter from Gordon P. Erspamer to
21	Joshua E. Gardner.
22	18. Attached hereto as Exhibit 4 is a true and accurate copy of excerpts of the July 6, 2011
23	deposition transcript of Department of Defense employee Dee Dodson Morris.
24	19. Attached hereto as Exhibit 5 is a true and accurate copy of excerpts of the July 6-8, 2011
25	deposition transcript of Department of Defense employee Dr. Michael Kilpatrick.
26	20. Attached hereto as Exhibit 6 is a true and accurate copy of the Department of Veterans
27	Affairs' ("VA") August 14, 2006 Information Letter 10-2006-010 (VET001_015606-09),
28	

- 41. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 24** is a true and accurate copy of the transcript of the December 15, 2011 hearing in this case.
- 42. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 25** is a true and accurate copy of a November 22, 2011 letter from Gordon P. Erspamer to Joshua E. Gardner identifying the eight individuals whom Plaintiffs wished to depose pursuant to Magistrate Judge Corley's November 17, 2011 Order.
- 43. On February 28, 2012, counsel for Plaintiffs Ben Patterson sent a letter to Joshua E. Gardner asking, for the first time, for Defendants' position regarding Plaintiffs' request to depose Dr. Kelley Brix and to re-open the depositions of Dee Dodson Morris, Joe Salvatore, and David Abbot, and requesting a response by close of business the next day. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 26** is a copy of that letter.
- 44. On February 29, 2012, counsel for Defendants, Joshua E. Gardner responded to Plaintiffs' February 28 letter. In that letter, Defendants stated, among other things, that with respect to the deposition of Dr. Brix, Plaintiffs had selected the eight depositions that they were entitled to under the Magistrate Judge's November 17 Order and provided no explanation in their letter for seeking depositions in excess of those permitted in the Court's Order. In addition, Defendants noted that Plaintiffs had failed to meaningfully meet and confer on this issue, because they failed to explain the reasons they sought to re-open either fact discovery generally or to re-open the specific depositions they sought, and the amount of time they sought with each deponent, and that Defendants could not agree to any additional depositions in the absence of Plaintiffs providing these basic facts. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 27** is a copy of that letter.
- 45. On March 1, 2012, the date Plaintiffs' motion to compel was due, counsel for Plaintiffs, Ben Patterson, called me to discuss the issue of taking the deposition of Dr. Brix and reopening the depositions of Joe Salvatore, Dave Abbot and Dee Dodson Morris. Because Plaintiffs had not responded to my February 29, 2012 letter, I asked Mr. Patterson to provide me with an explanation of the specific areas that they wished to explore with these individuals and the amount of additional time they wished to spend with each deponent.

Mr. Patterson would not provide any specific areas of inquiries or otherwise justify their request for yet more depositions beyond the generic fact that some documents were produced after the deponents' depositions. Mr. Patterson did suggest that one area they wished to question Dr. Brix about was the email she wrote to Dr. Brown about VA's Information Letter. In an attempt to try and narrow the discovery dispute, I asked Mr. Patterson whether this was the only area that they sought testimony on from Dr. Brix. However, Mr. Patterson indicated that they wanted testimony beyond this topic, but refused to identify what those areas were. At no time during this meet and confer did I indicate that Defendants would agree to put up Dr. Brix for deposition on the topic of her email to Dr. Brown (which would implicate information covered by the deliberative process privilege), or on any other topic.

- 46. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 28** is a true and accurate copy of minutes of a June 3, 2005 meeting between DoD and the VA (DVA003_006754-761), which previously has been used as a deposition exhibit in this case as Exhibit 796.
- 47. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 29** is a true and accurate copy of March 30, 2006 notes prepared by VA employee Joe Salvatore (DVA003 007671–74), discussing a meeting regarding the "Department of Defense's Chemical and Biological Release Project."
- 48. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 30** is a true and accurate copy of an August 20, 2008 email from former DoD contractor Roy Finno to another former DoD contractor Andrew Blackburn (Battelle_0000001077), which has been used as a deposition exhibit in this case as Exhibit 808.
- 49. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 31** is a true and accurate copy of a May 27, 2005 email from former DoD contractor Lionel West to VA employee Joe Salvatore, DoD employee Dee Dodson Morris, and former DoD contractors Roy Finno, Andrew Blackburn and Roxana Baylor, and attaching power point slides (VET140_002114-19), which has been used as a deposition exhibit in this case as Exhibit 811.
- 50. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 32** is a true and accurate copy of excerpts of the January 20, 2012 deposition transcript of former VA employee Dr. Mark Brown.

- 51. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 33** is a true and accurate copy of excerpts of the January 31, 2012 deposition transcript of VA employee Glen Wallick.
- 52. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 34** is a true and accurate copy of excerpts of the January 13, 2012 deposition transcript of VA employee Dr. Kenneth Hyams.
- 53. With respect to the magnetic tapes, it is my understanding that neither of the vendors who submitted responses had the necessary security clearance. As a result, DoD turned to the Defense Logistics Agency ("DLA"), which, although it lacked the necessary hardware at that time to perform the conversion, was able to acquire the hardware it deemed best suited to extract the information.
- 54. It is my understanding that since acquiring the hardware, DLA has extracted information from two of the six magnetic tapes and referred them to DoD for classification review. As to the remaining four tapes, it is my understanding that the hardware used was unsuccessful in recovering information. Accordingly, it is my understanding that DLA is undertaking alternative efforts to extract the data, including the possible acquisition of additional hardware, assuming the tapes contain retrievable data.
- 55. With respect to the MKULTRA FOIA set, the CIA offered to review two LSD documents in an effort to resolve the last dispute against the CIA (the two documents were the only ones potentially related to health effects identified by Plaintiffs at that time as being of interest to Plaintiffs). In return, however, the CIA asked that Plaintiffs agree to drop their request for other FOIA documents, as Plaintiffs had not identified how the remaining documents would be relevant to their secrecy oath claim against the CIA. Plaintiffs would not agree either to drop the remaining document requests or to identify the purported relevance of the remaining documents.
- 56. DoD provided Plaintiffs with a bibliography from the Defense Technical Information Center with 548 entries concerning LSD, and Plaintiffs chose the entries that they would like to receive.
- 57. Additionally, Defendants have produced to Plaintiffs the 1980 "LSD Follow-Up Study," for which the Army attempted to contact every service member exposed to LSD as part of

the Army's chemical test programs and which analyzed the potential health effects of LSD usage on test participants, as well as the follow up studies by the National Research Council that included an analysis of LSD usage during the experiments and that also included participant surveys regarding health effects. Plaintiffs also deposed Dr. George Aghajanian, a neuropsychologist with extensive research experience related to LSD.

- 58. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 35** is a true and accurate copy of excerpts of the July 14-15, 2010 deposition transcript of former Edgewood Arsenal employee, Dr. James Ketchum.
- 59. During the parties' meet and confer, counsel for Defendants pointed out to Plaintiffs the unequivocal deposition testimony from Dr. Ketchum in which he stated that he did not have any personal knowledge about the CIA's involvement in the test programs nor in the CIA's testing on service members.
- 60. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 36** is a true and accurate copy of excerpts of the November 9, 2011 deposition transcript of CIA employee Patricia Cameresi.
- 61. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 37** is an email chain between Dr. Mark Brown, and Dr. Kenneth Hyams, among others, dated June 29, 2006 (DVA052 000113-14), which previously has been used as a deposition exhibit in this case as Exhibit 727.
- 62. Beyond the Rule 45 subpoena served upon VA, Plaintiffs have served six sets of requests for production of documents on VA, totaling 236 separate requests, with the most recent set being served in October 2011.
- 63. Plaintiffs have obtained extensive testimony from Martha Hamed, Colonel Frederick Kolbrener and Norma St. Claire regarding DoD's efforts in identifying WWII-era test participants; have thousands of pages from the CWEST index reflecting those efforts, including the voluminous three-volume set that describes in great detail DoD's efforts; and have a copy of "Veterans at Risk," which provides a comprehensive overview of the WWII-era testing program.

1	64. Defendants provided Plaintiffs with the MKULTRA FOIA documents in October 2009.
2	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in
3	Washington, D.C. on March 15, 2012.
4	6 , 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,
5	/s/ Joshua E. Gardner
6	Joshua E. Gardner
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
- 3	NO C 09-37 CW 10

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

2	Exhibit	Title
3	1	May 18, 2010 letter from Wolverton to Erspamer
4	2	June 14, 2011 Letter from Blakely to Gardner
5	3	April 14, 2011 Letter from Erspamer to Gardner
6 7	4	Excerpts from the July 6, 2011 deposition of Dee Dodson Morris
8	5	Excerpts from the July 6 - 8, 2011 deposition of Dr. Michael E. Kilpatrick
9	6	Department of Veterans Affairs August 14, 2006 Information Letter (VET001-015606-09)
1011	7	July 7 and 10, 2006 email chain between Department of Defense employee Dr. Kelley Brix and former Department of Veterans Affairs employee Dr. Mark Brown (VET140-000723)
12	8	Excerpts from the June 29, 2011 deposition of Joe Salvatore
13	9	Excerpts from the January 24 – 25, 2012 deposition of David Abbot
1415	10	Department of Veterans Affairs notification letter to Cold War-era test participants, and the accompanying Department of Defense fact sheet and frequently asked questions (VET001_014266-271)
1617	11	Department of Defense call-in logs to its toll-free number for questions concerning chemical and biological exposures (VET001_011998-12052)
18	12	Excerpts from the June 9, 2011 deposition of Lloyd Roberts
19	13	June 13, 2006 notes by Department of Veterans Affairs employee Joe Salvatore discussing outreach efforts (VET001_014012)
20	14	November 29, 2004 notes prepared by Department of Veterans Affairs employee Joe Salvatore discussing a meeting regarding the "Department"
21 22		of Defense's Chemical and Biological Release Project," (DVA003 006436)
23	15	Excerpts from the January 27, 2012 deposition of Roy Finno
24	16	Plaintiffs' Notice of Deposition to Department of Veterans Affairs Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6)
2526	17	Plaintiffs' Notice of Deposition to Department of Defense and Department of the Army Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6)
27	18	Excerpts from the June 30, 2011 deposition of Paul Black
28	19	VHA Draft Legislation (DVA012 000505-18)

NO. C 09-37 CW

Case4:09-cv-00037-CW Document372 Filed03/15/12 Page12 of 12

1	20	VHA Draft Legislation (DVA052 000175-77)
2	21	VHA Draft Legislation (DVA052 000089-91)
3	22	VHA Draft Legislation (DVA052 000119-20)
4	23	VHA Draft Legislation (DVA052 000136-37)
5	24	Excerpts from December 15, 2011 hearing before Magistrate Judge Corley
6	25	November 22, 2011 Letter from Erspamer to Gardner
7	26	February 28, 2012 Letter from Patterson to Gardner
8	27	February 29, 2012 Letter from Gardner to Patterson
9	28	June 3, 2005 meeting minutes between the Department of Defense and the
10		Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA003_006754-761)
11	29	March 30, 2006 notes discussing a meeting regarding the "Department of Defense's Chemical and Biological Release Project (DVA003 007671-74)
12 13	30	August 20, 2008 e-mail from former DoD contractor Roy Finno to fromer DoD contractor Andrew Blackburn (Batelle 0000001077)
14 15	31	May 27, 2005 E-mail from Lionel West to VA Employee, Joe Salvatore, DoD Employee, Dee Dodson Morris, former DoD contractors, Roy Finno, Andrew Blackburn and Roxana Baylor (VET140-002114-19)
16	32	Excerpts from the January 20, 2012 deposition of Dr. Mark Brown
17	33	Excerpts from the January 31, 2012 deposition of Glen Wallick
	34	Excerpts from the January 13, 2012 deposition of Dr. Kenneth Hyams
18		
19	35	Excerpts from the July 14 - 15, 2010 deposition of Dr. James Ketchum
20	36	Excerpts from the November 9, 2011 deposition of Patricia Cameresi
21	37	June 29, 2006 email chain between Dr. Mark Brown, Dr. Kenneth Hyams, and others (DVA052 000113-14)
22		

NO. C 09-37 CW $\label{eq:competition} \mbox{Decl. of Joshua E. Gardner in Support of Defs' Opp'n To Pls' Mot. To \mbox{ Compel}$