

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

(b) (7)(E)

Photographs:

Real Estate Acquisitions

BACKGROUND:

The real estate process for O-1, 2, 3 was initiated back in 2007 as part of 225 to acquire privately-owned land required along the original 60-foot-wide swath. Approximately (b) (7)(E) of the original (b) (7)(E) swath was on U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) refuge land, thus it was cleared by virtue of the 2008 waiver. Soon after the project was de-scoped from PF225 because of the lack of International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) concurrence with the original proposed alignments, all negotiations and any active condemnation cases that had already been filed were placed 'on-hold'.

(b) (5)

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

(b) (5)

Since that time, the alignment has shifted as a result of consultation with IBWC and Border Patrol. Of the total (b) (7)(E) miles, approximately (b) (7)(E) of the new alignment overlaps with the original alignment. (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

REAL ESTATE ACQUISITION PROCESS GOING FORWARD:

The first step will be to identify the landowners along the new alignment to the extent possible. Once identified, USACE will need to try to obtain Rights of Entry for survey & exploration (RO-S). The fence alignment on paper will need to be adjusted following site evaluation – namely due to severe erosion, to avoid undesirable areas such as arroyos, and to navigate around fixed improvements such as major buildings and utilities. (b) (5). Those determinations cannot be made until ROEs are obtained, and that will require condemnation in cases where landowners will not sign or where landownership cannot be established.

Once ROEs are obtained, and the alignments are finalized, we can complete surveys and preliminary title work. The title work will indicate how many new owners we'll need to engage into negotiations who we did not engage back in 2008. Due to the poor condition of land records in Starr and Hidalgo counties, even where landowners willingly sign offers to sell, it is nearly certain that condemnation will be required to clear title. (b) (5)

In addition to making alignment adjustment decisions based on site assessments, CBP leadership will also need to decide (b) (5)

Additionally, CBP will need to partner with USACE to revalidate access roads and staging areas that were proposed for the original alignment to see if they're still viable for the new alignment. All acquisitions for temporary work area easements associated with roads and staging areas have expired, so those DTs will need to be re-filed as well. Finally, we'll need to identify all gates, and establish utility corridors that are needed to supply electricity to the gates.

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

REAL ESTATE SCHEDULE:

In order for the fencing to be completed within the here-to-for discussed goal of three years from an (b) (5). To meet that schedule, USACE needs to begin approaching landowners for ROE-S NLT (b) (5). That allows (b) (5) to secure ROE from willing landowners and identify those unwilling to grant access for investigatory work. Then, provided the funding hits on (b) (5), we will be in position to gain access to the remaining lands via condemnation as necessary.

The below estimated timeline applies to properties that are currently owned by Non-Federal entities, not Department of the Interior or other government agencies. The timeline does not account for any potential relocation of residences, businesses or utilities necessitated by the project. Nor does the timeline account for protracted deliveries of Orders of Possession by the federal court.

TOTAL: Estimate (b) (5) for substantial completion, but there is substantially high risk that there will be properties that take longer to acquire due to title issues, lawsuits, relocations, etc. Thus, a decision can be made at some point whether to award contracts prior to 100% real estate certification.

- 1) ID Landowners (b) (5)
- 2) Secure ROE's (some may be voluntary, some require condemnation): (b) (5)
 - a) While we might get some ROE-S within 5 days it not possible to get all ROE-S for a segment within 5 days, therefore set early finish at 30 (which is still improbable, folks are upset about the fence acquisition)
- 3) Conduct Required Surveys (Metes & Bounds, Phase-1 ESA, Bio, Cultural, Soil Analysis, etc.): (b) (5)
 - a) A number of surveys will likely take upwards of (b) (5) due to title issues, particularly in Starr County
 - b) Best practice is not to do Metes & Bounds until the cultural, environmental, Phase-1, and engineering are complete
- 4) Preliminary Title Work (Commence after Surveys are complete): (b) (5)
- 5) Valuations (Commence after Title work): (b) (5)
 - a) To the extent the decision is made to acquire property to the 'riverside' of the fence, there will be more 'formal' appraisals, which are required if the acquisition exceeds \$50,000. Formal appraisals may take 60+ days.
- 6) Negotiations (Assuming landowners are identified): (b) (5)
- 7) Possession thru Condemnation (Assuming 0% clear titles; Friendly DTs with signed Offer OR Adverse DTs): (b) (5)

NEPA/Environmental Permits

(b) (5)
(b) (5)
(b) (5), CBP strongly supports the Secretary's commitment to responsible environmental

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

stewardship. To that end, CBP prepared an Environmental Stewardship Plan (ESP) for all segments in RGV in 2008 which includes a Biological Resources Plan (BRP). The ESP and BRP analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with construction of tactical infrastructure in the entire U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Rio Grande Valley Sector. This ESP will need to be substantially supplemented due to its age and due to the change in the O1-O3 project from what was originally planned and analyzed in that ESP, but, in general establishes given mitigation ratios, the requirement for construction Best Management Practices which include onsite environmental and cultural resources monitoring plans, public outreach, and inclusion of (b) (7)(E)

“Other” Approvals

(b) (5)
(b) (5) As previously stated, USIBWC has already approved the general proposed alignments from a floodplain impacts perspective.

Schedule of Deliverables

[List key deliverables and their anticipated start date, duration and end date. Attach a detailed schedule as an addendum]

| Schedule of Deliverables | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | End Date |
|-----------------------------------|---------|------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| Key Deliverables | Costs | Start Date | FY14 | | | | FY15 | | | | FY16 | | | | |
| | | | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | |
| Project Management | | | (b) (5) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Real Estate | (b) (5) | | (b) (5) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental (Monitoring) Design | | | (b) (5) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Construction | | | (b) (5) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Construction Oversight | | | (b) (5) | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Q1 Oct – Dec; Q2 Jan – Mar; Q3 Apr – Jun; Q4 Jul – Sep

Schedule Assumption(s):

Environmental scheduling assumptions include:

- a) (b) (5)
- b)
- c)

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

Initial Cost Estimate

| \$ Total Project Cost | FY13 | FY14 | FY16 | FY16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> BSFIT <input type="checkbox"/> O&M <input type="checkbox"/> D&D | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> BSFIT <input type="checkbox"/> O&M <input type="checkbox"/> D&D | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> BSFIT <input type="checkbox"/> O&M <input type="checkbox"/> D&D | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> BSFIT <input type="checkbox"/> O&M <input type="checkbox"/> D&D | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> BSFIT <input type="checkbox"/> O&M <input type="checkbox"/> D&D |
| \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |


[Note: A detailed WBS and cost analysis will be required and submitted as a separate document post-PRD approval. Template will be provided.]

Cost Assumption(s):

Environmental cost assumptions include:

- d) 
- e)
- f)
- g)
- h)

Potential Project Risks/Mitigations

| Project Risks | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------|--------|---------------------|
| Category | Risk | Probability (%) | Impact | Mitigation Strategy |
| Contractor Performance |  | | | |
| Contractor Performance | | | | |

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

| | |
|------------------------|----------------|
| Contractor Performance | (b) (5) |
| Contractor Performance | |
| Design | |
| Design | |
| Environmental | |

Commented [SBW1]: Per (b) (6), (b) (7) don't agree with this risk.
(b) (5)

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------|
| Environmental | (b) (5) |
| Environmental | |
| External Entity Compliance | |
| External Entity Compliance | |
| External Entity Compliance | |
| External Entity Compliance | |
| External Entity Compliance | |

Commented [SBW2]: Per (b) (6), (b) (7)(E) - I don't concur this is a likely risk (b) (5)

Commented [SBW3]: Per (b) (6), (b) (7)(E) (b) (5)

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Latent Conditions | |
| Latent Conditions | |
| Latent Conditions | |
| Latent Conditions | |
| Latent Conditions | |
| Latent Conditions | |
| Latent Conditions | |
| Real Estate | |

Commented [SBW4]: Per (b) (6), (b) (7)(E) (b) (5)

Commented [SBW5]: Per (b) (6), (b) (7)(E) (b) (5)

Commented [SBW6]: Per (b) (6), (b) (7)(E) (b) (5)

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
 Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

| | |
|-------------|---------|
| Real Estate | (b) (5) |
| Real Estate | |
| Real Estate | |
| Scope | |

Interrelated Projects

[List any interrelated project dependencies on other projects including projects such as Military Deployment Constraints, Facilities, SBInet towers, or projects within other agencies or private construction. The Acquisition Directive refers to this as "Interoperability."]

| # | Interrelated Projects |
|-----|-----------------------|
| 001 | |
| 002 | |
| 003 | |
| 004 | |

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

Disposal Plan

[As directed in the FM&E Policy Document on Project Management, effective November 1, 2012, and in the FM&E RPAM 10042, the method, timeline, and all costs associated with a property disposal must be documented.]

DRAFT

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

PROJECT EXECUTION TEAM

[Name], Project Manager
BPFTI PMO, Facilities Division

Date

[Name], Project Manager
USACE, [Location] District

Date

DRAFT

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure PMO
Tactical Infrastructure Project Requirements Document

APPROVAL: Constructability

(b) (6), TI Branch Chief
ECSSO, USACE Date

APPROVAL: OBP Mission Needs

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C),
Office of Border Patrol, SPPA Date

APPROVAL: Financial

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Branch Chief
BPFTI PMO, Financial Management Branch Date

APPROVAL: Real Estate & Environmental

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Director
BPFTI PMO, Real Estate & Environmental Division Date

APPROVAL: Architecture and Engineering

[Name], Director
BPFTI PMO, A&E Services Division Date

PROJECT APPROVAL

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Director
BPFTI PMO, TI Division Date

CBP Office of Administration Facilities Management and Engineering

Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR)
Planning for O-1, 2, 3

March 1, 2013



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection



O-1 thru O-3 Scope

- Scope
 - Customer requirements
 - (b) (7)(E) miles in RGV Sector
 - Bollard-style fence with in-ground foundation system
 - Alignments coordinated with RGV Sector and IBWC with following goals:
 - Satisfy operational requirement
 - Minimize floodplain impacts
 - Stay within areas covered by 2008 DHS Waiver

- Real Estate
 - Collaboration with DOJ
 - ROE-S will take (b) (5)
 - Land Usage Agreements must be complete within 21 months



O-1 thru O-3 Scope (cont'd)

- Environmental
 - Covered by the April 2008 DHS Waiver
 - Environmental monitoring?
 - Any alignment changes may require updates and notifications

- Design
 - Full Design
 - Maximize setback from river (within RE and ENV constraints)
 - Minimize floodplain impacts
 - GFM incorporation dependent upon scale (lessons learned from PF/VF)
 - Multiple gate requirements
 - Stakeholder coordination (USFWS, IBWC)
 - Dependent upon geotech and topo surveys
 - Access and staging



Acquisition Strategy



- PgM/PM support: In-house; KTR; hybrid (support relationships)
- OPCELL: In-house; KTR (8(a)); hybrid (b) (5)
- Design: AE IDIQ (find existing capacity; new capacity on track for DEC 13)
 - Leverage VF/PF experience
 - Standard Designs
 - DDC
- Survey: existing capacity; 8(a)
 - Geotech
 - Topo
 - Property
- Construction:
 - Full & Open BV
 - MATOC: existing capacity; invest in new capacity (b) (5)
 - IFB
 - 8(a) (b) (5)



Staffing



- Dedicated PgM with 2-3 PMs in support: In-house; KTR; hybrid
- OPCELL: 4 pax: In-house; KTR (8(a)); hybrid
- Functional Area support: matrix with KTR augmentation
 - CT
 - ENV
 - RE
 - Construction (QA, Contract Admin)



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

Funding & Logistics



- IAA vs RWA: IAA introduces schedule risk
- GFM economy of scale



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

Major Milestones

- Initiate new acquisitions: (b) (5)
- Achieve ROE-S: (b) (5)
- Authority receipt: (b) (5)
- Funds receipt: (b) (5)
- Survey complete: (b) (5)
- Construction MATOC award: (b) (5)
- Design complete: (b) (5)
- RE Acquisition complete: (b) (5)
- Task Order award(s): (b) (5)
- Construction NTP: (b) (5)
- Construction Complet (b) (5)
- Required Completion: (b) (5)



From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence
Date: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:39:04 PM
Attachments: [O1toO3withLeveeWALL.ZIP](#)
[Fence mileage.xlsx](#)
Importance: High

Here you go. Alas, I only have it in a shape file....our GIS guy's kid just broke his leg and he had to split. We can make it pretty on Monday AM.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 Division Chief
 Rio Grande Valley Sector
 U.S. Border Patrol
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 5:36 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence
Importance: High

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(E)

Below and attached is the revised document with levee miles.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance | Levee Miles |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|
| RGC | O-1/ (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | 0 |
| RGC | O-2/ | | 0 |
| MCS | O-3 | | 0 |
| TOTAL | | 40.87 | 26.46 |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 5:30 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: Border Fence

Importance: High

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached are the Fence mileage broken down by zone. Also attached are the shapefiles to go with the tasker.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| RGC | O-1/ (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2/ | |
| MCS | O-3 | |
| (b) (7)(E) | | |
| TOTAL | | 40.87 |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --*Brian Tracy*

| Station | Project/zone | Distance | Levee Miles |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| RGC | O-1/ (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2 | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | O-3 | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| (b) (7)(E) | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| TOTAL | | 40.87 | 26.46 |

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: REVISION RE: new Map Request
Date: Wednesday, June 07, 2017 9:37:40 AM

Thanks for the quick turn – confirming with USBP.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Special Projects Analyst
Agile Group
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, June 7, 2017 9:25 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: REVISION RE: new Map Request

Please confirm.

Thanks,
(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, June 07, 2017 8:49 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: REVISION RE: new Map Request

Sorry guys they are for B1's testimony.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, June 7, 2017 8:48 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
>
Subject: RE: REVISION RE: new Map Request

(b) (6), (b) (7) – any way we can get these ASAP?

Thanks,

(b) (6), (b) (7)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Special Projects Analyst
Agile Group
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, June 6, 2017 8:31 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: REVISION RE: new Map Request

(b) (6), (b) (7) – USBP would like a few edits to the map.

Can you please provide a total on each map for the amount of Pedestrian Fence and Barrier specific to that map? So that all three maps added together total (b) (7)(E)?

And then for the second map, the same thing – totaling of the barrier, but also then a total for the Primary included on that map.

Let me know if you have any questions - we can chat on the phone first thing tomorrow morning if you have any issues with this.

Thanks!

(b) (6), (b) (7)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Special Projects Analyst
Agile Group
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, June 6, 2017 3:41 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) >

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: new Map Request

Please review and let me know if updates are needed.

Total mileage is reported in the Legend.

Thanks,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, June 06, 2017 12:07 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: new Map Request

Hi (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

I marked up the map we received this morning.

Here's what we're looking for:

- 3 Maps for RGV – Zone O-1 through O-6, Zone O-7 through O-13 (which is what you had pulled already, Zone O-14 through the end of RGV)
- Add the zones for labels, but we don't need the mileages per segment
- All three will include the Primary Pedestrian Barrier and the Existing PF (Primary) – so for the third map we have no proposed barrier there
- Remove the Table up top
- Label the Maps as Rio Grande Valley Sector Proposed Border Wall System

Does this help?

Thanks,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Special Projects Analyst

Agile Group

Office of Facilities and Asset Management

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, June 6, 2017 11:51 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: new Map Request

Hi (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) –

We have yet another MR coming your way. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is working the MR and writing on a map to show

you what is needed, but can get 15 mins with you to walk through this? Can you do 12:30 EST?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Director, Business Operations Division
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: [BORKOWSKI, MARK S](#)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [JACKSTA, LINDA L](#); (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski
Date: Monday, April 15, 2013 12:03:20 PM
Attachments: Not Responsive
[Project O-1thruO-32013.doc](#)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

I've copied (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), who manages these infrastructure projects. I think it would probably help if he sent you a map detailing where these projects are.

But the main context would relate to the "O-1 through O-10" information. Those are fence projects in Mexico, generally along the Rio Grande. Basically, since these can involve flood plains, the IBIWC has had an equity in reviewing our plans and ensuring that we've properly accounted for risks and impacts of floods, etc. We've had some experiences in the past where fences have actually created blockages and re-diversion of flood waters, causing problems. We believe we've worked this all out with the IBIWC and that at least the U.S. Commissioner is comfortable. The paper you have here, therefore, gives status on these fence projects that would be of interest to the IBIWC.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) —please add anything you think I've missed and, if possible, send a map showing where our projects have caught the interest of IBIWC.

Does that help?

- Mark

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 11:08 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); BORKOWSKI, MARK S
Cc: JACKSTA, LINDA L; (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

AC Borkowski; (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Do either of you have any additional information or added context that you would like to provide for C1's upcoming meeting with IBWC Commissioner Drusina-tomorrow.

Your feedback either way will be appreciated.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Director, Field Operations
Lead Executive-Border Initiatives
Customs and Border Protection

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Cell phone

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 10:43 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Here are the only infrastructure projects we have that have an IBWC nexus. OTIA, FM&E, and ORMB are the offices handling these.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C).
Associate Chief
Foreign Operations Branch
U.S. Border Patrol
Washington, D.C

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

~~This communication, along with any attachments, may contain information that is legally privileged, confidential, or exempt from disclosure, and is not for distribution, dissemination, use, forwarding, or copying by anyone other than the intended recipient. Please consult the sender by telephone or return e-mail before disclosing any information included in this e-mail, please notify sender immediately and delete this e-mail from your computer if you are not the intended recipient.~~

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2013 8:25 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

Gentlemen,

Here are some background documents on infrastructure for when you set up the meeting. The POC at IBWC that Russ mentioned was Lisa Holguin.

Lisa.Holguin@ibwc.gov

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

Associate Chief
Foreign Operations Branch
U.S. Border Patrol
Washington, D.C

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

[Redacted]

~~This communication, along with any attachments, may contain information that is legally privileged, confidential, or exempt from disclosure, and is not for distribution, dissemination, use, forwarding, or copying by anyone other than the intended recipient. Please consult the sender by telephone or return e-mail before disclosing any information included in this e-mail, please notify sender immediately and delete this e-mail from your computer if you are not the intended recipient.~~

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2013 8:02 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Fw: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

As discussed.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent from Blackberry

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Associate Chief
Foreign Operations Branch
U.S. Border Patrol
Washington, DC

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 09:49 PM Eastern Standard Time
To: 'FrisbieRI@state.gov' <FrisbieRI@state.gov>
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); Lisa.Holguin@ibwc.gov' <Lisa.Holguin@ibwc.gov>; 'russell.frisbie@ibwc.gov' <russell.frisbie@ibwc.gov> (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
HINOJOSA, ANA
Subject: Re: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

Thanks Russ! (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) cc'd here is one of Acting Commissioner Winkowski's advisors. I will get with him in the morning. I have also copied (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) who is the CBP Executive Director of Border Initiatives.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent from Blackberry

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

Associate Chief
Foreign Operations Branch
U.S. Border Patrol
Washington, DC

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: Frisbie, Russell L [<mailto:FrisbieRL@state.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 09:24 PM Eastern Standard Time
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); Lisa Holquin' <Lisa.Holquin@ibwc.gov>; 'russell.frisbie@ibwc.gov' <russell.frisbie@ibwc.gov>
Subject: RE: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) as you know, it has been about ten months since the Commissioners last met; their last get-together was in the context of the meeting June 15, 2012 at the Department of State in which Mr. Winkowski helped steer Department of State and Mexican Ministry of Foreign Relations officials , together with both IBWC Commissioners, to a common understanding of the use of IBWC credentials for mission-related border crossing. Those arrangements have worked very well ever since, and I know they were instrumental to the IBWC achieving an important agreement on the management of Colorado River resources at the end of 2012.

The meeting we are requesting now would be an opportunity for our agencies' two heads to "compare notes" on matters of mutual interest that are likely to continue to be a focus for our institutions. The most obvious would be border infrastructure, writ large: the likely timeline for construction of the remaining lower Rio Grande valley border fence segments, other possible fence or other tactical infrastructure projects that CBP may be contemplating, enhancing the visibility of the IBWC's boundary markers (in particular along the Arizona border with Mexico), etc. Security at the Amistad and Falcon dams, both of which as you know are also U.S. ports of entry, is another area of interest. We would also very much like to hear how we can be helpful to CBP in accomplishing its mission.

As I am still in a grand jury through Friday COB, I would be grateful if possible scheduling arrangements could be made through Lisa Holquin.

Best regards,

Russ

From: Frisbie, Russell L
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 7:16 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); Lisa Holquin'; 'russell.frisbie@ibwc.gov'
Subject: RE: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

Good morning, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and CBP colleagues. I should be able to get back to you on this request this

evening, but if necessary in the meantime, Lisa Holguin at our headquarters in El Paso is handling things from that end while I am indisposed during normal business hours for the next three days.

Thanks very much for this prompt response .

Russ

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 6:12 AM
To: Frisbie, Russell L
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Re: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

Russ,

Good to hear from you. I will pass on your request to the Commissioner's Office. With the retirement of Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Winkowski is Acting Commissioner.

Is there someone in your office that we can coordinate with if you are unavailable? Also, does Commissioner Drusina has a specific topic/issue for the meeting?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent from Blackberry

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

Associate Chief
Foreign Operations Branch
U.S. Border Patrol
Washington, DC

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: Frisbie, Russell L [<mailto:FrisbieRL@state.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 12:13 AM Eastern Standard Time
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: 'Russell.Frisbie@ibwc.gov' <Russell.Frisbie@ibwc.gov>
Subject: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

Greetings, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) I am writing for your advice as to through whom I should channel a request for an appointment for my boss with yours; Commissioner Drusina will be here in DC next week. I would be most grateful if you could let me know the proper POC(s) for this.

(This late hour is explained by the fact that I have been serving on a grand jury for the past four-plus weeks, and I have no recourse to the usual electronic media that we use to do our work during the day, as we are essentially sequestered all day. The one exception is access to my BlackBerry for an hour or so at lunch time, hence my use of the IBWC address, on the cc line, to which the BB is synched.)

Hope you are doing well, particularly under what I know are your own pretty dire sequestration circumstances (I see that San Diego and Laredo have been particularly affected by fiscal cuts).

Best regards,

Russ

Russell L. Frisbie | Special Assistant | International Boundary and Water Commission, U.S. Section | Washington, D.C. Liaison | c/o Office of Mexican Affairs, Department of State | (202) 647-8106 | **(b) (6)** (Cell)



"Excellence Through Teamwork"

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

The information contained in this electronic message and any attachment(s) to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. You are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, disclosure, and/or distribution of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently destroy along with any attachments without reading, forwarding, saving, or disclosing them.



United States Border Patrol Rio Grande Valley Sector



PF 225 Projects O-1 through O-3 Status February 20, 2013

ISSUE / BRIEFING TOPIC:

Office of Border Patrol (OBP) seeks to determine whether RGV Sector approves the reduction of O-1 through O-3 from (b) (7)(E) and include RVSS technology and patrol roads. **(Decisional)**.

DESIRED OUTCOME:

Establish a border fence, RVSS technology, and associated infrastructure to impact alien and narcotic smuggling in the Rio Grande City (RGC) and McAllen (MCS) Stations' Area of Responsibility (AOR).

BACKGROUND:

- Of the (b) (7)(E) Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225 projects in Rio Grande Valley Sector, two were planned for RGC (O-1 through O-2) and one for MCS (O-3).
- In October 2010, the International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) advised Customs and Border Protection (CBP) that they could not support projects O-1 through O-3 until hydraulic designs were in compliance with the treaty threshold limits for water surface and flow deflection impacts.
- In 2011 Facilities, Management, and Engineering (FM&E) submitted new 2-dimensional hydraulics models of the fence alignments to IBWC for review.
- In February 2012, IBWC issued a letter approving the construction of the fence portions that fell within the IBWC floodplain.
- IBWC unilaterally approved the fence designs after the Comision InternacionaI de Limites y Aguas (CILA) did not approve them.
- In June 2012, RGC and MCS station management met with Office of Border Patrol (OBP) representatives to discuss the "Total Mission Concept" approach with a mix of TI and Technology and (b) (7)(E) while including RVSS technology and patrol roads along the original fence alignment.

CHALLENGES/CONCERNS:

- Funding to construct Projects O-1 through O-3 is not currently available.
- (b) (7)(E)
- (b) (7)(E)
- (b) (7)(E)

Prepared by: SBPA (b) (5)

2/20/2013

~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

BW11 FOIA CBP 005898

- (b) (7)(E)

RECOMMENDATION:

- (b) (5)
-

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski
Date: Monday, April 15, 2013 12:18:43 PM
Attachments: Not Responsive
[Project O-1thruO-32013.doc](#)

We need to send the Maps of 01-03 and the IBWC approval and issues we know of -

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: BORKOWSKI, MARK S
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 12:03 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: JACKSTA, LINDA L; (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

I've copied (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), who manages these infrastructure projects. I think it would probably help if he sent you a map detailing where these projects are.

But the main context would relate to the "O-1 through O-10" information. Those are fence projects in Mexico, generally along the Rio Grande. Basically, since these can involve flood plains, the IBIWC has had an equity in reviewing our plans and ensuring that we've properly accounted for risks and impacts of floods, etc. We've had some experiences in the past where fences have actually created blockages and re-diversion of flood waters, causing problems. We believe we've worked this all out with the IBIWC and that at least the U.S. Commissioner is comfortable. The paper you have here, therefore, gives status on these fence projects that would be of interest to the IBIWC.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) —please add anything you think I've missed and, if possible, send a map showing where our projects have caught the interest of IBIWC.

Does that help?

- Mark

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 11:08 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) BORKOWSKI, MARK S
Cc: JACKSTA, LINDA L; (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

AC Borkowski/Mr (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Do either of you have any additional information or added context that you would like to provide for

C1's upcoming meeting with IBWC Commissioner Drusina-tomorrow.

Your feedback either way will be appreciated.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Director, Field Operations
Lead Executive-Border Initiatives
Customs and Border Protection

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 10:43 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Here are the only infrastructure projects we have that have an IBWC nexus. OTIA, FM&E, and ORMB are the offices handling these.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

Associate Chief
Foreign Operations Branch
U.S. Border Patrol
Washington, D.C

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

[Redacted]

This communication, along with any attachments, may contain information that is legally privileged, confidential, or exempt from disclosure, and is not for distribution, dissemination, use, forwarding, or copying by anyone other than the intended recipient. Please consult the sender by telephone or return e-mail before disclosing any information included in this e-mail, please notify sender immediately and delete this e-mail from your computer if you are not the intended recipient.

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2013 8:25 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

Gentlemen,

Here are some background documents on infrastructure for when you set up the meeting. The POC at IBWC that Russ mentioned was Lisa Holguin.

Lisa.Holguin@ibwc.gov

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

Associate Chief

Foreign Operations Branch

U.S. Border Patrol

Washington, D.C

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

~~This communication, along with any attachments, may contain information that is legally privileged, confidential, or exempt from disclosure, and is not for distribution, dissemination, use, forwarding, or copying by anyone other than the intended recipient. Please consult the sender by telephone or return e-mail before disclosing any information included in this e-mail, please notify sender immediately and delete this e-mail from your computer if you are not the intended recipient.~~

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2013 8:02 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: Fw: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

As discussed.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent from Blackberry

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Associate Chief

Foreign Operations Branch

U.S. Border Patrol

Washington, DC

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 09:49 PM Eastern Standard Time

To: 'FrisbieRL@state.gov' <FrisbieRL@state.gov>
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 'Lisa.Holguin@ibwc.gov'
<Lisa.Holguin@ibwc.gov>; 'russell.frisbie@ibwc.gov' <russell.frisbie@ibwc.gov>; (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Re: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

Thanks Russ! Mr. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) cc'd here is one of Acting Commissioner Winkowski's advisors. I will get with him in the morning. I have also copied (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) who is the CBP Executive Director of Border Initiatives.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent from Blackberry

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Associate Chief
Foreign Operations Branch
U.S. Border Patrol
Washington, DC

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: Frisbie, Russell L [<mailto:FrisbieRL@state.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 09:24 PM Eastern Standard Time
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 'Lisa Holguin'
<Lisa.Holguin@ibwc.gov>; 'russell.frisbie@ibwc.gov' <russell.frisbie@ibwc.gov>
Subject: RE: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) as you know, it has been about ten months since the Commissioners last met; their last get-together was in the context of the meeting June 15, 2012 at the Department of State in which Mr. Winkowski helped steer Department of State and Mexican Ministry of Foreign Relations officials, together with both IBWC Commissioners, to a common understanding of the use of IBWC credentials for mission-related border crossing. Those arrangements have worked very well ever since, and I know they were instrumental to the IBWC achieving an important agreement on the management of Colorado River resources at the end of 2012.

The meeting we are requesting now would be an opportunity for our agencies' two heads to "compare notes" on matters of mutual interest that are likely to continue to be a focus for our institutions. The most obvious would be border infrastructure, writ large: the likely timeline for construction of the remaining lower Rio Grande valley border fence segments, other possible fence or other tactical infrastructure projects that CBP may be contemplating, enhancing the visibility of the IBWC's boundary markers (in particular along the Arizona border with Mexico), etc. Security at the Amistad and Falcon dams, both of which as you know are also U.S. ports of entry, is another area of interest. We would also very much like to hear how we can be helpful to CBP in accomplishing its mission.

As I am still in a grand jury through Friday COB, I would be grateful if possible scheduling arrangements could be made through Lisa Holguin.

Best regards,

Russ

From: Frisbie, Russell L
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 7:16 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); 'Lisa Holguin'; 'russell.frisbie@ibwc.gov'
Subject: RE: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

Good morning, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and CBP colleagues. I should be able to get back to you on this request this evening, but if necessary in the meantime, Lisa Holguin at our headquarters in El Paso is handling things from that end while I am indisposed during normal business hours for the next three days.

Thanks very much for this prompt response .

Russ

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 6:12 AM
To: Frisbie, Russell L
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Re: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

Russ,

Good to hear from you. I will pass on your request to the Commissioner's Office. With the retirement of Mr. Aguilar, Mr. Winkowski is Acting Commissioner.

Is there someone in your office that we can coordinate with if you are unavailable? Also, does Commissioner Drusina has a specific topic/issue for the meeting?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent from Blackberry

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Associate Chief
Foreign Operations Branch
U.S. Border Patrol
Washington, DC

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: Frisbie, Russell L [<mailto:FrisbieRL@state.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 12:13 AM Eastern Standard Time
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: 'Russell.Frisbie@ibwc.gov' <Russell.Frisbie@ibwc.gov>
Subject: USIBWC Commissioner Drusina Meeting with Deputy Commissioner Winkowski

Greetings, (b) (6), (b) (6) I am writing for your advice as to through whom I should channel a request for an appointment for my boss with yours; Commissioner Drusina will be here in DC next week. I would be most grateful if you could let me know the proper POC(s) for this.

(This late hour is explained by the fact that I have been serving on a grand jury for the past four-plus weeks, and I have no recourse to the usual electronic media that we use to do our work during the day, as we are essentially sequestered all day. The one exception is access to my BlackBerry for an hour or so at lunch time, hence my use of the IBWC address, on the cc line, to which the BB is synched.)

Hope you are doing well, particularly under what I know are your own pretty dire sequestration circumstances (I see that San Diego and Laredo have been particularly affected by fiscal cuts).

Best regards,

Russ

Russell L. Frisbie | Special Assistant | International Boundary and Water Commission, U.S. Section | Washington, D.C. Liaison | c/o Office of Mexican Affairs, Department of State | (202) 647-8106 | (b) (6) (Cell)



"Excellence Through Teamwork"

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

~~The information contained in this electronic message and any attachment(s) to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. You are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, disclosure, and/or distribution of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently destroy, along with any attachments without reading, forwarding, saving, or disclosing them.~~

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 1:19:19 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[RGV_03-20-17.pdf](#)
[Quick \(but easy i hope\) map request.msg](#)
[FW Border Fence .msg](#)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) – can you give me a call when you have a sec? we have a disconnect on requirements.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 3:42 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Ok, this is a complicated story.
I'm going to give you all the details here so that you can decide on a course of action and tell us how we can help.

I received two emails with RGV data (both attached):
Email from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on Friday with GIS data and a table – the table information is NOT the same as the GIS data.
Email from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) today with the same GIS, a table, and a map – the table in this email DOES match the GIS data.

So – attached are maps that show the GIS data and the table from the second email (also shown below).
We have no idea on the source of data for table in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) email. Please don't use that data.

These maps are not for distribution.
They provide a visual of the data for your understanding.
If you want maps that you can send out, please let me know and I will reformat with our FOIA, Legend, Date, tracking info, etc.

Here's what you can see:

Yellow with labels = RGV-proposed alignments highlighted as per the table. The labels are either O-X or Zone X as in the table.

Green = other RGV-proposed fence locations that are not called out

Green polygons = Federal Land (it's all National Wildlife Refuge)

Orange = RGV-proposed secondary fence (b) (5)
[Redacted]

Black lines that look like train tracks = levee (start on page 4)

We have also added the Station names and the Zone numbers (they are kind of hard to see).

As with all our PDFs, the data are divided into layers. You can expand the layer menu on the left side, and use the eye icon to turn things on and off.

For the record:

(b) (7)(E) O-1
 O-2
 (b) (7)(E) O-3

Their mileages for these segments match ours.

Again – please don’t redistribute, these maps would qualify as “embarrassing.”

| Zone Breakdown | | | | Project Breakdown | |
|----------------|------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Station | Zone | Distance (mi.) | Project | | |
| RGC | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | O-1 thru O-3 | O-1 | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | | | | O-2 | |
| RGC | | | | O-3 | |
| RGC | | | | Total | |
| MCS | | | | | |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | | Levee Proposed Wall | Levee Proposed Wall | |
| MCS | | | | Total | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | | | | |
| WSL | | | | | |
| WSL | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) | | | |

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 1:03 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

(b) (5)

That may only make sense to me, but there you have it.

We are creating a map of the information provided below so that you can see it, and use it this week.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:48 PM

To: (b) (6)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

Importance: High


(b) (6) – See the attached. Can the Baker team lay this GIS info into a map we can look at of RGV quickly on Monday? It doesn't have to be pretty right away, just viewable.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(E), (b) (5)



(b) (7)(E), (b) (7)(F)




Sources: Esri, DeLor
AeroGRID, IGN, and

(b) (7)(E), (b) (5)



(b) (7)(E), (b) (5)

(b) (7)(E), (b) (5)



(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

From:

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Sent:

Sunday, March 19, 2017 2:50 PM

To:

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Cc:

Subject:

Quick (but easy i hope?) map request

Attachments:

NON-RESPONSIVE

(b) (6) For the Hill brief this week on the budget, we need a couple of maps to lay into the slides. That said, they don't need to have any alignment in them. All we need is:

1. A map of RGV sector that shows the station AORs. We'll need one map that highlights the border (like the blue line you did for the BIS a couple of weeks back) in Rio Grande City, McAllen and Weslaco AORs. We'll need a second map that highlights the same, except this time just Rio Grande City AOR. I would use the same map view as you did for the BIS slide you did for me a couple weeks ago on both of these. I've attached it as a reminder. We're going to use it again, so we want to keep the look consistent.
2. We're also going to need another map of another sector much like the one I described here for RGV. Problem is, I won't know which other sector and which stations with in the sector until tomorrow morning. As soon as I know, I'll send a follow up.

If this makes no sense at all because it's Sunday and yikes...well, we can talk in the AM. We have the first pre-brief of what's supposed to be a complete deck at 3PM tomorrow, which means we'll need to lay these slides in by about 130 in order to get them printed and be at RRB in time.

Thanks,

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Chief of Staff

Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Mobile: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 10:50 AM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: FW: Border Fence
Attachments: O1O3_Levee.pdf; Zone_Project Breakdown.xlsx; O1O3_LeveeWall_shapefiles.zip

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 9:29 AM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 9:20 AM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

PDF gives a good snapshot of Fridays changes.

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Division Chief
Rio Grande Valley Sector
U.S. Border Patrol

O: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 8:13 AM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Chief,

We identified (b)(7)(E) wall/fence that lies in conjunction with the existing levee and also includes the old O1-O3 project. The O1, O2 and O3 project totals (b)(7)(E) and is the only new wall identified in Zones (b)(7)(E) New proposed

levee wall totals (b) (7)(E) miles in Zone (b) (7)(E). The only Zone identified for (b) (7)(E) wall is in Zone (b) (7)(E) which is the beginning of the floodway and is on the south levee.

*There are additional fencing requirements in the zones identified, however because they do not run in conjunction with the levee, they were not included.

| Zone Breakdown | | | |
|----------------|------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Station | Zone | Distance (mi.) | Project |
| RGC | (b) (7)(C) | (b) (7)(E) | O-1 thru O-3 |
| RGC | (b) (7)(C) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| RGC | (b) (7)(C) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| RGC | (b) (7)(C) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| MCS | (b) (7)(C) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| MCS | (b) (7)(C) | (b) (7)(E) | Levee Proposed Wall |
| MCS | (b) (7)(C) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(C) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(C) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(C) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) | |

| Project Breakdown | | |
|---------------------|------------|------------|
| O-1 | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| O-2 | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| O-3 | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| Total | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| Levee Proposed Wall | | |
| Total | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |

v/r

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Supervisor | RGV Sector Technology, TI and TACCOM
 4400 South Expressway 281 | Edinburg, TX 78542 | (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) O: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

"It is only when we become aware or are reminded that our time is limited that we can channel our energy into truly living"
 - Ludovico Einaudi

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 8:09 PM

To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Ok thanks. Let's get that before 0800 on Monday, please.

Thanks for the good, quick work this afternoon, too.

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:11:01 PM

To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Sir,

(b)(7)(E) has (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) fencing on the floodway. I don't have the exact measurement but its roughly (b)(7)(E).

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Operations Officer

RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C))

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:03 PM

To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Did we call for any of the areas of (b)(7)(E) to have (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) fencing?

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 4:36:02 PM

To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

DCPA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Below and attached is the revised document with levee miles.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance | Levee Miles |
|---------|---------------|----------|-------------|
| RGC | O-1 (b)(7)(E) | | (b)(7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2 | | |

| | | |
|--------------|-----|------------|
| MCS | O-3 | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | 9 |
| MCS | | (b) |
| MCS | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) |

Respectfully,

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Operations Officer
 RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 5:30 PM

To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Subject: Border Fence

Importance: High

DCPA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Below and attached are the Fence mileage broken down by zone. Also attached are the shapefiles to go with the tasker.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance |
|--------------|--------------|------------|
| RGC | O-1 | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2 | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | O-3 | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) |

Respectfully,

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Operations Officer

RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --*Brian Tracy*

(b) (7) (E), (b) (5)



From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:43:01 PM

Given that the "boys" are going to RGV this week to sort it out, change it up, etc; not sure it's worth doing the CSI on how it came to exist...

The meeting we had last week with RGV Sector was a joke – they pretty much started by saying "we can't change any of the locations, because it was a committee that decided where it would go".... I believe that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) have been working Sector leadership since then.

(b) (5)

I told (b) (6), (b) (7) and (b) (6), (b) (7) – good luck!

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:39 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

FYSA

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:33 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

No. Thanks for the heads up

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Director - Tactical Infrastructure
U. S. Border Patrol
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 11:48:14 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

This is one of the requests (b) (6) and I are trying to sort out. Did this come through you at all?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 9:20 AM

To: [Redacted] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: [Redacted] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

PDF gives a good snapshot of Fridays changes.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Division Chief
Rio Grande Valley Sector
U.S. Border Patrol

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 8:13 AM

To: [Redacted] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

[Redacted]

Cc: [Redacted] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

[Redacted]

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Chief,

We identified (b) (7)(E) of wall/fence that lies in conjunction with the existing levee and also includes the old O1-O3 project. The O1, O2 and O3 project totals (b) (7)(E) and is the only new wall identified in Zones (b) (7)(E). New proposed levee wall totals (b) (7)(E). The only Zone identified for (b) (7)(E) is in (b) (7)(E) which is the beginning of the floodway and is on the south levee.

*There are additional fencing requirements in the zones identified, however because they do not run in conjunction with the levee, they were not included.

| Zone Breakdown | | | |
|----------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Station | Zone | Distance (mi.) | Project |
| RGC | [Redacted] | (b) (7)(E) | O-1 thru O-3 |
| RGC | [Redacted] | [Redacted] | |
| RGC | [Redacted] | [Redacted] | |
| RGC | [Redacted] | [Redacted] | |
| MCS | [Redacted] | [Redacted] | |
| MCS | [Redacted] | [Redacted] | |

| Project Breakdown | | |
|---------------------|------------|------------------|
| O-1 | [Redacted] | (b) (7)(E) |
| O-2 | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |
| O-3 | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |
| Total | [Redacted] | [Redacted] |
| Levee Proposed Wall | | |
| Total | [Redacted] | (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) |

| | | |
|--------------|------------|----------|
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | Levee |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | Proposed |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | Wall |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | |
| TOTAL | | |

v/r

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | (A) Special Operations Supervisor | RGV Sector Technology, TI and TACCOM
 4400 South Expressway 281 | Edinburg, TX 78542 | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"It is only when we become aware or are reminded that our time is limited that we can channel our energy into truly living"
 - Ludovico Einaudi

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 8:09 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Ok thanks. Let's get that before 0800 on Monday, please.

Thanks for the good, quick work this afternoon, too.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 XO-RGV
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:11:01 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Sir,

(b) (7)(E) has (b) (7)(E) fencing on the floodway. I don't have the exact measurement but its roughly (b) (7)(E).

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 Operations Officer
 RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:03 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 [Redacted]
 [Redacted]

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Did we call for any of the areas of (b) (7)(E) to have (b) (7)(E) fencing?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
XO-RGV
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 4:36:02 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached is the revised document with levee miles.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance | Levee Miles |
|--------------|---------------------|------------|-------------|
| RGC | O-1 (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2 | | |
| MCS | O-3 | | |
| MCS | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | | |
| MCS | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | | |
| MCS | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | | |
| WSL | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | | |
| WSL | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | | |
| WSL | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | | |
| TOTAL | | | |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 5:30 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Border Fence
Importance: High

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached are the Fence mileage broken down by zone. Also attached are the shapefiles to go with the tasker.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance |
|--------------|-----------------|------------|
| RGC | O-1/ (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2/ | |
| MCS | O-3 | |
| MCS | (b) | |
| MCS | (b) | |
| MCS | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Operations Officer
 RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Border Fence
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 5:05:06 PM

I have no clue anymore – all I know is im going to fort worth tomorrow and they will be there. One day at a time ;)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:46 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

This week.

They are going to be there Thursday.....

No??

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:45 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Agreed

Hopefully the dynamic duo can work their magic next week ☺

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:43 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Given that the “boys” are going to RGV this week to sort it out, change it up, etc; not sure it’s worth doing the CSI on how it came to exist...

The meeting we had last week with RGV Sector was a joke – they pretty much started by saying “we can’t change any of the locations, because it was a committee that decided where it would go”.... I believe that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) have been working Sector leadership since then.

(b) (5)
I told (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) – good luck!

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:39 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

FYSA

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:33 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

No. Thanks for the heads up

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Director - Tactical Infrastructure
U. S. Border Patrol
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 11:48:14 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

This is one of the requests Lisa and I are trying to sort out. Did this come through you at all?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 9:20 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

PDF gives a good snapshot of Fridays changes.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Division Chief
Rio Grande Valley Sector
U.S. Border Patrol

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 8:13 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Chief,

We identified (b) (7)(E) of wall/fence that lies in conjunction with the existing levee and also includes the old O1-O3 project. The O1, O2 and O3 project totals (b) (7)(E) and is the only new wall identified in Zones (b) (7)(E). New proposed levee wall totals (b) (7)(E) in Zones (b) (7)(E). The only Zone identified for (b) (7)(E) is in Zone (b) (7)(E) which is the beginning of the floodway and is on the south levee.

*There are additional fencing requirements in the zones identified, however because they do not run in conjunction with the levee, they were not included.

| Zone Breakdown | | | |
|----------------|------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Station | Zone | Distance (mi.) | Project |
| RGC | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | O-1 thru O-3 |
| RGC | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| RGC | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| RGC | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | Levee Proposed Wall |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) | |

| Project Breakdown | | |
|---------------------|------------|------------|
| O-1 | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| O-2 | (b) (7)(E) | |
| O-3 | (b) (7)(E) | |
| Total | | |
| Levee Proposed Wall | | |
| Total | (b) (7)(E) | |

v/r

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | (A) Special Operations Supervisor | RGV Sector Technology, TI and TACCOM
4400 South Expressway 281 | Edinburg, TX 78542 | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"It is only when we become aware or are reminded that our time is limited that we can channel our energy into truly living"
- Ludovico Einaudi

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 8:09 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Ok thanks. Let's get that before 0800 on Monday, please.

Thanks for the good, quick work this afternoon, too.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

XO-RGV

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:11:01 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Sir,

(b) (7)(E) has (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) fencing on the floodway. I don't have the exact measurement but its roughly (b) (7)(E).

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Operations Officer

RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:03 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Did we call for any of the areas of (b) (7)(E) to have (b) (7)(E) fencing?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

XO-RGV

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 4:36:02 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached is the revised document with levee miles.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance | Levee Miles |
|--------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| RGC | O-1 (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2 | | |
| MCS | O-3 | | |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | | |
| MCS | | | |
| MCS | | | |
| WSL | | | |
| WSL | | | |
| WSL | | | |
| TOTAL | | 40.87 | |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 5:30 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: Border Fence
Importance: High

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached are the Fence mileage broken down by zone. Also attached are the shapefiles to go with the tasker.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance |
|---------|----------------|------------|
| RGC | O-1 (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2 | |
| MCS | O-3 | |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | |
| MCS | | |

| | | |
|--------------|-----|------------|
| MCS | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:46:45 PM

BTW – (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) knows that he’s not getting a revised metrics xls until this RGV stuff is resolved.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:45 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Agreed

Hopefully the dynamic duo can work their magic next week ☺

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:43 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Given that the “boys” are going to RGV this week to sort it out, change it up, etc; not sure it’s worth doing the CSI on how it came to exist...

The meeting we had last week with RGV Sector was a joke – they pretty much started by saying “we can’t change any of the locations, because it was a committee that decided where it would go”.... I believe that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) have been working Sector leadership since then.

(b) (5)
_____ I told (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) – good luck!

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:39 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

FYSA

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:33 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

No. Thanks for the heads up

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Director - Tactical Infrastructure
U. S. Border Patrol

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 11:48:14 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

This is one of the requests (b) (6) and I are trying to sort out. Did this come through you at all?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 9:20 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

PDF gives a good snapshot of Fridays changes.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Division Chief
Rio Grande Valley Sector
U.S. Border Patrol

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 8:13 AM

To: [REDACTED] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 >
 Cc: [REDACTED] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Chief,

We identified (b) (7)(E) of wall/fence that lies in conjunction with the existing levee and also includes the old O1-O3 project. The O1, O2 and O3 project totals (b) (7)(E) and is the only new wall identified in Zones (b) (7)(E). New proposed levee wall totals (b) (7)(E). The only Zone identified for (b) (7)(E) is in (b) (7)(E) which is the beginning of the floodway and is on the south levee.

*There are additional fencing requirements in the zones identified, however because they do not run in conjunction with the levee, they were not included.

| Zone Breakdown | | | |
|----------------|------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Station | Zone | Distance (mi.) | Project |
| RGC | [REDACTED] | (b) (7)(E) | O-1 thru O-3 |
| RGC | [REDACTED] | | |
| RGC | [REDACTED] | | |
| RGC | [REDACTED] | | |
| MCS | [REDACTED] | | |
| MCS | [REDACTED] | (b) (7)(E) | Levee Proposed Wall |
| MCS | [REDACTED] | | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | | |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) | |

| Project Breakdown | | |
|---------------------|------------|------------|
| O-1 | [REDACTED] | (b) (7)(E) |
| O-2 | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| O-3 | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Total | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |
| Levee Proposed Wall | | |
| Total | [REDACTED] | (b) (7)(E) |

v/r

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | (A) Special Operations Supervisor | RGV Sector Technology, TI and TACCOM
 4400 South Expressway 281 | Edinburg, TX 78542 | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"It is only when we become aware or are reminded that our time is limited that we can channel our energy into truly living"
 - Ludovico Einaudi

From: [REDACTED] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 8:09 PM
To: [REDACTED] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [REDACTED] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Ok thanks. Let's get that before 0800 on Monday, please.

Thanks for the good, quick work this afternoon, too.

(b) (6), (b) (7)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
XO-RGV
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:11:01 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Sir,

(b) (7)(E) has (b) (7)(E) fencing on the floodway. I don't have the exact measurement but its roughly (b) (7)(E).

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:03 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Did we call for any of the areas of (b) (7)(E) to have (b) (7)(E) fencing?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
XO-RGV
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 4:36:02 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)

Below and attached is the revised document with levee miles.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance | Levee Miles |
|---------|-----------------|------------|-------------|
| RGC | O-1/ (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2/ (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | O-3 | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | 9 |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |

| | | | |
|--------------|-----|--|------------|
| WSL | (b) | | |
| WSL | (b) | | |
| WSL | (b) | | |
| TOTAL | | | (b) (7)(E) |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 Operations Officer
 RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 5:30 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Border Fence
Importance: High

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached are the Fence mileage broken down by zone. Also attached are the shapefiles to go with the tasker.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance |
|--------------|----------------|------------|
| RGC | O-1 (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2 | |
| MCS | O-3 | |
| MCS | (b) | |
| MCS | (b) | |
| MCS | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 Operations Officer
 RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Border Fence
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:45:03 PM

Agreed

Hopefully the dynamic duo can work their magic next week ☺

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:43 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Given that the “boys” are going to RGV this week to sort it out, change it up, etc; not sure it’s worth doing the CSI on how it came to exist...

The meeting we had last week with RGV Sector was a joke – they pretty much started by saying “we can’t change any of the locations, because it was a committee that decided where it would go”.... I believe that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) have been working Sector leadership since then.

(b) (5)
[Redacted]

I told (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) – good luck!

Thanks,

(b) (6)
[Redacted]

(b) (6)
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:39 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

FYSA

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:33 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

No. Thanks for the heads up

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Director - Tactical Infrastructure
U. S. Border Patrol

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 11:48:14 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

This is one of the requests (b) (6) and I are trying to sort out. Did this come through you at all?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 9:20 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

PDF gives a good snapshot of Fridays changes.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Division Chief
Rio Grande Valley Sector
U.S. Border Patrol

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 8:13 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Chief,

We identified (b) (7)(E) of wall/fence that lies in conjunction with the existing levee and also includes the old O1-O3 project. The O1, O2 and O3 project totals (b) (7)(E) and is the only new wall identified in Zones (b) (7)(E). New proposed levee wall totals (b) (7)(E). The only Zone identified for (b) (7)(E) is in (b) (7)(E) which is the beginning of the floodway and is on the south levee.

*There are additional fencing requirements in the zones identified, however because they do not run in conjunction with the levee, they were not included.

| Zone Breakdown | | | |
|----------------|------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Station | Zone | Distance (mi.) | Project |
| RGC | | (b) (7)(E) | O-1 thru O-3 |
| RGC | | | |
| RGC | | | |
| RGC | | | |
| MCS | | | |
| MCS | | | |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) | Levee Proposed Wall |
| WSL | (b) | | |
| WSL | (b) | | |
| WSL | (b) | | |
| TOTAL | | | |

| Project Breakdown | | |
|---------------------|--|------------|
| O-1 | | (b) (7)(E) |
| O-2 | | |
| O-3 | | |
| Total | | |
| Levee Proposed Wall | | |
| Total | | (b) (7)(E) |

v/r

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | (A) Special Operations Supervisor | RGV Sector Technology, TI and TACCOM
4400 South Expressway 281 | Edinburg, TX 78542 | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"It is only when we become aware or are reminded that our time is limited that we can channel our energy into truly living"
- Ludovico Einaudi

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 8:09 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

[Redacted]

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Ok thanks. Let's get that before 0800 on Monday, please.

Thanks for the good, quick work this afternoon, too.

(b) (6), (b) (7)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

XO-RGV

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:11:01 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Sir,

(b) (7)(E) has (b) (7)(E) fencing on the floodway. I don't have the exact measurement but its roughly (b) (7)(E).

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:03 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Did we call for any of the areas of (b) (7)(E) to have (b) (7)(E) fencing?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

XO-RGV

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 4:36:02 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6);(b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached is the revised document with levee miles.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance | Levee Miles |
|--------------|----------------|------------|-------------|
| RGC | O-1 (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2 | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | O-3 | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 5:30 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: Border Fence

Importance: High

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached are the Fence mileage broken down by zone. Also attached are the shapefiles to go with the tasker.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance |
|--------------|-----------------|------------|
| RGC | O-1/ (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2/ | |
| MCS | O-3 / | |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | |
| MCS | | |
| MCS | | |
| WSL | | |
| WSL | | |
| WSL | | |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:46:27 PM

This week.

They are going to be there Thursday.....

No??

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:45 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Agreed

Hopefully the dynamic duo can work their magic next week ☺

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:43 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Given that the “boys” are going to RGV this week to sort it out, change it up, etc; not sure it’s worth doing the CSI on how it came to exist...

The meeting we had last week with RGV Sector was a joke – they pretty much started by saying “we can’t change any of the locations, because it was a committee that decided where it would go”.... I believe that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) have been working Sector leadership since then.

(b) (5)
I told (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) – good luck!

Thanks,
(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:39 PM

To: (b) (6)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

FYSA

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Business Operations

OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:33 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

No. Thanks for the heads up

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Director - Tactical Infrastructure

U. S. Border Patrol

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 11:48:14 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

This is one of the requests (b) (6) and I are trying to sort out. Did this come through you at all?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Business Operations

OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 9:20 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

PDF gives a good snapshot of Fridays changes.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Division Chief

Rio Grande Valley Sector

U.S. Border Patrol

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 8:13 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Chief,

We identified (b) (7)(E) of wall/fence that lies in conjunction with the existing levee and also includes the old O1-O3 project. The O1, O2 and O3 project totals (b) (7)(E) and is the only new wall identified in Zones (b) (7)(E). New proposed levee wall totals (b) (7)(E). The only Zone identified for (b) (7)(E) is in (b) (7)(E) which is the beginning of the floodway and is on the south levee.

*There are additional fencing requirements in the zones identified, however because they do not run in conjunction with the levee, they were not included.

| Zone Breakdown | | | |
|----------------|------|----------------|---------------------|
| Station | Zone | Distance (mi.) | Project |
| (b) (7)(E) | | | O-1 thru O-3 |
| (b) (7)(E) | | | Levee Proposed Wall |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) | |

| Project Breakdown | | |
|---------------------|--|------------|
| O-1 | | (b) (7)(E) |
| O-2 | | |
| O-3 | | |
| Total | | |
| Levee Proposed Wall | | |
| Total | | (b) (7)(E) |

v/r

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | (A) Special Operations Supervisor | RGV Sector Technology, TI and TACCOM
4400 South Expressway 281 | Edinburg, TX 78542 | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"It is only when we become aware or are reminded that our time is limited that we can channel our energy into truly living"
- Ludovico Einaudi

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 8:09 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: [REDACTED]

Ok thanks. Let's get that before 0800 on Monday, please.

Thanks for the good, quick work this afternoon, too.

(b) (6), (b) (7)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

XO-RGV

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:11:01 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: [REDACTED]

Sir,

(b) (7)(E) has (b) (7)(E) fencing on the floodway. I don't have the exact measurement but its roughly (b) (7)(E).

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Operations Officer

RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:03 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: [REDACTED]

Did we call for any of the areas of (b) (7)(E) to have (b) (7)(E) fencing?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

XO-RGV

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 4:36:02 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)

Below and attached is the revised document with levee miles.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance | Levee Miles |
|---------|----------------|------------|-------------|
| RGC | O-1 (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2 (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |

| | | | |
|--------------|-----|------------|--------------|
| MCS | O-3 | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | (b) | | |
| MCS | (b) | | |
| MCS | (b) | | |
| WSL | (b) | | |
| WSL | (b) | | |
| WSL | (b) | | 6 |
| TOTAL | | | 40.87 |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 Operations Officer
 RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 5:30 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject:
Importance: High

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached are the Fence mileage broken down by zone. Also attached are the shapefiles to go with the tasker.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance |
|--------------|--------------|------------|
| RGC | O-1 | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2 | |
| MCS | O-3 | |
| MCS | (b) | |
| MCS | (b) | |
| MCS | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| WSL | (b) | |
| TOTAL | | (b) |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 Operations Officer
 RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --*Brian Tracy*

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Border Fence
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 5:04:14 PM

Ok cool – it isn't urgent right now anyway since we are still trying to figure out what we are doing across the SWB

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:47 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

BTW – (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) knows that he's not getting a revised metrics xls until this RGV stuff is resolved.

Thanks,

(b) (6)
[Redacted]

(b) (6)
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:45 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Agreed

Hopefully the dynamic duo can work their magic next week ☺

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:43 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) >
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Given that the “boys” are going to RGV this week to sort it out, change it up, etc; not sure it's worth doing the CSI on how it came to exist...

The meeting we had last week with RGV Sector was a joke – they pretty much started by saying “we can't change any of the locations, because it was a committee that decided where it would go”.... I believe that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) have been working Sector leadership since then.

(b) (5)

I told (b) (6), (b) (7) and (b) (6), (b) (7) – good luck!

Thanks,

(b) (6),

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:39 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

FYSA

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Business Operations

OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:33 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

No. Thanks for the heads up

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Director - Tactical Infrastructure

U. S. Border Patrol

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 11:48:14 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

This is one of the requests (b) (6) and I are trying to sort out. Did this come through you at all?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Business Operations

OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 9:20 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

PDF gives a good snapshot of Fridays changes.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Division Chief
Rio Grande Valley Sector
U.S. Border Patrol

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 8:13 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Chief,

We identified (b) (7)(E) of wall/fence that lies in conjunction with the existing levee and also includes the old O1-O3 project. The O1, O2 and O3 project totals (b) (7)(E) and is the only new wall identified in Zones (b) (7)(E). New proposed levee wall totals (b) (7)(E). The only Zone identified for (b) (7)(E) is in (b) (7)(E) which is the beginning of the floodway and is on the south levee.

*There are additional fencing requirements in the zones identified, however because they do not run in conjunction with the levee, they were not included.

| Zone Breakdown | | | |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Station | Zone | Distance (mi.) | Project |
| RGC | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | O-1 thru O-3 |
| RGC | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| RGC | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| RGC | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | Levee Proposed Wall |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| WSL | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) | |

| Project Breakdown | |
|---------------------|------------|
| O-1 | (b) (7)(E) |
| O-2 | (b) (7)(E) |
| O-3 | (b) (7)(E) |
| Total | (b) (7)(E) |
| Levee Proposed Wall | |
| Total | (b) (7)(E) |

v/r

"It is only when we become aware or are reminded that our time is limited that we can channel our energy into truly living"
- Ludovico Einaudi

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 8:09 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Ok thanks. Let's get that before 0800 on Monday, please.

Thanks for the good, quick work this afternoon, too.

(b) (6), (b) (7)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

XO-RGV

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:11:01 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE:

Sir,

(b) (7)(E) has (b) (7)(E) fencing on the floodway. I don't have the exact measurement but its roughly (b) (7)(E).

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Operations Officer

RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:03 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Did we call for any of the areas of (b) (7)(E) to have (b) (7)(E) fencing?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

XO-RGV

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 4:36:02 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 Subject: FW: Border Fence

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached is the revised document with levee miles.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance | Levee Miles |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|
| RGC | O-1/ (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2/ | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | O-3 / | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| TOTAL | | 40.87 | (b) (7)(E) |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 Operations Officer
 RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 5:30 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Border Fence
Importance: High

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached are the Fence mileage broken down by zone. Also attached are the shapefiles to go with the tasker.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance |
|---------|----------------|------------|
| RGC | O-1 (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2 | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | O-3 | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | (b) (7)(E) |

| | | |
|-------|--|------------|
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) |
|-------|--|------------|

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: Border Fence
Date: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 4:38:33 PM

FYSA

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 3:33 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

No. Thanks for the heads up

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Director - Tactical Infrastructure
U. S. Border Patrol
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 11:48:14 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

This is one of the requests (b) (6) and I are trying to sort out. Did this come through you at all?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 9:20 AM
To: [Redacted] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [Redacted] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence

PDF gives a good snapshot of Fridays changes.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Division Chief
Rio Grande Valley Sector
U.S. Border Patrol
[Redacted] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 8:13 AM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

Chief,

We identified (b) (7)(E) of wall/fence that lies in conjunction with the existing levee and also includes the old O1-O3 project. The O1, O2 and O3 project totals (b) (7)(E) and is the only new wall identified in Zones (b) (7)(E). New proposed levee wall totals (b) (7)(E). The only Zone identified for (b) (7)(E) is in (b) (7)(E), which is the beginning of the floodway and is on the south levee.

*There are additional fencing requirements in the zones identified, however because they do not run in conjunction with the levee, they were not included.

| Zone Breakdown | | | |
|----------------|------|----------------|---------------------|
| Station | Zone | Distance (mi.) | Project |
| (b) (7)(E) | | | O-1 thru O-3 |
| | | | Levee Proposed Wall |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) | |

| Project Breakdown | |
|---------------------|------------|
| O-1 | (b) (7)(E) |
| O-2 | |
| O-3 | |
| Total | (b) (7)(E) |
| Levee Proposed Wall | |
| Total | (b) (7)(E) |

v/r

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) | (A) Special Operations Supervisor | RGV Sector Technology, TI and TACCOM
4400 South Expressway 281 | Edinburg, TX 78542 | (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"It is only when we become aware or are reminded that our time is limited that we can channel our energy into truly living"
- Ludovico Einaudi

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 8:09 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: [REDACTED]

Ok thanks. Let's get that before 0800 on Monday, please.

Thanks for the good, quick work this afternoon, too.

(b) (6), (b) (7)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

XO-RGV

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:11:01 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: [REDACTED]

Sir,

(b) (7)(E) has (b) (7)(E) fencing on the floodway. I don't have the exact measurement but its roughly (b) (7)(E).

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Operations Officer

RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:03 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: [REDACTED]

Did we call for any of the areas of (b) (7)(E) to have (b) (7)(E) fencing?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

XO-RGV

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 4:36:02 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: HOW (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)

Below and attached is the revised document with levee miles.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance | Levee Miles |
|---------|----------------|------------|-------------|
| RGC | O-1 (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) | |
| RGC | O-2 | | |

| | | | |
|--------------|-----|------------|------------|
| MCS | O-3 | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | (b) (7)(E) | |
| MCS | | | |
| MCS | | | |
| WSL | | | |
| WSL | | | |
| WSL | | | |
| TOTAL | | | |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 Operations Officer
 RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --Brian Tracy

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 5:30 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Border Fence
Importance: High

DCPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Below and attached are the Fence mileage broken down by zone. Also attached are the shapefiles to go with the tasker.

| Station | Project/zone | Distance |
|--------------|------------------|------------|
| RGC | O-1/ (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | O-2/ (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | O-3 / (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | (b) (7)(E) | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | |
| MCS | | |
| WSL | | |
| WSL | | |
| WSL | | |
| TOTAL | | |

Respectfully,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
 Operations Officer
 RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." --*Brian Tracy*

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RGV Priority Segments With Land Ownership
Date: Friday, March 24, 2017 2:11:54 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[RGV_03-20-17.pdf](#)
[FW Border Fence .msg](#)
[FW Border Fence .msg](#)

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 4:41 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Ok, this is a complicated story.
I'm going to give you all the details here so that you can decide on a course of action and tell us how we can help.

I received two emails with RGV data (both attached):
Email from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on Friday with GIS data and a table – the table information is NOT the same as the GIS data.
Email from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) today with the same GIS, a table, and a map – the table in this email DOES match the GIS data.

So – attached are maps that show the GIS data and the table from the second email (also shown below).
We have no idea on the source of data for table in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) email. Please don't use that data.

These maps are not for distribution.
They provide a visual of the data for your understanding.
If you want maps that you can send out, please let me know and I will reformat with our FOIA, Legend, Date, tracking info, etc.

Here's what you can see:

Yellow with labels = RGV-proposed alignments highlighted as per the table. The labels are either O-X or Zone X as in the table.

Green = other RGV-proposed fence locations that are not called out

Green polygons = Federal Land (it's all National Wildlife Refuge)

Orange = RGV-proposed secondary fence (b) (5)

Black lines that look like train tracks = levee (start on page 4)

We have also added the Station names and the Zone numbers (they are kind of hard to see).

As with all our PDFs, the data are divided into layers. You can expand the layer menu on the left side, and use the eye icon to turn things on and off.

For the record:

(b) (7)(E) O-1
O-2
(b) (7)(E) O-3

Their mileages for these segments match ours.

Again – please don't redistribute, these maps would qualify as "embarrassing."

| Zone Breakdown | | | | Project Breakdown | | |
|----------------|------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Station | Zone | Distance (mi.) | Project | | | |
| RGC | (b) (7)(E) | | O-1 thru O-3 | O-1 | | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | | | | O-2 | | |
| RGC | | | | O-3 | | |
| RGC | | | | Total | | |
| MCS | | | | | Levee Proposed Wall | |
| MCS | | | Levee Proposed Wall | Total | | (b) (7)(E) |
| MCS | | | | | | |
| WSL | | | | | | |
| WSL | | | | | | |
| WSL | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | |

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 1:03 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

(b) (5)

That may only make sense to me, but there you have it.

We are creating a map of the information provided below so that you can see it, and use it this week.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:48 PM

To: (b) (6)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

Importance: High

(b) (6) – See the attached. Can the Baker team lay this GIS info into a map we can look at of RGV quickly on Monday? It doesn't have to be pretty right away, just viewable.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Border Fence
Date: Friday, March 24, 2017 12:18:46 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[RGV_03-20-17.pdf](#)
[FW Border Fence .msg](#)
[FW Border Fence .msg](#)

Please see this part:

For the record:

(b) (7)(E) = O-1
= O-2
(b) (7)(E) = O-3

Their mileages for these segments match ours.

I'm going to give you a table that shows our GIS miles for the segments listed in the table below.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2017 9:44 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Resending so that we have this archived with the correct email attachments.

I'm going to give this to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) also.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 4:41 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) >
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Ok, this is a complicated story.

I'm going to give you all the details here so that you can decide on a course of action and tell us how we can help.

I received two emails with RGV data (both attached):

Email from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on Friday with GIS data and a table – the table information is NOT the same as the GIS data.

Email from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) today with the same GIS, a table, and a map – the table in this email DOES match the GIS data.

So – attached are maps that show the GIS data and the table from the second email (also shown below). We have no idea on the source of data for table in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) email. Please don't use that data.

These maps are not for distribution.

They provide a visual of the data for your understanding.

If you want maps that you can send out, please let me know and I will reformat with our FOIA, Legend, Date, tracking info, etc.

Here's what you can see:

Yellow with labels = RGV-proposed alignments highlighted as per the table. The labels are either O-X or Zone X as in the table.

Green = other RGV-proposed fence locations that are not called out

Green polygons = Federal Land (it's all National Wildlife Refuge)

Orange = RGV-proposed secondary fence (b) (5)

Black lines that look like train tracks = levee (start on page 4)

We have also added the Station names and the Zone numbers (they are kind of hard to see).

As with all our PDFs, the data are divided into layers. You can expand the layer menu on the left side, and use the eye icon to turn things on and off.

For the record:

(b) (7)(E) = O-1

= O-2

(b) (7)(E) = O-3

Their mileages for these segments match ours.

Again – please don't redistribute, these maps would qualify as "embarrassing."

| Zone Breakdown | | | | Project Breakdown | |
|----------------|------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Station | Zone | Distance (mi.) | Project | | |
| RGC | (b) (7)(E) | | O-1 thru O-3 | O-1 | (b) (7)(E) |
| RGC | | | | O-2 | |
| RGC | | | | O-3 | |
| RGC | | | | Total | |
| MCS | | | | | |
| MCS | | | Levee Proposed Wall | Levee Proposed Wall | |
| MCS | | | | Total | (b) (7)(E) |
| WSL | | | | | |
| WSL | | | | | |
| WSL | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | (b) (7)(E) | | | |

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)

Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 1:03 PM

To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) >

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence



That may only make sense to me, but there you have it.

We are creating a map of the information provided below so that you can see it, and use it this week.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 6:48 PM

To: (b) (6)

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Border Fence

Importance: High

(b) (6) – See the attached. Can the Baker team lay this GIS info into a map we can look at of RGV quickly on Monday? It doesn't have to be pretty right away, just viewable.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Thursday, 04/20/17 - IBWC Meeting - FINAL MATERIALS
Date: Wednesday, April 19, 2017 11:08:14 AM
Attachments: [CBP & IBWC Meeting Agenda FINAL 042017.doc](#)
[CBP-IBWC Border Wall System Brief FINAL.ppt](#)
[MR 394 FY 17 in RGV v6.pdf](#)
Importance: High

(b) (6), (b) (7) & Team –

Attached are the final materials for the IBWC meeting tomorrow. I will send the agenda (minor tweaks) to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) but will NOT send the presentation or maps. My understanding is that they will be displayed via projector.

Big thank you to everyone for the help with this!

Thanks,

(b) (6),

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), BPAM Communications

Kearns & West supporting
OFAM/FM&E/BPAM

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection



**U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) &
U.S. International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC)
Rio Grande Valley (RGV) Border Wall System/Enforcement Zone Project**

Thursday, April 20, 2017

9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

IBWC Headquarter: 4171 N. Mesa St., El Paso, TX 79902

AGENDA:

- 8:45 – 9:00** **IBWC Starts Conference Line**
- **(b) (7)(E)** Conference code: **(b) (7)(E)**
- 9:00 – 9:15** **CBP: Border Wall System Program Background**
- Executive Order
 - U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) RGV FY17
- 9:15 – 9:45** **CBP: Border Wall System Project Overview**
- Location, Scope, & Anticipated Schedule
 - Planning Activities (Real Estate/Records Property Research)
- 9:45 – 10:15** **CBP, IBWC, & USACE: Project Coordination**
- Floodplain Issues
 - Update Memorandum of Agreement
 - Roles & Responsibilities
 - Communications Path Forward
- 10:15 – 10:45** **IBWC Questions & Concerns**
- 10:45 – 11:00** **CBP: Action Items & Next Steps**



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection



CBP Attendees:

- (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Director, Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office (BPAM PMO)
- (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Chief Engineer, BPAM PMO
- (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) USBP RGV Sector

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Attendees:

- (b) (6) Director, Regional Planning and Environmental Center
- (b) (6) Executive Liaison

IBWC Attendees:

- (b) (6), Chief, Environmental Management Division
- (b) (6), Lead Hydraulic Engineer, Engineering Services Division
- (b) (6), Chief, Construction within the Engineering Services Division
- (b) (6), Realty Specialist
- (b) (6), Chief, Security and Safety Division
- (b) (6), Chief, Operations & Maintenance
- (b) (6), Chief, Legal
- (b) (6), Supervisory Civil Engineer, Engineering Services Division
- (b) (6), Chief, Boundary & Realty

CBP Enterprise Services

Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Rio Grande Valley (RGV) Border Wall System

Border Patrol and Air & Marine Program Management Office

April 20, 2017



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection



RGV Border Wall System Program



RGV Border Wall System Program Background



In response to *Executive Order (EO) 13767: Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements*, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) is beginning the process to acquire land and conduct environmental consultation activities for the construction of the border wall/enforcement zone.

Program Justification: EO – Sections 2 & 4

- *Sec. 2. Policy. It is the policy of the executive branch to:*
 - (a) *secure the southern border of the United States through the immediate construction of a physical wall on the southern border, monitored and supported by adequate personnel so as to prevent illegal immigration, drug and human trafficking, and acts of terrorism;*
- *Sec. 4. Physical Security of the Southern Border of the United States. The Secretary shall immediately take the following steps to obtain complete operational control, as determined by the Secretary, of the southern border:*
 - (a) *In accordance with existing law, including the Secure Fence Act and IIRIRA, take all appropriate steps to immediately plan, design, and construct a physical wall along the southern border, using appropriate materials and technology to most effectively achieve complete operational control of the southern border;*
 - (b) *Identify and, to the extent permitted by law, allocate all sources of Federal funds for the planning, designing, and constructing of a physical wall along the southern border;*
 - (c) *Project and develop long-term funding requirements for the wall, including preparing Congressional budget requests for the current and upcoming fiscal years;*



RGV Border Wall System Program Background



- ❑ WHO? CBP (Border Patrol and Air & Marine Program Management Office – BPAM PMO), U.S. Border Patrol (USBP), and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

- ❑ WHAT? Construct approximately (b) (7)(E) of border/levee wall system in the USBP Rio Grande Valley (RGV) Sector

What is a border/levee wall system? A border wall system is a comprehensive solution that includes a combination of various types of infrastructure such as wall, fence, lighting, (b) (7)(E) and other related technology, and all-weather roads, which provide persistent impedance and facilitate the deterrence and prevention of successful entries.

- ❑ WHERE? (b) (7)(E) of levee wall within the McAllen Border Patrol Station (BPS) and Weslaco BPS areas of responsibilities (AOR) and (b) (7)(E) of border barrier within the Rio Grande City BPS AOR

- ❑ WHEN? Contract awards starting in **FY2017**

- ❑ WHY? President’s Executive Order and at the direction of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary John Kelly

RGV Border Wall System Project



RGV Border Wall System Project Overview

Initial RGV Border Wall System/Enforcement Zone Project

- ❑ The first construction project is approximately (b) (7)(E) of levee wall and border enforcement zone within the Weslaco BPS AOR.
- ❑ The project alignment will be on the south toe of the north U.S. International Boundary Water Commission (IBWC) levee along maintenance road.
- ❑ The project is to be a hybrid design bid build and design build construction project under the USACE's existing unrestricted horizontal Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC).

Approach:

- ❑ CBP anticipates completing this project in two phases:

Phase 1: Construction of a reinforced concrete levee wall with (b) (7)(E) enforcement zone including vegetation removal, (b) (7)(E), enforcement zone lighting, and a patrol road on the river side of the levee and parallel to the levee wall.

Phase 2: Construction of (b) (7)(E), within the (b) (7)(E) enforcement zone.

What is a border enforcement zone? A border enforcement zone is an engineered system of critical enforcement components that include the wall and/or border barriers, lights, (b) (7)(E) and an all-weather road to facilitate proactive and concentrated patrol efforts. This system of capabilities runs concurrently with and parallel to the wall throughout the project area.



RGV Border Wall System Conceptual Drawing




(b) (5), (b) (7)(E)



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

BW11 FOIA CBP 005972

RGV Border Wall System Initial Construction Location



Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV

April 17, 2017




U.S. Customs and Border Protection

BW11 FOIA CBP 005973

RGV Border Wall System Locations



RGV Border Wall System Locations




Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV

April 17, 2017



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

RGV Border Wall System Locations



Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV


April 17, 2017



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

BW11 FOIA CBP 005976

RGV Border Wall System Locations



Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV


April 17, 2017



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

BW11 FOIA CBP 005977

RGV Border Wall System Locations




Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV

April 17, 2017



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

RGV Border Wall System Locations




Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

April 17, 2017

BW11 FOIA CBP 005979

RGV Border Wall System Locations



Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV


April 17, 2017



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

BW11 FOIA CBP 005980

RGV Border Wall System Locations



Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

April 17, 2017

BW11 FOIA CBP 005981

RGV Border Wall System Project Coordination



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

RGV Border Wall System Project Coordination

Floodplain Issues

Update Memorandum of Agreement

Roles & Responsibilities

- BPAM PMO
- USACE
- IBWC

Communications Path Forward

- BPAM PMO points of contact (POC)
- USBP RGV Sector POCs
- USACE POCs
- IBWC POCs
- Program & project execution communications process
- Communication with other DHS & CBP components (Science & Technology Directorate, etc.)
- External requests for information (media, FOIA, Congress, etc.) process



Follow-Up Questions



Rio Grande City Station - Zone (b) (7)(E)


(b) (7)(E), (b) (5)

LEGEND

- |||| IBWC Levees
- █ Proposed Barrier
- █ Existing Pedestrian Fence
- █ Real Estate Green/Env Green Roads
- █ Real Estate Green/Env Red Roads
- █ Real Estate Red/Env Green Roads
- █ Real Estate Red/Env Red Roads
- Other Roads
- ⊕ USBP Station Zones
- ⊕ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Land

**If sheet measures less than 11x17" it is a reduced print.
Reduce scale accordingly.*

1 in = 0.5 mi 1:31,680



Michael Baker
INTERNATIONAL

WARNING: This document is **FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (FOUO)**. It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). It is to be controlled, stored, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to FOUO information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid "need-to-know" without prior approval of an authorized DHS official.

BW11 FOIA CBP 005985

(b) (7)(E), (b) (5)

LEGEND

- |||| IBWC Levees
- █ Proposed Barrier
- █ Existing Pedestrian Fence
- █ Real Estate Green/Env Green Roads
- █ Real Estate Green/Env Red Roads
- █ Real Estate Red/Env Green Roads
- █ Real Estate Red/Env Red Roads
- Other Roads
- ⊕ USBP Station Zones
- ⊕ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Land

**If sheet measures less than 11x17" it is a reduced print.
Reduce scale accordingly.*

1 in = 0.5 mi 1:31,680



Michael Baker
INTERNATIONAL

WARNING: This document is **FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (FOUO)**. It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). It is to be controlled, stored, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to FOUO information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid "need-to-know" without prior approval of an authorized DHS official.

BW11 FOIA CBP 005986

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: DOI and USFWS Agenda and Briefing
Date: Wednesday, April 26, 2017 9:41:54 AM
Attachments: [CBP USFWS Border Wall System Brief_04_25_17.ppt](#)
[CBP DOI Border Wall System Brief 04_25_17.ppt](#)
[CBP USFWS Meeting Agenda 42517.doc](#)
[CBP DOI Meeting Agenda 042517.doc](#)
[DOI-USFW Meeting Talking Points.docx](#)

Good morning,

Attached are the final decks and agendas that are being used this morning and tomorrow for the outreach meetings with DOI and USFWS.

Also attached are the approved talking points that may be used. The intention is that these meetings will not go to this level of detail, but we have these for our internal use as well.

Please do not send these to anyone outside of this group at this point.

Thanks-

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Program Information Specialist, Business Operations Division
E3 Federal Solutions
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office (BPAM PMO)
Facilities Management & Engineering

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CBP Enterprise Services

Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Rio Grande Valley (RGV) Border Wall System

Border Patrol and Air & Marine Program Management Office

April 27, 2017



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection



RGV Border Wall System Program



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

RGV Border Wall System Program Background

In response to *Executive Order (EO) 13767: Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements*, and to meet U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) operational requirements, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) has begun the process to acquire land and conduct environmental consultation activities for the construction of the border/levee wall system/enforcement zone.

Program Justification: EO – Sections 2 & 4

- *Sec. 2. Policy. It is the policy of the executive branch to:*
 - (a) *secure the southern border of the United States through the immediate construction of a physical wall on the southern border, monitored and supported by adequate personnel so as to prevent illegal immigration, drug and human trafficking, and acts of terrorism;*
- *Sec. 4. Physical Security of the Southern Border of the United States. The Secretary shall immediately take the following steps to obtain complete operational control, as determined by the Secretary, of the southern border:*
 - (a) *In accordance with existing law, including the Secure Fence Act and IIRIRA, take all appropriate steps to immediately plan, design, and construct a physical wall along the southern border, using appropriate materials and technology to most effectively achieve complete operational control of the southern border;*
 - (c) *Project and develop long-term funding requirements for the wall, including preparing Congressional budget requests for the current and upcoming fiscal years;*

We will balance administration priorities with Border Patrol requirements to determine Wall design and locations.



RGV Border Wall System Program Background

- ❑ WHO? CBP (Border Patrol and Air & Marine Program Management Office – BPAM PMO), USBP, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

- ❑ WHAT? Construct approximately **(b) (7)(E)** of border/levee wall system in the USBP Rio Grande Valley (RGV) Sector

What is a border/levee wall system? *A border/levee wall system is a comprehensive solution that includes a combination of various types of infrastructure such as wall, fence, lighting, **(b) (7)(E)** and other related technology, and all-weather roads, which provide persistent impedance and facilitate the deterrence and prevention of successful entries.*

- ❑ WHERE? **(b) (7)(E)** of levee wall within the McAllen Border Patrol Station (BPS) and Weslaco BPS areas of responsibilities (AOR) and **(b) (7)(E)** of border wall within the Rio Grande City BPS AOR

- ❑ WHEN? Contract awards starting in **FY2017**

- ❑ WHY? President’s Executive Order and at the direction of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary John Kelly , USBP operational requirements

RGV Border Wall System Project



RGV Border Wall System Project Overview

Initial RGV Border Wall/Levee System/Enforcement Zone Project

- ❑ The first construction project is approximately (b) (7)(E) of levee wall and border enforcement zone within the Weslaco BPS AOR.
- ❑ The project alignment will be on the south toe of the north U.S. International Boundary Water Commission (IBWC) levee along maintenance road.
- ❑ The project is to be a hybrid design bid build and design build construction project under the USACE's existing unrestricted horizontal Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC).

Approach:

- ❑ CBP anticipates completing this project in two phases:

Phase 1: Construction of a reinforced concrete levee wall with (b) (7)(E) enforcement zone including (b) (7)(E), vegetation removal, system, enforcement zone lighting, and a patrol road on the river side of the levee and parallel to the levee wall.

Phase 2: Construction of (b) (7)(E), within the (b) (7)(E) enforcement zone.

What is a border enforcement zone? A border enforcement zone is an engineered system of critical enforcement components that include the wall and/or border barriers, lights, (b) (7)(E), (b) (7)(E) and an all-weather road to facilitate proactive and concentrated patrol efforts. This system of capabilities runs concurrently with and parallel to the wall throughout the project area.



RGV Border Wall System Conceptual Drawing

- A: Maintenance Road
- B: (b) (7)(E)
- C: Light Tower
- D: All Weather Road
- E: Border Wall
- F: Vehicle Gate
- G: Pedestrian Gate

(b) (5)




RGV Border Wall System Conceptual Drawing



Capabilities of *Impedance and Denial, Domain Awareness, & Access and Mobility* Strategically Concentrated as an Enforcement System to Prevent and Deter Entry

- A: (b) (7)(E)
- (b) (7)(E)
- B: Levee Road
- C: Border Wall
- D: All-Weather Road
- E: Lights (b) (7)(E)
- F: (b) (7)(E)



RGV Border Wall System Conceptual Drawing

Capabilities of *Impedance and Denial, Domain Awareness, & Access and Mobility*
Strategically Concentrated as an Enforcement System to Prevent and Deter Entry

A: (b) (7)(E)

(b) (7)(E)

B: Levee Road

C: Border Wall

D: All-Weather
Road

E: Lights (b) (7)(E)

F: (b) (7)(E)


(b) (5)



RGV Border Wall System Conceptual Drawing

Capabilities of *Impedance and Denial, Domain Awareness, & Access and Mobility*
Strategically Concentrated as an Enforcement System to Prevent and Deter Entry.


- A: (b) (7)(E)
- (b) (7)(E)
- B: Border Wall
- C: Lights (b) (7)(E)
- D: (b) (7)(E)



RGV Border Wall System Locations



RGV Border Wall System Locations



Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV


April 17, 2017



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

BW11 FOIA CBP 005999

RGV Border Wall System Locations




Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV

April 17, 2017



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

RGV Border Wall System Locations




Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV

April 17, 2017



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

RGV Border Wall System Locations




Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV

April 17, 2017



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

RGV Border Wall System Locations




Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV

April 17, 2017



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

RGV Border Wall System Initial Construction Location




Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV

April 17, 2017



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

RGV Border Wall System Locations



Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV


April 17, 2017



U.S. Customs and Border Protection

BW11 FOIA CBP 006005

RGV Border Wall System Locations



Map Request 394 - FY17 Proposed Barrier RGV

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

April 17, 2017

BW11 FOIA CBP 006006

RGV Border Wall System Project Coordination



RGV Border Wall System Project Coordination

- ❑ **Recap of Meeting with DOI**
- ❑ **Project Coordination Process**
- ❑ **Current Efforts**
- ❑ **Benefits of Border Wall System**
- ❑ **Communications Path Forward**
 - BPAM PMO points of contact (POC)
 - USBP RGV Sector POCs
 - DOI POCs
 - USFWS POCs
 - Program & project execution communications process
 - Communication with other DHS & CBP components (Science & Technology Directorate, etc.)
 - External requests for information (media, FOIA, Congress, etc.) process



Environmental Impact



Debris and damage found in Los Velas Refuge near Hidalgo, TX due to cross-border activity



U.S. Customs and Border Protection