

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

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 4:04 PM
Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: Re: CATEX for GSA site next to Otay Mesa POE

Any CATEX needs to reference access to border road and not mention prototypes

Sent using OWA for iPhone

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 4:00:37 PM
Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: Re: CATEX for GSA site next to Otay Mesa POE

(b)(6)(b)(7)(C) probably has info regarding the potential waiver. Issue is I need to do some work in prep on this site before prototypes

Sent using OWA for iPhone

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 3:18:45 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: CATEX for GSA site next to Otay Mesa POE

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

There is much that can be recycled from the Tent Cities CATEX. I have all the backup material that was mined in preparation for the CATEX. I am sure that (b)(6)(b)(7)(C) is quite familiar with the site, and may have gone to it when the last survey for burrowing owls was performed.

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the EEMD liaison to FOF, and I had a discussion about the NEPA requirements for the fence prototypes. He has suggested that CATEX B9 might be most suitable:

*B9 Acquisition, installation, operation, or evaluation of physical security devices, or controls to enhance the physical security of existing critical assets and the eventual removal and disposal of that equipment in compliance with applicable requirements to protect the environment. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Motion detection systems,
- (b) Use of temporary barriers, fences, and jersey walls on or adjacent to existing facilities or on land that has already been disturbed or built upon,
- (c) Impact resistant doors and gates,
- (d) X-ray units,
- (e) Remote video surveillance systems,
- (f) Diver/swimmer detection systems, except sonar,
- (g) Blast/shock impact-resistant systems for land based and waterfront facilities,
- (h) Column and surface wraps, and
- (i) Breakage/shatter-resistant glass.

Coordination with the CA SHPO will be required, but we think they will be able to respond very quickly (<week). The site was surveyed for archaeology in 2009, and nothing was found. We used the "credible threat" clause in the SW Border

PA for the tent cities, and are preparing the after action report now. (b)(6)(b)(7)(C) has a good relationship with the CA SHPO, and has coordinated numerous projects with them, and she is available to lend a hand.

Let us know how we can assist BPAM.

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

(contractor)

PRIMCORP, LLC

in support of

Field Operations Facilities Program Management Office

U.S. Customs and Border Protection

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

Washington, DC 20229-1400

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

mobile
office
facsimile



Every Day is Earth Day

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

~~IMPORTANT NOTICE: This information is the property of the Department of Homeland Security and may contain sensitive data that is confidential or proprietary. If you have received this email in error, please notify the originator immediately. Your assistance is appreciated.~~

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

Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 1:41 PM

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

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

Subject: CATEX for GSA site next to Otay Mesa POE

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

I tried calling but went to VM. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had copied me on a portion of the CATEX for the Otay Mesa Port Tent City. I believe this could satisfy the need for GSA regarding BPAM using the property for access to the Wall Prototype site. Can you take a look at it and let me know? What we want to do is basically some minor smoothing, compacting and bring in some material to support vehicle traffic through here during the construction period.

thanks

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

LMI

7940 Jones Branch Drive

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

Complex Problems. Practical Solutions.

www.lmi.org