Engineering and Construction Support Office

Environmental Assessment for the Installation of 4.2 miles of Pedestrian Fence along the International Border near Lukeville, Arizona, Office of Border Patrol Tucson Sector, Arizona

National Park Service
ATTN: Ms. Kathy Billings
Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument
10 Organ Pipe Drive
Ajo, AZ 85321

Dear Ms. Billings:

While no final decisions on the fence locations have been made, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District (USACE) on behalf of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) intends to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) to address the feasibility of installing and maintaining 4.2 miles of barrier fence.

Based on congressional and executive mandates, CBP is assessing operational requirements and land issues along the entire Southwest border. Preparing the EA does not necessarily mean the 4.2 miles of barrier fence will be installed. This effort is a prudent part of the planning process needed to assess any environmental concerns.

This potential project would consist of replacing 4.2 miles of vehicle barriers with border fence. The construction footprint for this potential project would encompass the entire Roosevelt Reservation (80 feet from the U.S.-Mexico border north). The proposed border fence would begin 2.1 miles west of the Lukeville Port of Entry and extend eastward along the U.S. – Mexico border for 4.2 miles. Attached is a portion of the Lukeville 7.5 minute U.S.G.S. quadrangle, which identifies the possible project site.

We are currently in the process of gathering the most current information available regarding Federally and state listed species, cultural resources, and sensitive and unique areas occurring within the potential project area. We respectfully request that your agency provide any information regarding those resources and/or issues that you believe may be affected.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. If you have any
questions, please call Mr. Charles McGregor of my staff at (817) 886-1585 or Assistant
Chief Patrol Agent Craig L. Weinbrenner at the Office of Border Patrol Tucson Sector at
(520) 748-3000

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Eric W. Verwers
Director, Engineering and
Construction Support Office
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
FORT WORTH DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P. O. BOX 17300
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76102-0300

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF: 

June 4, 2007

Engineering and Construction Support Office

Environmental Assessment for the Installation of 4.2 miles of Pedestrian Fence along the International Border near Lukeville, Arizona, Office of Border Patrol Tucson Sector, Arizona

Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge
ATTN: Mr. Roger DiRosa, Refuge Manager
1611 N. Second Ave
Ajo, AZ 85321

Dear Mr. DiRosa:

While no final decisions on the fence locations have been made, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District (USACE) on behalf of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) intends to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) to address the feasibility of installing and maintaining 4.2 miles of border barrier fence.

Based on congressional and executive mandates, CBP is assessing operational requirements and land issues along the entire Southwest border. Preparing the EA does not necessarily mean the 4.2 miles of barrier fence will be installed. This effort is a prudent part of the planning process needed to assess any environmental concerns.

This potential project would consist of replacing 4.2 miles of vehicle barriers with border fence. The construction footprint for this potential project would encompass the entire Roosevelt Reservation (60 feet from the U.S.-Mexico border north). The proposed border fence would begin 2.1 miles west of the Lukeville Port of Entry and extend eastward along the U.S. – Mexico border for 4.2 miles. Attached is a portion of the Lukeville 7.5 minute U.S.G.S. quadrangle, which identifies the possible project site.

We are currently in the process of gathering the most current information available regarding Federally and state listed species, cultural resources, and sensitive and unique areas occurring within the potential project area. We respectfully request that your agency provide any information regarding those resources and/or issues that you believe may be affected.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. If you have any
questions, please call Mr. Charles McGregor of my staff at (817) 886-1585 or Assistant Chief Patrol Agent Craig L. Weinbrenner at the Office of Border Patrol Tucson Sector at (520) 748-3000

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Eric W. Verwers
Director, Engineering and Construction Support Office
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
FORT WORTH DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
P. O. BOX 17300  
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 78102-0300  

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF  
June 4, 2007  

Engineering and Construction Support Office  

Environmental Assessment for the Installation of 4.2 miles of Pedestrian Fence along the International Border near Lukeville, Arizona, Office of Border Patrol Tucson Sector, Arizona  

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
ATTN: Mr. Steve Spangle  
Arizona Ecological Services  
2321 W. Royal Palm Road, Suite 103  
Phoenix, AZ 85021  

Dear Mr. Spangle:  

While no final decisions on the fence locations have been made, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District (USACE) on behalf of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) intends to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) to address the feasibility of installing and maintaining 4.2 miles of barrier fence.  

Based on congressional and executive mandates, CBP is assessing operational requirements and land issues along the entire Southwest border. Preparing the EA does not necessarily mean the 4.2 miles of barrier fence will be installed. This effort is a prudent part of the planning process needed to assess any environmental concerns.  

This potential project would consist of replacing 4.2 miles of vehicle barriers with border fence. The construction footprint for this potential project would encompass the entire Roosevelt Reservation (60 feet from the U.S.-Mexico border north). The proposed border fence would begin 2.1 miles west of the Lukeville Port of Entry and extend eastward along the U.S. – Mexico border for 4.2 miles. Attached is a portion of the Lukeville 7.5 minute U.S.G.S. quadrangle, which identifies the possible project site.  

We are currently in the process of gathering the most current information available regarding Federally and state listed species, cultural resources, and sensitive and unique areas occurring within the potential project area. We respectfully request that your agency provide any information regarding those resources and/or issues that you believe may be affected.  

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. If you have any
questions, please call Mr. Charles McGregor of my staff at (817) 888-1585 or Assistant Chief Patrol Agent Craig L. Weinbrener at the Office of Border Patrol Tucson Sector at (520) 748-3000

Sincerely,

Eric W. Verwers
Director, Engineering and
Construction Support Office
APPENDIX D
Air Quality Calculations
### Assumptions for Cumbustable Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Construction Equipment</th>
<th>Num. of Units</th>
<th>HP Rated</th>
<th>Hrs/day</th>
<th>Days/yr</th>
<th>Total hp-hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Truck</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>864000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Road Compactors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Dump Truck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Excavator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Hole Cleaners/Trenchers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>504000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Bore/Drill Rigs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>864000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Cement &amp; Mortar Mixers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>864000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Cranes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>504000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Graders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>288000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Bull Dozers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>864000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Front End Loaders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>864000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Fork Lifts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>432000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Generator Set</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>345600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emission Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Construction Equipment</th>
<th>VOC g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO g/hp-hr</th>
<th>NOx g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM-10 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>PM-2.5 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>SO2 g/hp-hr</th>
<th>CO2 g/hp-hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Truck</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>5.490</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>536.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Road Compactors</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>1.480</td>
<td>4.900</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>536.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Dump Truck</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>5.490</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>536.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Excavator</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>536.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Trenchers</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>2.440</td>
<td>5.810</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>535.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Bore/Drill Rigs</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>2.290</td>
<td>7.150</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>529.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Cement &amp; Mortar Mixers</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>2.320</td>
<td>7.280</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>529.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Cranes</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>5.720</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>530.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Graders</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>4.730</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>536.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>8.210</td>
<td>7.220</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>1.330</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>691.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Bull Dozers</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>4.760</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>536.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Front End Loaders</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>536.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Fork Lifts</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>7.760</td>
<td>8.560</td>
<td>1.390</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>690.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Generator Set</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>3.760</td>
<td>5.970</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>587.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emission factors (EF) were generated from the NONROAD2005 model for the 2006 calendar year. The VOC EFs includes exhaust and evaporative emissions. The VOC evaporative components included in the NONROAD2005 model are diurnal, hotsoak, running loss, tank permeation, hose permeation, displacement, and spillage. The construction equipment age distribution in the NONROAD2005 model is based on the population in U.S. for the 2006 calendar year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Construction Equipment</th>
<th>VOC tons/yr</th>
<th>CO tons/yr</th>
<th>NOx tons/yr</th>
<th>PM-10 tons/yr</th>
<th>PM-2.5 tons/yr</th>
<th>SO2 tons/yr</th>
<th>CO2 tons/yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Truck</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>1.971</td>
<td>5.227</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>510.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Road Paver</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Dump Truck</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Excavator</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Hole Cleaners\Trenchers</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>3.227</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>297.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Bore/Drill Rigs</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>2.180</td>
<td>6.808</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>504.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Cement &amp; Mortar Mixers</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>2.209</td>
<td>6.931</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>504.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Cranes</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>3.177</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>294.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Graders</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.291</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>219.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Bull Dozers</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>4.532</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>510.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Front End Loaders</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>4.761</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>510.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Aerial Lifts</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>3.694</td>
<td>4.075</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>328.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Generator Set</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>2.274</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>223.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Emissions</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.794</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.959</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.303</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.790</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.686</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.383</strong></td>
<td><strong>3904.125</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversion factors

<p>| Grams to tons | 1.102E-06 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>PM-10</th>
<th>PM-2.5</th>
<th>SO₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combustable Emissions</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>43.30</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Site-fugitive PM-10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Workers Commuter &amp; Trucking</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total emissions</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>23.49</td>
<td>43.93</td>
<td>32.92</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De minimis threshold</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Construction Worker Personal Vehicle Commuting to Construction Sight - Passenger and Light Duty Trucks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutants</th>
<th>Emission Factors</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Results by Pollutant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Cars g/mile</td>
<td>Pick-up Trucks, SUVs g/mile</td>
<td>Mile/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCs</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM-10</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.5</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Heavy Duty Trucks Delivery Supply Trucks to Construction Sight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutants</th>
<th>Emission Factors</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Results by Pollutant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000-19,500 lb Delivery Truck</td>
<td>33,000-60,000 lb semi trailer rig</td>
<td>Mile/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCs</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM-10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.5</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OBP Commute to New Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutants</th>
<th>Emission Factors</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Results by Pollutant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Cars g/mile</td>
<td>Pick-up Trucks, SUVs g/mile</td>
<td>Mile/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCs</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM-10</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>0.0065</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2.5</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fleet Characterization: 20 POVs commuting to work were 50% are pick up trucks and 50% passenger cars.
| Conversion factor: gms to tons | 0.000001102 |
### Fugitive Dust Emissions at New Construction Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Site</th>
<th>Emission Factor (tons/acre/month)</th>
<th>Total Area-Construction Site/month</th>
<th>Months/yr</th>
<th>Total PM-10 Emissions (tons/yr)</th>
<th>Total PM-2.5 (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust Emissions</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>37.82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. 20% of the total PM-10 emissions are PM-2.5 (EPA 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Construction Area</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>37.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction Area</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37.82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversion Factors</th>
<th>Feet to Miles</th>
<th>Acres to sq ft</th>
<th>Sq ft to acres</th>
<th>Sq ft in 0.5 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5280</td>
<td>0.000022957</td>
<td>43560</td>
<td>21780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Sections/day</th>
<th>Length of Section (ft)</th>
<th>Length/day (ft)</th>
<th>Days/yr</th>
<th>Length/yr (ft)</th>
<th>Miles/yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fencing installed per day (ft)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>63800</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Sections/day</th>
<th>Length of Section (ft)</th>
<th>Length/day (ft)</th>
<th>Days/Month</th>
<th>Length/Month (ft)</th>
<th>Miles/Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fencing installed per day (ft)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5280</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of fence/yr (miles)</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ok, this time for real. Can you get [redacted] to look at this please?

Director, Business Operations Division
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
Mobile: [redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 3:55 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Answer #3 RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

Agreed [redacted] last version appears to be clear on the fed lands and RR.

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 12:53 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Answer #3 RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

Thanks [redacted] I think it makes more sense now.

Chief, Portfolio Management and Analysis (PMA) Branch
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Mobile: [redacted]
Office: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Answer #3 RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

(b) (5)

Correct me if I am wrong.

How about this:

(b) (5)

Director, Business Operations Division
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
Mobile: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 12:20 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Answer #3 RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

Please read my note I just sent, and then decide if it's ready...

v/r
[b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 3:19 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Answer #3 RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

To keep it simple suggest deleting what is in red.

[b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
good to go?

[b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
one more for him to look at please.

[b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Director, Business Operations Division
Simplified answer:

(b) (5)

Chief, Portfolio Management and Analysis (PMA) Branch
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Mobile: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Office: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 10:09 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: Answer #3 RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

I think we are still on the hook to tackle our #3, which is their #11 from the larger list of questions – see attached.

My advice is to say something like the following:

(b) (5)
v/r
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 10:40 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

So no need to respond to 3#?

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Chief, Portfolio Management and Analysis (PMA) Branch
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Mobile: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Office: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 9:39 AM
Great, thank you.

Will send this response up.

Looks like we’re only on the hook for the IBWC question? I believe OCC is working the RE responses, I forwarded them what I had so far below. Below is a draft response for the IBWC question.

Thanks,

1. (b) (5)
(b) (5)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 8:55 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

I said for #4, I meant #2.

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 8:48:50 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

for #4, we have that 2-page white paper I prepared, since they're asking for something nlt today, do you want that or something like it? I mean they're asking an extremely broad multi-layered question including - what's the process, how long does it take, why does it take so long, etc.

Alternatively, I can try to keep it at even a higher level, but by the way their question was phrased, I'm sure they don't understand RE at all nor do they know that condemnation is needed to clear title even if price is agreed. The white paper explains all that...I just need to review it and tailor it a bit, and it shouldn't take long for OCC to exit it since they've done so once already.

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, May 29, 2017 8:04:49 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

Hi all –

Looks like we need to get these answered asap (sorry, I hate that too) – hoping this isn’t a big lift. Can we target 10 am Tuesday?

Can you take #1? The answer is no – no issues and we can highlight our past meeting and upcoming one as well.

Can you take #2 and #4? I know these answers can be lengthy, but let’s try to keep it as
straightforward as possible.

BusOps can take #3 – I think we have that answer already (can you confirm)?

1. (b) (5)

2. (b) (5)

3. (b) (5)

4. (b) (5)

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

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 1:10 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

SCOTT A (USBP) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
LUCK,

Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

ATTOOREY-CLINT PRIVILEGED/ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

This communication might contain communications between attorney and client, communications that are part of the agency deliberative process, or attorney work product, all of which are privileged and not subject to disclosure outside the agency or to the public. Please consult with the Office of Chief Counsel, U.S. Customs and Border Protection before disclosing any information contained in this email.

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 12:31 PM
To: CALVO, KARL H. [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

Karl – we will need to loop in OCC for confirmation.
All: Rather than trying to coordinate a call with multiple parties on a Friday before the holiday weekend, I’m attempting to explain what is needed via email. Below I’ve highlighted those questions from the Domestic Policy Council (DPC) that we need to pull together input from your offices. The highlighted sections are assigned to various offices (either USBP, OCC, Procurement or OFAM). Just to note, the DPC is a high ranking council (similar to NSC but on domestic issues) and has direct input to POTUS. Your help w/ these questions is highly important to ensure we get the answers correctly articulated.
I need your input by COB Tuesday, May 30th. OFAM will compile and send to FAC Kolbe before noon on Wednesday, May 31st.

I’d like to offer some clarity from my perspective from the meeting that might help with answers:

1. (b) (5)
Please call or email me if you have questions. Thanks.

v/r Karl

Karl H. Calvo, CFM, PMP
Assistant Commissioner, Office of Facilities and Asset Management
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Washington, DC
(Office) (b)(7)(C) (cell)

From: KOLBE, KATHRYN
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 5:31 AM
To: CALVO, KARL H. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: FW: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

Karl, Would you please coordinate clarification to the questions from yesterday that require follow-up (see asterisks) and provide to my front office for review, as soon as possible. Please help understand the context of question 3. Did you get contact information? Would appreciate your clarification on the highway discussion for internal use only.

Appreciate your assistance with answering question 3 for the White House staff. Karl can provide clarification.
Thank you…VR, KK

Kathryn L. Kolbe  
Executive Assistant Commissioner  
Enterprise Services  
U.S. Customs and Border Protection  
Office  
Cell  

From: VITIELLO, RONALD D (USBP)  
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 5:21 AM  
To: KOLBE, KATHRYN  
Subject: RE: Domestic Policy Council Meetings  

thanks

Ronald Donato Vitiello  
Acting Deputy Commissioner  
Customs and Border Protection  

From: KOLBE, KATHRYN  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 9:51 PM  
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K  
VITIELLO, RONALD D (USBP)  
MCLENNAN, ROBERT J.  
CALVO, KARL H.  
PROVOST, CARLA (USBP)  

Subject: Domestic Policy Council Meetings  

Commissioner/Deputy,

The meeting with the DPC today went well. AC Calvo & I attended. We briefed Andrew Bremberg, Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy; Paul Winfree, Deputy Assistant to the President, Director of Budget Policy; Gene Hamilton, Senior Counselor to the Secretary, DHS; and several others with immigration-related responsibilities.

Some key takeaways: They would like us to stay in touch with them regarding an event with the POTUS for the roll-out of the wall prototypes in San Diego. They conveyed the HAC/SAC desire for details in support of the FY18 & beyond wall construction as a pre-requisite to securing funds. They also offered their assistance...
in removing regulatory obstacles, if necessary. Below is a list of some of the dialogue/questions.

1. (b) (5)

VR, KK

Kathryn L. Kolbe
Executive Assistant Commissioner
Enterprise Services
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Office (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cell (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
On item 3 – we are talking about federal land right? If so, I can ask Baker to pull that. I’m also guessing we want it in border miles, right?

Hi all –

Looks like we need to get these answered asap (sorry, I hate that too) – hoping this isn’t a big lift. Can we target 10 am Tuesday?

...can you take #1? The answer is no – no issues and we can highlight our past meeting and upcoming one as well.

...can you take #2 and #4? I know these answers can be lengthy, but let’s try to keep it as straightforward as possible.

BusOps can take #3 – I think we have that answer already (can you confirm)?
3. (b) (5)

4. (b) (5)

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

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 1:10 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

(b) (5)

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

Associate Chief Counsel - Trade and Finance
Office of the Chief Counsel
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED/ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

This communication might contain communications between attorney and client, communications that are part of the agency deliberative process, or attorney work product, all of which are privileged and not subject to disclosure outside the agency or to the public. Please consult with the Office of Chief Counsel, U.S. Customs and Border Protection before disclosing any information contained in this email.
Subject: RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

Karl – we will need to loop in OCC for confirmation.

Executive Director, Budget Directorate
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Department of Homeland Security

Subject: RE: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

Karl, thanks for this.
Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Acquisition
Head of the Contracting Activity

Location: National Place, Washington, DC

From: CALVO, KARL H.
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 11:17 AM
To:
Cc:

Subject: FW: Domestic Policy Council Meeting
Importance: High

All: Rather than trying to coordinate a call with multiple parties on a Friday before the holiday weekend, I’m attempting to explain what is needed via email. Below I’ve highlighted those questions from the Domestic Policy Council (DPC) that we need to pull together input from your offices. The highlighted sections are assigned to various offices (either USBP, OCC, Procurement or OFAM). Just to note, the DPC is a high ranking council (similar to NSC but on domestic issues) and has direct input to POTUS. Your help w/ these questions is highly important to ensure we get the answers correctly articulated.

I need your input by COB Tuesday, May 30th. OFAM will compile and send to FAC Kolbe before noon on Wednesday, May 31st.

I’d like to offer some clarity from my perspective from the meeting that might help with answers:

1. (b) (5)

2. (b) (5)
Please call or email me if you have questions. Thanks.

v/r Karl

Karl H. Calvo, CFM, PMP
Assistant Commissioner, Office of Facilities and Asset Management
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Washington, DC

From: KOLBE, KATHRYN
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 5:31 AM
To: CALVO, KARL H. <b>(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)</b>
Cc: <b>(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)</b>

Subject: FW: Domestic Policy Council Meeting

Karl, Would you please coordinate clarification to the questions from yesterday that require follow-up (see asterisks) and provide to my front office for review, as soon as possible. Please help understand the context of question 3. Did you get contact information? Would appreciate your clarification on the highway discussion for internal use only.

Appreciate your assistance with answering question 3 for the White House staff. Karl can provide clarification.

Thank you…VR, KK

Kathryn L. Kolbe
Executive Assistant Commissioner
Enterprise Services
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Office <b>(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)</b>
Cell <b>(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)</b>

From: VITIELLO, RONALD D (USBP)
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 5:21 AM
To: KOLBE, KATHRYN <b>(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)</b>
Subject: RE: Domestic Policy Council Meetings
thanks

Ronald Donato Vitiello
Acting Deputy Commissioner
Customs and Border Protection

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 9:51 PM
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K [redacted]; VITIELLO, RONALD D [redacted]
Cc: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S [redacted]; CALVO, KARL H. [redacted]; PROVOST, CARLA [redacted]

Subject: Domestic Policy Council Meetings

Commissioner/Deputy,

The meeting with the DPC today went well. AC Calvo & I attended. We briefed Andrew Bremberg, Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy; Paul Winfree, Deputy Assistant to the President, Director of Budget Policy; Gene Hamilton, Senior Counselor to the Secretary, DHS; and several others with immigration-related responsibilities.

Some key takeaways: They would like us to stay in touch with them regarding an event with the POTUS for the roll-out of the wall prototypes in San Diego. They conveyed the HAC/SAC desire for details in support of the FY18 & beyond wall construction as a pre-requisite to securing funds. They also offered their assistance in removing regulatory obstacles, if necessary. Below is a list of some of the dialogue/questions.

1. [redacted]
2. [redacted]
3. [redacted]
4. [redacted]
5. [redacted]
6. [redacted]
VR, KK

Kathryn L. Kolbe
Executive Assistant Commissioner
Enterprise Services
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Office (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cell (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sir,

I will also review, but OLA received an updated version of the border bill that we discussed earlier this week. DHS OLA (b)(6) is circulating with components for feedback and OCA (AC Lowry) is coordinating for CBP.

Thank you,

From: LOWRY, KIM M
Sent: Thursday, June 1, 2017 10:11 AM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: FW: quick call re: TA request (border bill)

Per our conversation....

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 4:55 PM
To: LOWRY, KIM M (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: quick call re: TA request (border bill)

Hi Kim,

I was hoping to speak with you directly before sending this to avoid any confusion, but also want to ensure CBP has enough time for review. Please call any time with questions or to discuss further...

In brief, we have received an updated version of the Cornyn-McCaul border bill for further review and comment (attached). The new draft incorporates prior feedback from CBP, ICE and USCIS, as well as track change comments requesting DHS response.

We have been asked to provide immediate feedback on this new draft. To ensure there is sufficient time for review and comment, however, OLA is requesting that ICE, USCIS and CBP provide TA by COB Monday (6/5). Like last time, please provide comments from both a policy and legal perspective. Anything that might undermine law enforcement or present operational challenges should be flagged. OLA will review the comments and compile them for Gene’s review prior to distribution to Hill staff.

I’m still waiting for guidance on comment format. Until further notice, please ask your team to compile TA in the form of track change comments to the attached document.
Thanks in advance for your help, and please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Best,

(b) (6)

PS – I hope we can find a time to meet soon! Are there times over the next couple of weeks that might work for you?

(b) (6)
Office of Legislative Affairs
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 3:21 PM
To: LOWRY, KIM M (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) >
Subject: quick call re: TA request (border bill)
Importance: High

Hi Kim,

Hope you are well!

Do you have time for a quick call? Want to be sure I’m directing a TA request to the right person.

Thanks for your help,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)
Office of Legislative Affairs
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
(b) (6)
FYI

V/R
Patrick

Please see attached for the CJ just transmitted to the Hill.

Thank you; and let us know when the Congressional Justifications come in.

V/R
Patrick

Patrick Flanagan

Notice: FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - this transmission contains material covered by the Privacy Act of 1974 and should be viewed only by personnel having an official "need to know." If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by email and delete the original message.
Briefing materials are attached. Note that the Congressional Justification is not yet final and is expected to be transmitted by DHS late today. A copy can be added to these materials once finalized. I also understand that Kim has already provided the reprogramming briefing deck - will be delivering a hard copy of that and all other materials shortly.

Please let me know if anything further is needed.

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 3:48:55 PM
To: [b] (b) (b) (7)(C); LOWRY, KIM M
Cc: [b] (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: FYs 2017 & 2018 budget roll out

Should have it in the next 30 minutes.

From: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 3:35:31 PM
To: [b] (b) (b) (7)(C); LOWRY, KIM M
Cc: [b] (b) (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: FYs 2017 & 2018 budget roll out

Status check on when we can expect materials for the Sen Boozman meeting?

V/R
Patrick

Patrick Flanagan
(b) (6)

Notice: FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - this transmission contains material covered by the Privacy Act of 1974 and should be viewed only by personnel having an official "need to know." If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by email and delete the original message.

From: [b] (b) (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 5:27 PM
To: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S <[b] (b) (b) (7)(C)>
Cc: [b] (b) (b) (7)(C) LOWRY, KIM M <(b) (b) (7)(C)>
Cc: [b] (b) (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: FYs 2017 & 2018 budget roll out

Hi Patrick,
We prepared a mini-Congressional Justification similar to what we normally send to the Hill for Budget rollouts, which they will have in advance of Monday’s meeting (expected to be sent tomorrow). Are you also looking for any materials we developed internally with DHS and OMB that could be shared? We’re working to pull that information together for both Monday’s meeting and the HAC/SAC staff briefing on Wednesday. Happy to track down anything specific the Commissioner is interested in including.

From: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 4:14 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) ; LOWRY, KIM M [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: FYs 2017 & 2018 budget roll out

For prep materials, the Commissioner asked for what information we sent up with the Budget on the Wall. And can we share that information with the Hill.

V/R
Patrick

Patrick Flanagan
[b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

Notice FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - this transmission contains material covered by the Privacy Act of 1974 and should be viewed only by personnel having an official "need to know." If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by email and delete the original message.

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 3:27 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) ; LOWRY, KIM M [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: FLANAGAN, PATRICK S [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: FYs 2017 & 2018 budget roll out

Thanks very much. We’ll begin working briefing materials.
That works, I will get it on C1’s calendar.

Hi

Chairman Boozman is available for a 4:30 meeting in Hart 141. I would anticipate 45 minute duration. Please let me know if that works.

Thank you, I am including [redacted] from the aprops team who has been speaking with [redacted] and can coordinate. [redacted] is also included as a back up. Kim
Ma’am,

Who should I work with to Schedule? C1 wants to take the meeting and has some availability on Monday, I can pretty much make anything work other than 9:00-12:30. C1 has the Sen. Cornyn Briefing and a meeting with FEDEX, but any other times will work. Just let me know who I should coordinate with and we’ll get it scheduled.

Thank you,

From: LOWRY, KIM M
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 11:28 AM
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
Cc: ALLES, RANDOLPH D
Subject: RE: FYs 2017 & 2018 budget roll out

C1,
The Senator Boozman call is now a meeting per (b) (6). (b) (6) is targeting the meeting for Monday, either with you or the C2. If we can’t make Monday work, we can go back and work with (b) (6) (he may not be pleased though). Please advise how you would like to proceed.

Thank you
VR
Kim

From: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 5:57 PM
To: LOWRY, KIM M
Cc: ALLES, RANDOLPH D; FLANAGAN, PATRICK S
Subject: RE: FYs 2017 & 2018 budget roll out

Yes, okay with both proposed approaches.

From: LOWRY, KIM M
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 5:24 PM
To: MCALEENAN, KEVIN K
C1,
I spoke with the C2 this morning at the 0830 regarding the way forward regarding the reprogramming as well as the budget roll out. I recommended, the C2 concurred, that we brief the appropriations committee next Thursday and provide a comprehensive briefing on the current state of play as well as the strategy with regards to the wall as well as the hiring related to the budget request. I believe that the staff is frustrated that we have provided information in pieces. If appropriations committee staff concur, the goal would be to brief the wall (and also address the funding for the surge) in the first hour and walk through the strategy and the associated funding (and being honest with the information that we don’t know at this point in time). This briefing would be followed up with a hiring briefing focused on FY 2017. I spoke with EAC Kolbe and her leadership team earlier today (OF, OFAM, HRM) as well as DHS OCFO Budget Director about this proposed way forward. They did not have any issues with this way forward. Please advise if you are okay with this way forward.

In addition to the briefings, indicated yesterday that Chairman Boozman would like a call with you. It seems to be driven by the staff feeling they do not have the full information they need to brief the Chairman regarding the reprogramming/wall. The Chairman offered to get involved if it would help. I would recommend that you have a call with the Chairman to provide assurance that we are going down a reasonable path and understand the staff’s frustration with limited information flow. It will also be an opportunity to inform the Chairman that we will be briefing his staff with more complete information in the near future.

I will be at the Senator Cornyn pre-brief in the am, if you would like to discuss further.

VR
Kim