All,
Please find the action items from today's TI call.
Let me know if you have any questions.
Best,
(b)(6)

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CBP PM</th>
<th>USACE PM</th>
<th>Status FITT 12/16</th>
<th>Comments 12/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGV</td>
<td>PF225</td>
<td>O-1 through O-3</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td>Project on hold</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (6)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments 12/09</th>
<th>Comments 12/02</th>
<th>Comments 11/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 11/4</td>
<td>Comments 10/28</td>
<td>Comments 10/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 10/14</td>
<td>Comments 10/7</td>
<td>Comments 9/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 9/9</td>
<td>Comments 8/26</td>
<td>Comments 8/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 7/29</td>
<td>Comments 7/22</td>
<td>Comments 7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action item:</strong> [b] get closeout documents from [b] for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td><strong>Action item:</strong> [b] get closeout documents from [b] for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 7/8</td>
<td>Comments 6/24</td>
<td>Comments 6/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td><em>(b) (5)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 6/10</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 6/3</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 5/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 4/8</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/25</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/11</td>
<td>Comments/Notes - 2/25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attached are my comments. I have a hard copy to use for review at our meeting this afternoon.

---

Project Manager, TI Project Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.

---

See below. This will take a team effort. There is a dead line.

Can we set some time aside on Friday from 3:15 to 4:15 to go over your thoughts, inputs and comments?

I would appreciate it if you all look and address this RAP from an M&R (b) (6), Milcon ((b) (6)) and Towers (b) (6) perspective. I’ll work the projects for right now.

We can certainly add to this RAP.

Please confirm that we can meet on Friday.

Thanks.

CBM, PMP
Division Director, TI Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
We received OBP’s new TI requirements so I’m sending along your RAP tasking for your action. I’m breaking them down into three items.

Please review the first tab of the workbook (OBP TI Reqt) and complete the following:

1. Review the ‘Validate Cost’ line items and confirm the cost. These are items that were on the RAP FY13-17 and also on OBPs requirements that they just provided.

2. Review the ‘Compare Column G and H. Determine if they are the same requirement. Validate cost’ line items. These items were provided as new OBP requirements; however, these requirements seem similar to prior year estimates (FY13-17).

   Validate whether or not the requirements are the same (compare columns G and H). If the requirements are the same, confirm this by adding notes to the ‘Comment’ column and validate the cost.

3. Review the ‘Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?’ line items and determine whether or not these requirements are needed. If the requirement is needed, confirm its need by adding notes to the ‘Comment’ column and validate or develop the cost. These items were included in the FY13-17, but just want to make sure that we don’t need these requirements anymore.

   - **Note:**
   A couple of good ‘Comment’ column updates may include the following:

   1. The Requirements listed in both columns G and H are the same. Please see validated or new cost.
   2. The requirement/project is no longer needed. Please remove requirement.

   Also, please note that any RE/ENV costs must be accounted for when considering the TI requirements and validating costs. Teaming up with **(b) (6)** team will be best for this effort.

   Both **(b) (6)** and **(b) (6)** are available to address your questions and/concerns, so please feel free to reach out to them for assistance. Also, please keep in mind that additional information may be needed at a later time.

   We’ll need your information back by COB January 18th – but would prefer to get them as soon as possible. **(b) (6)** assisted with this task last year. He may be a good point of contact.

   Thanks!

   **(b) (6)**

---

**Deputy Director, Business Operations Division**

**Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office**

**Facilities Management & Engineering**

**(b) (6) (w)**

**(b) (6) (bberry)**

BW11 FOIA CBP 001023
Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - (b)(7)(E) (O-1 - O-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
See below. This will take a team effort. There is a deadline.

Can we set some time aside on Friday from 3:15 to 4:15 to go over your thoughts, inputs and comments?

I would appreciate it if you all look and address this RAP from an M&R, Milcon and Towers perspective. I’ll work the projects for right now.

We can certainly add to this RAP.

Please confirm that we can meet on Friday.

Thanks.

CBM, PMP
Division Director, TI Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office:
Cell:

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.

Hi,

We received OBP’s new TI requirements so I’m sending along your RAP tasking for your action. I’m breaking them down into three items.

Please review the first tab of the workbook (OBP Ti Reqt) and complete the following:

1. Review the ‘Validate Cost’ line items and confirm the cost. These are items that were on the RAP FY13-17 and also on OBP\’s requirements that they just provided.

2. Review the ‘Compare Column G and H. Determine if they are the same requirement. Validate cost’ line items. These items were provided as new OBP requirements; however, these requirements seem similar to prior year estimates (FY13-17).
Validate whether or not the requirements are the same (compare columns G and H). If the requirements are the same, confirm this by adding notes to the ‘Comment’ column and validate the cost.

3. Review the ‘Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?’ line items and determine whether or not these requirements are needed. If the requirement is needed, confirm its need by adding notes to the ‘Comment’ column and validate or develop the cost. These items were included in the FY13-17, but just want to make sure that we don’t need these requirements anymore.

**Note:**
A couple of good ‘Comment’ column updates may include the following:

1. The Requirements listed in both columns G and H are the same. Please see validated or new cost.
2. The requirement/project is no longer needed. Please remove requirement.

Also, please note that any RE/ENV costs must be accounted for when considering the TI requirements and validating costs. Teaming up with Chris Colacicco’s team will be best for this effort.

Both [b] and [b] are available to address your questions and concerns, so please feel free to reach out to them for assistance. Also, please keep in mind that additional information may be needed at a later time.

We’ll need your information back by COB January 18th – but would prefer to get them as soon as possible. [b] assisted with this task last year. He may be a good point of contact.

**Thanks!**

**Deputy Director, Business Operations Division**
**Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office**
**Facilities Management & Engineering**

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - (b) (7)(E) O-1 - O-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As discussed, Thank you. Please submit with your final to [redacted] and [redacted] with the cc to [redacted] and I.

CBM, PMP
Division Director, TI Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office: [redacted]
Cell: [redacted]

*Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>PPA</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validate Cost</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>BSFIT D&amp;D</td>
<td>(b) (E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Miles / Num</td>
<td>Standard Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - O-1/O-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPFTI - Validated Cost</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Env ROM</td>
<td>Env ROM Assumptions</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA (b)(5) BA (b)(5) for monitoring Mitigation (b)(5) MBTA (b)(5) environmental monitors (b)(5)</td>
<td>this will be covered by waiver ESP and existing documents but will need to be updated, but we will need monitors full-time for environmental and CR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Last PRD is (b)(5) Deviate from Standard*
My December 22, 2011 weekly below. This week changes are in red.

NON-RESPONSIVE
f. **O-3 (South of fence line) - Roma Boat Ramp (Los Puertos)**

I have been reviewing the emails and documentation in preparation for M&R transition of the Roma Boat Ramp Project. I am receiving information from (b)(6) on his environmental actions, and (b)(6) on his real estate actions. Requested name change based on request from Sector; from Roma to Los Puertos Boat Ramp. Awaiting approval. Requested update from (b)(6), 12/13/11. (b)(6) has defined that the environmental work will be completed by February 2012. (b)(6) is working to complete PRD; 95%. Sector is willing to perform all work necessary to build the ramp. Funding will be required to perform Real Estate actions. Any needed material to build the ramp will be provided through existing inventories.
Thanks,

(b) (6)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RWA Line Item</th>
<th>CEFMS FWI</th>
<th>Funding Account</th>
<th>CBP WBS</th>
<th>Amount Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1745-7000-1 Program Planning / Oversight</td>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>$15,003,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1745-7000-2 Environmental Compliance</td>
<td>Environmental Compliance</td>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>$27,455,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1745-7000-4 Preliminary Design</td>
<td>Preliminary Design</td>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>$22,810,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1745-7000-3 Real Estate Acquisition</td>
<td>Real Estate Acquisition</td>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Amount Obligated</td>
<td>Current Estimate at Completion</td>
<td>Balance to be Funded</td>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (3)</td>
<td>$13,747,379</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (3)</td>
<td>$25,749,488</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (3)</td>
<td>$21,355,299</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>Real Estate Acquisition</td>
<td>Real Estate Acquisition</td>
<td>Real Estate Acquisition</td>
<td>RE &amp; Environmental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1745-7000-6 Construction Oversight**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100</th>
<th>920</th>
<th>1110</th>
<th>1190</th>
<th>2130</th>
<th>2250</th>
<th>2560</th>
<th>2610</th>
<th>2920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>PF225 Phase 1 Construction Oversight</td>
<td>PF225 Phase 2 Construction Oversight</td>
<td>PF225 Phase 2 Construction Oversight</td>
<td>PF225 Phase 2 Construction Oversight</td>
<td>PF225 Phase 2 Construction Oversight</td>
<td>PF225 Phase 2 Construction Oversight</td>
<td>PF225 Phase 2 Construction Oversight</td>
<td>PF225 Construction Oversight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotals: $32,322,602

**1745-7000-5 Phase 1 Construction Projects**

**1745-7000-5 Phase 2 Construction Projects**

**1745-7000-5 Phase 3 Construction Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rio Grande Valley Sector</th>
<th>(b)(7)(E)</th>
<th>(b)(7)(E)</th>
<th>(b)(7)(E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>O-2</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>O-3A</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$69,187,332</td>
<td>$32,325,647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$26,688,957</td>
<td>#REF!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#REF!</td>
<td>#REF!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#REF!</td>
<td>#REF!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#REF!</td>
<td>#REF!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(5)</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>(b)(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Will bring you hard copies too.

Branch Chief - TI Division Projects, Maintenance and Repair
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office: (b) (6)
Mobile: (b) (6)

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Required By DHS</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence O-1 - O-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we discussed Friday, attached is our working version of the Env requirements for TI projects. Please see if this meets your needs.

I do need some guidance however based on our call Friday...............The second attachment is the original workbook of requirements. The first attachment is our working version. We focused thus far only on the requirements in tabs 2 and 3 of the workbook. Please see if this fits your needs.

If needed we could quickly develop estimates for the other projects on Tab 1 but we were not sure if all of these would be carried forward.

Thanks!!

I wanted to get you what we have so far but we are still working things.

Based on the conversation and I had with on Friday it is not clear in my mind what our deliverable for TI should be. Should we be developing env cost estimates for all of the projects on tab 1 or just focus on the 2nd and 3rd tabs in the TI workbook (TI Reqs FY14-18 1-10-11 v4)

So our final deliverable with have 4 parts (later this weekend)

1) RE-Env spreadsheet (will contain BPA costs, etc)
2) Assumptions narrative
3) Facilities spreadsheet
4) TI spreadsheet (but need to clarify what tab we should use)

Let me know if you have any questions.
From:  
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2012 7:39 PM  
To:  
Subject: RE: RAP Assumptions

– I went back through the new construction projects spreadsheet and manually input $’s for each project based on their size (updated sheet attached and labeled “FY14-FY18 RAP estimates for support of environmental planning on new construction 011312”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total NC Cost by year (in thousands)</th>
<th>Total Env. Planning Cost by Year (in Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL (FY13 to FY18)</td>
<td>Average of 4 prior years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also reviewed the combined Facilities and TI RAP requirements spreadsheet that was submitted before the holidays and the version we should use going forward is attached (file labeled “FY14-FY18 RAP Requirements Env Compliance TI Facilities RE Combined 011312”). I added a couple of sections to the assumptions page you sent me yesterday to include the basis of the costs for water system upgrades and O&M on water systems (I had added these before the holiday break). The revised assumptions page is attached. We will still also need to add the amounts needed for the BPA for each fiscal year as per our estimate yesterday (the estimates we came up with are in the attached email).

I think all the parts are here, we just need to organize them a bit. Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

From:  
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2012 9:22 AM  
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: FW: RAP Assumptions

Thanks,
We can discuss more if you want.

Thanks!

From: (b) (6)  
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 7:52 PM  
To: (b) (6)  
Subject: RE: RAP Assumptions

Thanks (b) (6) I will review and include my assumptions for planning. Attached is a sheet I used to estimate the environmental planning needs for FY14 to FY18. Summary of estimated needs is provided below. Let me know what you think. Thanks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total New Const. Cost by Year (in thousands)</th>
<th>Total Env. Planning Cost by Year (in Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL (FY13 to FY18)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Average of 4 prior years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: (b) (6) 
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 4:23 PM 
To: (b) (6) 
Subject: RE: RAP Assumptions

Attached is my latest draft of our assumptions. Please take a look.

(b) (5)

thanks
Ok, sounds good.

I've been talking to some of the PM’s about the funding they receive for new construction and the spreadsheet that forecasts the new stations and checkpoints.

I will draft some words for our assumptions paper to explain this.

Thanks!

Concur with the forecasts.

Below is my estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Facilities ($000)</th>
<th>TI ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thoughts??

All –
Here is the BPA spreadsheet. I have not heard from [b] (6) so if you see something that does not look correct let me know.
“Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.”

Here is the paper that we need to update. I have started but we will need to revise accordingly. I added a section E for the BPA requirements. Please go ahead and edit/update this paper.

Will do.

I will need your help on the assumptions bullets for facilities.

Thanks!!

After you left the call we developed this path forward:

1) will with BOD on how the BOD wants our input (the spreadsheets sent out did not already provide space for FY18)
2) get the BPA execution data broken by facilities and TI to use as our basis for budget
3) will take lead on facilities requirements and get with PMs and SMEs on including env costs
4) will take the spreadsheet we updated before Holidays (attached) and compare to the spreadsheet just sent out by to see if any changes
5) [b] (6) will take lead for TI and get with SMEs (and [b] (6) as needed) to develop env cost for TI projects.

6) [b] (6) will draft our assumptions bullets based on our 4 grouping framework below [b] (6) will also review the attached assumptions paper to update/revise to conform to this framework) (Will also need to check with [b] (6) on her expectations for Env revising this document or whether the BOD will do it)

We have planned a status call for Tuesday Jan 17 at 1 PM EST. Let me know if I missed anything.

Env RAP is based on 4 groupings of requirements:

- a) General env support for large projects (like new BPS, etc) funded via a “planning tax” on the total construction cost (such as 5%)
- b) Special programs/initiatives that will have unique environmental requirements beyond the general support capability
  - Such as range cleanup; UST cleanups; Carrizo Cane; erosion control/revegetation programs; program to upgrade water systems
  - These would be funded separately
- c) Increased PMO Env staff support for expanded mission. PMO now “owns and operates” hundreds of facilities. The current environmental staff was built for environmental planning, not for operating hundreds of facilities.
- d) BPA funding for each FY for facilities and TI support based on historical funding/execution levels

I pasted in what I think is the latest version of the PMO goals/initiatives/metrics that we should be working with—along with whatever is the latest CBP/FME goals/initiatives to tie funding requirements to.

Environment/Energy Goal

*Integrate environmental compliance and energy conservation solutions into all program activities.*

**Objective 1.** Ensure facilities and TI actions comply with NEPA and associated planning laws

- Initiative 1. Provide periodic training to PMs and USACE/PMO staff with model Scopes of Work and guidance on considering environmental requirements early in the planning process
  - Metric 1: % of PMs/staff trained each quarter (Target is 25%)
  - Metric 2: % of PMO Env Staff with environmental professional credential
- Ensure the PMO has multiple avenues for accessing consultant services for NEPA, Endangered Species, Cultural resources and water planning
  - Metric 1: Number of BPAs and ECSO contracts active and $ capacity (Target is redundant capacity between ECSO and PMO)
  - Metric 2: % of total facilities and TI footprint (acres) that have appropriate bio and cultural surveys completed (Target is 100%)
- Ensure facilities and TI have appropriate NEPA documents completed before construction
  - Metric 1: % of total construction dollars for facilities and TI that have appropriate NEPA (or waiver) documents completed each FY (Target is 100%)
  - Metric 2: % of Miles of fence and road that are “green-green” compared to total OBP requirement (Target is 100%)

Objective 2. Comply with applicable requirements for construction, remediation and disposal of facilities and tactical infrastructure

- Initiative 1. During facility reviews, inventory environmental permits, plans, and needed management actions/resolutions
  - Metric 1: % of facilities reviewed (Target is 100%)
  - Metric 2: % of total project costs for either facilities or TI that went for environmental compliance (Target is less than 5%)
- Initiative 2. Standardize processes for violation resolution, deficiencies and delinquencies
  - Metric: Issue PMO guidance within 6 months
- Initiative 3. Support firing range remediation/re-commissioning compliance
  - Metric: % of firing range projects with appropriate permits (Target is 100%)
- Initiative 4. Identify required operating permits during the environmental planning for new facilities or renovations and ensure construction agents obtain those permits
  - Metric 1: % of environmental planning documents (NEPA, etc) that identify the required permits (Target is 100%)
  - Metric 2: % of facilities that have the required operating permits (Target is 100%)

Objective 3. Promote sustainable facilities and TI to meet CBP Operational Sustainability Performance Plan goals

- Initiative 1. Integrate sustainability and IPT outputs into design of TI and facilities
• Metric: % of construction/projects designs that have undergone sustainability review (Target is 100%)

• Initiative 2. Provide energy scorecard for every new design
  • Metric: % of designs that included the energy scorecard (Target is 100%)

• Initiative 3. Create standard language for energy requirements in SOWs
  • Metric: Issue standard language NLT 6 months after PMO goals promulgated (Target is less than 6 months)

• Initiative 4. Establish sustainability goals and guidelines for non-permanent construction
  • Metric: Goals supporting the OSPP issued within 6 months

• Initiative 5. Incorporate environmental/energy compliance into sector master plans
  • Metric: % of sector master plans including environmental and energy considerations (Target is 100%)

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: FY 2014-2018 RAP Kicks Off

All,

The FY 2014-2018 Rap is right around the corner. More guidance to follow.

Division Directors,

We have officially begun the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 – 2018 Resource Allocation Plan (RAP) process to identify our funding requirements for FY 2014 and the proceeding out-years. Please keep in mind that this our only opportunity to present requirements that are not constrained by fiscal guidance, as well.

We anticipate that OBP will provide operational requirements on or around December 14, 2011. To place our PMO at an advantage and allow sufficient time to compile all of the funding requirements, please begin gathering internal funding requirements (IAAs, lease information, etc). Once we receive the final list of requirements from our business partner we will provide you with formal guidance on what each division will need to do to help us gather all the information required for the RAP.

In the interim, if you have any questions or concerns, don’t hesitate to reach out.
Best,

Deputy Director, Business Operations Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office
Facilities Management & Engineering

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - (b) (7)(E) O-1 - O-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/ OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi all,
Please see the internal action items from the TI weekly call today.
I’ve also attached a copy of the notes as well in case you need more clarification.
Thanks,
Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CBP PM</th>
<th>USACE PM</th>
<th>Status FITT 1/27</th>
<th>Comments 1/27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGV</td>
<td>PF225</td>
<td>O-1 through O-3</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td>Project on hold</td>
<td>Waiting on the discussion with OBP internally to see how they would like to proceed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 1/20</td>
<td>Comments 1/13</td>
<td>Comments 1/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No current requirement to report on. IBWC is moving forward. Need to work on documents to move this forward, should receive clearance from IBWC with in the next few weeks. [b] needs to [b] try to update all he can for FITT.</td>
<td>Moved up to OBP leadership as a priority project. Waiting for OBP to push it up to Chief and Commissioner for approval. FITT currently does not have a schedule. There still is not PRD requirement, have not been requested to do any kind of detailed scheduling. <strong>Need to update FITT with current progress of project.</strong> [b] to be the PM.</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 12/16</td>
<td>Comments 12/09</td>
<td>Comments 12/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 11/18</td>
<td>Comments 11/4</td>
<td>Comments 10/28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 10/21</td>
<td>Comments 10/14</td>
<td>Comments 10/7</td>
<td>Comments 9/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 9/16</td>
<td>Comments 9/9</td>
<td>Comments 8/26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 8/12</td>
<td>Comments 7/29</td>
<td>Comments 7/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>Action item: (b) (6) get closeout documents from (b) (6) for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td>Action item: (b) (6) get closeout documents from (b) (6) for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 7/15</td>
<td>Comments 7/8</td>
<td>Comments 6/24</td>
<td>Comments 6/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td><em>(b) (5)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 6/10</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 6/3</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 5/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 4/8</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/25</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/11</td>
<td>Comments/Notes - 2/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As discussed, spreadsheet and comments below, let me know if you have any questions.

Division Director, TI Division  
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure  
Program Management Office  
Facilities Management and Engineering  
Office:  
Cell:  

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.

Below is the analysis that did (I already deleted the ones that I thought the BOD would automatically do)

1. I cited overarching RE assumptions in the lower right corner of the spreadsheet
2. I deleted two columns from the spreadsheet sent me – RE & ENV (formerly columns 'H' & 'I') – they weren't being used since we're now summarizing RE & ENV estimates all the way to the right.
3. I added Column 'T' totaling the Project, ENV & RE Costs
4. Lines 69 and 70 are duplicates – should delete one of these rows from the spreadsheet
5. Column 'G' reflects original cost estimates –
6. Column 'L' – there are a number of empty cells for quantity, which makes project cost = '0' – as discussed, is already aware of this.
7. I inserted comments in Column 'C' (highlighted in YELLOW) for RE-related programmatic line items only, answering questions as to whether they should remain on the spreadsheet given that they appear not to be 'OBP Requirements'...
8. There is nothing on this spreadsheet that I can see indicating which FY the Project/Programmatic Expense is projected to fall into...is that a follow on exercise to determine in what FY to assign
what % of a given expense?

Thanks,

Division Director, RE and ENV Services Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office: (b) (6)
Mobile: (b) (6)

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy

Of note:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm With</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>PPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validate Cost</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>BSFIT D&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/ OBP Costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence (b) (7)(E) O-1 - O-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Miles / Num</td>
<td>Standard Cost</td>
<td>BPFTI - Validated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Env ROM</td>
<td>Env ROM Assumptions</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Real Estate ROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA [b][5]</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA [b][5]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for monitoring Mitigation</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>404 [b][5]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBTA [b][5]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>environmental monitors [b][5]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Last PRD is (b) (5) (Deviate from Standard)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of TI</th>
<th>Standard Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Basis of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lights</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culverts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossover/small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane Removal</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditching</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey Barrier</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commercial Cost Assumptions**

- **Type of TI**: Lights, Road, Culverts, Bridge, Boat Ramp, Crossover/small bridge, VF, PV, Gate, Cane Removal, Ditching, Jersey Barrier.
- **Standard Cost Estimate**: (b) (5).
- **Assumptions**: (b) (5).
- **Basis of Estimate**: (b) (7)(E).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Miles / Num</th>
<th>Standard Cost</th>
<th>BPFTI - Validated Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chain Link Fence</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Per Mile</td>
<td>ROM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drain Flaps</td>
<td></td>
<td>Per Storm Drain</td>
<td>FY13 RAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence Capping</td>
<td></td>
<td>Per Mile</td>
<td>ROM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env ROM</td>
<td>Env ROM Assumptions</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Real Estate ROM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY REAL ESTATE ASSUMPTIONS:**

(b) (5)

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Env ROM</th>
<th>Env ROM Assumptions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Real Estate ROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
I made changes to the attached notes for this week. Updates included the following:

- Changes to Project Names for new projects
- Change for Project Type to all Military construction projects. Originally noted as TI.
- Addition of Military Projects

Additionally if you could please move to the Closeout Tab, it would be appreciated.

Lastly, I believe you mentioned a few changes that were discussed with. Once those changes have been made, please use that template for the Friday notes.

Thanks,

[Signature]

Project Manager, TI Project Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CBP PM</th>
<th>USACE PM</th>
<th>Status FITT 1/27</th>
<th>Comments 1/27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGV</td>
<td>PF225</td>
<td>O-1 through O-3</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td>Project on hold</td>
<td>Waiting on the discussion with OBP internally to see how they would like to proceed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 1/20</td>
<td>Comments 1/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No current requirement to report on. IBWC is moving forward. Need to work on documents to move this forward, should receive clearance from IBWC with in the next few weeks. [b][6] needs to try to update all he can for FITT.</td>
<td>Moved up to OBP leadership as a priority project. Waiting for OBP to push it up to Chief and Commissioner for approval. FITT currently does not have a schedule. There still is not PRD requirement, have not been requested to do any kind of detailed scheduling. <strong>Need to update FITT with current progress of project.</strong> [b][6] to be the PM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 1/6</td>
<td>Comments 12/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 12/09</td>
<td>Comments 12/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 11/18</td>
<td>Comments 11/4</td>
<td>Comments 10/28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 10/21</td>
<td>Comments 10/14</td>
<td>Comments 10/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 9/30</td>
<td>Comments 9/16</td>
<td>Comments 9/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 8/26</td>
<td>Comments 8/12</td>
<td>Comments 7/29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>Action item: <em>(b)(6)</em> get closeout documents from <em>(b)(6)</em> for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 7/22</td>
<td>Comments 7/15</td>
<td>Comments 7/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action item:</strong></td>
<td><strong>No update</strong></td>
<td><strong>No update</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] (6) get closeout documents from for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 6/24</td>
<td>Comments 6/17</td>
<td>Comments 6/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 5/13</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 5/6</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 4/29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 4/15</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 4/8</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/18</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/11</td>
<td>Comments/Notes - 2/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All,

Just a heads up that [redacted] will be running the call on Friday.

Thanks,

[redacted]

Project Manager, TI Project Division  
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure  
Program Management Office  
Facilities Management and Engineering  
Office: [redacted]  
Mobile: [redacted]

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>FITT Module</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CBP PM</th>
<th>USACE PM</th>
<th>Needs discussing on FITT call?</th>
<th>Comments 2/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td>PF225</td>
<td>O-1 through O-3</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td>No - Project on hold</td>
<td>No new updates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 2/10</td>
<td>Comments 2/3</td>
<td>Comments 1/27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new updates</td>
<td>Waiting on the discussion with OBP internally to see how they would like to proceed.</td>
<td>Waiting on the discussion with OBP internally to see how they would like to proceed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 1/20</td>
<td>Comments 1/13</td>
<td>Comments 1/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No current requirement to report on. IBWC is moving forward. Need to work on documents to move this forward, should receive clearance from IBWC within the next few weeks.[(b) (6)] needs to try to update all he can for FITT.</td>
<td>Moved up to OBP leadership as a priority project. Waiting for OBP to push it up to Chief and Commissioner for approval. FITT currently does not have a schedule. There still is not PRD requirement, have not been requested to do any kind of detailed scheduling. Need to update FITT with current progress of project.[(b) (6)] to be the PM.</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 12/16</td>
<td>Comments 12/09</td>
<td>Comments 12/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 11/18</td>
<td>Comments 11/4</td>
<td>Comments 10/28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 10/21</td>
<td>Comments 10/14</td>
<td>Comments 10/7</td>
<td>Comments 9/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 9/16</td>
<td>Comments 9/9</td>
<td>Comments 8/26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 8/12</td>
<td>Comments 7/29</td>
<td>Comments 7/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action item: <strong>(b) (6)</strong> get closeout documents from <strong>(b) (6)</strong> for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td>Action item: <strong>(b) (6)</strong> get closeout documents from <strong>(b) (6)</strong> for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No update
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments 7/15</th>
<th>Comments 7/8</th>
<th>Comments 6/24</th>
<th>Comments 6/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 6/10</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 6/3</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 5/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 4/8</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/25</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/11</td>
<td>Comments/Notes - 2/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am forwarding these to (b) (6) as I know (b) (6) is working this for him.

Let us know if we need to take action on this task.

Thanks,

Project Manager, TI Project Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
Good afternoon,

I know you are extremely busy, but I need a few minutes of your time. I will be going on the 2nd round of the Southwest Border Sector Chief Tour (Goodwill Mission) next week.

Please review the attached briefing for any updates or "hot topics" since the last submission. The due date is NLT COB tomorrow Thursday, February 23. This is a hard deadline as the briefing materials must be printed and in the briefing books by 2 pm on Friday. No exceptions!

Thanks so much for your help!

(b) (6)
1) Personnel:
   a. Chief: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
      i. Of BP Service including assignments in the San Diego, Laredo, McAllen, and Swanton sectors. As a command-level agent, he served as Supervisory Border Patrol Agent, Field Operations Supervisor and Assistant Patrol Agent in Charge and as an acting Chief on the northern and southern borders
      ii. Deputy Chief Patrol Agent for the Laredo Sector from 2001 prior to appointment in RGV
      iii. Appointed as SES Chief Patrol Agent of the RGV Sector in January 2011
   b. Deputy Chief Patrol Agent: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
   c. Number of WG / WL in Sector: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
   d. Last Meeting in Sector: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

2) TI Summary:
   a. Topics for Discussion:
      i. Military Construction (MILCON) Roads: Areas within the and AORs have been identified for MILCON projects for all weather roads; OBP and FM&E are currently resolving real estate and licensing issues:
      ii. PF-225 Projects O-1, O-2, and O-3: Project O-1 = O-2 = O-3 = ; Projects remain a High Priority for RGV Sector; Projects are awaiting final written approval from IBWC and concurrence from Mexico. Once approved, funding must be obtained to begin with the real estate, environmental, and construction processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Mgr.</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td>12/2011</td>
<td>12/2012</td>
<td>No issues at this time. Testing ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On hold, awaiting funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-20</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td>02/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>02/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete; only awaiting signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Military Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please see attachment.

NON-RESPONSIVE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CBP PM</th>
<th>USACE PM</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments 7/8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGV</td>
<td>PF25</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td>Project on hold</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV</td>
<td>PF25</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project on hold</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV</td>
<td>PF25</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project on hold</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you feel comfortable briefing this to the FSC on Wednesday?
Overview of Border Tactical Infrastructure
# CHIEF'S BI-WEEKLY TI REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactical Infrastructure*</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>VF</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>PF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Border</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data current as of 1/20/2012

(b) (5)
SAN DIEGO SECTOR (SDC)

- Border Infrastructure System

  - Programmed Budget: (b) (5)

  - Stabilization
    - Waived project on BLM land
    - Construction to begin in (b) (5); project will stabilize cut slopes along patrol road
    - 3 solutions will be installed: (b) (7)(E)
    - NTP issued 2/8/12
    - Programmed Budget: (b) (5)

  - Road Repair FY’13 Military Construction [April JTF-N Conference]
    - 2 deployments scheduled to repair drainages and repair road surface
    - ROM (b) (5)
El Centro Sector (ELC)

- **FY ’13 Military Construction [April JTF-N Conference]**
  - 15% design to be presented at the JTF-N planning conference in ROM
  - [Redacted]

- **RFP**
  - Results from the corrosion testing and what steps are being taken to remediate fence segments

- **Modifications**
  - Project is an “in-house” project that modifies existing fence to further deter [Redacted]
Yuma Sector (YUM)

- **Road Improvement**
  - On the (b) (7)(E) (Possibly like the Pilot project built by Sundt Construction in the (b) (7)(E))

- **Additional All-Weather Road**
  - Deploy additional all-weather type road along the border in the (b) (7)(E)

- (b) (7)(E) **lighting project**
  - From (b) (7)(E)

  The environmental is complete and the materials such as light poles, lights, and electrical wiring is already staged at Yuma Sector.
Tucson Sector (TCA)

Naco Station Landing Mat Fence Replacement Project

- The project area includes all of Border Zone located in Naco Station, AZ. [Priority subject to funding]

Zone 7 Road

- Waived project. Forest Service property
- Phase II of Military Construction continues from (b) (5)
- Phase III (b) (5)
- Length of road to be constructed in Phase II-III will be (b) (7)(E).
- Zone 7 Road project is a total of (b) (7)(E). [Phase I was (b) (7)(E)]
- Programmed Budget: (b) (5)

Zone 10 Road

- Waived project. Forest Service property, City of Nogales property
- Military Construction (b) (5). Repair of road and associated drainage structures.
- Total length of road to be constructed will be (b) (7)(E).
- Programmed Budget: (b) (5)

Douglas Permanent Border Light Upgrade

- The proposed project will replace the lights within the poles / light fixture system with LED technology (b) (7)(E)
- Greatly reduce energy consumption therefore reducing the costs associated with the existing sodium bulbs. Studies have shown that upgrading to LED technology would pay for itself in reduced energy costs within two to three years.
El Paso Sector (EPT)

- **PF-225:**
  - This area lies within the El Paso Station Area of Responsibility (AOR) consisting of a fence. Design efforts have reached 95% completion. Real Estate acquisition has been difficult to finalize as there is
  - **Crossovers**
    - Crossovers are proposed to be constructed over irrigation canals in the Fabens and Ysleta Stations AOR.
    - Design efforts have reached 100% completion.
  - **Interagency Agreement (IAA)**
    - 
  - **19 Canyon Road Construction**
    - Military Construction-Final Deployment (6th) will begin the end of and will construct of road.
    - Road will total once construction is completed.
  - **Programmed Budget:**
    - 
Big Bend Sector (BBT)

- **L-1 Low Water Crossing (LWC)s**
  - [PHOTO]
  - (b) (7)(E)

- **L-1 Vehicle Barriers**
  - There are vehicle barriers.
  - (b) (7)(E)
  - (b) (7)(E)
  - (b) (7)(E)

- **Recommendation:**
  - (b) (5)
  - (b) (5)

  Barrier needed to prevent animals from falling into trenches. When trenches are filled with rain water, the animals (horses, cattle, javelina) in the area tend to go to the water and have a tendency of falling in. There is no drainage for the trenches which also causes a concern with mosquitoes (West Nile).

- **Chispa Road Access**
  - A County Road that Sector would like maintained. Due to legal restrictions on repairing County roads, Sector cannot expend funding to make those repairs.
  - The County must sell the land to CBP for repairs to occur. The County is currently opposed.
  - This is a potential military project.
Del Rio Sector (DRT)

- **Permanent Lighting**
  - Zone (b) (7)(E) permanent lighting to enhance the existing fence construction.
  - Zone permanent lighting to enhance the current fence construction.

- **Additional brush clearing**
  - In Zone (b) (7)(E) to enhance enforcement around the constructed fence along with the permanent lighting.

- **Boat Ramps**
  - All weather boat ramp in Zone (b) (7)(E) to increase coverage in the area especially during low river flow.
  - All weather boat ramp between the Zone (b) (7)(E) dams to increase operational functionality in the area.

- **Bridge Construction**
  - In the (b) (7)(E) area between Zones (b) (7)(E) where there is currently no connectivity along the international boundary.
Laredo Sector (LRT)

- **LRW Boat Ramp**
  - Boat Ramp will allow efficient patrolling of the border with boat patrols.
  - This capability allows agents to establish full situational awareness along the border.
  - Provide unequaled lateral movement and response capabilities along the river.
  - LRT will be receiving additional Riverine Units and without the additional boat ramp; LRT will not have the ability to deploy them in the LRW AOR.

- **Laredo Riverbend Phase III B/C**
  - EA completed in 2005. Coordination for real estate with City of Laredo.
  - Military Construction began in January 2012 to complete the final phase of this road project. This road has been constructed using entirely military support through coordination with the Border Patrol Special Coordination Center.
  - Programmed Budget: (b) (5)

- **LRS Boat Ramp Modification and Light Pole Installation [PHOTO]**
  - EA completed in 2005. Coordination for real estate with City of Laredo.
  - Original construction completed in February 2011.
  - Grade of current ramp need modification so vehicles and boat trailers remain on the same slope when entering the water.
  - Light pole installation scheduled for (b) (5).
**Rio Grande Valley Sector (RGV)**

- **Military Construction for FY’13**
  - Areas within the AORs have been identified for military construction for road repair using M&R funds.
  - Scope of repairs to be determined based on the level of Real Estate and Environmental Planning to be executed in the next 16 months.
    - FM&E, ORMB, BPSCC, RGV Sector will meet at Sector HQ on to discuss the level of planning that can take place in the next 16 months to support an FY ’13 military deployment. Commercial construction is an alternative if completion of real estate and environmental compliance planning is not realistic in 16-months.
  - ROM: Scope is grading and aggregate base
    - ROM [This ROM was based on a full design and all weather road. Since this is a river road, the final project will be a low cost grade/aggregate road]

- **PF-225 Projects 0-1, O-2, and O-3**
  - Project O-1 = O-2 = O-3 = Projects remain a High Priority for RGV Sector
  - Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project
    - The RGV Sector PF-225 Fence will have constructed in phases
    - Phase I will involve the construction of in 2012
    - Construction of the remaining is needed to complete the PF-225 Fence
    - Real estate and power issues must be resolved
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Hi All,

Not sure who will be leading the TI call tomorrow, but I wanted to attach the notes with the new projects provided.

Please see attached. (includes [b] (6).)

Thanks!

Special Projects Analyst, Business Operations Division
Strategic Analysis, Inc.
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>FITT Module</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CBP PM</th>
<th>USACE PM</th>
<th>Needs discussing on FITT call?</th>
<th>Comments 2/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td>PF225</td>
<td>O-1 through O-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td>No - Project on hold</td>
<td>No new updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 2/10</td>
<td>Comments 2/3</td>
<td>Comments 1/27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new updates</td>
<td>Waiting on the discussion with OBP internally to see how they would like to proceed.</td>
<td>Waiting on the discussion with OBP internally to see how they would like to proceed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 1/20</td>
<td>Comments 1/13</td>
<td>Comments 1/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No current requirement to report on. IBWC is moving forward. Need to work on documents to move this forward, should receive clearance from IBWC with in the next few weeks. needs to try to update all he can for FITT.</td>
<td>Moved up to OBP leadership as a priority project. Waiting for OBP to push it up to Chief and Commissioner for approval. FITT currently does not have a schedule. There still is not PRD requirement, have not been requested to do any kind of detailed scheduling. Need to update FITT with current progress of project to be the PM.</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 12/16</td>
<td>Comments 12/09</td>
<td>Comments 12/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 11/18</td>
<td>Comments 11/4</td>
<td>Comments 10/28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 10/21</td>
<td>Comments 10/14</td>
<td>Comments 10/7</td>
<td>Comments 9/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 9/16</td>
<td>Comments 9/9</td>
<td>Comments 8/26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 8/12</td>
<td>Comments 7/29</td>
<td>Comments 7/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>Action item: <em>(b) (6)</em> get closeout documents from <em>(b) (6)</em> for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td>Action item: <em>(b) (6)</em> get closeout documents from <em>(b) (6)</em> for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 7/15</td>
<td>Comments 7/8</td>
<td>Comments 6/24</td>
<td>Comments 6/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 6/10</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 6/3</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 5/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 4/8</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/25</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/11</td>
<td>Comments/Notes - 2/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attached are the latest TI project notes.

Updates:
Boat Ramps Post and cable - finalizing award with work anticipated to start late and completed in.
Boat Ramp slope alteration – 60% design review by.
La Boat License agreement – final draft for review sent to landowner on.
Phase III re-vegetation – will be doing a site visit this week to assess the area and determine the needs and best path forward.

Thanks

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>FITT Module</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CBP PM</th>
<th>USACE PM</th>
<th>Needs discussing on FITT call?</th>
<th>Comments 3/2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rio Grande Valley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF225</td>
<td>O-1 through O-3</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No - Project on hold</td>
<td>Has been approved by IBWC. OBP has the action to get a decision on this segments fence construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 2/3</td>
<td>Comments 1/27</td>
<td>Comments 1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Waiting on the discussion with OBP internally to see how they would like to proceed. | Waiting on the discussion with OBP internally to see how they would like to proceed. | No current requirement to report on. IBWC is moving forward. Need to work on documents to move this forward, should receive clearance from IBWC with in the next few weeks. Needs to try to update all he can for FITT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments 1/13</th>
<th>Comments 1/6</th>
<th>Comments 12/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved up to OBP leadership as a priority project. Waiting for OBP to push it up to Chief and Commissioner for approval. FITT currently does not have a schedule. There still is not PRD requirement, have not been requested to do any kind of detailed scheduling. <strong>Need to update FITT with current progress of project</strong>.</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(B) (6) to be the</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 11/4</td>
<td>Comments 10/28</td>
<td>Comments 10/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 10/14</td>
<td>Comments 10/7</td>
<td>Comments 9/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 9/9</td>
<td>Comments 8/26</td>
<td>Comments 8/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action item:</td>
<td>Action item:</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] (6) get closeout documents from [b] (6) for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td>[b] (6) get closeout documents from [b] (6) for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 7/8</td>
<td>Comments 6/24</td>
<td>Comments 6/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 6/10</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 6/3</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 5/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 4/8</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/25</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/11</td>
<td>Comments/Notes - 2/25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I did that analysis and we can insert the language before sending to

Ok. My only real question is did we address the comments as required? I did not see that in the spreadsheet.

I saw a lot of needs to address.

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.

Will be in tomorrow...we can get together in the AM
Thanks all where are the footnotes in your tab?

Let's chat I have a few questions before I launch this puppy.

Thank you.

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.

Attached is the consolidated RAP.

Please note that Items, 108, 115, 116, and 117 could not be validated by me on the first tab. Either or you needed to confirm.

Thanks,

CBM, PMP
Division Director, TI Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office: Cell:

Project Manager, TI Project Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office: Mobile:
Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm With</th>
<th>Field Required By DHS</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>PPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm With</td>
<td>Action Required</td>
<td>State / Country</td>
<td>Sector / DFO</td>
<td>PPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>PPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>BSFIT D&amp;D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - (b) (7)(E) (O-1 - O-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Miles / Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/ OBP Costs)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Miles / Num</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*(b) (7)(E)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Miles / Num</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Cost</td>
<td>BPFTI - Validated Cost</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As discussed, attached is TI’s review of the RAP information.

We have complied with the requirements and send you the final revised spreadsheet.

Also, I will forward to you the ENV spreadsheet that accompanies this set of requirements.

Any questions, please contact [redacted], CBM, PMP
Division Director, TI Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office: [redacted]
Cell: [redacted]

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm With</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>PPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm With</td>
<td>Action Required</td>
<td>State / Country</td>
<td>Sector / DFO</td>
<td>PPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm With</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>PPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>BSFIT D&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>RE Cost</td>
<td>ENV Cost</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - (b) (7)(E) (O-1 - O-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Miles / Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/ OBP Costs)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Miles / Num</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Miles / Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Cost</td>
<td>BPFTI - Validated Cost</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Cost</th>
<th>BPFTI - Validated Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attached is the consolidated RAP.

NON-RESPONSIVE

Thanks,

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
Field Required By DHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>PPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm With</td>
<td>Action Required</td>
<td>State / Country</td>
<td>Sector / DFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm With</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>PPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>BSFIT D&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>RE Cost</td>
<td>ENV Cost</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - (b) (7)(E) (O-1 - O-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Miles / Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/ OBP Costs)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Miles / Num</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Miles / Num</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Cost</td>
<td>BPFTI - Validated Cost</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Cost</th>
<th>BPFTI - Validated Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Cost</th>
<th>BPFTI - Validated Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Great report. I am concerned about the procurements. Have we started the process and do we have funds request?

The Feb 1 date is really making my hair stand on end.

Why did we wait to get this going?
RGV Phase 1 Gate Project – O-6 Mac Pump (2), O-11 LaFeria, O-14 Penn Road, O-19 Art Leagues.

- 1/5/2012 - Weston Solutions worked during the holiday to meet gate project schedules. Working with Weston Solution and (b) (6) to ensure electrical utility transition. Weston to control electric provider until end of January. Government will assume responsibility to ensure continued utilities to test gates and all future gates.

- 1/10/2012 - Test plan is being developed. Controllers will be installed and FM&E has 4 days to selected final controller for test gates. Requested manual and specs in preparation for short controller selection time.

- 1/10/2012 - Meeting was held with Hidalgo Water District Manager. (b) (6). FM&E will write up an agreement defining that the Hidalgo Water District will be allowed to attach their own (b) (7)(E) to the supporting utility pole that leads to gate system at O-6a1 & 2. This will also be responsible for all maintenance. An agreement will also be written to allow the Hidalgo Water District to raise the existing (b) (5) road and utilize Sector scrap bollards to raise existing fence bollards to meet height requirements.

- 1/12/2012 - Received and reviewed controllers for gates. Controller testing of the O-19 B Art League and the O-6A MAC Pump 1 gates are now scheduled to occur from (b) (5). 1 week slippage to project schedule. These will be the first two gates to be tested in RGV. Weston will be performing controller testing at O-19 Art League on the (b) (5) Bird spikes to be delivered this week to RGV for Sector evaluation. Test plan is in development stage with deadline (b) (7)(E). Sector to report if they will accept (b) (7)(E) Continue to work out payment structure details to ensure proper utility transition from Weston. Letters to landowners will be going out today, 1/12/2012. (b) (7)(E) 1/13/2012. Performed site visits at all test gates and some Phase 1 gates with utility companies, Weston Solutions, and COR. Defined utility pole location, evaluated required gate footprint, determined if (b) (7)(E) could be supported with new utility hook-up. Phase 1 Gate O-12 Harlingen Canal (not test gates) may be issue as the pilaster may impact existing bridge. Bridge foundation extends into (b) (7)(E). Weston to investigate and report.

- 1/13/12 Testing plan complete. Awaiting bird spikes samples to determine if appropriate. Sector has complete report they will use (b) (7)(E) to determine (b) (7)(E) Most construction work focused on O-6a1 and O-19 Test Gates.

- O-6 Mac Pump
Gate 1 –
1/6/12 - Support beams, vertical beams, and gate installed. Tack welding being performed on gate.
1/16/12 - Backfill complete & gate access to land owner.
1/13/12. Backfill complete and gives owner access. Weston is having problems with controller. Will be a delay in testing; one week.
1/17/12 - Lights installed. Energized. Defined as ready for testing on

Gate 2 –
1/9/12 - Scheduled to begin frame work on pilasters.
1/17/12 - Frame work on pilasters and concrete work has begun.

- O-11 LaFeria –
Foundation complete, awaiting support beams. Support beams have been delivered. Raised power lines to accommodate fence height. Piers complete. 1/10/12 - Old utility pole to be removed. Power boxes in place.

- O-14 Penn Road –
Foundation complete.
Utility meter in place. No electric hook up.
Supports delivered to site.
Pilasters set.

- O-19 Art Leagues –
Gate in place, access to owner, controller to be installed. Crews continue working on the electrical components. The has been place across the and the light units have been installed. Power is attached. Weston to begin testing 1/16/2012.
1/13/12 - Energized.
1/16/12 - Weston performing preliminary gate testing. Sector performing. Defined as ready for testing on.

1/13/12 - Site inspection at Area O-9 is satisfactory.
Preparing for gap filler contract to extend to 6/2012.
Contractor working Area O-14 & progressing well. Expect contractor to meet contractual obligations.
1/18/12 - Inspected and satisfactory; O-17, 18, 19, 20. Contractor working O-21.
Sector personnel inputting vegetation coordinates in Sector mapping system to clearly define vegetation areas within RGV. Will be required for gap filler contract. Delays due to gate testing.

O-3 (South of fence line) – Roma Boat Ramp (Los Puertos)
Sector O&M to investigate if previous boat ramp exists under silt build up from last storm. PRD on hold until Sector report.
1/19/12 - O&M meeting with Fish & Wildlife to define investigation plan and road maintenance. Sector requests that we develop an MOU with Fish & Wildlife to cover all RGV boat ramps; similar to existing MOU for roads.

O-17 West Rail Project –
Sector defined that Cameron County contractor to remove ramp and place gate in lower position. Major operational incidents are occurring in this area. 1/10/2012 - Fence project that extends under newly constructed West Rail Bridge is complete. COR accepted. Final inspection report complete.

O-20 Fence Project –
1/10/2012 - Final inspection complete. COR accepted. Final inspection report complete. Marginally accepted. Contractor evaluation will state low quality concrete work.

Misc.
- Stations have requested immediate need for barriers. Investigating alternatives. FM&E has given acceptance to Station to build temporary barriers at various locations. Plans were sent to FM&E engineers and no issues
were found. We have also received agreement that Station will perform all maintenance for the barriers. Station will also be responsible for their removal if attached to permanent fencing. will be informed of gate schedule and will remove barriers to ensure no impact to gate schedule. COR has also defined that this causes no issues with the permanent fencing. 1/13/12 has begun barrier builds.

- 1/19/12 - O-18 Fencing accident left wide gap in picket fencing. Due to RGV not having an interim fence contract, working with O&M Division to make emergency repairs.

- Site visits: week ending 1/19/2011. O-17,18,19,20,21 Vegetation Contractor site. Acceptable performance to date.

- Photos, updates sent to FM&E. O-11, O-19, O-6a1&2.

Program Manager
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Facilities Management and Engineering
Tactical Infrastructure Division (Maintenance & Repair)

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
Attached is the actual FINAL FINAL RAP! Sorry one more change was made. We should be all set now!

Thanks,

[Redacted]

Project Manager, TI Project Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office: [Redacted]
Mobile: [Redacted]

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.

Attached is the Final RAP

[Redacted]

Project Manager, TI Project Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office: [Redacted]
Mobile: [Redacted]

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm With</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>PPA</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validate Cost</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>BSFIT D&amp;D</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Miles / Num</td>
<td>Standard Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - O-1 / O-3</td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPFTI - Validated Cost</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Env ROM</td>
<td>Env ROM Assumptions</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA, BA, 404 for monitoring mitigation</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBTA environmental monitors</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Last PRD is (Deviate from Standard)*
Attached is the Final RAP

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>PPA</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validate Cost</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>BSFIT D&amp;D</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Miles / Num</td>
<td>Standard Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - [O-1:O-3]</td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPFTI - Validated Cost</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Env ROM</td>
<td>Env ROM Assumptions</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>NEPA BA 385 (b) (5)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Last PRD is (Deviate from Standard)*
As indicated in the previous email, here is the ENV rap review.

I talked with [b](6) and the RE portion is being finalized.

Any questions, please each our to [b](6).

CBM, PMP
Division Director, TI Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.

As we discussed Friday, attached is our working version of the Env requirements for TI projects. Please see if this meets your needs.

I do need some guidance however based on our call Friday..................The second attachment is the original workbook of requirements. The first attachment is our working version. We focused thus far only on the requirements in tabs 2 and 3 of the workbook. Please see if this fits your needs.

If needed we could quickly develop estimates for the other projects on Tab 1 but we were not sure if all of these would be carried forward.

Thanks!!
I wanted to get you what we have so far but we are still working things.

Based on the conversation and I had with on Friday it is not clear in my mind what our deliverable for TI should be. Should we be developing env cost estimates for all of the projects on tab 1 or just focus on the 2nd and 3rd tabs in the TI workbook (TI Reqs FY14-18 1-10-11 v4)

So our final deliverable with have 4 parts (later this weekend)

1) RE-Env spreadsheet (will contain BPA costs, etc)
2) Assumptions narrative
3) Facilities spreadsheet
4) TI spreadsheet (but need to clarify what tab we should use)

Let me know if you have any questions.
I also reviewed the combined Facilities and TI RAP requirements spreadsheet that was submitted before the holidays and the version we should use going forward is attached (file labeled “FY14-FY18 RAP Requirements Env Compliance TI Facilities RE Combined 011312”). I added a couple of sections to the assumptions page you sent me yesterday to include the basis of the costs for water system upgrades and O&M on water systems (I had added these before the holiday break). The revised assumptions page is attached. We will still also need to add the amounts needed for the BPA for each fiscal year as per our estimate yesterday (the estimates we came up with are in the attached email).

I think all the parts are here, we just need to organize them a bit. Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

From: [Redacted]  
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2012 9:22 AM  
To: [Redacted]  
Cc: [Redacted]  
Subject: FW: RAP Assumptions

Thanks.

We can discuss more if you want.

Thanks!

From: [Redacted]  
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 7:52 PM  
To: [Redacted]  
Subject: RE: RAP Assumptions

Thanks. I will review and include my assumptions for planning. Attached is a sheet I used to estimate the environmental planning needs for FY14 to FY18. Summary of estimated needs is provided below. Let me know what you think. Thanks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total New Const. Cost by Year (in thousands)</th>
<th>Total Env. Planning Cost by Year (in Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Average of 4 prior years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL (FY13 to FY18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 4:23 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: RAP Assumptions

Attached is my latest draft of our assumptions. Please take a look.

thanks

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 6:40 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: RAP Assumptions

Ok, sounds good.

I've been talking to some of the PM's about the funding they receive for new construction and the spreadsheet that forecasts the new stations and checkpoints.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 3:27 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: RAP Assumptions
I will draft some words for our assumptions paper to explain this.

Thanks!

Concur with the forecasts.

Below is my estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Facilities ($000)</th>
<th>TI ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think the “other” category was actually TI money right? Also we had to reimburse TI for some facilities work so I think the facilities level is higher than this would indicate. This represents all of our BPAs over the past few years and our TI workload should level off now from past levels so I would propose that we show requirements as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Facilities ($000)</th>
<th>TI ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thoughts??

Environmental Analyst, Business Operations Division
Strategic Analysis, Inc.
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office: (b) 6
Cell: (b) 6

“Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.”

Here is the paper that we need to update. I have started but we will need to revise accordingly. I added a section E for the BPA requirements. Please go ahead and edit/update this paper

Will do.
I will need your help on the assumptions bullets for facilities

Thanks!!

After you left the call we developed this path forward:

1) will with BOD on how the BOD wants our input (the spreadsheets sent out did not already provide space for FY18)
2) will get the BPA execution data broken by facilities and TI to use as our basis for budget
3) will take lead on facilities requirements and get with PMs and SMEs on including env costs
4) will take the spreadsheet we updated before Holidays (attached) and compare to the spreadsheet just sent out by to see if any changes
5) will take lead for TI and get with SMEs (and as needed) to develop env cost for TI projects
6) will draft our assumptions bullets based on our 4 grouping framework below will also review the attached assumptions paper to update/revise to conform to this framework) (Will also need to check with on her expectations for Env revising this document or whether the BOD will do it)

We have planned a status call for Tuesday Jan 17 at 1 PM EST. Let me know if I missed anything.

Env RAP is based on 4 groupings of requirements:

a) General env support for large projects (like new BPS, etc) funded via a “planning tax” on the total construction cost (such as 5%)

b) Special programs/initiatives that will have unique environmental requirements beyond the general support capability
   - Such as range cleanup; UST cleanups; Carrizo Cane; erosion control/revegetation programs; program to upgrade water systems
   - These would be funded separately;

c) Increased PMO Env staff support for expanded mission. PMO now “owns and operates” hundreds of facilities. The current environmental staff was built for environmental planning, not for operating hundreds of facilities.
I pasted in what I think is the latest version of the PMO goals/initiatives/metrics that we should be working with—along with whatever is the latest CBP/FME goals/initiatives to tie funding requirements to.

Environment/Energy Goal

Integrate environmental compliance and energy conservation solutions into all program activities.

Objective 1. Ensure facilities and TI actions comply with NEPA and associated planning laws

- Initiative 1. Provide periodic training to PMs and USACE/PMO staff with model Scopes of Work and guidance on considering environmental requirements early in the planning process
  - Metric 1: % of PMs/staff trained each quarter (Target is 25%)
  - Metric 2: % of PMO Env Staff with environmental professional credential
- Ensure the PMO has multiple avenues for accessing consultant services for NEPA, Endangered Species, Cultural resources and water planning
  - Metric 1: Number of BPAs and ECSO contracts active and $ capacity (Target is redundant capacity between ECSO and PMO)
  - Metric 2: % of total facilities and TI footprint (acres) that have appropriate bio and cultural surveys completed (Target is 100%)
- Ensure facilities and TI have appropriate NEPA documents completed before construction
  - Metric 1: % of total construction dollars for facilities and TI that have appropriate NEPA (or waiver) documents completed each FY (Target is 100%)
  - Metric 2: % of Miles of fence and road that are “green-green” compared to total OBP requirement (Target is 100%)

Objective 2. Comply with applicable requirements for construction, remediation and disposal of facilities and tactical infrastructure

- Initiative 1. During facility reviews, inventory environmental permits, plans, and needed management actions/resolutions
  - Metric 1: % of facilities reviewed (Target is 100%)
Objective 3. Promote sustainable facilities and TI to meet CBP Operational Sustainability Performance Plan goals

- Initiative 1. Integrate sustainability and IPT outputs into design of TI and facilities
  - Metric: % of construction/projects designs that have undergone sustainability review (Target is 100%)
- Initiative 2. Provide energy scorecard for every new design
  - Metric: % of designs that included the energy scorecard (Target is 100%)
- Initiative 3. Create standard language for energy requirements in SOWs
  - Metric: Issue standard language NLT 6 months after PMO goals promulgated (Target is less than 6 months)
- Initiative 4. Establish sustainability goals and guidelines for non-permanent construction
  - Metric: Goals supporting the OSPP issued within 6 months
- Initiative 5. Incorporate environmental/energy compliance into sector master plans
  - Metric: % of sector master plans including environmental and energy considerations (Target is 100%)
All,

The FY 2014-2018 Rap is right around the corner. More guidance to follow.

Division Directors,

We have officially begun the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 – 2018 Resource Allocation Plan (RAP) process to identify our funding requirements for FY 2014 and the proceeding out-years. Please keep in mind that this our only opportunity to present requirements that are not constrained by fiscal guidance, as well.

We anticipate that OBP will provide operational requirements on or around December 14, 2011. To place our PMO at an advantage and allow sufficient time to compile all of the funding requirements, please begin gathering internal funding requirements (IAAs, lease information, etc). Once we receive the final list of requirements from our business partner we will provide you with formal guidance on what each division will need to do to help us gather all the information required for the RAP.

In the interim, if you have any questions or concerns, don’t hesitate to reach out.

Best,

Deputy Director, Business Operations Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office
Facilities Management & Engineering

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - (b) (7)(E) O-1 - O-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here is the update ENV budget information to support TI projects.

Division Director, RE and ENV Services Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Facilities Management and Engineering

As indicated in the previous email, here is the ENV rap review.

I talked with and the RE portion is being finalized.

Any questions, please each our to .

Division Director, TI Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
As we discussed Friday, attached is our working version of the Env requirements for TI projects. Please see if this meets your needs.

I do need some guidance however based on our call Friday. The second attachment is the original workbook of requirements. The first attachment is our working version. We focused thus far only on the requirements in tabs 2 and 3 of the workbook. Please see if this fits your needs.

If needed we could quickly develop estimates for the other projects on Tab 1 but we were not sure if all of these would be carried forward.

Thanks!!

I wanted to get you what we have so far but we are still working things.

Based on the conversation and I had with on Friday it is not clear in my mind what our deliverable for TI should be. Should we be developing env cost estimates for all of the projects on Tab 1 or just focus on the 2nd and 3rd tabs in the TI workbook (TI Reqts FY14-18 1-10-11 v4)

So our final deliverable with have 4 parts (later this weekend)

1) RE-Env spreadsheet (will contain BPA costs, etc)
2) Assumptions narrative
3) Facilities spreadsheet
4) TI spreadsheet (but need to clarify what tab we should use)

Let me know if you have any questions.
I went back through the new construction projects spreadsheet and manually input $'s for each project based on their size (updated sheet attached and labeled “FY14-FY18 RAP estimates for support of environmental planning on new construction 011312”). I also reviewed the combined Facilities and TI RAP requirements spreadsheet that was submitted before the holidays and the version we should use going forward is attached (file labeled “FY14-FY18 RAP Requirements Env Compliance TI Facilities RE Combined 011312”). I added a couple of sections to the assumptions page you sent me yesterday to include the basis of the costs for water system upgrades and O&M on water systems (I had added these before the holiday break). The revised assumptions page is attached. We will still also need to add the amounts needed for the BPA for each fiscal year as per our estimate yesterday (the estimates we came up with are in the attached email).

I think all the parts are here, we just need to organize them a bit. Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
We can discuss more if you want.

Thanks!

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 7:52 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: RAP Assumptions

Thanks [redacted] I will review and include my assumptions for planning. Attached is a sheet I used to estimate the environmental planning needs for FY14 to FY18. Summary of estimated needs is provided below. Let me know what you think. Thanks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total New Const. Cost (in thousands)</th>
<th>Total Env. Planning Cost (in Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL (FY13 to FY18)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of 4 prior years

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 4:23 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: RAP Assumptions

Attached is my latest draft of our assumptions. Please take a look.

thanks

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 6:40 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: RAP Assumptions
Ok, sounds good.

I’ve been talking to some of the PM’s about the funding they receive for new construction and the spreadsheet that forecasts the new stations and checkpoints.

I will draft some words for our assumptions paper to explain this.

Thanks!

Concur with the forecasts.

Below is my estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Facilities ($000)</th>
<th>TI ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 12:41 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: RAP Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Facilities ($000)</th>
<th>TI ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thoughts??

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2012 1:55 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: RAP Assumptions

All –
Here is the BPA spreadsheet. I have not heard from [REDACTED] so if you see something that does not look correct let me know.

Environmental Analyst, Business Operations Division
Strategic Analysis, Inc.
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office: [REDACTED]
Cell: [REDACTED]

“Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.”
Here is the paper that we need to update. I have started but we will need to revise accordingly. I added a section E for the BPA requirements. Please go ahead and edit/update this paper.

Will do.

I will need your help on the assumptions bullets for facilities.

Thanks!!

After you left the call we developed this path forward:

1) (b) (6) will with BOD on how the BOD wants our input (the spreadsheets sent out did not already provide space for FY18)
2) (b) (6) will get the BPA execution data broken by facilities and TI to use as our basis for budget
3) (b) (6) will take lead on facilities requirements and get with PMs and SMEs on including env costs
4) (b) (6) will take the spreadsheet we updated before Holidays (attached) and compare to the spreadsheet just sent out by (b) (6) to see if any changes
5) (b) (6) will take lead for TI and get with SMEs (and as needed) to develop env cost for TI projects
6) (b) (6) will draft our assumptions bullets based on our 4 grouping framework below (b) (6) will also review the attached assumptions paper to update/revise to conform to this framework) (Will also need to check with (b) (6) on her expectations for Env revising this document or whether the BOD...
will do it)

We have planned a status call for Tuesday Jan 17 at 1 PM EST. Let me know if I missed anything.

-----------------------------------

Env RAP is based on 4 groupings of requirements:

a) General env support for large projects (like new BPS, etc) funded via a “planning tax” on the total construction cost (such as 5%)  

b) Special programs/initiatives that will have unique environmental requirements beyond the general support capability
   - Such as range cleanup; UST cleanups; Carrizo Cane; erosion control/revegetation programs; program to upgrade water systems  
   - These would be funded separately; 

b) (5)

c) Increased PMO Env staff support for expanded mission. PMO now “owns and operates” hundreds of facilities. The current environmental staff was built for environmental planning, not for operating hundreds of facilities.

b) (5)

d) BPA funding for each FY for facilities and TI support based on historical funding/execution levels

From: (b) (6)  
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2011 2:28 PM  
To: (b) (6)  
Cc: (b) (6)  
Subject: FW: FY 2014-2018 RAP Kicks Off

I pasted in what I think is the latest version of the PMO goals/initiatives/metrics that we should be working with—along with whatever is the latest CBP/FME goals/initiatives to tie funding requirements to.

Environment/Energy Goal

Integrate environmental compliance and energy conservation solutions into all program activities.

Objective 1. Ensure facilities and TI actions comply with NEPA and associated planning laws

- Initiative 1. Provide periodic training to PMs and USACE/PMO staff with model Scopes of Work and guidance on considering environmental requirements early in the planning process
  - Metric 1: % of PMs/staff trained each quarter (Target is 25%)
  - Metric 2: % of PMO Env Staff with environmental professional credential
- Ensure the PMO has multiple avenues for accessing consultant services for NEPA, Endangered Species, Cultural resources and water planning
  - Metric 1: Number of BPAs and ECSO contracts active and $ capacity (Target is redundant capacity between ECSO and PMO)
• Metric 2: % of total facilities and TI footprint (acres) that have appropriate bio and cultural surveys completed (Target is 100%)

• Ensure facilities and TI have appropriate NEPA documents completed before construction
  • Metric 1: % of total construction dollars for facilities and TI that have appropriate NEPA (or waiver) documents completed each FY (Target is 100%)
  • Metric 2: % of Miles of fence and road that are “green-green” compared to total OBP requirement (Target is 100%)

Objective 2. Comply with applicable requirements for construction, remediation and disposal of facilities and tactical infrastructure

• Initiative 1. During facility reviews, inventory environmental permits, plans, and needed management actions/resolutions
  • Metric 1: % of facilities reviewed (Target is 100%)
  • Metric 2: % of total project costs for either facilities or TI that went for environmental compliance (Target is less than 5 %)

• Initiative 2. Standardize processes for violation resolution, deficiencies and delinquencies
  • Metric: Issue PMO guidance within 6 months

• Initiative 3. Support firing range remediation/re-commissioning compliance
  • Metric: % of firing range projects with appropriate permits (Target is 100%)

• Initiative 4. Identify required operating permits during the environmental planning for new facilities or renovations and ensure construction agents obtain those permits
  o Metric 1: % of environmental planning documents (NEPA, etc) that identify the required permits (Target is 100%)
  o Metric 2: % of facilities that have the required operating permits (Target is 100%)

Objective 3. Promote sustainable facilities and TI to meet CBP Operational Sustainability Performance Plan goals

• Initiative 1. Integrate sustainability and IPT outputs into design of TI and facilities
  • Metric: % of construction/projects designs that have undergone sustainability review (Target is 100%)

• Initiative 2. Provide energy scorecard for every new design
  • Metric: % of designs that included the energy scorecard (Target is
• Initiative 3. Create standard language for energy requirements in SOWs
  • Metric: Issue standard language NLT 6 months after PMO goals promulgated (Target is less than 6 months)
• Initiative 4. Establish sustainability goals and guidelines for non-permanent construction
  • Metric: Goals supporting the OSPP issued within 6 months
• Initiative 5. Incorporate environmental/energy compliance into sector master plans
  Metric: % of sector master plans including environmental and energy considerations (Target is 100%)

All,

The FY 2014-2018 Rap is right around the corner. More guidance to follow.

Division Directors,

We have officially begun the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 – 2018 Resource Allocation Plan (RAP) process to identify our funding requirements for FY 2014 and the proceeding out-years. Please keep in mind that this our only opportunity to present requirements that are not constrained by fiscal guidance, as well.

We anticipate that OBP will provide operational requirements on or around December 14, 2011. To place our PMO at an advantage and allow sufficient time to compile all of the funding requirements, please begin gathering internal funding requirements (IAAs, lease information, etc). Once we receive the final list of requirements from our business partner we will provide you with formal guidance on what each division will need to do to help us gather all the information required for the RAP.

In the interim, if you have any questions or concerns, don’t hesitate to reach out.

Best,
Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>(O)(5)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - (b)(7)(E)(O-1 - O-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/ OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greetings everyone

Attached is the agenda/briefing for tomorrow. Selfishly, I have a doctor’s appointment at 4 PM EST/2 PM MST so we’ll need to wrap up the meeting within 1 hr. I apologize in advance for any inconvenience this causes.

Thanks

[b] [b] <<IBWC Issues 03 20 12.pdf>>

-----Original Appointment-----
From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 3:20 PM
To: (b) (6)

Subject: Monthly IBWC/CBP conference call
When: Wednesday, March 21, 2012 3:00 PM-4:30 PM (GMT-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: (b) (6)

Agenda to follow
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

Border Patrol Tactical Infrastructure Program
IBWC Coordination Activities
March 21st, 2012
Agenda

- Levee Crest/Road Maintenance MOA
- B.I.S. Friendship Circle
- PF225 B-4 Playa & Alamo Areas
- Gate at Monument 223
- Calexico West POE Improvements
- Nogales Tunnels Gates
- Mexican Levee/Road @ Silvercreek wash
- Douglas Fence Replacement
- Anapra Area-CBP/Corps Drainage Study
- PF225 K-1B Fence
- El Paso Vega Mowing
- Ft Hancock/Zac Dominguez Field Office Vehicle Gates

- Ft Hancock/Zac Dominguez Field Office Vehicle Gates
- Eagle Pass River Bank Reconstruction
- Laredo Boat Ramp-Phase 2
- Laredo Cane Removal Pilot
- PF225 O-1, O-2 & O-3
- Penitas Pump Station Levee Wall (PF225 O-4B)
- Hidalgo POE PH 2
- RGV Vehicle Gates-Phase 1
- Cameron County East Loop Project
- Additional Miscellaneous Items
Levee Crest/Road Maintenance MOA

- CBP drafted MOA amendment to address levee crest maintenance in the El Paso sector.
- Final draft of MOA submitted on June 1st for IBWC signature.
- MOA is reportedly with IBWC for signature. No known issues.
  
  - Update: IBWC recently notified us that there are some concerns with the MOA being discussed internally within IWBC—specifics not known.
  
  - MOA being re-reviewed by IBWC’s SMEs.
- CBP re-sent draft MOA to IBWC on Feb 17th.
- Status?
B.I.S. Friendship Circle & Surf Fence Replacement

- Replacement of border fencing in proximity to [redacted]
- Project has been broken into two phases. Phase 1 consists of the primary fence replacement, which is currently under construction
  - Fence replacement on land complete including Friendship Circle
    - Fence installed per IBWC requirements
  - Surf fence replacement underway and expected to be completed by [redacted]
    - Work is essentially complete—punch list items being addressed
- Phase 2 consists of [redacted]
  - Work continuing—no issues

[Image of map with marked areas]
B.I.S. Bunker Hill Road

- Construction of a new road and border lighting that will connect the west and east side of Bunker Hill with the existing B.I.S.
- Project to be constructed by a military training deployments
- CBP received IBWC “concurrence” letter on June 27th
- Construction to begin on [b](7)(E) [b](5)
• Mexico contends the ponding is from the American canal; CBP sent IBWC aerial photos on 11/08/11 which show the ponding is the result of overflow from the Mexican irrigation canal (see next 2 photos)
• CBP resent aerial photos on Nov 28th that show the surface water coming from the MX irrigation ditch
• PE(b)(6) to discuss w/ CILA. CBP requested IBWC to observe the condition of the Mexican canal embankments to determine if a breach(es) is/are causing the flooding into the U.S.
• CBP forwarded geotechnical analysis to IBWC
• At IBWC’s request, CBP contacted their local rep on Feb 28th as surface water has re-appeared.
Gate Installation @ Monument 223

- IBWC has requested that an access gate be installed at border monument 223
- CBP previously installed a gate at this monument—photos of gate and monument provided to IBWC
- Has IBWC confirmed?
Calexico West POE Expansion

- Mexico is installing a new box culvert.
- IBWC has not yet “concurred” with Mexico’s proposed culvert extension.
- Significant erosion has occurred along the banks of the immediately north of the border that is adversely impacting an existing bridge abutment and primary and chain link fencing.
- IBWC has advised that Mexico’s construction will stop 20 ft short of the border.
- PE to meet with CILA at the POE to observed and discuss the issues.
- No response from Mexico as to IBWC/CBP concerns.
- Any updates?
Nogales Tunnels Gates

- Removal of the existing 3-feet retaining wall in the Grand tunnel and the installation of primary gates at the Grand and Morley tunnels
  - Project also involves tunnel access improvements
- RFP issued on November 18, 2011; contract was awarded on February 10, 2012
- IBWC to notify CILA of the impending construction activities w/in the tunnel
- Construction kick-off meeting was held on March 1st; local IBWC rep was invited to the meeting but unable to attend; construction underway; no issues to report
• A levee/road constructed across a major drainage wash in proximity to the border is causing flood waters to back-up into the U.S. and exacerbate erosion that is occurring in Silver Creek

• IBWC sent a letter to the property owner putting them on notice that they will be held accountable for damages to gov’t property

• Property owner recently observed raising the height of the levee/road

• IBWC is conducting H&H modeling to determine what height of the gabion wall would be acceptable to them based on the maximum 6-inch backwater requirement

• IBWC provided CBP with the results of their H&H modeling, which shows that the gabion wall must be removed or re-located further downstream so as to not adversely impact the U.S.; CBP concurs with IBWC’s conclusions-what are the next steps?
Douglas Fence Replacement

- Replacement of existing legacy border fencing (landing mat) in proximity to the City of Douglas (via 4 phases)
- Construction of phases 1 and 2 should be completed by the end of
- Design of phases 3 and 4 underway; construction of phase 3 if funded
- Construction of the final phase of the Douglas Ditch improvements underway
- Baker met with IBWC on Feb 23rd and agreed on analysis approach for some drainage challenges associated with Phase 4.
CBP reviewed preliminary draft of report

Corps/M. Baker updating report; once draft is completed, CBP would like IBWC to review

Unique challenges in this area may require unique solutions

Once the report is “preliminarily finalized” we would like to meet with IBWC in field to review the proposed solutions
PF225 K-1B Fence

- IBWC advised that they plan to have an A/E under contract by [redacted] to design the box culvert to replace the existing canal. Goal is to have the design complete by [redacted], and to award a construction contract in time to allow the work to occur in [redacted].
- RFP is ready to go out to bid; awaiting final real estate acquisitions
  - IBWC sent CBP concurrence letter on revised design: [redacted]
  - CBP responded to PE [redacted] concurrence letter on February 10th
- CBP reviewing URS 60% design for box culvert design-CBP is OK with 60% design: [redacted]
- According to IBWC, construction funding not yet received but it’s in the President’s 2013 budget. The box culvert was considered in the EA. FONSI being revised to reflect installation of the box culvert
El Paso Canal Crossovers & Vega Ramps

- Project involves the construction of anal crossovers and new vehicle ramps into the floodway in the Border Patrol’s Yselata and Fabens Stations areas of responsibility (PF225 segments K-2C, K-2D, K-3 and K-4 (future))
- Design is complete and has been approved by IBWC
- Draft MOA and cover letter to District provided to IBWC
- A meeting with IBWC, Corps, DoJ and CBP was held on Jan 18th to discuss real estate issues associated with this project. Separate meeting notes were prepared and disseminated among the attendees
- IBWC notified Corps that they have questions pertaining to our surveys supporting documents; Corps is going to set up a meeting with their surveyor and IBWC to discuss-
Wasteway #1 and #2 Culvert Replacements

- IBWC project involves the removal and replacement of wasteway structures under recently constructed primary pedestrian fence and vehicle gates
- CBP has reviewed 60% design drawings and has questions regarding proposed levee modifications
- CBP drafting MOA b/t IBWC and CBP to cover the temporary removal and replacement of the fence and gates and to be installed when work is not occurring
- CBP requires the border barrier to be “intact” during non-construction hours
El Paso Vega Mowing

- Draft IAA submitted to IBWC in mid-Feb, 2011
- Public comments (including IBWC) received and addressed relative to the draft EA
- Conference call held on Sept 1st between IBWC, CBP and FWS to discuss FWS desire for a formal consultation
- On November 15, 2011 CBP received concurrence from Fish and Wildlife on the mowing action proposed in the EA. The concurrence from FWS was the last remaining item needed to finalize the Environmental Assessment
- CBP forwarded IBWC a copy of our executed FONSI
- Draft re-vegetation plan is in the process of being prepared
- Updated draft IAA to reflect EA and FONSI submitted to IBWC on Feb 1st
- IBWC to forward their comments on the IAA – status?
Ft Hancock/Zac Dominguez Field Office Vehicle Gates

• The Corps is going to design the gate modifications “in-house”. Design underway
• IBWC is OK w/ CBP using the maintenance yard for staging and access.
Eagle Pass River Bank Reconstruction

- IBWC is planning to meet with the property owner (b) (5) to discuss IBWC’s proposed path forward; IBWC to notify us of meeting logistics so “local” CBP personnel may attend – status?
Phase I Cane Removal Pilot Project

• CBP submitted draft summary report relative to water quality samples collected during the herbicide applications to IBWC on August 26th
• PE(b)(6) is going to transmit the analysis to Mexico for their review and concurrence
• Analysis was forwarded to CILA for their review and concurrence in late December. No response yet
• Still awaiting for response from Mexico – status?
Laredo Boat Ramp-Phase 2

- CBP submitted design documents to IBWC on June 28th for formal “concurrence”
- CBP provided written response to CILA’s design modification requests
  IBWC and CBP have agreed on which CILA comments will be addressed and those that cannot.
- Target RFP release date is (b)(5)
- Project still on schedule
IBWC coordinating project “concurrence” with Mexico

IBWC to coordinate meeting with CBP and Dept of State regarding these fence segments and the new Los Ebanos POE
  – Conference call occurred on Oct 20th

IBWC indicated that Mexico had some technical questions regarding the hydraulic model, which they would be addressing on Oct 20th. IBWC continues to believe the model results are accurate.

IBWC concurrence letter relative to hydraulic modeling received on Feb 14th.

(b) (5)
Penitas Pump Station Levee Wall (PF225 O-4B)

- Project involves the construction of new levee wall(s) and levee in proximity to the Pump Station
- CBP assisting IBWC with resolution of design issues
  - CBP requests update on the status of the real estate info-Status?

U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Project involves the construction of a new flood protection wall in proximity to the Hidalgo POE.

CBP and IBWC have executed an IAA for IBWC to incorporate bollards into the new flood wall.

IAA to be revised to reflect new period of performance and funding of $320K.

Revised IAA has been finalized.

As of Nov 28th, the project is 56% complete and estimated to be completed by .

West end of the project should be completed by the . What’s the status of the east end?
CBP/Corps have hired Weston Solutions to design-build vehicle gates in Cameron and Hidalgo Counties.

Weston's concept designs for the gate configurations to be built as part of the project were provided to IBWC on Dec 4th and again on Dec 14th.

CBP submitted letter to IBWC confirming project is covered by April 2008 waiver.

“Concurrence” for the first site specific designs (test gates) received on June 30th.

IBWC authorized CBP to use the O-20 fence staging area (IBWC’s Ft Brown parcel) as the staging area for O19, B-4 Art League Vehicle Gate project.

In Hidalgo where the flood protection wall has been built, IBWC and CBP agreed to and as-built drawings will be provided to IBWC once available.

Construction underway and proceeding smoothly.

No issues.
Cameron County East Loop Project

- Cameron County is planning to a new highway (aka East Loop) to connect the Veterans International bridge with the Port of Brownsville. The project is going to require the relocation of a portion of IBWC’s levee system and CBP fencing.
- CBP met with Cameron County on January 26, 2011 to learn more specifics regarding the project to include anticipated timing. IBWC and FWS participated in the meeting.
- IBWC concurred with CBP’s recommended changes to the proposed typical levee/fence cross-section, which have been forwarded to Cameron County.
- No new info to report.
Additional Items

- IBWC asked if CBP could install primary pedestrian fences. CBP recommends sending their request to CBP’s Acting Commissioner Aguilar.

- CBP has provided IBWC with access to their TI document library (construction drawings, as-built, studies, etc.)

- (b) (7)(E) and associated infrastructure—we need to keep in service.
Hi,

Just wanted to check in on the TI RAP tasker due tomorrow. Let me know if you or your team has any questions – we’re happy to help!

Thanks,

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.

Hi,

We received OBP’s new TI requirements so I’m sending along your RAP tasking for your action. I’m breaking them down into three items.

Please review the first tab of the workbook (OBP TI Reqt) and complete the following:

1. Review the ‘Validate Cost’ line items and confirm the cost. These are items that were on the RAP FY13-17 and also on OBP’s requirements that they just provided.

2. Review the ‘Compare Column G and H. Determine if they are the same requirement. Validate cost’ line items. These items were provided as new OBP requirements; however, these requirements seem similar to prior year estimates (FY13-17).

   Validate whether or not the requirements are the same (compare columns G and H). If the requirements are the same, confirm this by adding notes to the ‘Comment’ column and validate the cost.

3. Review the ‘Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?’ line items and determine whether or not these requirements are needed. If the requirement is needed, confirm its need by adding notes to the ‘Comment’ column and validate or develop the cost. These items were included in the FY13-17, but just want to make sure that we don’t need these requirements anymore.
Note:
A couple of good ‘Comment’ column updates may include the following:

1. The Requirements listed in both columns G and H are the same. Please see validated or new cost.
2. The requirement/project is no longer needed. Please remove requirement.

Also, please note that any RE/ENV costs must be accounted for when considering the TI requirements and validating costs. Teaming up with [b (6)] team will be best for this effort.

Both [b (6)] and [b (6)] are available to address your questions and/concerns, so please feel free to reach out to them for assistance. Also, please keep in mind that additional information may be needed at a later time.

We’ll need your information back by COB January 18th – but would prefer to get them as soon as possible. [b (6)] assisted with this task last year. He may be a good point of contact.

Thanks!
[b (6)]

[b (6)]
Deputy Director, Business Operations Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office
Facilities Management & Engineering
[b (6)]
[berry]

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not on OBP Requirement List. Do we still want to include this requirement?</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - (b) (7)(E) O-1 - O-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NON-RESPONSIVE
Folks,

Please find attached Revision Two of the White Paper in advance of today's meeting on the subject.

I've incorporated additional comments from (PWS), (RE), and (Cost).

Thanks,

(b) (6) PE, PMP
ECSO TI Branch Chief
819 Taylor Street, Rm (b) (6)
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
{(b) (6)} office
{(b) (6)} mobile

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6) Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2012 11:03 PM
To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: White Paper Draft for O-1-2-3

I made some suggested edits to the PWS (item #1) and added a couple of comments.
Thanks

(b) (5)
Folks,

Please find Revision One of the White Paper attached for your review. I have included comments and suggestions from everyone who provided them. Thanks.

But please check my ability to incorporate these comments to make sure I did it correctly.

Also, I have included some remarks/comments in red font for areas where we could use more input and/or where we need to decide on a number (i.e. -- cost of steel).

Risk Matrix and/or Historical Fence cost table still need to be added in if we decide they are necessary.

Please take a look prior to our meeting on Thursday. If you have any glaring errors or subject matter to add, then please send to me ASAP and I'll do my best to incorporate and re-send prior to the meeting.

Thanks,
Completed.

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy

All,

I have also been forwarding these emails to so I recommend you all keep them in the loop on an RE.

Thanks,

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
Good stuff.

Thanks

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2012 5:30 PM
To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: White Paper Draft for O-1-2-3

Folks,

Here are some maps from (out sick today) that may be useful to us as we continue to work on the draft White Paper.

(b) (6) PE, PMP
ECSO TI Branch Chief
819 Taylor Street, Rm (b) (6)
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(b) (6) office
(b) (6) mobile

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2012 3:41 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: Fw: White Paper Draft for O-1-2-3

Hope the attachments gets thru if so could you share with the rest of the folks. Thought the info might help with the white paper.

Thanks,

(b) (6)
As you requested, here’s the last version of the TI RAP that I have – as I mentioned, I’m certain that [b](6) group [b](6) in particular) has a more current version…she’s CC’d on this email.

Also as was requested, here’s our DRAFT briefing to [b](6) regarding some outstanding RE items – (O-1,2,3), Phase-2 [b](6) & Remaining PF225 Litigation.

It’s my understanding that we’re not funded for the first two.

We have roughly [b](5) un-obligated already w/Corps to cover PF225 RE [b](5)

It’s my understanding that this will be briefed to him tomorrow by [b](6)

Very Respectfully,

W:
M:

[b](6)

As discussed, here is our updated input.

Of note:

1. I cited overarching RE assumptions in the lower right corner of the spreadsheet
2. I deleted two columns from the spreadsheet [b](6) sent me – RE & ENV (formerly columns ‘H’ & ‘I’) – they weren’t being used since we’re now summarizing RE & ENV estimates all the way to the right.
3. I added Column ‘T’ totaling the Project, ENV & RE Costs
4. Lines 69 and 70 are duplicates – should delete one of these rows from the spreadsheet
5. [b](5)
6. Column ‘G’ reflects original cost estimates – [b](5)
7. Column ‘L’ – there are a number of empty cells for quantity, which makes project cost = ‘0’ – as discussed, [b] [5] is already aware of this.

8. I inserted comments in Column ‘C’ (highlighted in **YELLOW**) for RE-related programmatic line items only, answering questions as to whether they should remain on the spreadsheet given that they appear not to be ‘OBP Requirements’…

9. Column ‘M’ – Cells highlighted in **LIGHT BLUE** are some ‘Miscellaneous’ Programmatic Requirements that are neither ENV nor RE – so a ‘validated’ cost still needs to be inserted by someone (presumably the BOD)

10. There is nothing on this spreadsheet that I can see indicating which FY the Project/Programmatic Expense is projected to fall into…is that a follow on exercise to determine in what FY to assign what % of a given expense?

---

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**MBA PMP**

Real Estate PM
Border Patrol Facilities & Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Office: [b] (6)
Blackberry: [b] (6)

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing border patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88 Validate Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TI RAP FY14-18

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Pedestrian Fence (b) (7)(E) O-1 - O-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Miles / Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Env ROM</td>
<td>Env ROM Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA (b) (5) BA (b) (5) for monitoring Mitigation (b) (5)? 404 (b) (5) MBTA (b) (5) environmental monitors (b) (5)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Last PRD is (b) (5) (Deviate from Standard)*
TOTAL INCLUDING
PROJECT/ENV/RE

(b) (5)

(b) (7)(E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of TI</th>
<th>Standard Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Basis of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lights</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culverts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossover/small bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane Removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditching</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey Barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Miles / Num</td>
<td>Standard Cost</td>
<td>BPFTI - Validated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Link Fence</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Per Mile</td>
<td>ROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drain Flaps</td>
<td></td>
<td>Per Storm Drain</td>
<td>FY13 RAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence Capping</td>
<td></td>
<td>Per Mile</td>
<td>ROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env ROM Assumptions</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Real Estate ROM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY REAL ESTATE ASSUMPTIONS:**

(b) (5)

(b) (7)(E)
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

Real Estate Briefing

1. Un-constructed Fence Segments O-1,2,3
2. RGV Phase-2 Gates – (b)(7)(E) Public Roads
3. PF225 Litigation Snapshot (RGV & BIS)

PRE-DECISIONAL
RGV SEGMENTS (O-1,2,3)

UN-CONSTRUCTED FENCE
O-1,2,3 Original Alignment

- Total Swath (approx\textsubscript{(b)} (7)(E)): (b) (7)(E) on USFWS / to acquire on Private
  - O-1: (b) (7)(E) on USFWS / on Private
  - O-2: (b) (7)(E) on USFWS / on Private
  - O-3: (b) (7)(E) on USFWS / on Private

- Factors Driving Remaining Costs (Total ROM of (b) (5))

- Access Cures – Required if CBP builds fence and doesn’t acquire all land to the river
O-1,2,3 New Alignment

NEW ALIGNMENT:

- IBWC provided written concurrence on Feb 15, 2012
- Appro overlap with original alignment
- Appro New Swath with no overlap atop original swath

RIVERSIDE REMAINDER:

- 5X More land from fence to river than original alignment
  \[ (b)(7)(E) \text{ total} = (b)(7)(E) + (b)(7)(E) \text{ on USFWS} \]
1. Complete Acquisition of Entire Original Alignment and Make Necessary Adjustments for Areas that Eroded into the River

(Total ROM for RE = \( \text{(b) (5)} \))
- Real Estate ROM for Final Acquisition Payment = \( \text{(b) (5)} \)
- Required Real Estate Pre-Acquisition Work = \( \text{(b) (5)} \)
  (Survey / Title / Appraisal – \( \text{(b) (5)} \) acquisitions at \( \text{(b) (5)} \) per)

2. Retain Portion of Original Alignment and Revest Portion
   - Ability to revest property based on landowner willingness

\text{RGV} \( \text{(b) (7)(E)} \) PROJECT:
   - \( \text{(b) (5)} \)
PHASE-2 RGV GATES

GATING PUBLIC ROADS
Challenges/Risks

1. PROPERTY NEEDED FOR GATE CONSTRUCTION:
   (Secondary Risk)
   (b)(5)

2. IMPACT TO PROPERTY SOUTH OF FENCE:
   (Primary Risk)
   (b)(5)
Proposed Solution & Total Cost Estimate
(ROM Estimates Rounded to Nearest Million)

TOTAL ROM ESTIMATE RANGE: $ \text{(b) (5)}$
PF225 RE SNAP SHOT

RGV and BIS (California)
PF225 Real Estate Acquisitions / Litigation

- **Border-wide:** Nearly 400 land acquisitions, of which 330 required condemnation

- **RGV:** 280 land acquisitions (273 condemnations, 7 ‘clean purchases’)
  - (cases cover multiple land tracts & owners)
    - (Un-constructed RGV Segments O-1,2,3):
    - (Constructed RGV Segments O-4 thru O-21): Of 217 acquisitions…
      - 210 ‘initial’ condemnation cases filed; 7 ‘clean purchases’
      - 107 cases, compensation resolved: (63 closed; 44 open but ‘paid’)
        - Ex: (b) (6)  (b) (5)
        - Conservative ROM to Complete = (b) (6)
  - Ex: (b) (6)  (b) (5)
Border Infrastructure System (BIS)
Real Estate Acquisitions / Litigation

- Condemnations with Wide Value Disparity between Gov’t / Owner:
  1) (b) (5)
  2) (b) (5)
  3) (b) (5)

- (b) (5)

- (b) (5)
(b)(5)
Thanks for sending Rev Four. I've reviewed and offer a few "final" corrections to the text before we call it done.

See yellow highlighted areas in the attached document.

The first area is simply a redundancy to be deleted. The other 3 are minor corrections/suggestions.

Thanks!

PE, PMP
ECSO TI Branch Chief
819 Taylor Street, Rm
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
office
mobile
Thank you all for your time, energies and collaboration.

Regards,

(b)(6)
Thank you all for your time, energies and collaboration.

Regards,

(b) (5)
All

Attached are my meeting notes from our April 25th call. Please contact me if you have any questions. Next meeting date and time TBD.

Thanks

[b] (6) <<IBWC Issues 04 24 12_meeting notes.pdf>>
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

Border Patrol Tactical Infrastructure Program
IBWC Coordination Activities
April 24th, 2012

Meeting notes prepared by (b) (6)
Agenda

- Levee Crest/Road Maintenance MOA
- B.I.S. Friendship Circle
- PF225 B-4 Playa & Alamo Areas
- Gate at Monument 223
- Calexico West POE Improvements
- Nogales Tunnels Gates
- Mexican Levee/Road @ Silvercreek wash
- Douglas Fence Replacement
- Anapra Area-CBP/Corps Drainage Study
- PF225 K-1B Fence
- El Paso Vega Mowing
- Ft Hancock/Zac Dominguez Field Office Vehicle Gates

- Ft Hancock/Zac Dominguez Field Office Vehicle Gates
- Eagle Pass River Bank Reconstruction
- Laredo Boat Ramp-Phase 2
- Laredo Cane Removal Pilot
- PF225 O-1, O-2 & O-3
- Penitas Pump Station Levee Wall (PF225 O-4B)
- Hidalgo POE PH 2
- RGV Vehicle Gates-Phase 1
- Cameron County East Loop Project
- Additional Miscellaneous Items
Levee Crest/Road Maintenance MOA

- CBP drafted MOA amendment to address levee crest maintenance in the El Paso sector.
- Final draft of MOA submitted to (b) (6) on June 1st for IBWC signature.
- MOA is reportedly with (b) (6) for signature. No known issues (12/9 update: IBWC recently notified us that there are some concerns with the MOA being discussed internally within IWBC-specifics not known)
  - (b) (5)
  - MOA being re-reviewed by IBWC’s SMEs
- CBP re-sent draft MOA to IBWC on April 9th
- (b) (5)
B.I.S. Friendship Circle & Surf Fence Replacement

- Replacement of border fencing in proximity to (b) (7)(E)
- Project has been broken into two phases. Phase 1 consists of the primary fence replacement, which is currently under construction
  - Fence replacement on land complete including Friendship Circle
    - *Fence installed per IBWC requirements*
  - Surf fence replacement underway and expected to be completed by (b) (5)
    - *Work is essentially complete-punch list items being addressed*
- Phase 2 consists of (b) (7)(E) area in general
  - *Work continuing-no issues*
B.I.S. Bunker Hill Road

- Construction of a new road and border lighting that will connect the west and east side of Bunker Hill with the existing B.I.S.
- Project to be constructed by a military training deployments
  - CBP received IBWC “concurrence” letter on June 27th
- Construction underway-no issues
PF225 B-4 Playa & Alamo Areas

- Mexico contends the ponding is from the American canal; CBP sent IBWC aerial photos on 11/08/11 which show the ponding is the result of overflow from the Mexican irrigation canal (see next 2 photos)
- CBP resent aerial photos on Nov 28th that show the surface water coming from the MX irrigation ditch
- PE (b) (6) to discuss w/ CILA. CBP requested IBWC to observe the condition of the Mexican canal embankments to determine if a breach(es) is/are causing the flooding into the U.S.
- CBP forwarded geotechnical analysis to IBWC
- At IBWC’s request, CBP contacted their local rep on Feb 28th as surface water has reappeared.
  IBWC met with Mexican representatives on Mar 1st-
  Ponding may be caused from both the Mexican irrigation canal and the All-American canal; rainfall event occurred just prior to Mar 1st so ponding may also be due to low lying area; Bureau of Reclamation investigating All-American canal

(b) (5)
Calexico West POE Expansion

- Mexico is installing a new box culvert.
- Significant erosion has occurred along the banks of the river immediately north of the border that is adversely impacting an existing bridge abutment and primary and chain link fencing.
- PE to meet with CILA at the POE to observed and discuss the issues.
- No response from Mexico as to IBWC/CBP concerns.
- IBWC sent GSA letter describing their concerns and agreed to forward copy to CBP.
Nogales Tunnels Gates

- Removal of the existing 3-feet retaining wall in the Grand tunnel and the installation of primary gates at the Grand and Morley tunnels
  - Project also involves tunnel access improvements
- RFP issued on November 18, 2011; contract was awarded on February 10, 2012; *current completion date* *(b) (5)*
- IBWC to notify CILA of the impending construction activities w/in the tunnel
- *Construction proceeding-no significant issues*
Mexican Road Constructed @ Silvercreek wash

- A levee/road constructed across a major drainage wash in proximity to the border (b) (7)(E)s causing flood waters to back-up into the U.S. and exacerbate erosion that is occurring in Silver Creek
- IBWC sent a letter to the property owner putting them on notice that they will be held accountable for damages to gov’t property
- Property owner recently observed raising the height of the levee/road
- IBWC is conducting H&H modeling to determine what height of the gabion wall would be acceptable to them based on the maximum 6-inch backwater requirement

**IBWC provided CBP with the results of their H&H modeling, which shows that the gabion wall must be removed or re-located further downstream so as to not adversely impact the U.S.; CBP concurs with IBWC’s conclusions; IBWC planning to meet with CILA again to present H&H results**
Douglas Fence Replacement

- Replacement of existing legacy border fencing (landing mat) in proximity to the City of Douglas (via 4 phases)
- Construction of phases 1 and 2 completed
- Design of phase 4 recently submitted to IBWC for review
- IBWC had comments on drainage design for phase 3-Baker has addressed. IBWC concurrence letter for phase III forthcoming
- IBWC to assist with resolution of border incursions once construction gets underway; IBWC requested CBP provide contract award/construction schedule once available
- Construction of the final phase of the Douglas Ditch improvements underway-no issues
Anapra Area-CBP/Corps Drainage Study

- CBP reviewed preliminary draft of report.
- Corps/M. Baker updating report; once draft is completed, CBP would like IBWC to review.
- Unique challenges in this area may require unique solutions.
- Once the report is “preliminarily finalized” (expected), we would like to meet with IBWC in field to review the proposed solutions.
IBWC advised that they plan to have an A/E under contract by [redacted] to design the box culvert to replace the existing canal. Goal is to have the design complete by [redacted] and to award a construction contract in time to allow the work to occur [redacted].

RFP is ready to go out to bid; awaiting final real estate acquisitions
- [redacted]

CBP responded to PE [redacted] concurrence letter on February 10th

CBP reviewing URS 60% design for box culvert design-CBP is OK with 60% design:

According to IBWC, construction funding not yet received but it’s in the President’s 2013 budget. The box culvert was considered in the EA. FONSI being revised to reflect installation of the box culvert

[redacted]

[redacted] identified as CBP point of contact; [redacted] agreed to provide a sample flood protection plan
El Paso Canal Crossovers & Vega Ramps

- Project involves the construction of canal crossovers and new vehicle ramps into the floodway in the Border Patrol’s Yselata and Fabens Stations areas of responsibility (PF225 segments K-2C, K-2D, K-3 and K-4 (future))
- Design is complete and has been approved by IBWC
- CBP in the process of completing real estate negotiations with EPCWID#1
  - Draft MOA and cover letter to District provided to IBWC
- A meeting with IBWC, Corps, DoJ and CBP was held on Jan 18th to discuss real estate issues associated with this project. Separate meeting notes were prepared and disseminated among the attendees
- IBWC notified Corps that they have questions pertaining to our surveys supporting documents; Corps is going to set up a meeting with their surveyor and IBWC to discuss-DoJ/Corps to meet this Thursday, March 22nd
  - Meeting with DoJ went well; IBWC concurs with CBP and DoJ with regards to what land the federal government owns
Wasteway #1 and #2 Culvert Replacements

- IBWC project involves the removal and replacement of wasteway structures under recently constructed primary pedestrian fence and vehicle gates
- CBP has reviewed 60% design drawings and has questions regarding proposed levee modifications
- CBP drafting MOA b/t IBWC and CBP to cover the temporary removal and replacement of the fence and gates and to be installed when work is not occurring
- CBP requires the border barrier to be “intact” during non-construction hours
- IBWC has included a requirement in the design drawings that...
El Paso Vega Mowing

- Draft IAA submitted to IBWC in mid-Feb, 2011
- Public comments (including IBWC) received and addressed relative to the draft EA
- Conference call held on Sept 1st between IBWC, CBP and FWS to discuss FWS desire for a formal consultation
- On November 15, 2011 CBP received concurrence from Fish and Wildlife on the mowing action proposed in the EA. The concurrence from FWS was the last remaining item needed to finalize the Environmental Assessment
- CBP forwarded IBWC a copy of our executed FONSI
- Updated draft IAA to reflect EA and FONSI submitted to IBWC on Feb 1st
• The Corps is going to design the gate modifications “in-house”.

• IBWC is OK w/ CBP using the maintenance yard for staging and access.
Eagle Pass River Bank Reconstruction

- IBWC is planning to meet with the property owner to discuss IBWC’s proposed path forward; IBWC to notify us of meeting logistics so “local” CBP personnel may attend
Laredo Phase I Cane Removal Pilot Project

- CBP submitted draft summary report relative to water quality samples collected during the herbicide applications to IBWC on August 26th
- PE(b)(6) is going to transmit the analysis to Mexico for their review and concurrence
- Analysis was forwarded to CILA for their review and concurrence in late December. No response yet
- Still awaiting for response from Mexico – no new news. CBP suggested IBWC send Mexico a letter stating that the report will be assumed accurate if no comments are received by a date TBD. IBWC agreed to do so.
Laredo Boat Ramp-Phase 2

- CBP submitted design documents to IBWC on June 28th for formal “concurrence”
- CBP provided written response to CILA’s design modification requests IBWC and CBP have agreed on which CILA comments will be addressed and those that cannot.
- Target RFP release date is (b) (5)
- Project still on schedule. IBWC requested that their local field office be notified when the work is about to begin
PF225 O-1 thru O-3

- IBWC coordinating project “concurrence” with Mexico
- IBWC to coordinate meeting with CBP and Dept of State regarding these fence segments and the new Los Ebanos POE
  – Conference call occurred on Oct 20th
- IBWC indicated that Mexico had some technical questions regarding the hydraulic model, which they would be addressing on (b) (5); IBWC continues to believe the model results are accurate
- IBWC concurrence letter relative to hydraulic modeling received on Feb 14th
- (b) (5)
Penitas Pump Station Levee Wall (PF225 O-4B)

- Project involves the construction of new levee wall(s) and levee in proximity to the Pump Station
- CBP assisting IBWC with resolution of design issues
- CBP requests IBWC land survey info associated with the project ASAP as we need to acquire real estate from the Hidalgo Irrigation District #1 for the vehicle gates we will be constructing
  - CBP requests update on the status of the real estate info-no new news
- IBWC is in the process of issuing a modification to the contractor to hire the engineer of record to assist in the identification of the best solution for changed site conditions

(b) (5)
Hidalgo POE PH 2

• Project involves the construction of a new flood protection wall in proximity to the Hidalgo POE
• CBP and IBWC have executed an IAA for IBWC to incorporate bollards into the new flood wall
  - (b) (5)
• IAA to be revised to reflect new period of performance and funding of $320K
• Revised IAA has been finalized
  - As of Nov 28th, the project is 56% complete and estimated to be completed by (b) (5)
  - West end of the project should be completed by the (b) (5)-CBP to be invited to the punch-list meeting. IBWC anticipates work being completed on the east end by (b) (5)
RGV Vehicle Gates-Phase 1

- CBP/Corps have hired Weston Solutions to design-build vehicle gates in Cameron and Hidalgo Counties
- Weston’s concept designs for the gate configurations to be built as part of the project were provided to IBWC on Dec 4th and again on Dec 14th
- CBP submitted letter to IBWC confirming project is covered by April 2008 waiver
  - “Concurrence” for the first site specific designs (test gates) received on June 30th
- IBWC authorized CBP to use the fence staging area (IBWC’s Ft Brown parcel) as the staging area for O19, B-4 Art League Vehicle Gate project
- In Hidalgo where the flood protection wall has been built, IBWC and CBP agreed to install and as-built drawings will be provided to IBWC once available
- Construction underway and proceeding smoothly
- No issues
Cameron County East Loop Project

- Cameron County is planning to a new highway (aka East Loop) to connect the Veterans International bridge with of the Port of Brownsville. The project is going to require the relocation of a portion of IBWC’s levee system and CBP fencing
- CBP met with Cameron County on January 26, 2011 to learn more specifics regarding the project to include anticipated timing. IBWC and FWS participated in the meeting
- IBWC concurred with CBP’s recommended changes to the proposed typical levee/fence cross-section, which have been forwarded to Cameron County
- *IBWC advised of a planned conference call with FHA regarding their draft EA and agreed to forward meeting invite*
Additional Items

- IBWC asked if CBP could install primary pedestrian fence. CBP recommended that IBWC send their request to CBP’s Acting Commissioner Aguilar.
- CBP added IBWC to their organization “pick-list” so IBWC can access their TI document library (construction drawings, as-builts, studies, etc.).
- CBP drafting MOA; should be forwarded to IBWC for review and comment shortly.
- CBP would like to discuss issues we are having in the fence area; agreed to discuss with CBP.
- IBWC requested that CBP install (b) (5) additional items; CBP indicated they would evaluate.
Attached for your review, comment and guidance is the White Paper for the next steps in O1-O3.

The White Paper is a partnership and collaboration with ECSO, RE/ENV, TI, BPFTI Eng team) and OCC.

Look it over and let’s set up a time to discuss. Otherwise, you have a good document if CBP inquires.
Attached is the briefing for today’s call. Sorry for getting it out late but I wanted to make sure it was as up to date as I could get it.

Thanks

[b] (6) <<IBWC Issues 05 30 12.pdf>>

Notes from last meeting attached. Agenda to follow. << File: IBWC Issues 04 24 12_meeting notes.pdf >>
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

Border Patrol Tactical Infrastructure Program
IBWC Coordination Activities
May 30th, 2012
Levee Crest/Road Maintenance MOA

- CBP drafted MOA amendment to address levee crest maintenance in the El Paso sector.
- Final draft of MOA submitted to (b) (6) on June 1st for IBWC signature.
- MOA is reportedly with (b) (6) for signature. No known issues (12/9 update: IBWC recently notified us that there are some concerns with the MOA being discussed internally within IWBC-specifics not known)
  - (b) (5)
  - MOA being re-reviewed by IBWC’s SMEs
- CBP re-sent draft MOA to IBWC on April 9th.
- (b) (5)
- ?
B.I.S. Friendship Circle & Surf Fence Replacement

- Replacement of border fencing in proximity to (b) (7)(E)
- Project has been broken into two phases. Phase 1 consists of the primary fence replacement, which is currently under construction
  - Fence replacement on land complete including Friendship Circle
    - Fence installed per IBWC requirements
  - Surf fence replacement underway and expected to be completed by (b)(5)
    - Work is essentially complete-punch list items being addressed
- Phase 2 consists of (b)(7)(E) area in general
  - Work is essentially complete-punch list items being addressed
B.I.S. Bunker Hill Road

- Construction of a new road and border lighting that will connect the west and east side of Bunker Hill with the existing B.I.S.
- Project to be constructed by a military training deployments
  - CBP received IBWC “concurrence” letter on June 27th
- Construction underway-no issues
At IBWC’s request, CBP contacted their local rep on Feb 28th as surface water has reappeared. IBWC met with Mexican representatives on Mar 1st. Ponding may be caused from both the Mexican irrigation canal and the All-American canal; rainfall event occurred just prior to Mar 1st so ponding may also be due to low lying area; Bureau of Reclamation investigating All-American canal.

Any new news?
Calexico West POE Expansion

- Mexico is installing a new box culvert.
- Significant erosion has occurred along the banks of the river immediately north of the border that is adversely impacting an existing bridge abutment and primary and chain link fencing.
- PE to meet with CILA at the POE to observe and discuss the issues.
- No response from Mexico as to IBWC/CBP concerns.
- IBWC sent GSA letter describing their concerns and provided copy to CBP.
- Any new news?
Nogales Tunnels Gates

- Removal of the existing 3-feet retaining wall in the Grand tunnel and the installation of primary gates at the Grand and Morley tunnels
  - Project also involves tunnel access improvements
- RFP issued on November 18, 2011; contract was awarded on February 10, 2012; current completion date (b) (5)
- IBWC to notify CILA of the impending construction activities w/in the tunnel
- Construction proceeding-no significant issues
Mexican Road Constructed @ Silvercreek wash

• A levee/road constructed across a major drainage wash in proximity to the border is causing flood waters to back-up into the U.S. and exacerbate erosion that is occurring in Silver Creek.

• IBWC sent a letter to the property owner putting them on notice that they will be held accountable for damages to gov’t property.

• IBWC provided CBP with the results of their H&H modeling, which shows that the gabion wall must be removed or re-located further downstream so as to not adversely impact the U.S.; CBP concurs with IBWC’s conclusions; IBWC planning to meet with CILA again to present H&H results.

• Any news news?
Douglas Fence Replacement

- Replacement of existing legacy border fencing (landing mat) in proximity to the City of Douglas (via 4 phases)
- CBP/Baker received IBWC’s comments on phase 4 design on May 29th
- CBP received IBWC’s concurrence letter for phase 3 on May 3rd; CBP expects contract to be awarded by (b) (5)
- IBWC to assist with resolution of border incursions once construction gets underway; IBWC requested CBP provide contract award/construction schedule once available
- Construction of the final phase of the Douglas Ditch improvements underway-no issues
Anapra Area-CBP/Corps Drainage Study

- CBP reviewed preliminary draft of report
- Unique challenges in this area may require unique solutions
- Once the report is “preliminarily finalized” (now expected), we would like to meet with IBWC in field to review the proposed solutions
PF225 K-1B Fence

- IBWC advised that they plan to have an A/E under contract by (b) (5) to design the box culvert to replace the existing canal. Goal is to have the design complete by (b) (5) and to award a construction contract in time to allow the work to occur (b) (5).

- RFP is ready to go out to bid; awaiting final real estate acquisitions.
  - IBWC sent CBP concurrence letter on revised design: (b) (5).

- CBP responded to PE (b) (6) concurrence letter on February 10th.

- CBP reviewing URS 60% design for box culvert design-CBP is OK with 60% design: (b) (5).

- According to IBWC, construction funding not yet received but it’s in the President’s 2013 budget. The box culvert was considered in the EA. FONSI being revised to reflect installation of the box culvert.

- IBWC agreed to discuss the potential use of the vega area for contractor staging; (b) (6) identified as CBP point of contact; (b) (6) has provided a sample flood protection plan.
El Paso Canal Crossovers & Vega Ramps

- Project involves the construction of canal crossovers and new vehicle ramps into the floodway in the Border Patrol’s Yselata and Fabens Stations areas of responsibility (PF225 segments K-2C, K-2D, K-3 and K-4 (future))
- Design is complete and has been approved by IBWC
- Draft MOA and cover letter to District provided to IBWC
- A meeting with IBWC, Corps, DoJ and CBP was held on Jan 18th to discuss real estate issues associated with this project. Separate meeting notes were prepared and disseminated among the attendees
- IBWC notified Corps that they have questions pertaining to our surveys supporting documents; meeting with DoJ went well; IBWC concurs with CBP and DoJ with regards to what land the federal government owns; CBP/DoJ would like a letter from IBWC concurring with analysis results
Wasteway #1 and #2 Culvert Replacements

- IBWC project involves the removal and replacement of wasteway structures under recently constructed primary pedestrian fence and vehicle gates.
- CBP drafting MOA b/t IBWC and CBP to cover the temporary removal and replacement of the fence and gates and to be installed when work is not occurring.
- IBWC has included a requirement in the design drawings that (b) (5) and (b) (7)(E)
El Paso Vega Mowing

- Draft IAA submitted to IBWC in mid-Feb, 2011
- Public comments (including IBWC) received and addressed relative to the draft EA
- Conference call held on Sept 1\(^{st}\) between IBWC, CBP and FWS to discuss FWS desire for a formal consultation
- On November 15, 2011 CBP received concurrence from Fish and Wildlife on the mowing action proposed in the EA. The concurrence from FWS was the last remaining item needed to finalize the Environmental Assessment
- CBP forwarded IBWC a copy of our executed FONSI
- Draft re-vegetation plan is in the process of being prepared
- Updated draft IAA to reflect EA and FONSI submitted to IBWC on Feb 1\(^{st}\)
Ft Hancock/Zac Dominguez Field Office Vehicle Gates

• The Corps is going to [redacted] (b) (5)

• IBWC is OK w/ CBP using the maintenance yard for staging and access.
Eagle Pass River Bank Reconstruction

- IBWC is planning to meet with the property owner on (b)(5) to discuss IBWC’s proposed path forward; IBWC provided us the meeting logistics so “local” CBP personnel may attend.
Laredo Phase I Cane Removal Pilot Project

• CBP submitted draft summary report relative to water quality samples collected during the herbicide applications to IBWC on August 26th
• PE(b) (6) is going to transmit the analysis to Mexico for their review and concurrence
• Analysis was forwarded to CILA for their review and concurrence in late December. No response yet
• Still awaiting for response from Mexico – no new news. CBP suggested IBWC send Mexico a letter stating that the report will be assumed accurate if no comments are received by a date TBD. IBWC agreed to do so
Laredo Boat Ramp-Phase 2

- CBP submitted design documents to IBWC on June 28th for formal “concurrence”
- CBP provided written response to CILA’s design modification requests IBWC and CBP have agreed on which CILA comments will be addressed and those that cannot.
- Construction is underway
PF225 O-1 thru O-3

- IBWC coordinating project “concurrence” with Mexico
- IBWC to coordinate meeting with CBP and Dept of State regarding these fence segments and the new Los Ebanos POE
  - Conference call occurred on Oct 20th
- IBWC indicated that Mexico had some technical questions regarding the hydraulic model, which they would be addressing on (b) (5); IBWC continues to believe the model results are accurate
- IBWC concurrence letter relative to hydraulic modeling received on Feb 14th
- CBP evaluating potential funding sources; IBWC advised that there was significant public opposition to the fence segments voiced at a recent town hall meeting hosted by Commissioner Drusina
Penitas Pump Station Levee Wall (PF225 O-4B)

- Project involves the construction of new levee wall(s) and levee in proximity to the Pump Station
- CBP assisting IBWC with resolution of design issues
- CBP requests IBWC land survey info associated with the project ASAP as we need to acquire real estate from the Hidalgo Irrigation District #1 for the vehicle gates we will be constructing
  - CBP requests update on the status of the real estate info - no new news
- IBWC is in the (b) (5)
- IBWC awarded additional design services mod and (b) (5)
- (b) (5)
Hidalgo POE PH 2

- Project involves the construction of a new flood protection wall in proximity to the Hidalgo POE
- CBP and IBWC have executed an IAA for IBWC to incorporate bollards into the new flood wall
  - IAA to be revised to reflect new period of performance and funding of $320K
  - Revised IAA has been finalized
    - As of Nov 28th, the project is 56% complete and estimated to be completed by [redacted]
    - West end of the project should be completed by the end of [redacted] CBP to be invited to the punch-list meeting. IBWC anticipates work being completed on the east end by [redacted] Need to confirm period of performance for the IAA
    - [redacted] gap between the new floodwall bollards and existing levee wall bollards needs to be reduced to [redacted] to comply with CBP fence design standards
RGV Vehicle Gates-Phase 1

- CBP/Corps have hired Weston Solutions to design-build vehicle gates in Cameron and Hidalgo Counties.
- Weston’s concept designs for the gate configurations to be built as part of the project were provided to IBWC on Dec 4\textsuperscript{th} and again on Dec 14\textsuperscript{th}.
- CBP submitted letter to IBWC confirming project is covered by April 2008 waiver.
- “Concurrence” for the first site specific designs (test gates) received on June 30\textsuperscript{th}.
- IBWC authorized CBP to use the O-20 fence staging area (IBWC’s Ft Brown parcel) as the staging area for O19, B-4 Art League Vehicle Gate project.
- In Hidalgo where the flood protection wall has been built, IBWC and CBP agreed to [redacted] and as-built drawings will be provided to IBWC once available.
- Construction underway and proceeding smoothly.
- [redacted]
Cameron County East Loop Project

• Cameron County is planning to a new highway (aka East Loop) to connect the Veterans International bridge with the Port of Brownsville. The project is going to require the relocation of a portion of IBWC’s levee system and CBP fencing.
• CBP met with Cameron County on January 26, 2011 to learn more specifics regarding the project to include anticipated timing. IBWC and FWS participated in the meeting.
• IBWC concurred with CBP’s recommended changes to the proposed typical levee/fence cross-section, which have been forwarded to Cameron County.
• IBWC and CBP participated in a conference call with FHA regarding their draft EA.
Additional Items

- IBWC asked if CBP could install primary pedestrian fence from the existing fence segment. CBP recommended that IBWC send their request to CBP’s Acting Commissioner Aguilar.
- CBP added IBWC to organization “pick-list” so IBWC can access our TI document library (construction drawings, as-builts, studies, etc.).
- IBWC requested that CBP install; CBP indicated they would evaluate.
Please add your column so that I can add your numbers to the final number.

Please send the spreadsheet back. Thanks.

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.

Attached is the actual FINAL FINAL RAP! Sorry one more change was made. We should be all set now!

Thanks,

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.

Attached is the Final RAP
Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol’s proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirm With</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>State / Country</th>
<th>Sector / DFO</th>
<th>PPA</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>RE Cost</th>
<th>ENV Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Validate Cost</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td>BSFIT D&amp;D</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference (New OBP Requirements w/OBP Costs)</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Miles / Num</td>
<td>Standard Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Fence - O-1/O-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPFTI - Validated Cost</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Env ROM</td>
<td>Env ROM Assumptions</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[b] (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[b] (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Note: Last PRD is (b) (5) Deviate from Standard</em></td>
<td>(b) (5) plus mitigation</td>
<td>this will be covered by waiver ESP and existing documents but will need to be updated, but we will need monitors full-time for environmental and CR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attached are last weeks notes.

From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Fw: TI Call Notes from 1/13
Date: Thursday, January 19, 2012 10:00:32 PM
Attachments: TI Projects Review Call Notes 011312.xls

All,
Please see the attached notes from the TI Projects Review call last week. Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks!

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>CBP PM</th>
<th>USACE PM</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments 1/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGV</td>
<td>PF225</td>
<td>O-1 through O-3</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td>(b) (6)</td>
<td>Project on hold</td>
<td>Moved up to OBP leadership as a priority project. Waiting for OBP to push it up to Chief and Commissioner for approval. FITT currently does not have a schedule. There still is not PRD requirement, have not been requested to do any kind of detailed scheduling. <strong>Need to update FITT with current progress of project.</strong> (b) (6) to be the PM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 1/6</td>
<td>Comments 12/16</td>
<td>Comments 12/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 12/02</td>
<td>Comments 11/18</td>
<td>Comments 11/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 10/28</td>
<td>Comments 10/21</td>
<td>Comments 10/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 10/7</td>
<td>Comments 9/30</td>
<td>Comments 9/16</td>
<td>Comments 9/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 8/26</td>
<td>Comments 8/12</td>
<td>Comments 7/29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>Action item: (b) (6) get closeout documents from (b) (6) for RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 7/22</td>
<td>Comments 7/15</td>
<td>Comments 7/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action item:</strong> get closeout documents from RGV - O-1 to O-10 projects.</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td>No update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments 6/24</td>
<td>Comments 6/17</td>
<td>Comments 6/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No update</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/25</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/18</td>
<td>Comments/Notes 3/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments/Notes - 2/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Hold - met with IBWC on two dimensional hydraulic model - in agreement on assumptions agreed on 75% and working out the other 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perfect. Thank you.
(b) (5)
Attached are the final edits to the white paper. The edits include OCC’s, mine and others.

If you would, please look at this one last time and make any additional edits or comments and get this back to me by close of business today.

I plan to then take this and make a few slides to present to you.

If you are on BB, I have pasted the entire paper below for your easy review:

Subject: 01-2-3 Fence, Rio Grande Valley (RGV) Sector
(b) (5)