New RWA

M&R funding

Request [b] (6) eng/dsn funding for engineering assessment of flood damages to TI in RGV, LRT, DRT & MAR sectors

Note: This funds request is based off a ROM. There is not an approved PRD or CR. Attached is an email from [b] (6) authorizing a funds request.

Attached is the PR and updated funds management spreadsheet.

Thanks,

[b] (6)

<<TI rgv lrt drt mar flood damage assmt proc req 21july2010.doc>> <<ECSO TX Flood Damage Funds Management Spreadsheet 21july2010.xls>> <<FW: Damage Assessments - RGV, DRT, LRT, MAR>>
Tactical Infrastructure Procurement Request

**Date:** 21 July 2010

**Completed by Division Staff / Project Management**

Complete and submit the Procurement Request (PR) form to the Financial Officer for review, revision, and/or approval. Please include the Statement of Work (SOW) and/or Statement of Objectives (SOO) and Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE).

Subject Matter: **M&R: RGV/LRT/DRT/MAR flood damage assessment**

Originator Information: Name: **ECSO PgM**

PR Amount: **(b) (5)**

Contract Type: **(b) (6)**

Contract Action: Need to award Funds Transfer

Summary (Provide a brief description of what the funds are being used for):

*New RWA*

*M&R funding*

*Request* **(b) (5)** eng/dsn funding for engineering assessment of flood damages to TI in RGV, LRT, DRT & MAR sectors

---

**Completed by Financial Officer**

Funds Availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Center:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Class Distribution:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR#:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date Entered into SAP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Approvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division Director: (If different from Originator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Officer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI Program Manager:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Updated 10-31-07
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RWA Line Item</th>
<th>CEFMS FWI</th>
<th>Funding Account</th>
<th>WBS</th>
<th>Amount Received</th>
<th>Amount Obligated</th>
<th>Current Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Balance to be Funded</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1- Program Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2- Environmental Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3- Design and RFP Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
<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>4- Real Estate Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5- Implementation Oversight/QA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6- O&amp;M Implementation Projects</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RWA Line Item</th>
<th>CEFMS FWI</th>
<th>Funding Account</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>SBI Project ID</th>
<th>Amount Received</th>
<th>Amount Obligated</th>
<th>Current Estimate at Completion</th>
<th>Balance to be Funded</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marfa Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Del Rio Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laredo Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL         |           |                 | 0.00       | 0.00          |                 |                 |                               |                   |                 |         |
Per your request.

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2010 12:10 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: Damage Assessments - RGV, DRT, LRT, MAR

See (b) (6)s approval to request M&R funds below.


Please request these M&R funds as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering/Design</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thanks,

-----Original Message-----
From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, July 19, 2010 11:50 AM
To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Damage Assessments - RGV, DRT, LRT, MAR

Please proceed with a formal request for funds.

Thank you.
Below please find a ROM cost estimate for the subject efforts per your request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senior Civil Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>ROM Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course this is a ROM cost estimate and the actual needs in the field may be different than this estimate. ROM cost estimate includes travel, reproduction, overhead, and profit.

Please recall that we will assess current construction contracts with USACE personnel as quickly as possible to keep those projects moving.

Please contact me if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Program Manager
USACE Fort Worth District
CESWF-PM-ECSO-TI
office
bb
We're on it.

-----Original Message-----
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 8:02 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Damage Assessments - RGV, DRT, LRT, MAR

[REDACTED] & OBP would like to have an engineer do a damage assessment of the TI in the above Sectors once the flooding subsides and there is access to the TI. Timing would have to be coordinated with the Sectors involved to assure access.

I might suggest [REDACTED] in RGV if he has time, since he's got the roads interim contract and has managed a lot of the fence construction.

I will try to accompany whoever you select to do this. The output would be a damage listing and photos with recommended actions. I'm hearing the flooding in RGV may exist for another couple weeks, but DRT may be ready for the assessment much sooner.

[REDACTED] can give you any particulars on MAR (if it needs one) and LRT.

LMI Contractor
DHS - Customs and Border Protection (CBP)
FM&E BP-F-TI-Maintenance and Repair

"ONE TEAM, ONE MISSION, SECURING OUR HOMELAND"
Not that you have enough to read, I thought I would forward you the RGV minutes from the “total mission” request from OBP.

At this point, all this is sitting in OBP’s lap and we have pressed them for any help they may need. “Crickets”

Let me know if you have any questions.

Per your request, attached are the final notes and O-segment Maps with Markups.

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.
Rio Grande Valley Sector “Total Mission Planning”

Monday, June 18th - Friday, June 22nd

Trip Report and Notes Prepared by [redacted]

Executive Summary

The below trip report and notes are to capture the requirements, challenges, and conversations held in and throughout the Rio Grande Valley Sector, to include OBP HQ and Station representation. The week of events were driven by OBP HQ as a result of the DHS Secretary’s approval of the Southwest Texas Campaign. The below notes include information that may directly or indirectly impact the BPFTI office to include discussions on Tactical Infrastructure (O-1, O-2, O-3, RGV Phase 1 & 2, Roads), CTIMR, New Reolocation & Access Roads, C2 Facilities, Facilities, Checkpoints, FOBs and Mobile needs by Border Patrol. Briefings and Google Earth points for TI locations were presented by each Station, but are not in the possession of any OTIA or BPFTI participants. They may be available upon request to OBP HQ but are not readily available at this point in time.

OBP HQ commented that they would take all the requirements from this week and sit down to review Station priorities once back in DC over the next couple of week. At that point they will have a better view of what is needed for RGV Sector. A date for this determination was not established, funding is not currently available for new requirements, and knowledge on whom will be briefed was not provided at the end of the week in the field.

A few points of observation:

OBP HQ continued to express to Stations that they need to “think about the cost” or “be cost effective”, but on more then one occasion the RGV Sector PAIC expressed and guided the Stations that this is a requirement gathering meeting and that they should focus on the operational requirements they have and provide the raw need to OBP HQ and OBP HQ would review cost effective manners.

Regarding location, OBP HQ acknowledged towards the end of the week that they should have been asking the stations instead of having station report location of. They noted that they were doing this backwards, but all Stations did present locations. Access Roads, Real Estate, nor utilities access were not taken into account when placing locations. If utilities are required, Real Estate would need to be acquired and easements will need to be out-granted to utility companies. The out-grant process is done through DHS, since CBP does not currently have the authority to do so. Environmental impact was not discussed either unless it was on USFWS land. BPFTI took note that some currently planned sites are in the flood plain, which will require coordination with IBWC due to the restrictions associated with the treaty with
Mexico. Many stations do have existing facilities for future C2 Facilities, some better than others but could be taken into account when working through this requirement for future use. Overlap was seen on a handful of exiting Real Estate and Environmental actions that the government could leverage for the construction of TI or future Checkpoints / Facilities. Timing may be an issue, but future coordination with OTIA and BPFTI may help to save the government time and money.

Participants

- Participates included: OTIA (PM), OTIA (lead for ENV/Real Estate), BPFTI, OBP HQ (Chief), RGV TI Sector team, and 2 other BP Agents from HQ), RGV Sector PAIC, RGV TI Sector team, 25+ Border Patrol Agents representing each of the Station within RGV Sector.

Agenda

- **Monday June 18th**: a included a site visit to Station to the C2 Facility (~2 hour travel time; ~2 hours at the facility)
- **Tuesday June 19th**: a site visit to the AOR (8am - 5pm)
- **Wednesday June 20th**: located at Station all day with presentations from OBP HQ (Chief), OTIA, BPFTI, TI Division Director, Technology Lead, and Station Briefings.
- **Thursday June 21st**: located at Station all day with presentations from the remaining Stations and Station.

Program Overview Briefs by OBP HQ, OTIA, and BPFTI

- Chief briefed the group to explain that the purpose of this week was to review each Stations’ challenges and issues which could be fixed by future Technology, Tactical Infrastructure, CTIMR, Facilities, and mobile / manpower. No funding currently exists, but they are using this meeting as a preplanning for future funding by DHS. discussed the need to collect and prioritize technology & TI requirements.
- briefed on the OTIA program. No funding currently existing for RGV Construction. Noted to get locked down in next 3 months.
- briefed O-1, O-2, O-3 Real Estate. We mentioned that this was briefed to OBP HQ and a decision is waiting on the priority and need for this Fence Segment so we can move forward with Real Estate at BPFTI. Reviewed RGV Project: Under test O-1, O-2, O-2, O-1, O-1. All private roads are in the Project which is fully funded and all county and state roads are in which is not funded.
Station covers Zones and has. There are houses that back up to the river. A lot of private land owners along most of the roads – no big ranches. Project is currently being worked for roadwork in Zone area. Escondito pump area road, Falcon Heights Road and Chapeno Road. Have a two track. Alternate sites were not chosen.
- Discussed O-1 & O-2 Fence Segment and Roads (See Map). Station would like to keep original fence alignment access roads (red line) but go with the proposed fence alignment (yellow line).
- **(b) (7)(E)** coverage in DOI land.
- 6 proposed (locations unknown)

**NON-RESPONSIVE**

[(b) (7)(E)] Station

- Discussed O-3 Fence Segment and Roads (See Map). Station did provide fence segment that is most significant, but stated they would like the original road more then anything if funds were tight.
- **(b) (7)(E)**
O-2 Current and Proposed Fence Alignments

- Original Fence Alignment
- Proposed Fence Alignment
- Proposed Floodplain*
- Proposed Floodplain*

*The floodplain limit represents proposed conditions after the fence is installed, and is not indicative of existing conditions.

*If sheet measures less than 11x17" it is a reduced print. Reduce scale accordingly.

March 28, 2012
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
March 28, 2012
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

O-3 Current and Proposed Fence Alignments

**Fence**
- Original Fence Alignment
- Proposed Fence Alignment

**Proposed Floodplain**
- Proposed Floodplain

*The floodplain limit represents proposed conditions after the fence is installed, and is not indicative of existing conditions.

*If sheet measures less than 11x17" it is a reduced print. Reduce scale accordingly.

1 in = 0.13 mi

1:7,920
As awareness of the RGV planning meeting. Reading at your leisure.

Per your request, attached are the final notes and O-segment Maps with Markups.

Thanks,

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

I am sorry for the late notice however we just received this task which has to be completed by COB tomorrow. Attached is what was submitted last month for your convenience. Please let me know if you have any questions or if you need any assistance.

Regards,

(b) (6)

Strategic Analysis, Inc.
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Facilities Management & Engineering
Tactical Infrastructure Program Office

Office: (b) (6)
Cell: (b) (6)
Email: (b) (6)

Warning: This document is For Official Use Only (FOUO). It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5U.S.C. 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid “need-to-know” without prior approval from the originator. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the originator for disposition instructions. FOUO is not to be considered classified information.
OBP PMO Tactical Infrastructure White Paper
March 3, 2010

Background:
- The Office of Administration’s Facilities Management and Engineering Directorate will provide a monthly Tactical Infrastructure (TI) Program report, to include the following topics, as applicable: status of current TI projects and related initiatives, future TI planning, legal updates, the status of TI funds, and other emergent issues. This requirement replaces prior monthly TI briefings to the CBP Commissioner.
- The following is the March 1, 2010 TI Program deliverable, which addresses current fence mileage, recent real estate actions and associated legal activity, Comprehensive TI Maintenance and Repair contract status, and issues associated with fence segments in County Texas. The paper has been cleared by the CBP Offices of Border Patrol and Chief Counsel, as well as State and Local.

Fence Status:
- As of February 19, 2010:
  - (b) of Vehicle Fence (VF) have been completed.
  - (b) of Pedestrian Fence (PF) have been completed.
  - There are (b) of PF left to construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Seg #</th>
<th>Seg ID</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target Comp Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for Proposal</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RFP is pending Award</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fence Segments O-1 through O-3:
- Despite former Commissioner Ruth’s acknowledgement during a January 6, 2010 meeting with CBP, that from a practical perspective the fencing will have no impact on the floodplain (zero impact to Mexico and negligible to U.S.), new Commissioner Drusina sent the Acting Commissioner a letter on January 21, 2010 indicating that the U.S. International Boundary Water Commission (USIBWC) could not support the construction of the fence due to "substantial increases in water surface elevations and deflection in water flows at several locations."
Facilities Management & Engineering (FM&E) has drafted a suggested response letter for the Acting Commissioner to send to USIBWC Commissioner Drusina and the Department of State that refutes their conclusion.

Real Estate Status:

Comprehensive Tactical Infrastructure Maintenance and Repair (CTIMR):

- FM&E, working in coordination with Procurement, is staggering the release of the four Requests for Proposal for CTIMR.
- Dates of note:
  - All four CTIMR RFPs have been issued, as of February 2010.
  - FM&E received proposals for the first two RFPs on February 12, 2010. (b) (5)
  - (b) (5)
See attached edits for your consideration.

Regards,

[Redacted]

DHS - Customs and Border Protection (CBP)
FM&E Tactical Infrastructure - Program Office
Ronald Reagan Building
1400 Pennsylvania Ave N.W.
Washington DC 20229

"ONE TEAM, ONE MISSION. SECURING OUR HOMELAND."

The guidance is the same for each white paper. Include recent challenges and accomplishments and anything that we think C1 needs to know or that we might need Commissioner's intervention on for decision. That's all we've got to go on.

[Redacted]

Communications and Reporting Branch Chief
Office of Border Patrol Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

Let me know if you need any info from me.
Dear All,

I am sorry for the late notice however we just received this task which has to be completed by COB tomorrow. Attached is what was submitted last month for your convenience. Please let me know if you have any questions or if you need any assistance.

Regards,

Strategic Analysis, Inc.
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Facilities Management & Engineering
Tactical Infrastructure Program Office

Warning: This document is For Official Use Only (FOUO). It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5U.S.C. 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid “need to know” without prior approval from the originator. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the originator for disposition instructions. FOUO is not to be considered classified information.
OBP PMO Tactical Infrastructure White Paper
March 3, 2010

Background:
- The Office of Administration’s Facilities Management and Engineering Directorate will provide a monthly Tactical Infrastructure (TI) Program report, to include the following topics, as applicable: status of current TI projects and related initiatives, future TI planning, legal updates, the status of TI funds, and other emergent issues. This requirement replaces prior monthly TI briefings to the CBP Commissioner.
- The following is the March 1, 2010 TI Program deliverable, which addresses current fence mileage, recent real estate actions and associated legal activity, Comprehensive TI Maintenance and Repair contract status, and issues associated with fence segments in County Texas. The paper has been cleared by the CBP Offices of Border Patrol and Chief Counsel, as well as State and Local.

Fence Status:
- As of February 19, 2010:
  - of Vehicle Fence (VF) have been completed.
  - of Pedestrian Fence (PF) have been completed.
  - There are of PF left to construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Seg #</th>
<th>Seg ID</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Target Comp Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for Proposal (RFP) is being prepared</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RFP is pending Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fence Segments O-1 through O-3 (b) (7)(E) Texas:
- Despite former Commissioner Ruth’s acknowledgement during a January 6, 2010 meeting with CBP, that from a practical perspective the fencing will have no impact on the floodplain (zero impact to Mexico and negligible to U.S.), new Commissioner Drusina sent the Acting Commissioner a letter on January 21, 2010 indicating that the U.S. International Boundary Water Commission (USIBWC) could not support the construction of the fence due to "substantial increases in water surface elevations and deflection in water flows at several locations.”
Facilities Management & Engineering (FM&E) has drafted a suggested response letter for the Acting Commissioner to send to USIBWC Commissioner Drusina and the Department of State that refutes their conclusion.

Real Estate Status:

Comprehensive Tactical Infrastructure Maintenance and Repair (CTIMR):
- FM&E, working in coordination with Procurement, is staggering the release of the four Requests for Proposal for CTIMR.
- Dates of note:
  - FM&E received proposals for the third RFP on March 1, 2010.
  - CTIMR COTR “boot camp” training received approval by DHS as a certified training course.