Attached is the briefing we will be using today.

Thx <<07_20_10_O-1 thru O-3 State Dept brief.ppt>>

For folks that cannot attend in person, please use the conference call in numbers below:

(b) (7)(E)
Passcode (b) (7)(E)

IBWC friends-please go to the main entrance of the EPA building located at 1301 Constitution Avenue and we will meet you there and escort you to our conference room.
Briefing to Department of State
Pedestrian Fence Segments O-1, O-2 and O-3

July 20, 2010
Why Are These Fence Segments Needed?

**BLUF:** The construction of O-1, O-2 and O-3 is critical to our Nation’s security as well as the safety of the nearby local communities and we need IBWC and Department of State’s support for an unilateral decision to proceed with the fence construction.

Areas in which O-1, O-2 and O-3 are proposed are currently and have historically been subjected to significant illegal border activities.

– In FY 09:
  
  
  
  (b) (7)(E)

The construction of O-1, O-2 and O-3 is CBP’s highest tactical infrastructure priority.

– Included in April 2008 Secretary Waiver

– Construction is funded
Background

- All 3 segments to be built in areas with no flood protection levees with wide flood plain limits
- O-1, O-2 and O-3 are ___ miles in length, respectively.
- “Bollard style” fence
- Began planning & design of the segments in Fall 2007 thru present
- Technical analysis has proven to be very challenging (and expensive)
  - Hydraulic modeling is not an exact science
  - Treaty thresholds are conservative
  - Multiple analyses conducted over the last 2 yrs
  - +$1M in “design analysis” costs
- Mexico has consistently opposed the construction of border fencing since the passage of the Secure Fence Act
Study Summary

- Assumed flood event (240,000 cfs) is based on a 1988 Hurricane Gilbert in Rio Grande City
- IBWC criteria:
  - Max. flow deflection = 5%
  - Max rise in water surface elevation (WSE) = 3” in Urban areas and 6” in Rural Areas.
- Fence is modeled as solid wall
  - Conservative assumption
- Current CBP proposed alignments result in:
  - No impacts above thresholds in Mexico!
  - Impacts in U.S. are minimal (see segment summary slides & maps)
- IBWC recommended alignments
  - (b) (7)(E)
  - (b) (5)
O-1 Segment Summary

- Located in Roma, Texas
- Approximately located with approximately located in the floodplain
- Fence modeled as an impermeable barrier with an
- 100% of the projected impacts on Mexico within IBWC’s criteria
- 91% of the projected impacts on U.S. within IBWC’s criteria
  - 9 X-sections (out of 95) have projected Water Surface Elevations (W.S.E.) increases greater than 6-inches
    - Of the 9 X-sections, 6 exceed threshold by less than 2.5 inches; maximum increase is 11.4 inches
    - All 9 X-sections located in agricultural areas; no impacts on existing structures; maximum increase in flood plain width is 35 feet
  - All 95 X-sections meet Flow Diversion threshold
O-2 Segment Summary

- Located in Rio Grande City, Texas
- Approximately (b) (7)(E) with approximately (b) (7)(E) located in the floodplain
- Fence modeled as an impermeable barrier with (b) (7)(E)

- 100% of the projected impacts on Mexico within IBWC’s criteria
- 84% of the projected impacts on U.S. within IBWC’s criteria
  - 3 X-sections (out of 83) have projected Water Surface Elevations (W.S.E.) increases greater than 6-inches
    - Of the 3 X-sections, 2 exceed threshold by less than 1.5 inches; maximum increase is 9.8-inches
    - The 3 X-sections are located in an approximately 1000 ft section of agricultural areas; no impacts on existing structures
  - 69 X-sections (out of 83) meet Flow Diversion threshold
    - All 14 X-sections located immediately downstream of the (b) (7)(E)
    - Of the 14 X-sections that exceed the threshold, 11 exceed by less than 2%; maximum flow diversion is 10.62% at X-section 9385.623
    - At all 14 X-sections, the projected river velocities are reduced relative to the existing conditions and all very low (less than 1 ft/sec)
O-3 Segment Summary

- Located in Los Ebanos, Texas
- Approximately 7 miles long all of it located in the floodplain
- Fence modeled as an impermeable barrier
- 100% of the projected impacts on Mexico within IBWC’s criteria
- 89% of the projected impacts on U.S. within IBWC’s criteria
  - All X-sections (out of 35) have projected Water Surface Elevations (W.S.E.) within the threshold
  - 4 X-section (out of 35) exceeded the Flow Diversion threshold
    - Because of the alignment of the river channel (serpentine) and the orientation of the cross-sections in this area, the model’s estimate flow diversion results are not indicative of actual expected conditions
    - Projected velocities are essentially the same for pre-fence vs. post fence conditions and are very low (less than 1 ft/sec)
Conclusion

- From a practical perspective, our proposed fence alignments will not adversely affect the floodplain in Mexico or U.S.
- Our current proposed alignments reflect the optimum locations from the perspective of border security and flood plain impacts
- We need IBWC and State Department support to build these segments as soon as possible
From: [Redacted]
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: O1, O2, O3 Report
Date: Friday, July 30, 2010 12:47:49 PM
Attachments: 07_20_10 O-1 thru O-3 State Dept brief.ppt

I’d like to refer to the attached during our call. Thx

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 30, 2010 11:41 AM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: O1, O2, O3 Report

I’m available now until 10 then again from 10:30 to noon.

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 30, 2010 5:07 AM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: O1, O2, O3 Report

Can we talk about the report today (this AM)? I do have some questions and suggestions and would like to get this into the hand of IBWC and State ASAP. Let me know what time works best for you all. It shouldn’t take more than 15 minutes.

Thx

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, July 29, 2010 5:06 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: O1, O2, O3 Report

Below is the link to the Summary Report we completed in preparation for your August 4th meeting regarding O1, O2, & O3. Like to suggested that we teleconference on Monday to go over any questions or changes you may have on the report. Let me know if you need anything else.

(b) (6)
To retrieve these attachments, click on the secure link below. (b) (7)(E)

Access to this information will expire on 8/5/2010 12:00:00 AM

Legal Disclaimer:
This website is intended solely for use by the Michael Baker Corporation, its affiliates, clients, subcontractors, and other designated parties. All information utilized on this website is for designated recipients only. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this material by any individual other than the said designated recipients is strictly prohibited. The Michael Baker Corporation, its affiliates and employees, makes no representation or warranty (express or implied) as to the merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose of any documents or information available from this website and therefore assumes neither legal liability nor responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, technical/scientific quality or usefulness of said documents or information.
The updated briefing is attached.

(b) (5)

Thx

If you can send me the PP I can make my edits — if not here are my edits

(b) (7)(E) add a bullet – Require S-1 approval to initiate the ESP for the Project –

Delete the Yuma (b) (7)(E) bullet

Thanks
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
O-1 thru O-3

- Awaiting IBWC/Dept of State decision on our current proposed alignments
- We believe we have successfully demonstrated that the fence will not impact the flood plain in MX and not adversely impact any existing structures in the U.S.
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
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,

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
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, Phase 1 & 2, Roads), CTIMR, New / Relocation of & 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 procession 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 presented locations. Access Roads, nor Real Estate were not taken into account when placing. Additionally, Environmental impact was not discussed either unless it was on USFWS land. Many stations do have existing facilities for future C2 Facilities, some better then others but could be taken into account when working through this requirement for future use.
Participants

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

Agenda

- Monday June 18th was a site visit to Brownville Station to the C2 Facility (~2 hour travel time; ~2 hours at the facility)
- Tuesday June 19th was a site visit to the AOR and AOR (8am - 5pm)
- Wednesday June 20th was located at Weslaco Station all day with presentations from OBP HQ (Chief OTIA BPFTI Division Director Technology Lead and Station Briefings (Falfurrias Station, Kingsville Station, Harlington Station, and Brownsville Station.
- Thursday June 21st was located at Weslaco Station all day with presentations from the remaining Stations (Rio Grande City, Ft. Brown Station, Weslaco Station, and McAllen 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.
- 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 Phase 1 Project: Under test Project which is fully funded and all county and state roads are in Phase 2 which is not funded.
Station Brief

- Locations for Laydown and were provided.

- Station stated that

- New Checkpoint is #4 on the construction list, fully funded, and is currently slatted for a construction completion of February 2016 per last months BPFTI Report (OBP pulled up the report during the meeting). Two Real Estate locations are currently under Market Research and hasn’t been finalized - (1) Preferred Location: along the Highway or (2) Alternate Location:

- The existing C2 Facility would not work at the existing Checkpoint, but the preferred location for a new C2 facility would be a the new Checkpoint with an alternative site at the Station. Noted that we may want to look into any existing facility drawings for the station C2 Room and LAN Room.

- Station is going to go back and review

Station

- Station currently cover Zone , but they do have current roads in

- A new Station is currently being planned and is funded. The draft public EA has just recently ended, Real Estate has almost concluded and construction is schedule for next year.
Currently has [redacted] of border fence and [redacted] fencing segments (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\)).

Station AOR covers [redacted] total border miles (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\)).

Has wildlife refuges land and sandpit challenges.

Border zones (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\)).

POE - issues (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\)).

Port of (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\)).

\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\). (Current (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\) is being tested)

Discussed the relocation of some existing (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\) and making other exiting (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\) locations around the (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\) Fence Segment.

Many of the access roads for the proposed (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\) locations are caliche.

Fence Line has a sand pit area that has an existing (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\) that they want to move to assist with this trouble spot.

The Ocolots are present in this area and propose the “IBC Road” (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\) to help for visibility.

OBP HQ is going to inquire with OFO if they could (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\) from the Port.

Looking to place (\(\text{(b)}\ (7)(E)\).

Since access roads to proposed sites are existing, may be able to cover with CTIMR.
Station

- Covers (b) (7)(E) miles
- Identification of Boat Ramps in the area that may need assistance, but are existing. Were created with old landing mats.
- Currently (b) (7)(E) and the proposed (b) (7)(E)
- Road issue to location site at (b) (7)(E). Muddy, but may be able to use current for new technology.
- Proposing a new (b) (7)(E) in (b) (7)(E). Land owner previously sued government for fence area. Road is a mix between calicha road and dirt, so help may be needed on the access road. There is an existing (b) (7)(E). The land owner has water access in the area. There is also a new development that is being constructed in that area.
- IBWC problems.

Station

- Station covers (b) (7)(E)
- A lot of private land owners along most of the roads – no big ranches.
- Project is currently being worked for roadwork in (b) (7)(E) area
- Proposed (b) (7)(E) locations were not based on Access Roads access, only operational. 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.
- New boat ramps proposed (locations unknown)
Station

- No current location for a C2 facility. Possibility to agree to a Co-location with Station. This would help to share resources and space.

Station

- Currently has C2 Facility space ready with workstations for SESs and a raise floor. Also has a separate room for LAN space.
- Station is the key issue area. Near POE, of current Road Project has no road to use and Station did provide fence segment that is most significant, but stated they would like the original road more then anything if funds were tight.
- 78% of border area is owned by USFWS
O-1 Current and Proposed Fence Alignments

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

(b) (5)

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 = 0.25 mi

115,840

March 28, 2012
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

WARNING: This document is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (FOUO). It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). It is to be controlled, stored, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to FOUO information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid "need-to-know" without prior approval of an authorized DHS official.
O-3 Current and Proposed Fence Alignments

March 28, 2012
Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

[mapping and diagram of fence alignments]

*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.