**New Start Time**

Overview of the Fence Follow-on Discussion

Start: Wednesday, November 23, 2016 2:00:00 PM

End: Wednesday, November 23, 2016 3:00:00 PM

Location: 4.4A Commissioner's Small C/R **Dial-In Included**

Attachments: C1 Briefing Memo - FENCE OVERVIEW FOLLOW-ON FINAL_112216.docx

C2 TI Requirements Deck INTERNAL 11_23_2016 FINALv2.pptx

<<C1 Briefing Memo - FENCE OVERVIEW FOLLOW-ON FINAL_112216.docx>> <<C2_TI Requirements Deck INTERNAL 11_23_2016 FINALv2.pptx>>

Dial-in: (b)(7)(E) or (b)(7)(D) PIN: (b)(7)(E)

Please do not forward this invitation, if you are unable to attend or would like to request a +1 please let me know.

OC POC: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

Lead: ES

BM: Yes
Overview:

- CBP Commissioner, CBP Enterprise Services’ Office of Facilities and Asset Management (OFAM), Office of Chief Counsel (OCC), and U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Discussion: Overview of CBP Fence and Roads
- Overall Goal: Provide CBP Leadership with a better understanding of existing fence and road mileage, estimated cost to construct and maintain fence and roads, estimated fence and road construction schedules, fence and road construction enablers, and proposed fence and road requirements.
- Participants. You will be meeting with Assistant Commissioner McAleenan, Chief Executive Assistant Commissioner Alles, Assistant Commissioner Borkowski, Assistant Commissioner Calvo, and Executive Assistant Commissioner Vitiello. A full list of participants is below.

Discussion Points:

- As of FY 2015, CBP completed 654 miles of pedestrian and vehicle fence. This total also includes the replacement of legacy fence in Arizona and New Mexico.
- USBP identified the following new primary and secondary pedestrian fence, replacement pedestrian fence, vehicle fence, construction of new roads, and maintenance and repair of existing roads.
- Approximately
- Approximately
- Approximately
- Approximately
- Approximately
- Approximately
- Approximately

Unconstrained operational need at the beginning of the planning process does not necessarily reflect the feasibility of the ultimate execution of those needs. These miles do not reflect the critical need nor do they reflect alternate enforcement solutions. Estimated new fence and roads cost is approximately with an annual reoccurring cost of approximately

Watch Out For/ If Asked:

- Q: Is CBP building more fence, what is the status of ongoing construction?
  A: At present, CBP has completed all new fence construction requirements identified by USBP. However, CBP is in the process of completing three legacy fence replacement projects:

    (b) (7)(E)
Q: If USBP does identify new fence requirements for funding, what are the key enablers to expeditiously completing fence construction?

A: *(b) (5)*

**Background:**

- CBP is responsible for sustaining the Tactical Infrastructure (TI) “fence” portfolio, which includes border fence and gates, roads and bridges, drainage structures and grates, lighting and electrical components, and vegetation and debris removal in support of USBP.
- The Tactical Infrastructure Program was established in 2007 to oversee the construction and maintenance of the pedestrian and vehicle fence. Since that TI, the PMO’s primary purpose has expanded to include all other components of the TI portfolio referenced above.
- Currently, CBP has approximately [redacted] miles of primary fence, [redacted] miles of secondary fence and [redacted] miles of tertiary fence. Current pedestrian fence includes a mixture of legacy fence designs such as landing mat, newer designs including welded wire mesh, fence on levee (also known as levee wall) and the preferred bollard fence design. Current vehicle fence includes primarily post on rail and normandy designs.

**TABLE 1 – Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary Fence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Primary Pedestrian Fence</th>
<th>Primary Vehicle Fence</th>
<th>Primary Fence Total</th>
<th>Secondary Pedestrian Fence</th>
<th>Tertiary Pedestrian Fence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend (BBT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rio (DRT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro (ELC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso (EP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laredo (LRT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley (RGV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego (SDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson (TCA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma (YUM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(b) (7)(E)*
• Today, CBP focuses its efforts on executing timely maintenance and repair of deployed TI assets and replacing existing legacy fence, in addition to preparing to deploy any potential new fence requirements if funding is appropriated.
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Overview of CBP Fence and Roads

November 23, 2016
A Foundation on Which to Build Fence

• CBP was tasked with building 700 miles of “two layer” fencing on the southwest border which was later changed to meet USBP operational requirements of 654 miles of primary fence.

• This was tasked to CBP in July 2007, with over 600 miles completed by January 20, 2009.

• [redacted] miles of primary fence have been completed to date, with the majority of mileage completed between 2008 and 2009.
Map of Existing & Proposed Fence

This is a high level view of proposed requirements refinements of geospatial lines in progress.
# Summary of Unconstrained Operational Needs & Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement Type</th>
<th>New Miles</th>
<th>Acquisition/Initial Costs ROM (-50%/+100%) Cost</th>
<th>20 Year Recurring Costs (Maintenance and Repair)</th>
<th>Total End State Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Primary PF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Primary PF &amp; VF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Secondary PF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Roads</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs to Existing Roads</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement Type</th>
<th>New Miles</th>
<th>Acquisition/Initial Costs ROM (-50%/+100%) Cost</th>
<th>20 Year Recurring Costs (Maintenance and Repair)</th>
<th>Total End State Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Primary PF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New VF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Primary PF &amp; VF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Secondary PF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Roads</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs to Existing Roads</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some miles are operationally achievable with TI or other assets*
Summary of Unconstrained Operational Needs & Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement Type</th>
<th>New Miles</th>
<th>Acquisition/Initial Costs ROM (-50%/+100%) Cost</th>
<th>20 Year Recurring Costs (Maintenance and Repair)</th>
<th>Total End State Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Primary PF</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New VF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Primary PF &amp; VF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Secondary PF</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs to Existing Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unconstrained operational needs at the beginning of the planning process do not necessarily reflect the feasibility of the ultimate execution of those needs. These miles do not reflect the critical need nor do they reflect alternate enforcement solutions.

***Statement pending USBP Approval / Edits***
Quickest Wins

• Replacement of 184.4 primary pedestrian and vehicle fence in El Centro, Tucson, and El Paso where CBP already has real estate access and environmental analysis has been completed.
  – Approximately \( \text{(b) (5)} \) miles of the fence replacement will be an upgrade \( \text{(b) (5)} \).

• Construction of new primary pedestrian and vehicle fence on within existing Roosevelt Reservation and within Federal lands and where fence and a waiver already exists.

- The right to access, construct, maintain, and repair tactical infrastructure in many areas of the border is secured through the Roosevelt Reservation: a 1907 Executive Order authorizing federal property rights within 60-feet of the international border in CA, AZ, & NM. The Roosevelt Reservation is the basis for CBP property rights along much of the border fence.
Quick Win Timeline

Quick Win Assumptions:

1. Notice to Proceed (NTP)
   - Acquisition
   - Design
   - Environmental

2. NTP + 12 months
   - (b) (5)

3. NTP + 24 months
   - (b) (5)

4. NTP + 36 months
   - (b) (5)
Approach to Fence Construction

**Cost:**

- Primary PF: \((b) (5)\) per mile
  - Average of \((b) (5)\)/mile for real estate and environmental planning, construction and construction oversight.
    - \((b) (5)\) mile for mileage in all Sectors except Laredo & RGV
    - \((b) (5)\) mile for mileage in Laredo & RGV
  - \((b) (5)\) mile for environmental mitigation
  - \((b) (5)\) mile for real estate acquisition
  - \((b) (5)\) mile for staffing increases required to support the program

- Secondary PF: \((b) (5)\) per mile
  - Average of \((b) (5)\) mile for real estate and environmental planning, construction and construction oversight – also include \((b) (5)\) mile for road between layers of fence
  - \((b) (5)\) mile for environmental mitigation
  - \((b) (5)\) mile for real estate acquisition
  - \((b) (5)\) mile for staffing increases required to support the program
Approach to Fence Construction

• Cost (continued)
  - VF: (b) (5) per mile
    - Average of (b) (5)/mile for real estate and environmental planning, construction and construction oversight.
    - (b) (5)/mile for environmental mitigation
    - (b) (5)/mile for real estate acquisition
    - (b) (5)/mile for staffing increases required to support the program

• Government Furnished Material (GFM) and Supply Chain:
  - (b) (5)

• Procurement
  - (b) (5)
Approach to Complete Fence Construction

- Other Considerations (slide 1 of 2)
Approach to Complete Fence Construction

• Other Considerations (slide 2 of 2)

(b) (5)
BACKUP
Border Fence Overview

• To date, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) completed \( [b] \) miles of primary pedestrian and vehicle fence.\[7](E)
  - Border Fence provides persistent impedance to illegal cross-border activity, which offers Border Patrol agents more time to respond to and resolve threats.
  - CBP has completed three main fence programs since the enactment of the Secure Fence Act in 2006: Pedestrian Fence (PF) 70, PF 225, and Vehicle Fence (VF) 300. Any fence constructed prior to these programs is considered “legacy.”*  
  - Tactical Infrastructure (TI) also includes gates; roads, bridges and boat ramps; drainage structures and grates; lighting and electrical systems; and vegetation and debris removal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Pedestrian Fence</th>
<th>Vehicle Fence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bend (BBT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rio (DRT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro (ELC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso (EPT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laredo (LRT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Valley (RGV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego (SDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson (TCA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma (YUM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The term “legacy” is also used to define older fence designs including landing mat. These legacy designs are being assessed for replacement. Please note that numbers may not add up due to rounding. Fence mileage is tracked to the thousandth decimal place.
Please Note: This is a high level view of proposed requirements refinements of geospatial lines in progress.
Please Note: This is a high level view of proposed requirements refinements of geospatial lines in progress.
Maps – Current Fence, New Mexico

Please Note: This is a high level view of proposed requirements refinements of geospatial lines in progress.
Maps – Current Fence, Texas

Please Note: This is a high level view of proposed requirements refinements of geospatial lines in progress.
Maps – Current & Proposed Fence Fence, Texas

(b) (7)(E), (b) (5)
Maps – Current & Proposed Fence Fence, Washington

(b) (7)(E), (b) (5)
Maps – Proposed Fence, Idaho

(b)(5)
Maps – Proposed Fence, Vermont

(b) (5)
Maps – Proposed Fence, New Hampshire

(b) (5)
Maps – Proposed Fence, Maine

(b)(5)
Proposed New Fencing

(b) (5)

Proposed New Fencing

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

PREDECISIONAL/FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
## All Fence Requirements – Primary, PF & VF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Existing VF</th>
<th>New Miles VF</th>
<th>ROM (-50/+100) Acquisition Cost VF</th>
<th>Existing Primary PF</th>
<th>New Miles Primary PF</th>
<th>ROM (-50/+100) Acquisition Cost Primary PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Border Total</strong></td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>$ (b) (5)</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLW</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUN</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTM</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFN</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLT</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVM</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPW</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest Border Total</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBT</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELC</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPT</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUM</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## All Fence Requirements – Replacement PF & Secondary PF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Replacement Miles PF</th>
<th>ROM (-50/+100) Acquisition Cost Replacement PF</th>
<th>Existing Secondary PF</th>
<th>New Miles Secondary PF</th>
<th>ROM (-50/+100) Acquisition Cost Secondary PF</th>
<th>Existing Tertiary PF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Border Total</strong></td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLW</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUN</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTM</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFN</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLT</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVM</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPW</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest Border Total</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBT</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELC</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPT</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUM</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Border Fence Photos – Legacy for Replacement

Pedestrian Fence – Bollard & Legacy

Pedestrian Fence – Legacy

(b) (7)(E)
Border Fence Photos – VF Designs

Vehicle Fence – Normandy

Vehicle Fence – Post/Rail
Border Fence Photos – Floating Fence Design

Pedestrian Fence – Floating Fence – El Centro Sector
Border Fence Photos – Preferred PF Design

Pedestrian Fence – PV-1 Bollard Tucson Sector
Border Fence Photos – Preferred PF Design

Pedestrian Fence – PV-1 Bollard Tucson Sector

Pedestrian Fence – PV-1 Bollard Yuma Sector
Border Fence Photos – Levee Wall

Pedestrian “Flevee” – Fence on Levee
Approach to Fence Construction

• **Costs to Construct Primary PF (same for fence replacement costs)**
  – On average, cost to construct primary pedestrian or replace primary pedestrian fence is approximately \((b) (5)\) per mile.
  – Estimate is a rough order of magnitude (-50/+100) and includes project planning and oversight, environmental planning and compliance, environmental mitigation, real estate planning and acquisition, staffing and human capital requirements, design and construction.

• **Cost to Construct Secondary PF**
  – On average, cost to construct secondary PF is approximately \((b) (5)\) per mile.
  – Estimate is a rough order of magnitude (-50/+100) and includes project planning and oversight, environmental planning and compliance, environmental mitigation, real estate planning and acquisition, staffing and human capital requirements, design and construction.

• **Costs to Construct VF**
  – On average, cost to construct vehicle fence fence is approximately \((b) (5)\) per mile.
  – Estimate is a rough order of magnitude (-50/+100) and includes project planning and oversight, environmental planning and compliance, environmental mitigation, real estate planning and acquisition, staffing and human capital requirements, design and construction.
Approach to Fence Construction

• Legal Considerations

(b) (5)
Approach to Complete Fence Construction

- **Government Furnished Material (GFM) and Supply Chain:**
  - The Buy American Act restricts the purchase of supplies that are not domestic products requiring 50% of the components to be produced in the U.S.
    - Exceptions include non-availability and unreasonable costs. In order to purchase steel at a reasonable cost, the CBP Head of Contracting Activity (HCA) will need to utilize FAR Part 25.2 to make a determination on cost reasonableness. Without a determination of cost reasonableness, there is a high risk of extremely high costs for steel.
  - In order to ensure steel availability on time, at a lower cost and to avoid contractors competing for materials, CBP will establish a Supply Chain Management contract to purchase and deliver steel to the sites. Contract will be similar to the Boeing contract utilized during the prior fence construction programs.

- **Procurement**
  - CBP continues to work with its service providers to establish Multiple Award Task Order Contracts (MATOC) and Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contracts to allow for an expedited contract award process for fence construction. Currently the existing contract vehicles allow for in capacity for design and M in capacity for construction.
Approach to Complete Fence Construction

• **Other Considerations:**
  - Additional staffing will be required in all program areas to meet the demands of fence construction while still maintaining current programs
    - Additional workload specifically in the areas of real estate, environmental, engineering, financial management, communications and reporting, project management, and support services will require additional staff within the program office and its parent organizations.
  - To meet additional staffing requirements, staff support contracts will need to be put in place and an expedited hiring process for hiring federal employees needs to be prioritized and completed as soon as possible.
Border Fence Background

- Section 102(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), as amended, authorizes the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to construct border infrastructure, including fencing, in locations where such infrastructure would be most practical and effective in deterring illegal entry on the southwest border.

- The purpose of border fence construction is to provide persistent impedance to illegal cross-border activity, which offers Border Patrol agents more time to respond to and resolve threats.

- To date, CBP completes miles of primary pedestrian and vehicle fencing along the southwest border: approximately miles of pedestrian fence and miles of vehicle fence at the cost of approximately.

- It is important to note that tactical infrastructure (TI) also includes roads; gates and bridges; drainage structures and grates; lighting and electrical systems; vegetation and debris removal; and tower real property, construction and maintenance.
# Road Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Existing All Weather Roads</th>
<th>New Road Miles</th>
<th>ROM (-50/+100) Acquisition Cost New Roads</th>
<th>Road Repair Miles*</th>
<th>ROM (-50/+100) Repair Cost New Roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Road Considerations

- CBP manages an inventory of over 5,100 miles of roads identified by the U.S. Border Patrol for maintenance.
  - Roads are utilized for operational requirements include patrol and drag roads. Additionally, these roads provide access to tactical infrastructure including fence and boat ramps.

- CBP is currently in the process of obtaining both real estate access and environmental clearance to ensure maintenance can be conducted on these roads.
  - As of November 2016, 1,509 miles are fully cleared for maintenance and the remaining 3,619 miles are in the process of acquiring both real estate access and environmental clearance. CBP is in the process of acquiring real estate access and completing environmental clearances on the remaining 3,619 miles.

- The average cost to construct new roads is currently estimated at (b)(5)
  - Estimate is a rough order of magnitude (-50/+100) and includes project planning and oversight, environmental planning and compliance, environmental mitigation, real estate planning and acquisition, staffing and human capital requirements, design and construction.

- The recurring average cost to maintain existing roads is (b)(5) per mile, per year.
  - Estimates for "recurring costs" are rough order of magnitude (-50/+100) and reflect average maintenance costs per mile of road plus environmental compliance and staffing and human capital requirements.
Other Critical TI Requirements

• **Carrizo Cane Removal**
  - Method: Mechanical with herbicide
  - Required in:
    - All Laredo
    - All Del Rio
    - Some RGV
    - Some El Centro

• **Boat Ramps**
  - RGV – 17
  - LRT – TBD
  - DRT – TBD
Current Tactical Infrastructure
Unfunded Requirements

• Currently identified requirements from USBP that have been documented by FM&E are listed below. USBP is currently developing their full requirements list to provide to CBP leadership.
  – RGV (b) (7)(E) Phase 2, (b) (5): Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) includes approximately (b) (5) in real estate costs.
  – RGV Fence Segments O-1 – O-3, (b) (5) Project includes the construction of (b) (5) miles of primary pedestrian fence. (Note, this mileage in
    ▪ ROM cost estimate includes (b) (5) miles of roads to access the fence segments.
    ▪ Assumes (b) (7)(E) bollard fence design and costs associated with real estate acquisition are not included in this estimate.
  – ELC Fence Repair / Panel Replacement, (b) (5) Project includes replacement and repair of (b) (7)(E) of primary pedestrian fence.
  – YUM (b) (7)(E) Sand Dunes All Weather Road Improvement, (b) (5): Project includes (b) (7)(E) of road improvements.
  – TCA Organ Pipe Maintenance and Repair, (b) (5): Requirement includes maintenance on the Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument.
Chief:

I looked over the attachments provided. It looks like FME is prepping for the O-1 through O-3 segments (RGV) in anticipation of the CIR. We had previously coordinated with FME on a C IR tasker which included the O-1 through O-3 segments. FME is planning for the original alignments, even though OBP is leaning toward the Total Mission alignments. (They prefer to submit alignments that get the most $).

OBP is still on the hook for committing to the Total Mission alignments, which would still request FME to execute the original real estate condemnations so Station would have patrol abilities outside the new fence alignments.

I will be calling into this meeting.

3/26- updated handouts. Print attached versions. 
3/25- Read aheads attached. More to come. If you cannot join via VTC (all in DC, Euless, Laguna should participate via VTC), call in added.

3/7- meeting is now a half day VTC meeting. If you cannot participate via VTC, please let me know and I will request a telecon. Agenda forthcoming.

R/

--

All- date is tentative and you will be notified once it has been confirmed.

Please identify any other key staff that need to be included.

3/26- updated handouts. Print attached versions.
3/25- Read aheads attached. More to come. If you cannot join via VTC (all in DC, Euless, Laguna should participate via VTC), call in added.

3/7- meeting is now a half day VTC meeting. If you cannot participate via VTC, please let me know and I will request a telecon. Agenda forthcoming.

R/

--

All- date is tentative and you will be notified once it has been confirmed.

Please identify any other key staff that need to be included.
Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR)
Planning for O-1, 2, 3

March 1, 2013
O-1 thru O-3 Scope

- **Scope**
  - Customer requirements
  - miles in RGV Sector
  - (b)(7)(E) system
  - Alignments coordinated with RGV Sector and IBWC with following goals:
    - Satisfy operational requirement
    - Minimize floodplain impacts
    - Stay within areas covered by 2008 DHS Waiver

- **Real Estate**
  - Collaboration with DOJ
  - ROE-S will take (b)(5)
  - Land Usage Agreements must be complete within 21 months
O-1 thru O-3 Scope (cont’d)

- **Environmental**
  - (b) (5)
  - Environmental monitoring?
  - Any alignment changes may require updates and notifications

- **Design**
  - Full Design
  - Maximize setback from river (within RE and ENV constraints)
  - Minimize floodplain impacts
  - GFM incorporation dependent upon scale (lessons learned from PF/VF)
  - Multiple (b) (7)(E) requirements
  - Stakeholder coordination (USFWS, IBWC)
  - Dependent upon geotech and topo surveys
  - Access and staging
Acquisition Strategy

(b)(5)
Staffing

- Dedicated PgM with 2-3 PMs in support: In-house; KTR; hybrid
- OPCELL: 4 pax: In-house; KTR (8(a)); hybrid
- Functional Area support: matrix with KTR augmentation
  - CT
  - ENV
  - RE
  - Construction (QA, Contract Admin)
Funding & Logistics

- IAA vs RWA: IAA introduces schedule risk
- GFM economy of scale
Major Milestones

- Initiate new acquisitions: (b) (5)
- Achieve ROE-S: (b) (5)
- Authority receipt: (b) (5)
- Funds receipt: (b) (5)
- Survey complete: (b) (5)
- Construction MATOC award: (b) (5)
- Design complete: (b) (5)
- RE Acquisition complete: (b) (5)
- Task Order award(s): (b) (5)
- Construction NTP: (b) (5)
- Construction Completion: (b) (5)
- Required Completion: (b) (5)
**Project Name:** O-1-O-3 RGV Primary Fence Construction

**Purpose of PRD:** This document authorizes designation of project, baselines, scope, cost and schedule. This document authorizes funding for all planning, acquisition, environmental assessment, programming design and construction activities.

**OBP Requirement:** FY [XXXX]

[This section should be developed by the OBP HQ Strategic Planning, Policy, & Analysis Division. It should detail the OBP Mission Need and Operational Requirement being met by this project. Language should cover what the need is and how operations will be affected.]

**PROJECT SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type:</th>
<th>Primary Pedestrian Fence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project #:</td>
<td>O-1 - b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Metric:</td>
<td>Total Miles: O-1 - b ; O-2 - b ; O-3 - b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provider:</td>
<td>USACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Cost Estimate:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Start Date:</td>
<td>October/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned End Date:</td>
<td>June/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description/Objective:**

This project involves the construction of an estimated [ ] miles of new primary pedestrian fence (PF). The project consist of 3 separate fence segments, segments O-1 and O-2 are located in Roma and Rio Grande City, Starr County, Texas. Segment O-3 is located in Los Ebanos, Hidalgo County, Texas; along the International Border. The new PF will be comprised of bollard style fence. This project is to be a design, bid, build construction contract.

This fence is located both within urban areas and undeveloped wildlife habitat areas, where there are numerous houses, utilities and miscellaneous structures in proximity to the proposed alignments. There are also dump-sites, significant drainage arroyos, erosive soils and areas of dense vegetation in the undeveloped areas, which presents significant challenges. The presence of many drainage features and potential sinkhole areas [b] in the fence.

The area is situated in an area identified by USFWS as a significant migratory pathway for two endangered species of cats (ocelot and jaguarundi), and is known to be the site of several different populations of rare, threatened, and endangered plants including Zapata Bladderpod, Star Cactus, Walker’s manioc and Johnson’s Frankenia.
The proposed alignments have been strategically analyzed by CBP from a law enforcement perspective and by USACE and IBWC from a flood control perspective. The USACE and CBP in conjunction with USFWS have analyzed the area from a habitat, vegetation, and a wildlife habitat perspective. A hydraulic model has been developed by USACE and review and approved by IBWC for the proposed alignments.

Other challenges include: significant potential opposition from local public officials, landowners, environmental NGOs and Mexico; Security issues; and high level political involvement (congressional and Whitehouse).

Points of Contact and Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>USACE Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>BPFTI PMO M&amp;R PM/COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Design Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Real Estate Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>USACE Real Estate Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Environmental Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Financial Management Branch Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPFETI PMO</td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Project Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPFETI PMO</td>
<td>OB Field Contact (Include location and position)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP Field Contact</td>
<td>OB Field Contact (Include location and position)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photographs:

Real Estate Acquisitions

BACKGROUND:

The real estate process for O-1, 2, 3 was initiated back in 2007 as part of 225 to acquire privately-owned land required along the original 60-foot-wide swath. Approximately 60% of the original 60-foot-wide swath was on U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) refuge land, thus it was cleared by virtue of the 2008 waiver. Soon after the project was de-scoped from PF225 because of the lack of International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) concurrence with the original proposed alignments, all negotiations and any active condemnation cases that had already been filed were placed ‘on-hold’.

(b) (5)
Since that time, the alignment has shifted as a result of consultation with IBWC and Border Patrol. Of the total 224.4 miles, approximately 52.4% of the new alignment overlaps with the original alignment.
REAL ESTATE SCHEDULE:

NEPA/Environmental Permits

(b)(5)

However, under (b)(5), CBP strongly supports the Secretary’s commitment to responsible environmental protection.
stewardship. To that end, CBP prepared an Environmental Stewardship Plan (ESP) for all segments in RGV in 2008 which includes a Biological Resources Plan (BRP). The ESP and BRP analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with construction of tactical infrastructure in the entire U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Rio Grande Valley Sector. This ESP will need to be substantially supplemented due to its age and due to the change in the O1-O3 project from what was originally planned and analyzed in that ESP, but, in general establishes given mitigation ratios, the requirement for construction Best Management Practices which include onsite environmental and cultural resources monitoring plans, public outreach, and inclusion of into the fence design.

“Other” Approvals

As previously stated, USIBWC has already approved the general proposed alignments from a floodplain impacts perspective.

Schedule of Deliverables

[List key deliverables and their anticipated start date, duration and end date. Attach a detailed schedule as an addendum]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Deliverables</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>FY14 1st</th>
<th>FY14 2nd</th>
<th>FY14 3rd</th>
<th>FY14 4th</th>
<th>FY15 1st</th>
<th>FY15 2nd</th>
<th>FY15 3rd</th>
<th>FY15 4th</th>
<th>FY16 1st</th>
<th>FY16 2nd</th>
<th>FY16 3rd</th>
<th>FY16 4th</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental (Monitoring)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1 Oct – Dec; Q2 Jan – Mar; Q3 Apr – Jun; Q4 Jul – Sep

Schedule Assumption(s):

Environmental scheduling assumptions include:

a)  

b)  

c)  

(b) (7)(E)
Initial Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ Total Project Cost</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSFIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: A detailed WBS and cost analysis will be required and submitted as a separate document post-PRD approval. Template will be provided.)

Cost Assumption(s):
Environmental cost assumptions include:

- d)
- e)
- f)
- g)
- h)

Potential Project Risks/Mitigations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Risks</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Probability (%)</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Performance</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Performance</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>Contractor Performance</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commented [SBW1]: Page (b) (5) don't agree with this risk.
Commented [SBW2]: Per (b) (5) I don’t concur this is a likely risk.

Commented [SBW3]: Per (b) (5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Conditions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Latent Conditions

Real Estate

Commented [SBW4]: Per [b] (5)

Commented [SBW5]: Per [b] (5)

Commented [SBW6]: Per [b] (5)
Interrelated Projects

[List any interrelated project dependencies on other projects including projects such as Military Deployment Constraints, Facilities, SBInet towers, or projects within other agencies or private construction. The Acquisition Directive refers to this as “Interoperability.”]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Interrelated Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disposal Plan

[As directed in the FM&E Policy Document on Project Management, effective November 1, 2012, and in the FM&E RPAM 10042, the method, timeline, and all costs associated with a property disposal must be documented.]
PROJECT EXECUTION TEAM

[Name], Project Manager
BPFTI PMO, Facilities Division

Date

[Name], Project Manager
USACE, [Location] District

Date
APPROVAL: Constructability

[Redacted]

ECSO, USACE

Date

APPROVAL: OBP Mission Needs

[Redacted]

Office of Border Patrol, SPPA

Date

APPROVAL: Financial

[Redacted]

BPFTI PMO, Financial Management Branch

Date

APPROVAL: Real Estate & Environmental

[Redacted]

BPFTI PMO, Real Estate & Environmental Division

Date

APPROVAL: Architecture and Engineering

[Name], Director

BPFTI PMO, A&E Services Division

Date

PROJECT APPROVAL

[Redacted]

BPFTI PMO, TI Division

Date
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Facilities Management & Engineering

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure (BPFTI)
Program Management Office (PMO)

Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR) Meeting

Agenda
Tuesday, March 26, 2013
VTC/Conference Line:  (b) (6)

I. Opening Remarks
   A. Update on status of the CIR initiatives
   B. CIR Team Organization

II. TI 01-03 Planning
    Lead:  (b) (6)
    A. Review of key lessons learned from VF/PF.
    B. Project Requirements Document (PRD) review
    C. Review the CIR planning assumptions, risks, costs and schedule
    D. Develop parking lot
    E. Keeping the proposal warm
    F. Next steps
    G. TI Team organization

III. Facilities Planning: 9 camps to FOB, 2 Marina FOBs and 1 FOB location TBD
    Lead:  (b) (6)
    A. Develop the FOBs Assumptions, risks, cost est. and schedule
    B. Market survey
    C. Facilities team organization
    D. Develop PRD
    E. Develop parking lot
    F. Keeping the proposal warm
    G. Next steps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Planned Duration</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1120</td>
<td>PRD Development</td>
<td>10d</td>
<td>Mar-08-2013</td>
<td>Mar-22-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1140</td>
<td>Risk Matrix Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td>Mar-22-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1160</td>
<td>Milestone Schedule Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td>Mar-22-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1160</td>
<td>Cost Model for PRD Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td>Mar-22-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>PRD Ready</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>Initiate New Acquisitions</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>PRD Approved</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>Receipt of Authority</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>Receipt of Funds</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>Initiate ROE-S</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>Achieve ROE-S</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>Construction MATOC Award</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>Survey Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1170</td>
<td>RE - Start Negotiation</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1190</td>
<td>RE - Negotiation Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1190</td>
<td>Environmental - Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1190</td>
<td>Design Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>RE Certified for Construction</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>Task Order Award(s)</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>Construction NTP</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1100</td>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1110</td>
<td>Required Completion</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### O-1-2-3 Real Estate

| RE-100 | Start Date Milestone for Real Estate                      | 0d               |                   |                   |
| RE-10   | Identify requirements and gather documentation from SMUs (on new tracts and tracts that have expended footprints from wh... |                   |                   |                   |
| RE-20   | Secure ROE(S) some may be voluntary, some require condemnation (150 days) |                   |                   |                   |
| RE-25   | 35% Design Complete (USACE)                               |                   |                   |                   |
| RE-30   | Conduct Required Surveys (Metes & Bounds, Phase-1 ESA, Bio, Cultural) |                   |                   |                   |
| RE-40   | Preliminary Title Work (Commence after Surveys are complete) (90 days) |                   |                   |                   |
| RE-50   | Valuations (Commence after Title work) (45 days)          |                   |                   |                   |
| RE-60   | Negotiations (Assuming landowners are identified) (60 days) |                   |                   |                   |
| RE-110  | RE - Start Negotiation                                   |                   |                   |                   |
| RE-120  | RE - Negotiation Complete                                |                   |                   |                   |
| RE-70   | [Real Estate Certified (via Closing or Condemnation)]     |                   |                   |                   |

### O-1-2-3 IAA

| IAA-20 | Latest Initiate IAA Date to complete 90 Days Before Task Order Award(s) Date | 0d               |                   |                   |
| IAA-10  | Identify requirements and gather documentation from SMPs (for all IAA)         |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-20  | Develop SOW                                                                    |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-40  | Finalize SOW                                                                    |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-50  | Develop AP                                                                      |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-60  | Develop IGCE                                                                    |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-70  | Develop D&M                                                                    |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-80  | Finalize D&M                                                                    |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-90  | Finalize AP                                                                     |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-100 | Finalize Detailed IGCE                                                          |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-110 | Prepare Purchase Request                                                        |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-120 | Approve PR                                                                      |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-130 | Commit Funds                                                                    |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-140 | CO Review of IAA Package                                                        |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-150 | Incorporate CO-Comments                                                         |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-160 | Finalize IAA Package                                                            |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-170 | Draft IAA Form                                                                  |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-180 | Quality Assurance Review                                                        |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-190 | Legal Review                                                                    |                   |                   |                   |
| IAA-200 | [USACE Review and Approval]                                                     |                   |                   |                   |

### O-1-2-3 Project Milestones

- **PRD Development**
- **Risk Matrix Complete**
- **Milestones Schedule Complete**
- **Cost Model for PRD Complete**
- **Initiate New Acquisitions**
- **PRD Approved**
- **Receipt of Authority**
- **Receipt of Funds**
- **Initiate ROE-S**
- **Achieve ROE-S**
- **Construction MATOC Award**
- **Survey Complete**
- **RE - Start Negotiation**
- **RE - Negotiation Complete**
- **Environmental - Complete**
- **Design Complete**
- **RE Certified for Construction**
- **Task Order Award(s)**
- **Construction NTP**
- **Construction Complete**
- **Required Completion**

### O-1-2-3 Real Estate

- **Start Date Milestone for Real Estate**
- **Identify requirements and gather documentation from SMUs (on new tracts and tracts that have expended footprints from wh...**
- **Secure ROE(S) some may be voluntary, some require condemnation (150 days)**
- **35% Design Complete (USACE)**
- **Conduct Required Surveys (Metes & Bounds, Phase-1 ESA, Bio, Cultural) (90 days)**
- **Preliminary Title Work (Commence after Surveys are complete) (60 days)**
- **Valuations (Commence after Title work) (45 days)**
- **Negotiations (Assuming landowners are identified) (60 days)**
- **Start Negotiation (60 days)**
- **Start Construction (45 days)**
- **Real Estate Certified (via Closing or Condemnation)**

### O-1-2-3 IAA

- **Latest Initiate IAA Date to complete 90 Days Before Task Order Award(s) Date**
- **Identify requirements and gather documentation from SMPs (for all IAA) (90 days)**
- **Develop SOW (180 days)**
- **Finalize SOW (120 days)**
- **Develop IGCE (150 days)**
- **Develop D&M (120 days)**
- **Finalize D&M (120 days)**
- **Finalize AP (90 days)**
- **Timing and Scheduling IGCE (120 days)**
- **Prepare Purchase Request (60 days)**
- **Approve PR (90 days)**
- **Commit Funds (90 days)**
- **CO Review of IAA Package (90 days)**
- **Incorporate CO-Comments (90 days)**
- **Finalize IAA Package (90 days)**
- **Draft IAA Form (90 days)**
- **Quality Assurance Review (60 days)**
- **Legal Review (60 days)**
- **USACE Review and Approval (90 days)**
From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on behalf of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: CIR Project Pre-Planning
Start: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 1:00:00 PM
End: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 4:00:00 PM
Location: VTC/ (b) (7)(C)
Attachments: CIR Planning Development (2).pptx
O1-3 Draft PRD 32513.docx
CIR Agenda 032613 Final.docx
O1-2-3 IMS Project 03-25-2013.pdf
CIR Budget Estimate RSD V4 (26 Mar 13).xls
O-1 O-2 O-3 Fence Draft Acq Schedule 25 Mar 13.xlsx
Risk Drivers.docx

When: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 1:00 PM-4:00 PM (GMT-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: VTC/ (b) (7)(E)

3/25- Read ahead versions. More to come. If you cannot participate via VTC (all in DC, Eeuless, Laguna should participate via VTC), call in added.

3/7- meeting is now a half day VTC meeting. If you cannot participate via VTC, please let me know and I will request a telecon. Agenda forthcoming.

R/
Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR)
Planning for O-1, 2, 3

March 1, 2013
O-1 thru O-3 Scope

- **Scope**
  - Customer requirements
  -  miles in RGV Sector
  - (b) (7)(E) system
  - Alignments coordinated with RGV Sector and IBWC with following goals:
    - Satisfy operational requirement
    - Minimize floodplain impacts
    - Stay within areas covered by 2008 DHS Waiver

- **Real Estate**
  - Collaboration with DOJ
  - ROE-S will take (b) (5)
  - Land Usage Agreements must be complete within 21 months
O-1 thru O-3 Scope (cont’d)

- Environmental
  - Environmental monitoring?
  - Any alignment changes may require updates and notifications

- Design
  - Full Design
  - Maximize setback from river (within RE and ENV constraints)
  - Minimize floodplain impacts
  - GFM incorporation dependent upon scale (lessons learned from PF/VF)
  - Multiple requirements
  - Stakeholder coordination (USFWS, IBWC)
  - Dependent upon geotech and topo surveys
  - Access and staging
Acquisition Strategy

(b)(5)
Staffing

- Dedicated PgM with 2-3 PMs in support: In-house; KTR; hybrid
- OPCELL: 4 pax: In-house; KTR (8(a)); hybrid
- Functional Area support: matrix with KTR augmentation
  - CT
  - ENV
  - RE
  - Construction (QA, Contract Admin)
Funding & Logistics

- IAA vs RWA: IAA introduces schedule risk
- GFM economy of scale
Major Milestones

- Initiate new acquisitions: (b) (5)
- Achieve ROE-S: (b) (5)
- Authority receipt: (b) (5)
- Funds receipt: (b) (5)
- Survey complete: (b) (5)
- Construction MATOC award: (b) (5)
- Design complete: (b) (5)
- RE Acquisition complete: (b) (5)
- Task Order award(s): (b) (5)
- Construction NTP: (b) (5)
- Construction Completion: (b) (5)
- Required Completion: (b) (5)
Project Name: O-1-O-3 RGV Primary Fence Construction

Purpose of PRD: This document authorizes designation of project, baselines, scope, cost and schedule. This document authorizes funding for all planning, acquisition, environmental assessment, programming design and construction activities.

OBP Requirement: FY [XXXX]
[This section should be developed by the OBP HQ Strategic Planning, Policy, & Analysis Division. It should detail the OBP Mission Need and Operational Requirement being met by this project. Language should cover what the need is and how operations will be affected.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Metric: Total Miles:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Cost Estimate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Start Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned End Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description/Objective:
This project involves the construction of an estimated miles of new primary pedestrian fence (PF). The project consists of 3 separate fence segments, segments O-1 and O-2 are located in Roma and Rio Grande City, Starr County, Texas. Segment O-3 is located in Los Ebanos, Hidalgo County, Texas; along the International Border. The new PF will be comprised of bollard style fence. This project is to be a design, bid, build construction contract.

This fence is located both within urban areas and undeveloped wildlife habitat areas, where there are numerous houses, utilities and miscellaneous structures in proximity to the proposed alignments. There are also dump-sites, significant drainage arroyos, erosive soils and areas of dense vegetation in the undeveloped areas, which presents significant challenges. The presence of many drainage features and potential sinkhole areas presented significant challenges in the fence.

The area is situated in an area identified by USFWS as a significant migratory pathway for two endangered species of cats (ocelot and jaguarundi), and is known to be the site of several different populations of rare, threatened, and endangered plants including Zapata Bladderpod, Star Cactus, Walker’s manioc and Johnson’s Frankenia.
The proposed alignments have been strategically analyzed by CBP from a law enforcement perspective and by USACE and IBWC from a flood control perspective. The USACE and CBP in conjunction with USFWS have analyzed the area from a habitat, vegetation, and a wildlife habitat perspective. A hydraulic model has been developed by USACE and review and approved by IBWC for the proposed alignments.

Other challenges include: significant potential opposition from local public officials, landowners, environmental NGOs and Mexico; Security issues; and high level political involvement (congressional and Whitehouse)

### Points of Contact and Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>USACE Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>BPFTI PMO M&amp;R PM/COR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Design Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Real Estate Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USACE Real Estate Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Environmental Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USACE Environmental Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Financial Management Branch Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BPFTI PMO Project Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBP Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BP Field Contact (Include location and position)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diagrams/Exhibits/Conceptual Designs:

(b) (6)
Background:
The real estate process for O-1, 2, 3 was initiated back in 2007 as part of 225 to acquire privately-owned land required along the original 60-foot-wide swath. Approximately [DELETED] of the original [DELETED] swath was on U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) refuge land, thus it was cleared by virtue of the 2008 waiver. Soon after the project was de-scoped from PF225 because of the lack of International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) concurrence with the original proposed alignments, all negotiations and any active condemnation cases that had already been filed were placed ‘on-hold’.

Real Estate Acquisitions

Photographs:
Since that time, the alignment has shifted as a result of consultation with IBWC and Border Patrol. Of the total 22 miles, approximately 0.7 (b)(E) of the new alignment overlaps with the original alignment. 

REAL ESTATE ACQUISITION PROCESS GOING FORWARD:
REAL ESTATE SCHEDULE:

NEPA/Environmental Permits

However, under the 2008 waiver, CBP strongly supports the Secretary’s commitment to responsible environmental...
stewardship. To that end, CBP prepared an Environmental Stewardship Plan (ESP) for all segments in RGV in 2008 which includes a Biological Resources Plan (BRP). The ESP and BRP analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with construction of tactical infrastructure in the entire U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) Rio Grande Valley Sector. This ESP will need to be substantially supplemented due to its age and due to the change in the O1-O3 project from what was originally planned and analyzed in that ESP, but, in general establishes given mitigation ratios, the requirement for construction Best Management Practices which include onsite environmental and cultural resources monitoring plans, public outreach, and inclusion of into the fence design.

“Other” Approvals

As previously stated, USIBWC has already approved the general proposed alignments from a floodplain impacts perspective.

Schedule of Deliverables

[List key deliverables and their anticipated start date, duration and end date. Attach a detailed schedule as an addendum]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Deliverables</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>FY14 1st</th>
<th>FY14 2nd</th>
<th>FY14 3rd</th>
<th>FY14 4th</th>
<th>FY15 1st</th>
<th>FY15 2nd</th>
<th>FY15 3rd</th>
<th>FY15 4th</th>
<th>FY16 1st</th>
<th>FY16 2nd</th>
<th>FY16 3rd</th>
<th>FY16 4th</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental (Monitoring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1 Oct – Dec; Q2 Jan – Mar; Q3 Apr – Jun; Q4 Jul – Sep

Schedule Assumption(s):
Environmental scheduling assumptions include:

a) 

(b) (5)

b) 

c) 

(b) (5)
Initial Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note: A detailed WBS and cost analysis will be required and submitted as a separate document post-PRD approval. Template will be provided.]

Cost Assumption(s):
Environmental cost assumptions include:

d)  
e)  
f)  
g)  
h)  

Potential Project Risks/Mitigations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commented [SBW4]: Per (b) (5)

Commented [SBW5]: Per (b) (5)

Commented [SBW6]: Per (b) (5)
Real Estate

Real Estate

Real Estate

Scope

### Interrelated Projects

[List any interrelated project dependencies on other projects including projects such as Military Deployment Constraints, Facilities, SBInet towers, or projects within other agencies or private construction. The Acquisition Directive refers to this as “Interoperability.”]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Interrelated Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disposal Plan

[As directed in the FM&E Policy Document on Project Management, effective November 1, 2012, and in the FM&E RPAM 10042, the method, timeline, and all costs associated with a property disposal must be documented.]
APPROVAL: Constructability

(b) (6), TI Branch Chief
ECSO, USACE

APPROVAL: OBP Mission Needs

(b) (6), Office of Border Patrol, SPPA

APPROVAL: Financial

(b) (6), Branch Chief
BPFTI PMO, Financial Management Branch

APPROVAL: Real Estate & Environmental

(b) (6), Director
BPFTI PMO, Real Estate & Environmental Division

APPROVAL: Architecture and Engineering

[Name], Director
BPFTI PMO, A&E Services Division

PROJECT APPROVAL

(b) (6), Director
BPFTI PMO, TI Division
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Facilities Management & Engineering

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure (BPFTI)
Program Management Office (PMO)

Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR) Meeting

Agenda
Tuesday, March 26, 2013
VTC/Conference Line: (b) (6)

I. Opening Remarks
A. Update on status of the CIR initiatives
B. CIR Team Organization

II. TI 01-03 Planning
Lead: (b) (6)
A. Review of key lessons learned from VF/PF.
B. Project Requirements Document (PRD) review
C. Review the CIR planning assumptions, risks, costs and schedule
D. Develop parking lot
E. Keeping the proposal warm
F. Next steps
G. TI Team organization

III. Facilities Planning: 9 camps to FOB, 2 Marina FOBs and 1 FOB location TBD
Lead: (b) (6)
A. Develop the FOBs Assumptions, risks, cost est. and schedule
B. Market survey
C. Facilities team organization
D. Develop PRD
E. Develop parking lot
F. Keeping the proposal warm
G. Next steps
### O-1-2-3 Project Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Finish Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1130</td>
<td>PRD Development</td>
<td>10d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-09-2013</td>
<td>Mar-22-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1140</td>
<td>Risk Matrix Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-09-2013</td>
<td>Mar-22-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1150</td>
<td>Milestones Schedule Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-22-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1160</td>
<td>Cost Model for PRD Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-22-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1190</td>
<td>Initiate New Acquisitions</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1200</td>
<td>PRD Approved</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1220</td>
<td>Receipt of Authority</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1230</td>
<td>Receipt of Funds</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1240</td>
<td>Initiate ROE-S</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1250</td>
<td>Achieve ROE-S</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1270</td>
<td>Construction MATOC Award</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1280</td>
<td>Survey Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1290</td>
<td>RE - Start Negotiation</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1300</td>
<td>RE - Negotiation/Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1310</td>
<td>Environmental/Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1320</td>
<td>Design Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1330</td>
<td>RE Certified for Construction</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1340</td>
<td>Task Order Award(s)</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1350</td>
<td>Construction NTP</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1360</td>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1370</td>
<td>Required Completion</td>
<td>0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### O-1-2-3 Real Estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE-10</td>
<td>Start Date Milestone for Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-20</td>
<td>Secure ROE'S (some may be voluntary, some require condemnation)</td>
<td>(150 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-25</td>
<td>35% Design Complete [USACE]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-30</td>
<td>Conduct Required Surveys (Miles &amp; Sounds, Phase 1 ESA, Bio, Cultural, Sol ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-40</td>
<td>Preliminary Title Work (Commence after Surveys are complete)</td>
<td>(90 days)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-50</td>
<td>Valuation (Commence after Title work) (45 days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-60</td>
<td>Negotiations (Assuming landowners are identified) (60 days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-70</td>
<td>RE - Start Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-120</td>
<td>RE - Negotiation/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-130</td>
<td>RE - Start Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### O-1-2-3 IAA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IAA-20</td>
<td>Latest Initiate IAA Date to complete 90 Days Before Task Order Award(s) Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-10</td>
<td>Identify requirements and gather documentation from SMEs (for all IAA's)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-20</td>
<td>Develop SOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-40</td>
<td>Finalize SOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-50</td>
<td>Develop AP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-60</td>
<td>Develop IGCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-70</td>
<td>Develop D&amp;M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-80</td>
<td>Finalize D&amp;M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-90</td>
<td>Finalize AP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-100</td>
<td>Finalize Detailed IGCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-110</td>
<td>Prepare Purchase Request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-120</td>
<td>Approve PR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-130</td>
<td>Commit Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-140</td>
<td>CO Review of IAA Package</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-150</td>
<td>Incorporate CO Coments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-160</td>
<td>Finalize IAA Package</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-170</td>
<td>Draft IAA Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-180</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-190</td>
<td>Legal Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-200</td>
<td>USACE Review and Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAA-210</td>
<td>IAA Awards IAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Strategy 1: 3 Stand Alone “C” Contracts**

- Acquisition Planning Phase
- Base Contract Solicitation Phase
- “C” Contract Solicitation Phase
- Task Order Solicitation Phase
- Award Phase
- Construction Phase

**Strategy 2: Issue 3 Task Orders off the SWD Construction MATOC**

- Acquisition Planning Phase
- Base Contract Solicitation Phase
- “C” Contract Solicitation Phase
- Task Order Solicitation Phase
- Award Phase
- Construction Phase

**Strategy 3: Award new TI MATOC and and issue 3 Task Orders off New MATOC**

- Acquisition Planning Phase
- Base Contract Solicitation Phase
- “C” Contract Solicitation Phase
- Task Order Solicitation Phase
- Award Phase
- Construction Phase

**Assumptions:**

1. Real Estate
2. Schedule
3. Unknowns

**Acquisition Risks:**

1. Real Estate: (b) (5)
2. Schedule: (b) (5)
3. Unknowns: (b) (5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition Planning Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources Sought</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Market Research</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Acquisition Strategy</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Staffing of Acq Plan</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Approval of Acq Plan</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC Review of Acq Plan</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC Approval of Acq Plan</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA Review of Acq Plan</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA Approval of Acq Plan</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Contract Solicitation Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP Preparation</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Review</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise RFP</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals Due</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-SSEB Activities</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEB</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNO</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Proposals</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;C&quot; Contract Solicitation Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP Preparation</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Review</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise RFP</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals Due</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-SSEB Activities</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEB</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNO</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Proposals</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Order Solicitation Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP Preparation</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Review</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy 1: 3 Stand Alone "C" Contract Solicitation

NOT APP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertise RFP</th>
<th>(b) (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals Due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-SSEB Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Award Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Doc Prep</th>
<th>(b) (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Notification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOT APP**
LICABLE

(b) (5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy 2: Issue 3 Task Orders off the SWD Construction MATOC

(b) (5)

NOT APPLICABLE

NOT APPLICABLE

NOT APPLICABLE

(b) (5)
(b) (5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (5) NOT APPLICABLE
Risk Drivers

0-1, 2, 3

1. Real Estate
2. Design/
   Construction
3. Environmental
4. Acquisition
5. Funding
Updated budget and ENV slides <<8 May Brief V 3.2.ppt>>

CTR-LMI
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Attached is briefing for today << File: 8 May Brief V 3.1.ppt >>

CTR-LMI

BPFTI PMO
Subject: CIR Pre brief
When: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 11:00 AM-11:45 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: B155 Large conf room

Purpose: Pre-brief for meeting with Mr. Calvo on 5/7
Agenda

Purpose: Discuss O-1 to O-3 Planning Process and Use on Other Potential CIR Related Projects

• RGV Sector Numbers
• Situation
• Acquisition Strategy and Timeline
• Budget
• Design
• Real Estate
• Environmental
• Risks
• Staffing
• Adapting to Change
• Next Steps
Rio Grande Valley Sector Numbers

Source: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, as reported in the USA Today (April 2, 2013)
*Only Tucson Sector has more apprehensions at 120,000
Situation

Rio Grande Valley (RGV)
- [b] [7][E] miles of border with Mexico
- [b][7][E] Border Patrol Stations
- Rio Grande City and McAllen Stations abut O-1 to O-3
- Existing Pedestrian Fence is [b] [7][E] miles
- O-1 to O-3 segments originally under Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225
- Comprises approximately [b] [7][E] of border between Roma and Rio Grande City (see map)
- Original alignment adjusted due to flood plane agreement with IBWC
- South Texas is a high priority for Border Patrol
Acquisition Strategy and Timeline

- Flexible Approach;
- Leverage multiple vehicles (Existing MATOC, New MATOC, Stand-Alones)

**Course of Action:**

- Concurrently pursue Acquisition plans for both 'C' and MATOC strategies;
- Keep all options on the table;
- Retain flexibility to seize opportunities.

### Base Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>O-3</th>
<th>O-1</th>
<th>O-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acq Strat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acq Plan Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (5)
Budget

Total: (b) (5)

Primary Drivers:

- Construction: (b) (5)
- Real Estate:
- Contingency (Risk):
- Program and Construction Management:
- Design:
- Environmental
Design

O-1 through O-3 will be constructed using:
• Existing Design
• TI Design Standards

Bollard with Steel Plate

(b) (7)(E)
Real Estate

- **ROM RE Budget:** (b) (5)
- **Projected RE Schedule:** (b) (5)
  - O-3: (b) (5) – In Hidalgo County; Owners already ID’d; Title work underway)
  - O-1: (b) (5) – Starr County;
  - O-2: (b) (5) – Starr County + more new owners;
- **Key Assumptions:**
  - (b) (5)
  - (b) (5)
- **Land Acquisition Options:** (will be evaluated tract-by-tract)
  - (b) (5)
- **Significant Risks:** (b) (5)
Environmental

- CBP will maintain strong environmental stewardship
- Strong proactive outreach program required
Risk

- 3 Point Estimate:
  - Low: (b) (5)
  - Medium: 
  - High: 

- Top Risk Categories:
  - Real Estate
  - Latent Conditions
  - Contractor Performance

- Milestones Affected (In order of frequency):
  - Construction Start Date
  - Obtain ROE-SE
  - Real Estate Certification
Staffing

BPFTI
- Align PMs by corridors (Border Patrol style)
  - Example: PM to oversee and monitor San Diego, El Centro and Yuma
- Flex capability by using Sector PM/CORs
- Surge capability by tapping into Facilities PMs

ECSO
- Utilizing current staffing
- Leveraging existing USACE Districts capabilities
- Complementing CBP corridors
- Leveraging surge capabilities within USACE
Adapt to Changing Requirements

*Aggressive planning and execution; retain flexibility to incorporate additional requirements*

**Consistent, Scalable Approach:**

- Real Estate & Environmental
- Acquisition: O-1, 2, 3 vehicles, existing vehicles in supporting Districts
- Risk: Real Estate driven
- Budget: Detailed estimates; risk-burdened
- Staffing: Corridor alignment

Leverage existing capabilities and capacities in supporting Districts

**Past Success on Similar Programs**

- **PF225**
  - $1.099B Program
  - USACE execution of *(b) (7)(E)*
- **VF300**
  - $255M Program
  - USACE execution of *(b) (7)(E)*

  4 executing Districts in 2 Divisions
  - High visibility, high political interest
  - 525+ USACE employees across 37 Divisions, Districts, and Labs

  Environmental, Real Estate, and Strategic Communications
Next Steps

- (b) (5)
Attached is briefing for today <<8 May Brief V 3.1.ppt>>
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-----Original Appointment-----

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

Sent: Wednesday, May 01, 2013 3:00 PM

To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: CIR Pre brief

When: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 11:00 AM-11:45 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).

Where: B155 Large conf room

Purpose: Pre-brief for meeting with Mr. Calvo on 5/7
From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
To: CALVO, KARL H.; (b) (6); (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: CIR O-1 thru O-3 Brief
Date: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 3:31:12 PM
Attachments: 8 May Brief V 4.ppt

<<8 May Brief V 4.ppt>>

CTR-LMI

BPFTI PMO

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

-----Original Appointment-----
From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, May 06, 2013 6:32 AM
To: CALVO, KARL H.; (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: CIR O-1 thru O-3 Brief
When: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 2:00 PM-3:00 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: BPFTI Large Conf Room/ VTC/ (b) (7)(E)
Importance: High

asked me to forward this invite to you

-----Original Appointment-----
From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) On Behalf Of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2013 4:31 PM
To: CALVO, KARL H.; (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: CIR O-1 thru O-3 Brief
When: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 2:00 PM-3:00 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: BPFTI Large Conf Room/ VTC/ (b) (7)(E)
Importance: High

Purpose is for TI Director (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to update XD and other Directors on status and path forward. Agenda and read aheads forthcoming.
Agenda

Purpose: Discuss O-1 to O-3 Planning Process and Use on Other Potential CIR Related Projects

- RGV Sector Numbers
- Situation
- Acquisition Strategy and Timeline
- Budget
- Design
- Real Estate
- Environmental
- Risks
- Staffing
- Adapting to Change
- Next Steps
Situation

Rio Grande Valley (RGV)

- (b) (7)(E) of border with Mexico

- Border Patrol Stations

- Rio Grande City and McAllen Stations abut O-1 to O-3

- Existing Pedestrian Fence is (b) (7)(E)

- O-1 to O-3 segments originally under Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225

- Comprises approximately (b) (7)(E) of fence between Roma and Rio Grande City (see map)

- IBWC concurrence with new alignment (satisfies treaty requirement)

- South Texas is a high priority for Border Patrol
Acquisition Strategy and Timeline

✓ Flexible Approach
✓ Leverage multiple vehicles (Existing MATOC, New MATOC, Stand-Alones, Steel)

Course of Action:
• Concurrently pursue Acquisition plans for both 'C' and MATOC strategies
  • Award on existing MATOC must be made by Feb 15
• Keep all options on the table
• Retain flexibility to seize opportunities.

Base Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>0-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acq Strat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acq Plan Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (5)
Design

O-1 through O-3 will be constructed using:

• Existing Design
• TI Design Standards

Bollard with Steel Plate
Real Estate

- ROM RE Budge *(b) (5)*
- Projected RE Schedule: *(b) (5)*
  - O-3: In Hidalgo County; Owners already ID’d; Title work underway)
  - O-1: – Starr County *(b) (5)*
  - O-2: Starr County + more new owners; *(b) (5)*

- Key Assumptions:

- Land Acquisition Options: (will be evaluated tract-by-tract)

- Significant Risks: *(b) (5)*
Latest version attached. <<8 May Brief V 4.ppt>>

CTR-LMI

BPFTI PMO

-----Original Appointment-----

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, May 01, 2013 3:00 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6)

Subject: CIR Pre brief
When: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 11:00 AM-11:45 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: B155 Large conf room/1

Purpose: Pre-brief for meeting with Mr. Calvo on 5/7
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

O-1 to O-3 Planning Brief
Agenda

Purpose: Discuss O-1 to O-3 Planning Process and Use on Other Potential CIR Related Projects

• RGV Sector Numbers
• Situation
• Acquisition Strategy and Timeline
• Budget
• Design
• Real Estate
• Environmental
• Risks
• Staffing
• Adapting to Change
• Next Steps
Situation

Rio Grande Valley (RGV)
- (b) (7)(E) of border with Mexico
- Border Patrol Stations
  - Rio Grande City and McAllen Stations abut O-1 to O-3
  - Existing Pedestrian Fence is (b) (7)(E)
  - O-1 to O-3 segments originally under Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225
  - Comprises approximately (b) (7)(E) of fence between Roma and Rio Grande City (see map)
  - IBWC concurrence with new alignment (satisfies treaty requirement)
  - South Texas is a high priority for Border Patrol
Acquisition Strategy and Timeline

✓ Flexible Approach
✓ Leverage multiple vehicles (Existing MATOC, New MATOC, Stand-Alones, Steel)

Course of Action:

Base Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>0-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acq Strat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acq Plan Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (5)
Design

O-1 through O-3 will be constructed using:

- Existing Design
- TI Design Standards

Bollard with Steel Plate
Real Estate

- ROM RE Budge
- Projected RE Schedule:
  - O-3: In Hidalgo County; Owners already ID’d; Title work underway
  - O-1: – Starr County
  - O-2: Starr County + more new owners
- Key Assumptions:
  - Land Acquisition Options: (will be evaluated tract-by-tract)
- Significant Risks:
Sir,

Per your request, attached are the slides for Monday’s 1000 meeting with AC. Should you have questions, please reach out directly.

R/
Agenda

- Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points
- Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns
- Amendments
- BPFTI PMO CIR Planning
- Staffing
- Sustainment
- C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)
- Next Steps
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points

- **Funding**: $1B available upon enactment for start-up costs available until end of FY15

- **Ongoing Funding**: No funding currently identified for sustainment of any new assets constructed as a result of this Bill

- **Comprehensive Southern Border Security Strategy**:
  - Strategy for achieving and maintaining effective control between the Ports of Entry in all “high risk” border Sectors
  - High risk = *(b) (7)(E)*
  - High-risk Sectors = *(b) (7)(E)*
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $3B funding is 5-year monies; discretionary and subject to the Appropriations Committee to act
  - All priorities must be met for the strategy to be successful
    - Forward Operating Bases (FOBs), Border Patrol Stations (BPS), Checkpoints, and additional facilities infrastructure need to be identified in this section
  - Written certification of substantially deployed and substantially operational required

*Information as of May 9, 2013*
Southern Border Fencing Strategy:
• Deploy additional fencing in high-risk border Sectors
• Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
• $1.5B funding is mandatory for fence – 5-year monies
• Secretary has authority to waive all laws to ensure expeditious construction of barriers, roads or other physical infrastructure
• Substantially complete certification required
Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns

1. Limited access to Federal Lands – Arizona only

2. Completion of a Southern Border Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) will not delay fence construction

3. Use of National Guard to:
   - Build fence (double and triple layer)
   - Supply materials
   - Construct (b) (7)(E) Checkpoints

Information as of May 9, 2013
Approximately 300 amendments were submitted on May 7, 2013

The amendments that could impact the legislation include:

- Leahy 4 – puts technology back in the $1.5B pot, adds consultation language and some additional reporting requirements for environmental waiver usage
- Schumer 2 – adds “such sums as necessary” to carry out O&M for border security and other investments (still a discretionary pot that must be appropriated, but it adds flexibility) **PASSED 05/09/13**
- Grassley 4 – changes the trigger from fencing “substantially” complete to “fully” complete
- Sessions 9 – requires the completion of 700 miles of pedestrian fence, vehicle fence does not count
- Cruz 1 – Triples the number of Border Patrol agents, requires completion of all required fence under the Secure Fence Act of 2006, gives grants to States to accomplish border security if DHS fails to do so

In addition, there are many other items that are tangentially related (changes to operational/effective control, reporting, submissions to Congress, etc.)
BPFTI PMO CIR Planning

- Coordination meetings with Office of Border Patrol (OBP) Facilities Branch, Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division (SPPA), Operational Requirements Management Branch (ORMB), and Office of Administration (OA) Budget

- Proposed meeting with Office of Technology, Innovation & Acquisition (OTIA) Chief of Staff \( (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) \) AC Mark Borkowski, FM&E XD Calvo

  **Purpose:** Map fence/BPS planning, acquisition and execution strategy

- BPFTI PMO internal planning:
  - **Tactical Infrastructure (TI) Division** – Developing fencing Project Requirements Document (PRD) with USACE and OBP
  - **Facilities (FAC) Division** – Developing PRD for FOBs, BPS, Checkpoints with OBP and USACE
  - **Business Operations Division** – Developing requirements to support planning, communication, and acquisition processes and budget actions

*Information as of May 9, 2013*
BPFTI PMO CIR Planning (cont.)

- Due to the language in the Senate bill, the BPFTI PMO has commenced pre-planning for the following:
  - TI fence segments O-1 through O-3 in Rio Grande Valley Sector
  - FOBs
  - BPS
### Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing needed for CIR</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY10 BPFTI PMO Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13 BPFTI PMO Staff* (current)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional requested with CIR (BPFTI)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total BPFTI PMO for post-CIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional staff with CIR (non-BPFTI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include Wage Grade (WG) maintenance employees and additional required personnel for sustainment requirements*

**The BPFTI PMO requests the insourcing of contractors**
Sustainment Costs – CIR

- Tactical Infrastructure*
  - Primary Fence Replacement *(b) (7)(E)*
  - O-1, O-2 and O-3

*Maintenance and Repair for *(b) (7)(E) useful life

- Facilities**
  - 12 FOBs
  - 15 SWB Stations (replacement)
    *(plus large MCA projects)*

**Maintenance, Repair and Operations for *(b) (7)(E) useful life for Stations and *(b) (7)(E) for FOBs

TI and Facilities Estimated Total: *(b) (5)*

*Information as of May 9, 2013*
C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)

- BPFTI Delegate: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
  Alternate: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

- CAT Team weekly meetings

**CIR Comment Request Process:**

Office of General Counsel → Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) → CAT Team
- Working closely with OCC on responses and inputs to proposed CIR Bill 744
- Anticipate increase in requests for comments beginning week of May 5

- A/C-1 CIR Focus/Questions: Flexibility – Oversight – Eligibility Requirements
- CIR is disconnected from the Appropriation process

**Upcoming Meetings:**
- May 7: Hearing, Homeland Security Committee A/C-1 and B-1
- May 7: All amendments due
- May 9: Senate Judiciary Committee mark-up begins and continues through Memorial Day
- June 2013: Anticipate report out to full Senate
Next Steps

- (b) (5)

Information as of May 9, 2013
Some questions or suggestions:

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Slides for your info. Recommend you comment to [REDACTED] today if you’d like to see changes that align with FM&E staffing analysis. Thanks.

r/ Karl

**Karl H. Calvo, PMP, CFM**
Executive Director, Facilities Management & Engineering
U.S. Customs & Border Protection
1313 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Read Ahead for Discuss the Pending CIR Legislation
Date: Friday, May 10, 2013 1:12 PM
Attachments: CIR Update Brief to AC Schied v3 050913.ppt
Importance: High

Attached is the deck that [REDACTED] submitted to you yesterday evening for Monday morning’s CIR meeting with AC [REDACTED]. Please advise if we are clear to submit to OA as read ahead material.
Thanks,
Agenda

- Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points
- Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns
- Amendments
- BPFTI PMO CIR Planning
- Staffing
- Sustainment
- C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)
- Next Steps
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points

- **Funding**: $1B available upon enactment for start-up costs available until end of FY15

- **Ongoing Funding**: No funding currently identified for sustainment of any new assets constructed as a result of this Bill

- **Comprehensive Southern Border Security Strategy**:
  - Strategy for achieving and maintaining effective control between the Ports of Entry in all “high risk” border Sectors
    - High risk = [redacted]
    - High-risk Sectors = [redacted]
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $3B funding is 5-year monies; discretionary and subject to the Appropriations Committee to act
  - All priorities must be met for the strategy to be successful
    - Forward Operating Bases (FOBs), Border Patrol Stations (BPS), Checkpoints, and additional facilities infrastructure need to be identified in this section
  - Written certification of substantially deployed and substantially operational required

Information as of May 9, 2013
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points (cont.)

- **Southern Border Fencing Strategy:**
  - Deploy additional fencing in high-risk border Sectors
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $1.5B funding is mandatory for fence – 5-year monies
  - Secretary has authority to waive all laws to ensure expeditious construction of barriers, roads or other physical infrastructure
  - Substantially complete certification required
Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns

1. Limited access to Federal Lands – Arizona only

2. Completion of a Southern Border Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) will not delay fence construction

3. Use of National Guard to:
   • Build fence (double and triple layer)
   • Supply materials
   • Construct (b) (7)(E) Checkpoints
Approximately 300 amendments were submitted on May 7, 2013.

The amendments that could impact the legislation include:

- Leahy 4 – puts technology back in the $1.5B pot, adds consultation language and some additional reporting requirements for environmental waiver usage.
- Schumer 2 – adds “such sums as necessary” to carry out O&M for border security and other investments (still a discretionary pot that must be appropriated, but it adds flexibility) **PASSED 05/09/13**
- Grassley 4 – changes the trigger from fencing “substantially” complete to “fully” complete.
- Sessions 9 – requires the completion of 700 miles of **pedestrian** fence, vehicle fence does not count.
- Cruz 1 – Triples the number of Border Patrol agents, requires completion of all required fence under the Secure Fence Act of 2006, gives grants to States to accomplish border security if DHS fails to do so.

In addition, there are many other items that are tangentially related (changes to operational/effective control, reporting, submissions to Congress, etc.)
BPFTI PMO CIR Planning

- Coordination meetings with Office of Border Patrol (OBP) Facilities Branch, Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division (SPPA), Operational Requirements Management Branch (ORMB), and Office of Administration (OA) Budget

- Proposed meeting with Office of Technology, Innovation & Acquisition (OTIA) Chief of Staff AC Mark Borkowski, FM&E XD Calvo

  **Purpose:** Map fence/BPS planning, acquisition and execution strategy

- BPFTI PMO internal planning:
  - **Tactical Infrastructure (TI) Division** – Developing fencing Project Requirements Document (PRD) with USACE and OBP
  - **Facilities (FAC) Division** – Developing PRD for FOBs, BPS, Checkpoints with OBP and USACE
  - **Business Operations Division** – Developing requirements to support planning, communication, and acquisition processes and budget actions

*Information as of May 9, 2013*
Due to the language in the Senate bill, the BPFTI PMO has commenced pre-planning for the following:

- TI fence segments O-1 through O-3 in Rio Grande Valley Sector
- FOBs
- BPS
# Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing needed for CIR</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY10 BPFTI PMO Staff</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13 BPFTI PMO Staff* (current)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional requested with CIR (BPFTI)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total BPFTI PMO for post-CIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional staff with CIR (non-BPFTI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include Wage Grade (WG) maintenance employees and additional required personnel for sustainment requirements*

**The BPFTI PMO requests the insourcing of contractors**
Sustainment Costs – CIR

- Tactical Infrastructure*
  - Primary Fence Replacement *(b) (7)(E)*
  - O-1, O-2 and O-3

  *Maintenance and Repair for *(b) (7)(E)* useful life

- Facilities**
  - 12 FOBs
  - 15 SWB Stations (replacement) *(plus large MCA projects)*

**Maintenance, Repair and Operations for *(b) (7)(E)* useful life for Stations and *(b) (7)(E)* for FOBs

TI and Facilities Estimated Total: *(b) (5)*

Information as of May 9, 2013
C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)

- BPFTI Delegate: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
  
Alternate: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

- CAT Team weekly meetings

- **CIR Comment Request Process:**
  
  Office of General Counsel → Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) → CAT Team
  
  - Working closely with OCC on responses and inputs to proposed CIR Bill 744
  
  - Anticipate increase in requests for comments beginning week of May 5

  - A/C-1 CIR Focus/Questions: Flexibility – Oversight – Eligibility Requirements
  
  - CIR is disconnected from the Appropriation process

- **Upcoming Meetings:**
  
  - May 7: Hearing, Homeland Security Committee A/C-1 and B-1
  
  - May 7: All amendments due
  
  - May 9: Senate Judiciary Committee mark-up begins and continues through Memorial Day

  - June 2013: Anticipate report out to full Senate

Information as of May 9, 2013
Next Steps

(b) (5)

Information as of May 9, 2013
I apologize, corrected read ahead for tomorrow is attached <<8 May Brief V 4.1.ppt>>
asked me to forward this invite to you

-----Original Appointment-----

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) On Behalf Of [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2013 4:31 PM
To: [b](6);[b](7)(C) CALVO, KARL H.; ;
     (b) (6)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: CIR O-1 thru O-3 Brief
When: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 2:00 PM-3:00 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: BPFTI Large Conf Room/ VTC/  (b) (7)(E)
Importance: High

Purpose is for TI Director [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) to update XD and other Directors on status and path forward. Agenda and read aheads forthcoming.

R/
Agenda

Purpose: Discuss O-1 to O-3 Planning Process and Use on Other Potential CIR Related Projects

• RGV Sector Numbers
• Situation
• Acquisition Strategy and Timeline
• Budget
• Design
• Real Estate
• Environmental
• Risks
• Staffing
• Adapting to Change
• Next Steps
Situation

Rio Grande Valley (RGV)
- (b) (7)(E) of border with Mexico
- Border Patrol Stations
- Rio Grande City and McAllen Stations abut O-1 to O-3
- Existing Pedestrian Fence is (b) (7)(E)
- O-1 to O-3 segments originally under Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225
- Comprises approximately (b) (7)(E) of fence between Roma and Rio Grande City (see map)
- IBWC concurrence with new alignment (satisfies treaty requirement)
- South Texas is a high priority for Border Patrol
Acquisition Strategy and Timeline

- Flexible Approach
- Leverage multiple vehicles (Existing MATOC, New MATOC, Stand-Alones, Steel)

Course of Action:

Base Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>O-3</th>
<th>O-1</th>
<th>O-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acq Strat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acq Plan Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design

O-1 through O-3 will be constructed using:

- Existing Design
- TI Design Standards

Bollard with Steel Plate
Real Estate

- ROM RE Budget: (b) (5)
- Projected RE Schedule: (b) (5)
  - O-3: In Hidalgo County; Owners already ID’d; Title work underway
  - O-1: – Starr County; (b) (5)
  - O-2: Starr County + more new owners; (b) (5)
- Key Assumptions:
- Land Acquisition Options: (will be evaluated tract-by-tract) (b) (5)
- Significant Risks: (b) (5)
Please find the Schied briefing attached. I’ve also included the staffing analysis in case we ever want to know where we pulled our numbers from.

Let me know if you have any edits or questions.

Thanks,
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office
Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR) Update
Prepared for AC Eugene Schied
May 13, 2013
Agenda

- Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points
- Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns
- Amendments
- Adapt to Changing Requirements
- BPFTI PMO CIR Planning
- Staffing
- Sustainment
- C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)
- Next Steps
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points

- **Funding**: $1B available upon enactment for start-up costs available until end of FY15

- **Ongoing Funding**: No funding currently identified for sustainment of any new assets constructed as a result of this Bill

- **Comprehensive Southern Border Security Strategy**:
  - Strategy for achieving and maintaining effective control between the Ports of Entry in all “high risk” border Sectors
    - High risk =
    - High-risk Sectors =
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $3B funding is 5-year monies; discretionary and subject to the Appropriations Committee to act
  - All priorities must be met for the strategy to be successful
    - Forward Operating Bases (FOBs), Border Patrol Stations (BPS), Checkpoints, and additional facilities infrastructure need to be identified in this section
  - Written certification of substantially deployed and substantially operational required

*Information as of May 9, 2013*
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points (cont.)

- **Southern Border Fencing Strategy:**
  - Deploy additional fencing in high-risk border Sectors
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $1.5B funding is mandatory for fence – 5-year monies
  - Secretary has authority to waive all laws to ensure expeditious construction of barriers, roads or other physical infrastructure
  - Substantially complete certification required
Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns

1. Limited access to Federal Lands – Arizona only

2. Completion of a Southern Border Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) will not delay fence construction

3. Use of National Guard to:
   • Build fence (double and triple layer)
   • Supply materials
   • Construct (b) (7)(E) Checkpoints
Approximately 300 amendments were submitted on May 7, 2013

The amendments that could impact the legislation include:

- **Leahy 4** – puts technology back in the $1.5B pot, adds consultation language and some additional reporting requirements for environmental waiver usage
- **Schumer 2** – adds “such sums as necessary” to carry out O&M for border security and other investments (still a discretionary pot that must be appropriated, but it adds flexibility) **PASSED 05/09/13**
- **Grassley 4** – changes the trigger from fencing “substantially” complete to “fully” complete
- **Sessions 9** – requires the completion of 700 miles of pedestrian fence, vehicle fence does not count
- **Cruz 1** – Triples the number of Border Patrol agents, requires completion of all required fence under the Secure Fence Act of 2006, gives grants to States to accomplish border security if DHS fails to do so

In addition, there are many other items that are tangentially related (changes to operational/effective control, reporting, submissions to Congress, etc.)
BPFTI PMO CIR Planning

- Coordination meetings with Office of Border Patrol (OBP) Facilities Branch, Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division (SPPA), Operational Requirements Management Branch (ORMB), and Office of Administration (OA) Budget

- Proposed meeting with Office of Technology, Innovation & Acquisition (OTIA) Chief of Staff, AC Mark Borkowski, FM&E XD Calvo

  **Purpose:** Map fence/BPS planning, acquisition and execution strategy

- BPFTI PMO internal planning:
  - **Tactical Infrastructure (TI) Division** – Developing fencing Project Requirements Document (PRD) with USACE and OBP
  - **Facilities (FAC) Division** – Developing PRD for FOBs, BPS, Checkpoints with OBP and USACE
  - **Business Operations Division** – Developing requirements to support planning, communication, and acquisition processes and budget actions

*Information as of May 9, 2013*
Due to the language in the Senate bill, the BPFTI PMO has commenced pre-planning for the following:

- TI fence segments O-1 through O-3 in Rio Grande Valley Sector
- FOBs
- BPS
## Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing needed for CIR</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY10 BPFTI PMO Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13 BPFTI PMO Staff* (current)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional requested with CIR (BPFTI)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total BPFTI PMO for post-CIR</strong></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional staff with CIR (non-BPFTI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include Wage Grade (WG) maintenance employees and additional required personnel for sustainment requirements

**The BPFTI PMO requests the insourcing of contractors

Information as of May 9, 2013
Sustainment Costs – CIR

- **Tactical Infrastructure***
  - Primary Fence Replacement
  - O-1, O-2 and O-3

*Maintenance and Repair for useful life

- **Facilities**
  - 12 FOBs
  - 15 SWB Stations (replacement) *(plus large MCA projects)*

**Maintenance, Repair and Operations for useful life

**TI and Facilities Estimated Total:** *(b) (5)*

Information as of May 9, 2013
C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)

- BPFTI Delegate: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
  Alternate: (b)(5)

- CAT Team weekly meetings

- **CIR Comment Request Process:**
  Office of General Counsel → Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) → CAT Team
  - Working closely with OCC on responses and inputs to proposed CIR Bill 744
  - Anticipate increase in requests for comments beginning week of May 5

- A/C-1 CIR Focus/Questions: Flexibility – Oversight – Eligibility Requirements
- CIR is disconnected from the Appropriation process

- **Upcoming Meetings:**
  - May 7: Hearing, Homeland Security Committee A/C-1 and B-1
  - May 7: All amendments due
  - May 9: Senate Judiciary Committee mark-up begins and continues through Memorial Day
  - June 2013: Anticipate report out to full Senate

Information as of May 9, 2013

U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Next Steps

• (b) (5)

Information as of May 9, 2013
From:  
To:  
Cc:  
Subject:  CIR Pre brief  
Start:  Tuesday, May 07, 2013 11:00:00 AM  
End:  Tuesday, May 07, 2013 11:45:00 AM  
Location:  B155 Large conf room  
8 May Brief V 3.2.ppt  

Purpose:  Pre-brief for meeting with Mr. Calvo on 5/7  

<<O-1-2-3 Milestones-v3.pdf>>  
<<8 May Brief V 3.2.ppt>>
### O123 Milestones Schedule

**Real Estate AE / Procurement / Construction Milestones O123**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE-O1-100</td>
<td>RE - O1 - Start Date for Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O1-200</td>
<td>RE - O1 - Valice RDS-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O1-300</td>
<td>RE - O1 - Complete RDS-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O1-400</td>
<td>RE - O1 - Start Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O1-500</td>
<td>RE - O1 - Negotiation Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O1-600</td>
<td>RE - O1 - Real Estate Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE Design</td>
<td>AE Design - O1 - Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES0001</td>
<td>AE Design - O1 - Design Start Milestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES0002</td>
<td>AE Design - O1 - Receipt of Final (90%) Submittal Milestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES0003</td>
<td>AE Design - O1 - Receive Corrected Final Submittal Milestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>New MATOC - O1 - Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON0001</td>
<td>Construction - O1 - Construction Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON0002</td>
<td>Construction - O1 - Construction Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON0003</td>
<td>Construction - O1 - Beneficial Occupancy Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Real Estate AE / Procurement / Construction Milestones O223**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE-O2-100</td>
<td>RE - O2 - Start Date for Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O2-200</td>
<td>RE - O2 - Complete RDS-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O2-300</td>
<td>RE - O2 - Start Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O2-400</td>
<td>RE - O2 - Negotiation Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O2-500</td>
<td>RE - O2 - Real Estate Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE Design</td>
<td>AE Design - O2 - Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES0004</td>
<td>AE Design - O2 - Design Start Milestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES0005</td>
<td>AE Design - O2 - Receipt of Final (90%) Submittal Milestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES0006</td>
<td>AE Design - O2 - Receive Corrected Final Submittal Milestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>New MATOC - O2 - Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON0004</td>
<td>Construction - O2 - Construction Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON0005</td>
<td>Construction - O2 - Construction Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON0006</td>
<td>Construction - O2 - Beneficial Occupancy Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Real Estate AE / Procurement / Construction Milestones O323**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE-O3-100</td>
<td>RE - O3 - Start Date for Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O3-200</td>
<td>RE - O3 - Complete RDS-S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O3-300</td>
<td>RE - O3 - Start Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O3-400</td>
<td>RE - O3 - Negotiation Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-O3-500</td>
<td>RE - O3 - Real Estate Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE Design</td>
<td>AE Design - O3 - Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES0007</td>
<td>AE Design - O3 - Design Start Milestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES0008</td>
<td>AE Design - O3 - Receipt of Final (90%) Submittal Milestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES0009</td>
<td>AE Design - O3 - Receive Corrected Final Submittal Milestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Existing Contract Order - O3 - ATC Request and Contract Package to CT Div</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON0007</td>
<td>Construction - O3 - Construction Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON0008</td>
<td>Construction - O3 - Construction Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON0009</td>
<td>Construction - O3 - Beneficial Occupancy Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

O-1 to O-3 Planning Brief
Agenda

Purpose: Discuss O-1 to O-3 Planning Process and Use on Other Potential CIR Related Projects
• RGV Sector Numbers
• Situation
• Acquisition Strategy and Timeline
• Budget
• Design
• Real Estate
• Environmental
• Risks
• Staffing
• Adapting to Change
• Next Steps
Situation

Rio Grande Valley (RGV)
- [b] (7)(E) miles of border with Mexico
- [b] (7)(E) Patrol Stations
- Rio Grande City and McAllen Stations abut O-1 to O-3
- Existing Pedestrian Fence is [b] (7)(E) miles
- O-1 to O-3 segments originally under Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225
- Comprises approximately [b] (7)(E) of border between Roma and Rio Grande City (see map)
- Original alignment adjusted due to flood plane agreement with IBWC
- South Texas is a high priority for Border Patrol
Acquisition Strategy and Timeline

✓ Flexible Approach;
✓ Leverage multiple vehicles (Existing MATOC, New MATOC, Stand-Alones)

Course of Action:

- Concurrently pursue Acquisition plans for both 'C' and MATOC strategies;
- Keep all options on the table;
- Retain flexibility to seize opportunities.

Base Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>0-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acq Strat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acq Plan Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (5)
Design

O-1 through O-3 will be constructed using:

- Existing Design
- TI Design Standards

Bollard with Steel Plate
Real Estate

- **ROM RE Budget:** (b) (5)
- **Projected RE Schedule:** (b) (5)
  - O-3: (b) (5) – In Hidalgo County; Owners already ID’d; Title work underway)
  - O-1: (b) (5) – Starr County;  
  - O-2: (b) (5) – Starr County + more new owners;  
- **Key Assumptions:**
  - (b) (5)
  - (b) (5)
- **Land Acquisition Options:** (will be evaluated tract-by-tract)
  - (b) (5)
  - (b) (5)
- **Significant Risks:** (b) (5)
Here's the revised revised briefing. Confirmed that we need to change the FOB lifecycle to years, it's adjusted to reflect this. Also, the apprehensions are 30,000 annually – confirmed with the legislation and with the CBP website. Please find the revised attached. I'm happy to perform any edits.

Thanks,

Special Projects Analyst, Business Operations Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure
Program Management Office

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

- Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points
- Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns
- Amendments
- BPFTI PMO CIR Planning
- Staffing
- Sustainment
- C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)
- Next Steps
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points

- **Funding:** $1B available upon enactment for start-up costs available until end of FY15

- **Ongoing Funding:** No funding currently identified for sustainment of any new assets constructed as a result of this Bill

- **Comprehensive Southern Border Security Strategy:**
  - Strategy for achieving and maintaining effective control between the Ports of Entry in all “high risk” border Sectors
    - High risk = (b) (7)(E)
    - High-risk Sectors = (b) (7)(E)
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $3B funding is 5-year monies; discretionary and subject to the Appropriations Committee to act
  - All priorities must be met for the strategy to be successful
    - Forward Operating Bases (FOBs), Border Patrol Stations (BPS), Checkpoints, and additional facilities infrastructure need to be identified in this section
  - Written certification of substantially deployed and substantially operational required

*Information as of May 9, 2013*
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points (cont.)

- **Southern Border Fencing Strategy:**
  - Deploy additional fencing in high-risk border Sectors
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $1.5B funding is mandatory for fence – 5-year monies
  - Secretary has authority to waive all laws to ensure expeditious construction of barriers, roads or other physical infrastructure
  - Substantially complete certification required
Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns

1. Limited access to Federal Lands – Arizona only

2. Completion of a Southern Border Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) will not delay fence construction

3. Use of National Guard to:
   • Build fence (double and triple layer)
   • Supply materials
   • Construct [blacked out] Checkpoints

Information as of May 9, 2013
Approximately 300 amendments were submitted on May 7, 2013. The amendments that could impact the legislation include:

- Leahy 4 – puts technology back in the $1.5B pot, adds consultation language and some additional reporting requirements for environmental waiver usage.
- Schumer 2 – adds “such sums as necessary” to carry out O&M for border security and other investments (still a discretionary pot that must be appropriated, but it adds flexibility) **PASSED 05/09/13**
- Grassley 4 – changes the trigger from fencing “substantially” complete to “fully” complete.
- Sessions 9 – requires the completion of 700 miles of **pedestrian** fence, vehicle fence does not count.
- Cruz 1 – Triples the number of Border Patrol agents, requires completion of all required fence under the Secure Fence Act of 2006, gives grants to States to accomplish border security if DHS fails to do so.

In addition, there are many other items that are tangentially related (changes to operational/effective control, reporting, submissions to Congress, etc.)
BPFTI PMO CIR Planning

- Coordination meetings with Office of Border Patrol (OBP) Facilities Branch, Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division (SPPA), Operational Requirements Management Branch (ORMB), and Office of Administration (OA) Budget

- Proposed meeting with Office of Technology, Innovation & Acquisition (OTIA) Chief of Staff AC Mark Borkowski, FM&E XD Calvo

  **Purpose:** Map fence/BPS planning, acquisition and execution strategy

- BPFTI PMO internal planning:
  - Tactical Infrastructure (TI) Division – Developing fencing Project Requirements Document (PRD) with USACE and OBP
  - Facilities (FAC) Division – Developing PRD for FOBs, BPS, Checkpoints with OBP and USACE
  - Business Operations Division – Developing requirements to support planning, communication, and acquisition processes and budget actions
BPFTI PMO CIR Planning (cont.)

- Due to the language in the Senate bill, the BPFTI PMO has commenced pre-planning for the following:
  - TI fence segments O-1 through O-3 in Rio Grande Valley Sector
  - FOBs
  - BPS
## Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing needed for CIR</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY10 BPFTI PMO Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13 BPFTI PMO Staff* (current)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional requested with CIR (BPFTI)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total BPFTI PMO for post-CIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional staff with CIR (non-BPFTI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include Wage Grade (WG) maintenance employees and additional required personnel for sustainment requirements*  
**The BPFTI PMO requests the insourcing of contractors*
Sustainment Costs – CIR

- Tactical Infrastructure*
  - Primary Fence Replacement
  - O-1, O-2 and O-3

*Maintenance and Repair for useful life

- Facilities**
  - 12 FOBs
  - 15 SWB Stations (replacement)

**Maintenance, Repair and Operations for useful life for Stations and for FOBs

TI and Facilities Estimated Total:

Information as of May 9, 2013
C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)

- BPFTI Delegate: [Redacted]
  Alternate: [Redacted]

- CAT Team weekly meetings

**CIR Comment Request Process:**
Office of General Counsel → Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) → CAT Team
- Working closely with OCC on responses and inputs to proposed CIR Bill 744
- Anticipate increase in requests for comments beginning week of May 5

- A/C-1 CIR Focus/Questions: Flexibility – Oversight – Eligibility Requirements
- CIR is disconnected from the Appropriation process

**Upcoming Meetings:**
- May 7: Hearing, Homeland Security Committee A/C-1 and B-1
- May 7: All amendments due
- May 9: Senate Judiciary Committee mark-up begins and continues through Memorial Day
- June 2013: Anticipate report out to full Senate

Information as of May 9, 2013
Next Steps

Information as of May 9, 2013
Please use this version.

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.
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office
Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR) Update
Prepared for AC Eugene Schied
May 13, 2013
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CIR Proposed Funding

- $1B available upon enactment for start-up costs available until end of FY15

- $1.5B funding is for mandatory fence (and technology) – 5-year monies

- $3B funding is 5-year monies; discretionary and subject to the Appropriations Committee to act (to include Border Patrol Stations, Forward Operating Bases (FOBs), and checkpoints)

- Amendment includes O&M for sustainment
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points

- **Comprehensive Southern Border Security Strategy:**
  - Strategy for achieving and maintaining effective control between the Ports of Entry in all “high risk” border Sectors
    - High risk = (b) (7)(E)
    - High-risk Sectors = (b) (7)(E)
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $3B funding is 5-year monies; discretionary and subject to the Appropriations Committee to act
  - All priorities must be met for the strategy to be successful
    - FOBs, Border Patrol Stations, Checkpoints, and additional facilities infrastructure need to be identified in this section
  - Written certification of substantially deployed and substantially operational required

Information as of May 9, 2013
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points (cont.)

- **Southern Border Fencing Strategy:**
  - Deploy additional fencing in high-risk border Sectors
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $1.5B funding is mandatory for fence – 5-year monies
  - Secretary has authority to waive all laws to ensure expeditious construction of barriers, roads or other physical infrastructure
  - Substantially complete certification required
Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns

1. Limited access to Federal Lands – Arizona only

2. Completion of a Southern Border Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) will not delay fence construction

3. Use of National Guard to:
   • Build fence (double and triple layer)
   • Supply materials
   • Construct [b](7)[E] Checkpoints

Information as of May 9, 2013
Approximately 300 amendments were submitted on May 7, 2013.

The amendments that could impact the legislation include:

- Leahy 4 – puts technology back in the $1.5B pot, adds consultation language and some additional reporting requirements for environmental waiver usage **PASSED 05/09/13**
- Schumer 2 – adds “such sums as necessary” to carry out O&M for border security and other investments (still a discretionary pot that must be appropriated, but it adds flexibility) **PASSED 05/09/13**
- Grassley 4 – changes the trigger from fencing “substantially” complete to “fully” complete **DEFEATED 05/09/13**
- Sessions 9 – requires the completion of 700 miles of pedestrian fence, vehicle fence does not count **DEFEATED 05/09/13**
- Cruz 1 – Triples the number of Border Patrol agents, requires completion of all required fence under the Secure Fence Act of 2006, gives grants to States to accomplish border security if DHS fails to do so **DEFEATED 05/09/13**

In addition, there are many other items that are tangentially related (changes to operational/effective control, reporting, submissions to Congress, etc.)
BPFTI PMO CIR Planning

- Coordination meetings with Office of Border Patrol (OBP) Facilities Branch, Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division (SPPA), Operational Requirements Management Branch (ORMB), and Office of Administration (OA) Budget

- Proposed meeting with Office of Technology, Innovation & Acquisition (OTIA) Chief of Staff AC Mark Borkowski, FM&E XD Calvo
  
  Purpose: Map fence/BPS planning, acquisition and execution strategy

- BPFTI PMO internal planning:
  - Tactical Infrastructure (TI) Division – Developing fencing Project Requirements Document (PRD) with USACE and OBP
  - Facilities (FAC) Division – Developing PRD for FOBs, BPS, Checkpoints with OBP and USACE
  - Business Operations Division – Developing requirements to support planning, communication, and acquisition processes and budget actions

Information as of May 9, 2013
Due to the language in the Senate bill, the BPFTI PMO has commenced pre-planning for the following:

- TI fence segments O-1 through O-3 in Rio Grande Valley Sector
- FOBs
- BPS
## Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing needed for CIR</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY10 BPFTI PMO Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13 BPFTI PMO Staff* (current)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional requested with CIR (BPFTI)**</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total BPFTI PMO for post-CIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional staff with CIR (non-BPFTI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include Wage Grade (WG) maintenance employees and additional required personnel for sustainment requirements

**The BPFTI PMO requests the insourcing of contractors

Information as of May 9, 2013
Portfolio – Facilities and TI

BPFTI PMO Total Assets - $3.3B Pre-CIR

- $638,500,000 (20%)
- $703,529,009 (22%)
- $1,924,228,461 (58%)

BPFTI PMO Total Assets - $\text{(b) (5)}$ Post-CIR

- Tactical Infrastructure
- Facilities Owned
- Facilities Leased

Information as of May 9, 2013
Post-CIR assumes

Information as of May 9, 2013
Portfolio – Facilities

- Post-CIR assumes (b) (5)

Information as of May 9, 2013
Sustainment Costs – CIR

- Tactical Infrastructure*
  - Primary Fence Replacement
  - O-1, O-2 and O-3

*Maintenance and Repair for useful life

- Facilities**
  - 12 FOBs
  - 15 SWB Stations (replacement) *(plus large MCA projects)*

**Maintenance, Repair and Operations for useful life for Stations and for FOBs

TI and Facilities Estimated Total: 

Information as of May 9, 2013
C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)

- BPFTI Delegate: [Redacted]
  Alternate: (b) (7)(E)

- CAT Team weekly meetings

- **CIR Comment Request Process:**
  Office of General Counsel → Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) → CAT Team
  - Working closely with OCC on responses and inputs to proposed CIR Bill 744
  - Anticipate increase in requests for comments beginning week of May 5

  - A/C-1 CIR Focus/Questions: Flexibility – Oversight – Eligibility Requirements
  - CIR is disconnected from the Appropriation process

- **Upcoming Meetings:**
  - May 7: Hearing, Homeland Security Committee A/C-1 and B-1
  - May 7: All amendments due
  - May 9: Senate Judiciary Committee mark-up begins and continues through Memorial Day
  - June 2013: Anticipate report out to full Senate

Information as of May 9, 2013
Next Steps

Information as of May 9, 2013
Here it is with changes.

Thanks!

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

- CIR Funding
- Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points
- Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns
- Amendments
- BPFTI PMO CIR Planning
- Staffing
- Portfolio Pre-CIR vs. Post-CIR
- Sustainment
- C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)
- Next Steps
CIR Proposed Funding

- $1B available upon enactment for start-up costs available until end of FY15

- $1.5B funding is for mandatory fence (and technology) – 5-year monies

- $3B funding is 5-year monies; discretionary and subject to the Appropriations Committee to act (to include Border Patrol Stations, Forward Operating Bases (FOBs), and checkpoints)

- Amendment includes O&M for sustainment
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points

- **Comprehensive Southern Border Security Strategy:**
  - Strategy for achieving and maintaining effective control between the Ports of Entry in all “high risk” border Sectors
    - High risk = (b) (7)(E)
    - High-risk Sectors = (b) (7)(E)
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $3B funding is 5-year monies; discretionary and subject to the Appropriations Committee to act
  - All priorities must be met for the strategy to be successful
    - FOBs, Border Patrol Stations, Checkpoints, and additional facilities infrastructure need to be identified in this section
  - Written certification of substantially deployed and substantially operational required
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points (cont.)

- **Southern Border Fencing Strategy:**
  - Deploy additional fencing in high-risk border Sectors
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $1.5B funding is mandatory for fence – 5-year monies
  - Secretary has authority to waive all laws to ensure expeditious construction of barriers, roads or other physical infrastructure
  - Substantially complete certification required
Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns

1. Limited access to Federal Lands – Arizona only

2. Completion of a Southern Border Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) will not delay fence construction

3. Use of National Guard to:
   • Build fence (double and triple layer)
   • Supply materials
   • Construct [b] (7)(E) Checkpoints

Information as of May 9, 2013
Amendments

- Approximately 300 amendments were submitted on May 7, 2013
- The amendments that could impact the legislation include:
  - Leahy 4 – puts technology back in the $1.5B pot, adds consultation language and some additional reporting requirements for environmental waiver usage PASSED 05/09/13
  - Schumer 2 – adds “such sums as necessary” to carry out O&M for border security and other investments (still a discretionary pot that must be appropriated, but it adds flexibility) PASSED 05/09/13
  - Grassley 4 – changes the trigger from fencing “substantially” complete to “fully” complete DEFEATED 05/09/13
  - Sessions 9 – requires the completion of 700 miles of pedestrian fence, vehicle fence does not count DEFEATED 05/09/13
  - Cruz 1 – Triples the number of Border Patrol agents, requires completion of all required fence under the Secure Fence Act of 2006, gives grants to States to accomplish border security if DHS fails to do so DEFEATED 05/09/13
- In addition, there are many other items that are tangentially related (changes to operational/effective control, reporting, submissions to Congress, etc.)
BPFTI PMO CIR Planning

- Coordination meetings with Office of Border Patrol (OBP) Facilities Branch, Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division (SPPA), Operational Requirements Management Branch (ORMB), and Office of Administration (OA) Budget

- Proposed meeting with Office of Technology, Innovation & Acquisition (OTIA) Chief of Staff AC Mark Borkowski, FM&E XD Calvo

  *Purpose: Map fence/BPS planning, acquisition and execution strategy*

- BPFTI PMO internal planning:
  - **Tactical Infrastructure (TI) Division** – Developing fencing Project Requirements Document (PRD) with USACE and OBP
  - **Facilities (FAC) Division** – Developing PRD for FOBs, BPS, Checkpoints with OBP and USACE
  - **Business Operations Division** – Developing requirements to support planning, communication, and acquisition processes and budget actions
Due to the language in the Senate bill, the BPFTI PMO has commenced pre-planning for the following:

- TI fence segments O-1 through O-3 in Rio Grande Valley Sector
- FOBs
- BPS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing needed for CIR</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY10 BPFTI PMO Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13 BPFTI PMO Staff* (current)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional requested with CIR (BPFTI)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total BPFTI PMO for post-CIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional staff with CIR (non-BPFTI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include Wage Grade (WG) maintenance employees and additional required personnel for sustainment requirements

**The BPFTI PMO requests the insourcing of contractors
Portfolio – Facilities and TI

BPFTI PMO Total Assets - $3.3B Pre-CIR

- $638,500,000 (20%)
- $703,529,009 (22%)
- $1,924,228,461 (58%)

BPFTI PMO Total Assets - $\text{(b) (5)}$ Post-CIR

- Tactical Infrastructure
- Facilities Owned
- Facilities Leased
Portfolio – Tactical Infrastructure

- Post-CIR assumes

Information as of May 9, 2013

(b) (5)
Portfolio – Facilities

- Post-CIR assumes (b) (5)
Sustainment Costs – CIR

- **Tactical Infrastructure***
  - Primary Fence Replacement
  - O-1, O-2 and O-3

*Maintenance and Repair for useful life

- **Facilities**
  - 12 FOBs
  - 15 SWB Stations (replacement) (plus large MCA projects)

**Maintenance, Repair and Operations for useful life for Stations and for FOBs

TI and Facilities Estimated Total:

Information as of May 9, 2013
C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)

- BPFTI Delegate:  
  *Alternate: (b) (7)(E)*

- CAT Team weekly meetings

**CIR Comment Request Process:**

  Office of General Counsel → Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) → CAT Team

  - Working closely with OCC on responses and inputs to proposed CIR Bill 744
  - Anticipate increase in requests for comments beginning week of May 5

- A/C-1 CIR Focus/Questions: Flexibility – Oversight – Eligibility Requirements
- CIR is disconnected from the Appropriation process

**Upcoming Meetings:**

- May 7: Hearing, Homeland Security Committee A/C-1 and B-1
- May 7: All amendments due
- May 9: Senate Judiciary Committee mark-up begins and continues through Memorial Day
- June 2013: Anticipate report out to full Senate

Information as of May 9, 2013
Next Steps

- (b) (5)
FW: CIR Pre Brief

Tuesday, May 07, 2013 10:49:27 AM

8 May Brief V 3.2.ppt

---

RE: CIR Pre brief

Updated budget and ENV slides <<8 May Brief V 3.2.ppt>>

CTR-LMI

BPFTI PMO

---

RE: CIR Pre brief

Attached is briefing for today << File: 8 May Brief V 3.1.ppt >>

CTR-LMI

BPFTI PMO
From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, May 01, 2013 3:00 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: CIR Pre brief
When: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 11:00 AM-11:45 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: B155 Large conf room
Purpose: Pre-brief for meeting with Mr. Calvo on 5/7
Agenda

Purpose: Discuss O-1 to O-3 Planning Process and Use on Other Potential CIR Related Projects

• RGV Sector Numbers
• Situation
• Acquisition Strategy and Timeline
• Budget
• Design
• Real Estate
• Environmental
• Risks
• Staffing
• Adapting to Change
• Next Steps
Situation

Rio Grande Valley (RGV)
- [b] (7)(E) miles of border with Mexico
- [b] (7)(E) Patrol Stations
- Rio Grande City and McAllen Stations abut O-1 to O-3
- Existing Pedestrian Fence is [b] (7)(E) miles
- O-1 to O-3 segments originally under Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225
- Comprises approximately [b] (7)(E) of border between Roma and Rio Grande City (see map)
- Original alignment adjusted due to flood plane agreement with IBWC
- South Texas is a high priority for Border Patrol
Acquisition Strategy and Timeline

- Flexible Approach;
- Leverage multiple vehicles (Existing MATOC, New MATOC, Stand-Alones)

Course of Action:

- Concurrently pursue Acquisition plans for both 'C' and MATOC strategies;
- Keep all options on the table;
- Retain flexibility to seize opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>0-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acq Strat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acq Plan Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (5)
Design

O-1 through O-3 will be constructed using:

- Existing Design
- TI Design Standards

Bollard with Steel Plate
Real Estate

- ROM RE Budget: (b) (5)
- Projected RE Schedule: (b) (5)
  - O-3: In Hidalgo County; Owners already ID’d; Title work underway)
  - O-1: (b) (5)
  - O-2: (b) (5)
- Key Assumptions:
  - (b) (5)
- Land Acquisition Options: (will be evaluated tract-by-tract)
  - (b) (5)
- Significant Risks: (b) (5)
FYSA. I am working this with everyone so that we have a unified response.

We will get with you and before anything goes out.

Plan to meet with the team, OCC, RE/ENV, and the Corps.

Plan to get this put to paper by the COB Tuesday.

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
Please advise how we want to address this question since anything we write may be filtered to this reporter.

Thanks,

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), PMP
Project Manager, TI Project Division
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office Facilities Management and Engineering
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Excel as a trusted strategic partner enhancing Border Patrol's proud legacy.
Potential Relocation (b) (5), (b) (6)
Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure (BPFTI) Program Management Office (PMO)

Real Estate Plan
Proposed Pedestrian Fencing
Segments O-1, O-2, O-3
Starr & Hidalgo Counties, Texas

As of:
30 November 2012

Prepared By:
The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District
REAL ESTATE PLANNING REPORT
PF225 Segments O-1-O-3; Rio Grande Valley Sector (Starr & Hidalgo Counties, Texas)
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SUMMARY SHEET
PF225 Segments O-1-O-3; Rio Grande Valley Sector (Starr & Hidalgo Counties, Texas

DATE: 30 November 2012

1. Fee Title (235 Acres)  (b) (5)
2. Easements (86 Acres)
3. Improvements
4. Hazard Removals
5. Mineral Rights
6. Damages
7. Contingencies
8. Relocations
9. Uniform Relocation Assistance
10. Acquisition Administrative Costs

TOTAL

ROUND E D

Estimated for Customs and Border Protection Planning Purposes:

DOJ Administrative Cost for Condemnation:  (b) (5)

Estimate based on 95% of cases resulting in condemnation.
REAL ESTATE PLANNING REPORT
PF225 Segments O-1-O-3; Rio Grande Valley Sector (Starr & Hidalgo Counties, Texas)

1. AUTHORITY.

The request for this report, along with an analysis of the real estate status in project areas known as O-1, O-2, and O-3 was via phone conversation on September 5, 2012 with Facilities Management and Engineering (FM&E) and U.S. Custom and Border Protection’s (CBP) Office of Chief Counsel (OCC).

Department of Homeland Security (DHS) authority for real estate acquisition is as follows:

Public Law 107-296, 116 Stat. 2311 and codified at 6 U.S.C. Sections 202, 251, 551, and 557, which transferred certain authorities to the Attorney General to the Secretary of Homeland Security; and by DHS Delegation No. 7010.3(II)(B), which delegated land acquisition authority from the Secretary of Homeland Security to the Commissioner of CBP; and by CBP Delegation 05-004, which delegated land acquisition authority to the Acting Executive Director, Facilities Management and Engineering.

2. PROJECT.

The Pedestrian Fence 225 (PF225) project involves constructing pedestrian fencing intended to deter illegal entry of persons and contraband into the United States. There are three proposed segments of fencing, referred to as Segments O-1 through O-3. Segments O-1 and O-2 are located in Roma and Rio Grande City, Starr County, Texas, respectively. Segment O-3 is located in Los Ebanos, Hidalgo County, Texas.

3. SITE SELECTION TEAM.

Alignment of the proposed PF225 fence segments is based upon a collaborative effort from CBP and the International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC). IBWC was involved to analyze any potential impediment the fence might cause to the flow of the Rio Grande during flood events. Input from CBP was based on law enforcement and operational strategies of their agency. USACE is involved in the capacity of engineering, contractual services, project management, and real estate.

4. SITES INSPECTED.

The proposed alignment has been strategically analyzed by CBP from a law enforcement perspective and by IBWC from a flood control perspective. The fence cannot be placed in an area that would potentially divert flood waters of the Rio Grande away from the United States and into Mexico, thus violating international treaty. As a result of the strategic location of the proposed alignment, the District has not performed a site inspection. This report will contain suggestions to consider repositioning the proposed alignment of the fence to affect fewer landowners, residences, and structures. However, these suggestions should be considered in conjunction with the functionality of the proposed tactical infrastructure.
5. DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION OF SELECTED SITE.

The project area is located near the Rio Grande River which serves as the international boundary between the United States and Mexico (see EXHIBIT “A”). All three project areas have a combination of native brush, commercial, and residential properties, as well as cropland in O-2 and O-3.

6. RELOCATIONS.
7. ATTITUDE OF OWNERS AND NEIGHBORHOOD

(b) (5)

8. OUTSTANDING INTERESTS AND RESERVATIONS.

Any outstanding mineral rights will not be known until title evidence is obtained. The recommended fee estate will except mineral and water rights.

9. SALES AND SUPPORTING DATA.

USACE has identified two relevant sales comparables indicative of vacant land in the floodplain in Starr and Hidalgo Counties.

(b) (5)
10. VALUATION

11. UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE COSTS.
12. RECOMMENDED ESTATE.

Fee Estate Language Recommendation:
Perpetual Road Easement Estate Recommendation:

Temporary Road Easement Estate Recommendation:

Temporary Work Area Estate Recommendation:

13. RECAPTURE RIGHTS.
14. GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY.

15. PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION.

16. POSSESSION DATE.

At the time of this report, there have been no funds set aside for construction of this project. As such, no possession date is required.
17. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.

(b) (5)

18. SCHEDULE OF ACQUISITION.

(b) (5)

19. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION.

(b) (5)
3. Fence realignment:

The below list of tracts reflects USACE recommendation of deviation from the proposed IBWC-approved alignment. The information provided is to assist in the decision making process.

O-1 Roma, Texas:

(b) (5)

O-2 Rio Grande City, Texas: (b) (5)
O-3 Los Ebanos, Texas

SUMMARY

The construction of segments O-1, O-2, and O-3 is going to be high profile project for the Government in addition to the affected landowners and communities. USACE-RE has presented several outstanding issues and recommendations, as well as cost estimates to assist with CBP decision. CBP and DHS should review the recommendations provided and determine a final path forward.
Pedestrian Fence
RGV Map Series
Project: O-1

(b) (5), (b) (6)
February 15, 2012

[b] (6), P.E., Project Manager
Customs and Border Protection
1301 Constitution Avenue NW
West Building, B-155
Washington, DC 20299

Dear Mr. (b) (6)

The U.S. Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission has completed its review of the Drainage Report dated August 2011, and associated two-dimensional hydraulic models prepared by Michael Baker, Jr. Inc., on behalf of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), for the erection of approximately (b) (7)(E) of security fence within the limits of the Rio Grande floodplain in Roma, Texas (Segment O-1, (b) (7)(E)), Rio Grande City, Texas (Segment O-2, (b) (7)(E)), and Los Ebanos, Texas (Segment O-3, (b) (7)(E)). After an in depth and thorough review, the USIBWC has concluded that the proposed fence project(s) will not cause significant deflection or obstruction of the normal or flood flows of the Rio Grande and is, therefore, consistent with the stipulations in Article IV-B of the 1970 Boundary Treaty. With this in mind, the USIBWC has no objection to the erection of the fence segments within the limits of the Rio Grande floodplain, provided that the fence closely follows the proposed alignment and standard design details (b) (7)(E) described in the respective Drainage Report. The USIBWC hereby requests that the DHS comply with the following conditions:

1. Implement a maintenance program to remove any trash and/or debris found along the alignment of each fence including the approaches to the fence on a regular basis, especially after a storm event.
2. To the USIBWC's satisfaction, provide any future repair along the adjacent banks pertinent to the fence segments mentioned above, should any damage occur.

It should be noted that the USIBWC did not review these fence projects for any potential environmental impacts since they are covered by the Environmental Waiver obtained by DHS in April 2008. If you have any questions, please contact me at (915) 832-4749 or via email at John.Merino@ibwc.gov.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

Principal Engineer
See slide 10 for staff number -

Here it is - slide 10

The attached slides are for the 10 am with [b](6), [b](7)(C) Sorry for the delay.

Karl H. Calvo, PMP, CFM
Executive Director, Facilities Management & Engineering
U.S. Customs & Border Protection
1313 Pennslyvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC
[b](6), [b](7)(C)

On Behalf Of

From: CALVO, KARL H.
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2013 9:30 AM
To: CALVO, KARL H.; [b](6), [b](7)(C)
Cc: [b](6), [b](7)(C)
Subject: FW: Read Ahead for Discuss the Pending CIR Legislation
Importance: High
Sir,

Per your request, attached please find the updated brief for our 1000 mtg. Please let us know if you have questions.

R/

Karl H. Calvo, PMP, CFM
Executive Director, Facilities Management & Engineering
U.S. Customs & Border Protection
1313 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC
Karl and [REDACTED]

Attached is the deck that [REDACTED] submitted to you yesterday evening for Monday morning’s CIR meeting with AC [REDACTED] Please advise if we are clear to submit to OA as read ahead material.

Thanks,
Agenda

- CIR Funding
- Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points
- Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns
- Amendments
- BPFTI PMO CIR Planning
- Staffing
- Portfolio Pre-CIR vs. Post-CIR
- Sustainment
- C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)
- Next Steps
CIR Proposed Funding

- $1B available upon enactment for start-up costs available until end of FY15
- $1.5B funding is for mandatory fence (and technology) – 5-year monies
- $3B funding is 5-year monies; discretionary and subject to the Appropriations Committee to act (to include Border Patrol Stations, Forward Operating Bases (FOBs), and checkpoints)
- Amendment includes O&M for sustainment
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points

- **Comprehensive Southern Border Security Strategy:**
  - Strategy for achieving and maintaining effective control between the Ports of Entry in all “high risk” border Sectors
    - High risk =
    - High-risk Sectors =
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $3B funding is 5-year monies; discretionary and subject to the Appropriations Committee to act
  - All priorities must be met for the strategy to be successful
    - FOBs, Border Patrol Stations, Checkpoints, and additional facilities infrastructure need to be identified in this section
  - Written certification of substantially deployed and substantially operational required
Proposed CIR Bill – Key Points (cont.)

- **Southern Border Fencing Strategy:**
  - Deploy additional fencing in high-risk border Sectors
  - Due to Congress 180 days after Bill enactment
  - $1.5B funding is mandatory for fence – 5-year monies
  - Secretary has authority to waive all laws to ensure expeditious construction of barriers, roads or other physical infrastructure
  - Substantially complete certification required
Proposed CIR Bill – Main Concerns

1. Limited access to Federal Lands – Arizona only

2. Completion of a Southern Border Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) will not delay fence construction

3. Use of National Guard to:
   • Build fence (double and triple layer)
   • Supply materials
   • Construct Checkpoints

Information as of May 9, 2013
Approximately 300 amendments were submitted on May 7, 2013.

The amendments that could impact the legislation include:

- **Leahy 4** – puts technology back in the $1.5B pot, adds consultation language and some additional reporting requirements for environmental waiver usage. Passed 05/09/13.

- **Schumer 2** – adds “such sums as necessary” to carry out O&M for border security and other investments (still a discretionary pot that must be appropriated, but it adds flexibility). Passed 05/09/13.

- **Grassley 4** – changes the trigger from fencing “substantially” complete to “fully” complete. Defeated 05/09/13.

- **Sessions 9** – requires the completion of 700 miles of pedestrian fence, vehicle fence does not count. Defeated 05/09/13.

- **Cruz 1** – Triples the number of Border Patrol agents, requires completion of all required fence under the Secure Fence Act of 2006, gives grants to States to accomplish border security if DHS fails to do so. Defeated 05/09/13.

In addition, there are many other items that are tangentially related (changes to operational/effective control, reporting, submissions to Congress, etc.)
BPFTI PMO CIR Planning

- Coordination meetings with Office of Border Patrol (OBP) Facilities Branch, Strategic Planning, Policy and Analysis Division (SPPA), Operational Requirements Management Branch (ORMB), and Office of Administration (OA) Budget

- Proposed meeting with Office of Technology, Innovation & Acquisition (OTIA) Chief of Staff (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) AC Mark Borkowski, FM&E XD Calvo
  
  *Purpose: Map fence/BPS planning, acquisition and execution strategy*

- BPFTI PMO internal planning:
  - **Tactical Infrastructure (TI) Division** – Developing fencing Project Requirements Document (PRD) with USACE and OBP
  - **Facilities (FAC) Division** – Developing PRD for FOBs, BPS, Checkpoints with OBP and USACE
  - **Business Operations Division** – Developing requirements to support planning, communication, and acquisition processes and budget actions

*Information as of May 9, 2013*
Due to the language in the Senate bill, the BPFTI PMO has commenced pre-planning for the following:

- TI fence segments O-1 through O-3 in Rio Grande Valley Sector
- FOBs
- BPS
### Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing needed for CIR</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY10 BPFTI PMO Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13 BPFTI PMO Staff* (current)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional requested with CIR (BPFTI)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total BPFTI PMO for post-CIR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional staff with CIR (non-BPFTI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include Wage Grade (WG) maintenance employees and additional required personnel for sustainment requirements

**The BPFTI PMO requests the insourcing of contractors

Information as of May 9, 2013
Portfolio – Facilities and TI

BPFTI PMO Total Assets - $3.3B Pre-CIR

- Tactical Infrastructure: $638,500,000 (20%)
- Facilities Owned: $1,924,228,461 (58%)
- Facilities Leased: $703,529,009 (22%)

BPFTI PMO Total Assets - $\text{(b) (5)}$ Post-CIR

- Tactical Infrastructure
- Facilities Owned
- Facilities Leased

Information as of May 9, 2013
Portfolio – Tactical Infrastructure

- Post-CIR assumes

Information as of May 9, 2013

(b) (5)
Portfolio – Facilities

- Post-CIR assumes (b) (5)
Sustainment Costs – CIR

- **Tactical Infrastructure***
  - Primary Fence Replacement
  - O-1, O-2 and O-3

  *Maintenance and Repair for useful life

- **Facilities**
  - 12 FOBs
  - 15 SWB Stations (replacement) (plus large MCA projects)

  **Maintenance, Repair and Operations for useful life for Stations and for FOBs

**TI and Facilities Estimated Total:**

Information as of May 9, 2013
C-1 CIR Crisis Action Team (CAT)

- BPFTI Delegate: **(b) (7)(E)**

- CAT Team weekly meetings

- **CIR Comment Request Process:**
  - Office of General Counsel → Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) → CAT Team
  - Working closely with OCC on responses and inputs to proposed CIR Bill 744
  - Anticipate increase in requests for comments beginning week of May 5

- A/C-1 CIR Focus/Questions: Flexibility – Oversight – Eligibility Requirements

- CIR is disconnected from the Appropriation process

- **Upcoming Meetings:**
  - May 7: Hearing, Homeland Security Committee A/C-1 and B-1
  - May 7: All amendments due
  - May 9: Senate Judiciary Committee mark-up begins and continues through Memorial Day
  - June 2013: Anticipate report out to full Senate

Information as of May 9, 2013
Next Steps

- (b) (5)

Information as of May 9, 2013
February 15, 2012

John Merino, P.E., Project Manager
Customs and Border Protection
1301 Constitution Avenue NW
West Building, B-155
Washington, DC 20299

Dear Mr. Merino,

The U.S. Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission has completed its review of the Drainage Report dated August 2011, and associated two-dimensional hydraulic models prepared by Michael Baker, Jr. Inc., on behalf of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), for the erection of approximately of security fence within the limits of the Rio Grande floodplain in Roma, Texas (Segment O-1), Rio Grande City, Texas (Segment O-2), and Los Ebanos, Texas (Segment O-3). After an in depth and thorough review, the USIBWC has concluded that the proposed fence project(s) will not cause significant deflection or obstruction of the normal or flood flows of the Rio Grande and is, therefore, consistent with the stipulations in Article IV-B of the 1970 Boundary Treaty. With this in mind, the USIBWC has no objection to the erection of the fence segments within the limits of the Rio Grande floodplain, provided that the fence closely follows the proposed alignment and standard design details described in the respective Drainage Report. The USIBWC hereby requests that the DHS comply with the following conditions:

1. Implement a maintenance program to remove any trash and/or debris found along the alignment of each fence including the approaches to the fence on a regular basis, especially after a storm event.
2. To the USIBWC’s satisfaction, provide any future repair along the adjacent banks pertinent to the fence segments mentioned above, should any damage occur.

It should be noted that the USIBWC did not review these fence projects for any potential environmental impacts since they are covered by the Environmental Waiver obtained by DHS in April 2008. If you have any questions, please contact me at (915) 832-4749 or via email at John.Merino@ibwc.gov.

Sincerely,

John L. Merino, P.E.
Principal Engineer

The Commons, Building C, Suite 100 • 4171 N. Mesa Street • El Paso, Texas 79902
(915) 832-4100 • (FAX) (915) 832-4190 • http://www.ibwc.state.gov
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

O-1 to O-3 Planning Brief
Purpose: Discuss O-1 to O-3 Planning Process and Use on Other Potential CIR Related Projects

• RGV Sector Numbers
• Situation
• Acquisition Strategy and Timeline
• Budget
• Design
• Real Estate
• Environmental
• Risks
• Staffing
• Adapting to Change
• Next Steps
Rio Grande Valley Sector Numbers

Source: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, as reported in the USA Today (April 2, 2013)

*Only Tucson Sector has more apprehensions at 120,000
Situation

Rio Grande Valley (RGV)
- ▪ [b] (7)(E) miles of border with Mexico
- ▪ [b] (7)(E) Border Patrol Stations
- ▪ Rio Grande City and McAllen Stations abut O-1 to O-3
- ▪ Existing Pedestrian Fence is [b] (7)(E) miles
- ▪ O-1 to O-3 segments originally under Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225
- ▪ Comprises approximately [b] (7)(E) of border between Roma and Rio Grande City
  (see map)
- ▪ Original alignment adjusted due to flood plane agreement with IBWC
- ▪ South Texas is a high priority for Border Patrol
Acquisition Strategy and Timeline

- Flexible Approach;
- Leverage multiple vehicles (Existing MATOC, New MATOC, Stand-Alones)

**Course of Action:**

- Concurrently pursue Acquisition plans for both 'C' and MATOC strategies;
- Keep all options on the table;
- Retain flexibility to seize opportunities.

**Base Plan:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>O-3</th>
<th>O-1</th>
<th>O-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acq Strat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acq Plan Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (5)

(b) (5)
Budget

Total: (b) (5)

Primary Drivers:

- Construction: (b) (5)
- Real Estate: (b) (5)
- Contingency (Risk): (b) (5)
- Program and Construction Management: (b) (5)
- Design: (b) (5)
- Environmental: (b) (5)
Design

O-1 through O-3 will be constructed using:

- Existing Design
- TI Design Standards

Bollard with Steel Plate
Real Estate

- ROM RE Budget: (b) (5)
- Projected RE Schedule: (b) (5)
  - O-3: (b) (5) – In Hidalgo County; Owners already ID’d; Title work underway
  - O-1: (b) (5) – Starr County
  - O-2: (b) (5) – Starr County + more new owners
- Key Assumptions:
  - (b) (5)
  - (b) (5)
- Land Acquisition Options: (will be evaluated tract-by-tract)
  - (b) (5)
  - (b) (5)
- Significant Risks: (b) (5)
Environmental

- CBP will maintain strong environmental stewardship
- Strong proactive outreach program required
Risk

• 3 Point Estimate:
  • Low:  
  • Medium:  
  • High:  
• Top Risk Categories:
  • Real Estate
  • Latent Conditions
  • Contractor Performance
• Milestones Affected (In order of frequency):
  • Construction Start Date
  • Obtain ROE-SE
  • Real Estate Certification
Staffing

BPFTI
- Align PMs by corridors (Border Patrol style)
  - Example: PM to oversee and monitor San Diego, El Centro and Yuma
- Flex capability by using Sector PM/CORs
- Surge capability by tapping into Facilities PMs

ECSO
- Utilizing current staffing
- Leveraging existing USACE Districts capabilities
- Complementing CBP corridors
- Leveraging surge capabilities within USACE
Adapt to Changing Requirements

Aggressive planning and execution; retain flexibility to incorporate additional requirements

Consistent, Scalable Approach:

- Real Estate & Environmental
- Acquisition: O-1, 2, 3 vehicles, existing vehicles in supporting Districts
- Risk: Real Estate driven
- Budget: Detailed estimates; risk-burdened
- Staffing: Corridor alignment

Leverage existing capabilities and capacities in supporting Districts

Past Success on Similar Programs

PF225
$1.099B Program
USACE execution of (b) (7)(E)

VF300
$255M Program
USACE execution of (b) (7)(E)

4 executing Districts in 2 Divisions
High visibility, high political interest

525+ USACE employees across 37 Divisions, Districts, and Labs
Environmental, Real Estate, and Strategic Communications
Next Steps

- (b) (5)
- 
- 
- 
-
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

O-1 to O-3 Planning Brief
Agenda

Purpose: Discuss O-1 to O-3 Planning Process and Use on Other Potential CIR Related Projects

• RGV Sector Numbers
• Situation
• Acquisition Strategy and Timeline
• Budget
• Design
• Real Estate
• Environmental
• Risks
• Staffing
• Adapting to Change
• Next Steps
Situation

Rio Grande Valley (RGV)
- [ ] miles of border with Mexico
- [b] (7)(E) Patrol Stations
- Rio Grande City and McAllen Stations abut O-1 to O-3
- Existing Pedestrian Fence is [b] (7)(E) miles
- O-1 to O-3 segments originally under Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225
- Comprises approximately [b] (7)(E) of border between Roma and Rio Grande City (see map)
- Original alignment adjusted due to flood plane agreement with IBWC
- South Texas is a high priority for Border Patrol
Acquisition Strategy and Timeline

✓ Flexible Approach;
✓ Leverage multiple vehicles (Existing MATOC, New MATOC, Stand-Alones)

Course of Action:

• Concurrently pursue Acquisition plans for both 'C' and MATOC strategies;
• Keep all options on the table;
• Retain flexibility to seize opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>0-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acq Strat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acq Plan Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (5)
O-1 through O-3 will be constructed using:

- Existing Design
- TI Design Standards

Bollard with Steel Plate
Real Estate

- ROM RE Budget: (b) (5)

- Projected RE Schedule: (b) (5)
  - O-3: In Hidalgo County; Owners already ID’d; Title work underway)
  - O-1: Starr County;   )
  - O-2: Starr County + more new owners; (b) (5)

- Key Assumptions:

- Land Acquisition Options: (will be evaluated tract-by-tract)

- Significant Risks: (b) (5)
Situation

Rio Grande Valley (RGV)
- Miles of border with Mexico
- Border Patrol Stations
- Rio Grande City and McAllen Stations abut O-1 to O-3

Existing Pedestrian Fence is XX X miles

O-1 to O-3 last segment under Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225
- Comprises approximately (b) (7)(E) of border between Roma and Rio Grande City (see map)
- Original alignment adjusted due to flood plan agreement with IBWC
- Does not comprise existing (b) (7)(E) in RGV

South Texas is a high priority for Border Patrol
Acquisition Strategy and Timeline

- Flexible Approach;
- Leverage multiple vehicles (Existing MATOC, New MATOC, Stand-Alones)

Course of Action:

- Concurrently pursue Acquisition plans for both 'C' and MATOC strategies;
- Keep all options on the table;
- Develop branch and sequel strategies with clearly defined decision points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>O-1</th>
<th>O-2</th>
<th>O-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Strategy</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Plan Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (5)
Design

O-1 through O-3 will be constructed using:

• Existing Design
• TI Design Standards
• Bollard with Steel Plate

Bollard
RE Activities TI – RGV – Segments O-1,2,3

- ROM RE Budget: (b) (5)
- Projected RE Schedule: (b) (5)
  - O-3: (b) (5) – In Hidalgo County; Owners already ID’d; Title work underway)
  - O-1: (b) (5) – Starr County; (b) (5)
  - O-2: (b) (5) – Starr County + more new owners; (b) (5)
- Key Assumptions:
  - (b) (5)
- Land Acquisition Options: (will be evaluated tract-by-tract)
  - (b) (5)
- Significant Risks: (b) (5)
Situation

Rio Grande Valley (RGV)

- **miles of border with Mexico**
- **Border Patrol Stations**
- Rio Grande City and McAllen Stations abut O-1 to O-3

Existing Pedestrian Fence is **XX X** miles

O-1 to O-3 last segment under Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225

- Comprises approximately of border between Roma and Rio Grande City (see map)
- Original alignment adjusted due to flood plan agreement with IBWC
- Does not comprise existing in RGV

South Texas is a high priority for Border Patrol
Acquisition Strategy and Timeline

✓ Flexible Approach;
✓ Leverage multiple vehicles (Existing MATOC, New MATOC, Stand-Alones)

Course of Action:

• Concurrently pursue Acquisition plans for both 'C' and MATOC strategies;
• Keep all options on the table;
• Develop branch and sequel strategies with clearly defined decision points.

Base Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>O-1</th>
<th>O-2</th>
<th>O-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Plan Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design

O-1 through O-3 will be constructed using:

- Existing Design
- TI Design Standards
- Bollard with Steel Plate

Bollard
“Pivot” Plan

Aggressive planning and execution; retain flexibility to incorporate additional requirements

Consistent Approach:

- Real Estate & Environmental:
- Acquisition: O-1, 2, 3 vehicles; existing vehicles in supporting USACE Districts
- Risk: Real Estate driven
- Budget: Detailed estimates; risk-burdened
- Staffing: Corridor alignment;
  Leverage existing capabilities and capacities in supporting Districts
Agenda

Purpose: Discuss O-1 to O-3 Planning Process and Use on Other Potential CIR Related Projects

- RGV Sector Numbers
- Situation
- Acquisition Strategy and Timeline
- Budget
- Design
- Real Estate
- Environmental
- Risks
- Staffing
- Adapting to Change
- Next Steps
Situation

Rio Grande Valley (RGV)
- (b) (7)(E) of border with Mexico
- Border Patrol Stations
  - Rio Grande City and McAllen Stations abut O-1 to O-3
  - Existing Pedestrian Fence is (b) (7)(E)
  - O-1 to O-3 segments originally under Pedestrian Fence (PF) 225
  - Comprises approximately (b) (7)(E) of fence between Roma and Rio Grande City (see map)
  - IBWC concurrence with new alignment (satisfies treaty requirement)
  - South Texas is a high priority for Border Patrol
Acquisition Strategy and Timeline

✓ Flexible Approach
✓ Leverage multiple vehicles (Existing MATOC, New MATOC, Stand-Alones, Steel)

Course of Action:
• Concurrently pursue Acquisition plans for both 'C' and MATOC strategies
  • Award on existing MATOC must be made by Feb 15
• Keep all options on the table
• Retain flexibility to seize opportunities.

Base Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>0-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acq Strat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acq Plan Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE Certified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (5)
O-1 through O-3 will be constructed using:

- Existing Design
- TI Design Standards

Bollard with Steel Plate
Real Estate

- ROM RE Budge (b) (5)
- Projected RE Schedule: (b) (5)
  - O-3: In Hidalgo County; Owners already ID’d; Title work underway
  - O-1: (b) (5)– Starr County
  - O-2: Starr County + more new owners; (b) (5)
- Key Assumptions:
- Land Acquisition Options: (will be evaluated tract-by-tract)
- Significant Risks: (b) (5)
I. Opening Remarks
   A. Update on status of the CIR initiatives
   B. CIR Team Organization

II. TI 01-03 Planning
    Lead:
    A. Review of key lessons learned from VF/PF.
    B. Project Requirements Document (PRD) review
    C. Review the CIR planning assumptions, risks, costs and schedule
    D. Develop parking lot
    E. Keeping the proposal warm
    F. Next steps
    G. TI Team organization

III. Facilities Planning: 9 camps to FOB, 2 Marina FOBs and 1 FOB location TBD
     Lead:
     A. Develop the FOBs Assumptions, risks, cost est. and schedule
     B. Market survey
     C. Facilities team organization
     D. Develop PRD
     E. Develop parking lot
     F. Keeping the proposal warm
     G. Next steps
The purpose of the Project Requirements Document Baseline Cost Estimate (PRDBCE) is to calculate a cost estimate for a project as part of the Project Requirements Document development (PRD). Once the PRD is approved this cost estimate is baselined and should not be changed.

The following information will explain the layout of the PRDBCE Worksheet. A detailed explanation of the header and first sub-heading (Project Management) will be given. The structure for all sub-headings is the same therefore the instructions are applicable to the remaining sub-headings. The alpha-numeric symbols (A2, A3, etc.) refer to the excel spreadsheet cell where the information is located.

The worksheet is divided into six sections: Project Management, Real Estate, Environmental, Design, Construction, and Construction Oversight. These sections contain the activities that account for the varying costs of each individual project. To ensure the accuracy of the cost estimate, each activity needs to have the correct resource, org code (organizational code must be the specific office where the work is being done, not at the executive level, for construction it must be the field office that is in control of RMS), hours (estimated time to be spent on each activity) and the fully burdened rate. The default equation automatically populates the sub-heading amount in column I by multiplying the hours by the fully burdened rate.

**Project Heading Instructions**
- A2 – Project Heading - enter project title in B2 to include FM&E project number.
- A3 – Sector - enter Border Patrol Sector or other controlling agency identifier in B3.
- E3 - USACE District - Enter USACE District Name in F3.
- A4 – Duration - Enter number of calendar days projected for the project in B4 – is this by 5 working days or 7 working days (most use 5 in P2).
- E4 – Date - Enter date worksheet is completed in F4.
- B5 - Enter Project P2#.

**Sub-Heading Instructions**
- A6 – This cell is set to auto-populate based on the P2# entered in cell B5.
- B6 – Activity Identification Number – Found in P2 Report.
- C6 – Name of the project sub-heading.
- H6 – This cell contains an equation that calculates the estimated total cost of the sub-heading activities. Verify that the formula includes all necessary values in the final sum (to included added cells). Cells H7-H16 are included in the default summation.
- C7 - Project Management – If needed, additional rows shall be added to account for District Project Manager, Program Manager, PPMD Support Staff, and any other costs that fall under this umbrella.
- C9 - PM Contract Support - Select type of support from drop down menu on cell E9 (OTHCONSV).
- I9 - Enter Contract monetary value.
- D10 - Contract Type - select contract type from drop down menu on cell E10.
- D11 - Contract Acquisition Codes – The entries for cells E12-E14 are mandatory for P2 entries.
- D12 - Contracting Type - select type from drop down menu on cell E12.
- D14 - Set-Aside Decision - select decision from drop down menu in cell E14.

**Repeat the above steps to the proceeding sub-headings.**

**Non-USACE Expenses**
- This section deals with those expenses that may be funded to USACE for work under the construction contract but for reporting purposes should be separated as Non-USACE costs. The BPFTI PM will coordinate this with the USACE PM and will ensure that these costs are not double counted.
- Category 4 “Other” should be addressed on the Assumptions tab and explain what other costs are included.

**Assumptions Tab**
- Each section of the PRD Baseline Cost Estimate has a corresponding section for assumptions on the Assumptions Tab of the workbook.
- The Assumptions that are already listed are Base Assumptions and should be identified as applicable via the Y and N check boxes to the left.
- Additional Assumptions for each sub-section can be added below and can be explained how ever necessary.
## Project Requirements Document Baseline Cost Estimate

### Activities

1. **Project Management**
   - 1 Project Management: LABOR, TRAVEL
   - 2 PM Contract Support: AESVCS, IDC AE
     - Contract Type: A, B - Fixed Price Re-determination
     - Contracting Method: MISIC - Competitive Credit Card, Small Purchases
     - Set-Aside Decision: SV - Service Disabled Veteran Owned SB

2. **Operations Cell**
   - 3 Operations Cell: LABOR

3. **PM Reserve**
   - 4 PM Reserve: CONTINGY

4. **USACE Contracting Support**
   - a. PM Services: LABOR
   - b. Real Estate: LABOR
   - Title Contract: LABOR
   - Survey Contract: LABOR
   - Appraisal Contract: LABOR
   - Environmental Services Contract: LABOR
   - Environmental Remediation: LABOR
   - Phase I ESA: LABOR
   - Biomonitor Contract: LABOR
   - Phase I ESA: LABOR
   - Environmental Remediation: LABOR
   - Phase I ESA: LABOR
   - Mitigation: LABOR
   - Phase I ESA: LABOR

### Real Estate

1. **USACE District RE Support**
   - 1 USACE District RE Support: LABOR, TRAVEL

2. **Land Payment**
   - 2 Land Payment: LAND

3. **Relocation Costs**
   - 3 Relocation Costs: DOJ Costs, Damages, etc

4. **Condemnation Costs**
   - 4 Condemnation Costs: ADVASTSVC

5. **Title Contract**
   - 5 Title Contract: ADVASTSVC

6. **Survey Contract**
   - 6 Survey Contract: OTHCONSV

7. **Appraisal Contract**
   - 7 Appraisal Contract: OTHCONSV

8. **RE Reserve**
   - 8 RE Reserve: CONTINGY

### Environmental

1. **USACE District ENV Support**
   - 1 USACE District ENV Support: LABOR, TRAVEL

2. **Environmental Services Contract**
   - 2 Environmental Services Contract: MATOC Task Order

3. **Environmental Remediation**
   - 3 Environmental Remediation: MATOC Task Order

4. **Mitigation**
   - 4 Mitigation: OTHCONSV

5. **Phase I ESA**
   - 5 Phase I ESA: OTHCONSV

---

- *add the information above for each additional contracting action required*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>MATOC Task Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Acquisition Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-Aside Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Type</td>
<td>OTHCON SVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Acquisition Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-Aside Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Type</td>
<td>MATOC Task Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Acquisition Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-Aside Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope/Requirements Definition</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Type</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Acquisition Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-Aside Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP Prep</td>
<td>OTHCON SVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Type</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Acquisition Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-Aside Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (D/B/B)</td>
<td>AESVCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Type</td>
<td>IDC AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Acquisition Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-Aside Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Review</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Estimating/Specifications</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Selection Evaluation Board</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE Review</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Reserve</td>
<td>CONTINGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract</td>
<td>CONST SVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Type</td>
<td>Complex Task Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Acquisition Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-Aside Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (D/B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - Fence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - Lights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Deployment (M&amp;E)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Trailer (Office, Util, Admin Tools)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (D/B)</td>
<td>R&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modular Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Agents</td>
<td>Insert #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Reserve</td>
<td>CONTINGY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If construction project will be managed out of RMS, the RMS P2 plug-in must be used at creation of the project
* Note which Districts RMS vs which District is awarding construction contract. Set up P2 accordingly

| Contract Type | N/A |
| Contract Acquisition Codes | |
| Contracting Type | |
| Contracting Method | |
| Set-Aside Decision | |
| Design | LABOR |
| Contract Type | ConReps & Proj Engr |
| Contract Acquisition Codes | |
| Contracting Type | |
| Contracting Method | |
| Set-Aside Decision | |
| Oversight Contract | OTHCON SVC |
| Contract Type | N/A |
| Contract Acquisition Codes | |
| Contracting Type | |
| Contracting Method | |
| Set-Aside Decision | |
| Contract Closeout/Warranty | LABOR |
| Contract Type | CONTINGY |

PROJECT TOTAL
### Assumptions - PRD Baseline Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>O-1,2, &amp; 3 (Comprehensive Immigration Reform)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector:</td>
<td>Rio Grande Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration:</td>
<td>990 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2#:</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XXXXXX</th>
<th>10000</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Assumptions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XXXXXX</th>
<th>90000</th>
<th>Real Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Assumptions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XXXXXX</th>
<th>95000</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Assumptions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XXXXXX</th>
<th>40000</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsection</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.61000</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Additional Assumptions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.61000.10</td>
<td>Construction Oversight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (5)</td>
<td>Additional Assumptions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON USACE EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assumptions and Explanation of 4. Other Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In House Resources</td>
<td>Support Contracts</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABOR</td>
<td>OTHCONVSC</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>AESVCS</td>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSAVEH</td>
<td>ADV&amp;ASTVSC</td>
<td>OTHCONVSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CONSTSVCS</td>
<td>AESVCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) (5)
Contracting Type
A - Fixed Price Re-determination
B - Firm Fixed Price Level of Effort
C - Basic Ordering Agreement
D - Purchase Order
J - Firm Fixed Price
K - Fixed Price w/ Economic Price Adjustment
L - Fixed Price Incentive
M - Fixed Price Award Fee
R - Cost Plus Award Fee
S - Cost No Fee
T - Cost Sharing
U - Cost Plus Fixed Fee
V - Cost Plus Incentive
Y - Time and Materials
Z - Labor Hours
2 - Combination (Awards only)
3 - Other (Nothing else apply)
5 - Fixed Ceiling Price w/ Retroactive Price Redetermination
6 - Fixed Price Incentive (firm target)
7 - Fixed Price Incentive (successive targets)
8 - Letter Contract
9 - Blanket Purchase Agreement

Contracting Method
IDC - Competitive DO/TO against existing contract
IDCN - Non-Competitive DO/TO against existing contract
IFB - Sealed Bid Low Bid
MISC - Competitive Credit Card, Small Purchases
MISCN - Non-Competitive Credit Card, Small Purchases
MOD - Competitive Modification
MODN - Non-Competitive Modification
OCM - Competitive Other Contracting Method
OCMN - Non-Competitive Other Contracting Method
RFP1 - Competitive RFP 1 Step
RFP1N - Non-Competitive RFP 1 Step
RFP2 - RFP 2 Step
SP1 - Competitive Simplified Acquisition Procedures over $100K
SP1N - Non-Competitive Simplified Acquisition Procedures over $100K
SP3 - Competitive Simplified Acquisition Procedures under $100K
SP3N - Non-Competitive Simplified Acquisition Procedures under $100K
Set Aside Decision
8a - 8(a)
HZ - HUB Zone SB
MI - Minority Serving Institutions
NONE - No set aside used
SB - Small Business
SV - Service Disabled Veteran Owned SB
WO - Woman Owned SB
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

Comprehensive Immigration Reform (CIR)
Planning for O-1, 2, 3

March 1, 2013

U.S. Customs and Border Protection
O-1 thru O-3 Scope

- **Scope**
  - Customer requirements
  - [Redacted]
  - System
  - Alignments coordinated with RGV Sector and IBWC with following goals:
    - Satisfy operational requirement
    - Minimize floodplain impacts
    - Stay within areas covered by 2008 DHS Waiver

- **Real Estate**
  - Collaboration with DOJ
  - ROE-S will take (b) (5)
  - Land Usage Agreements must be complete within 21 months
O-1 thru O-3 Scope (cont’d)

- Environmental
  - (b) (5)
  - Environmental monitoring?
  - Any alignment changes may require updates and notifications

- Design
  - Full Design
  - Maximize setback from river (within RE and ENV constraints)
  - Minimize floodplain impacts
  - GFM incorporation dependent upon scale (lessons learned from PF/VF)
  - Multiple gate requirements
  - Stakeholder coordination (USFWS, IBWC)
  - Dependent upon geotech and topo surveys
  - Access and staging
Acquisition Strategy

(b) (5)
Staffing

- Dedicated PgM with 2-3 PMs in support: In-house; KTR; hybrid
- OPCELL: 4 pax: In-house; KTR (8(a)); hybrid
- Functional Area support: matrix with KTR augmentation
  - CT
  - ENV
  - RE
  - Construction (QA, Contract Admin)
Funding & Logistics

- IAA vs RWA: IAA introduces schedule risk
- GFM economy of scale
Major Milestones

- Initiate new acquisitions: (b) (5)
- Achieve ROE-S: (b) (5)
- Authority receipt: (b) (5)
- Funds receipt: (b) (5)
- Survey complete: (b) (5)
- Construction MATOC award: (b) (5)
- Design complete: (b) (5)
- RE Acquisition complete: (b) (5)
- Task Order award(s): (b) (5)
- Construction NTP: (b) (5)
- Construction Completion: (b) (5)
- Required Completion: (b) (5)