All,

I have worked with your staffs to provide a comprehensive program briefing. I know this has been delayed, but this should be a good start.

Please let me know if you have any edits or questions on the briefing. I’m still waiting on some dates for the Master Plans but I’ve incorporated everyone else’s feedback to date.

Thanks,

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

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

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

- FY14 Budget Status
- FY14 Budget Challenges
- Consolidation/Co-Location
- TI FY15 Military Project Planning
- CTIMR
- Carrizo Cane Update
- Projects by Sector:
  - Rio Grande Valley Sector
  - Laredo Sector
  - Del Rio Sector
  - Big Bend Sector
  - El Paso Sector
  - Tucson Sector
  - Yuma Sector
  - El Centro Sector
  - San Diego Sector

Will add in the Master Plans in the Sector tables – emailed. 3/12

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
## FY14 Budget Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14 Facilities Funding</th>
<th>(b) (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Contracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV Remediation/Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Construction and Alterations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Cards (PCDs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel Remediation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14 TI Funding</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTIMR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;R Support (<a href="#">includes PCD funding, heavy equipment rentals and other support</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATOC Gap Fillers and Milcon Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This excludes rent funding and Towers/C2 funding with OTIA; additionally, this funding is only for sustainment as there is no funding for construction of Facilities or TI
FY14 Budget Challenges

- Focus for the budget is on sustaining the current portfolio.
- There are no funds right now for TI construction (D&D), only funding available for M&R (O&M).
- For the Facilities portfolio, there is only enough funding for the maintenance, repair and operations, although with many of the facilities completing in the last year we anticipate that we may be able to recover some funding for BPS.
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
CTIMR

- The Comprehensive Tactical Infrastructure Maintenance and Repair (CTIMR) Program segments maintenance and repair requirements into four work areas that encompass the nine Border Patrol Sectors along the Southwest Border: Area 1 (San Diego and El Centro Sectors), Area 2 (Yuma and Tucson Sectors), Area 3 (El Paso and Big Bend Sectors), and Area 4 (Del Rio, Laredo, and Rio Grande Valley Sectors).

- As of February 2014, all four work areas have been awarded with Area 2 being the last area awarded and the kickoff meeting was held on March 4th.
NON-RESPONSIVE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>FM&amp;E Project Manager</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Start Date Actual Date</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Start Date Planned Date</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Completion Actual Date</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Completion Planned Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-1 - O-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</td>
<td>TI</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades RGV</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades RGV C2 Facility Renovations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
From: [b] (6), (b) [7](C) on behalf of [b] (6), (b) [7](C)
To: [b] (6), (b) [7](C)  (b) (6), (b) [7](C)
Subject: TI/FAC Brief to Chief [b] (6), (b) [7](C)
Start: Monday, April 14, 2014 2:00:00 PM
End: Monday, April 14, 2014 4:00:00 PM
Location: BPFTI Large Conf Room  [b] (6), (b) [7](C)
Attachments: BPFTI SWB Projects Overview for OBP Ops v7 final 041414.ppt

4/14- read aheads attached.
R/

<<BPFTI SWB Projects Overview for OBP Ops v7 final 041414.ppt>>
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office

Southwest Border Projects

Prepared for OBP Operations Division

April 14, 2014
Agenda

- FY14 Budget Status - Facilities
- Consolidation/Co-Location
- Sector Maintenance Staff
- FY14 Budget Status - TI
- TI FY15 Military Project Planning
- CTIMR
- TI Contracting Assessment
- Carrizo Cane Update
- Projects by Sector:
  - Rio Grande Valley Sector
  - Laredo Sector
  - Del Rio Sector
  - Big Bend Sector
  - El Paso Sector
  - Tucson Sector
  - Yuma Sector
  - El Centro Sector
  - San Diego Sector
FY14 Budget Status - Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14 Facilities Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV Remediation/Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Construction and Alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Cards (PCDs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel Remediation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Focus for the budget is on sustaining the current portfolio
- For the facilities portfolio, there is only enough funding for the maintenance, repair and operations, although with many of the facilities completing in the last year we anticipate that we may be able to recover some funding for *(b)(7)(E)* BPS
- This total excludes rent funding of approximately $60M
NON-RESPONSIVE
FY14 Budget Status - TI

Focus for the budget is on sustaining the current portfolio
There are no funds right now for TI construction (D&D), only funding available for M&R (O&M)
This funding excludes Towers/C2 funding with OTIA of approximately $43M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14 TI Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTIMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;R Support <em>(includes PCD funding, heavy equipment rentals, environmental and other support)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Support (FITT, GIS, WMS, contract support)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(b) (5)*
NON-RESPONSIVE
The Comprehensive Tactical Infrastructure Maintenance and Repair (CTIMR) Program segments maintenance and repair requirements into four work areas that encompass the nine Border Patrol Sectors along the Southwest Border: Area 1 (San Diego and El Centro Sectors), Area 2 (Yuma and Tucson Sectors), Area 3 (El Paso and Big Bend Sectors), and Area 4 (Del Rio, Laredo, and Rio Grande Valley Sectors).

As of February 2014, all four work areas have been awarded with Area 2 being the last area awarded and the kickoff meeting was held on March 4th.

Owned vs. operational TI M&R
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>FM&amp;E Project Manager</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Start Date Actual Date</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Start Date Planned Date</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Completion Actual Date</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Completion Planned Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-1 - O-3</td>
<td>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</td>
<td>TI</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades RGV</td>
<td>(b)(7)(E)</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades RGV C2 Facility Renovations</td>
<td>(b)(7)(E)</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
Back Up Slides
NON-RESPONSIVE
We good with this version? I have not seen any updates.

If so, I will work with [Redacted] to finalize and add to invite.

R/

All,
I have revised the slides based on [Redacted] comments.
Any questions, edits or revisions? Let me know if you want me to set up some time Friday to discuss.
Thanks,

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

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

All,
Please find the most updated OBP Ops briefing that has incorporated earlier edits/comments (such as splitting TI and Facilities.)
Let me know if you’d like to meet to review or if you’d like me to make any edits.
Thanks,
Can you please send the latest TI/FAC Briefing we put together for the previously rescheduled briefing to [Redacted]? This is scheduled for Monday and we’d like to take a look again to ensure we have everything covered.

Thanks,
CBP Office of Administration
Facilities Management and Engineering

Border Patrol Facilities and Tactical Infrastructure Program Management Office

Southwest Border Projects

Prepared for OBP Operations Division
April 14, 2014
Agenda

- FY14 Budget Status - Facilities
- Consolidation/Co-Location
- Sector Maintenance Staff
- FY14 Budget Status - TI
- TI FY15 Military Project Planning
- CTIMR
- TI Contracting Assessment
- Carrizo Cane Update
- Projects by Sector:
  - Rio Grande Valley Sector
  - Laredo Sector
  - Del Rio Sector
  - Big Bend Sector
  - El Paso Sector
  - Tucson Sector
  - Yuma Sector
  - El Centro Sector
  - San Diego Sector
## FY14 Budget Status - Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14 Facilities Funding</th>
<th>(b) (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Contracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV Remediation/Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Construction and Alterations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Cards (PCDs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel Remediation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Focus for the budget is on sustaining the current portfolio
- For the facilities portfolio, there is only enough funding for the maintenance, repair and operations, although with many of the facilities completing in the last year we anticipate that we may be able to recover some funding for BPS
- This total excludes rent funding of approximately $60M
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
FY14 Budget Status - TI

- Focus for the budget is on sustaining the current portfolio
- There are no funds right now for TI construction (D&D), only funding available for M&R (O&M)
- This funding excludes Towers/C2 funding with OTIA of approximately $43M
NON-RESPONSIVE
The Comprehensive Tactical Infrastructure Maintenance and Repair (CTIMR) Program segments maintenance and repair requirements into four work areas that encompass the nine Border Patrol Sectors along the Southwest Border: Area 1 (San Diego and El Centro Sectors), Area 2 (Yuma and Tucson Sectors), Area 3 (El Paso and Big Bend Sectors), and Area 4 (Del Rio, Laredo, and Rio Grande Valley Sectors).

As of February 2014, all four work areas have been awarded with Area 2 being the last area awarded and the kickoff meeting was held on March 4th.

Owned vs. operational TI M&R
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>FM&amp;E Project Manager</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Start Date Actual Date</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Start Date Planned Date</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Completion Actual Date</th>
<th>Schedule Construction Completion Planned Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-1 - O-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(7)(F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades RGV C2 Facility Renovations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-RESPONSIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades RGV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE

NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
NON-RESPONSIVE
Back Up Slides
NON-RESPONSIVE
Attached, please let me know if you need anything else.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Thank you – I know folks are working as fast as possible but I was told by the staff that they need a response within the next few minutes. Is there anything we can provide on the mileage or the mileage if not the whole answer?

Thank you!

I realize it is 11:59 and you asked for this by noon – know that we are working as fast as we can to get you an update and will send asap.
Thank you!

– we are looking at it now, stay tuned.

All,

bw11 foia cbp 003985
Staff has pointed out that the zone project breakdown, attached here, which was provided by Chief Vitiello to accompany USBP's narrative includes mileage for each zone. This was circulated on March 23 as a getback to a conference call. They are questioning the mileage of ^[b] (7)(E)^ now that the updated map has eliminated the ^[b] (7)(E)^. They have also pointed out that the zone project breakdown ends at ^[b] (7)(E)^ and the map clearly show proposed wall into ^[b] (7)(E)^.

Can we update this chart or provide them with an accurate mileage breakout by zone? They are working to justify spending in the bill and need to be able to explain where these projects are located. We need to provide staff a response as soon as possible, by Noon the latest.

Thank you,

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 10:32 AM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Here is a more zoomed in version of that map so hopefully the zones are broken out a bit more clearly for you. Please let me know if you need anything else 😊

[b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 10:19 AM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Thank you!
Updated map attached

Thank you, and would you have time now to walk through the zones and segments on the RGV section (pg. 72-82) of the attached maps? I’m at existing pedestrian fence is segments and that is “fleevée” because they are confused by the labels of pedestrian existing, proposed barrier and then the labels used in the request.

Thank you,
Hi,

Yes to both of your questions.

We will have an updated map by 10 am and cc’d here, is available to walk you through the map labels as well. Please let us know when you are free and what # she can reach you at.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Good Morning All,

Staff has indicated they need to provide their leadership with a response on the appearance of the levee fences in by this morning at 10 am. Have you made any progress with USBP or do we need to elevate this with their leadership this morning?

Additional the staff is very confused regarding the difference between the segment labels and the zones. Can we walk through the various segments of existing and planned fencing in RGV shown in the attached maps this morning so that we can try and provide some clarity on that front and hopefully avoid a fire drill phone request from the staff?

Thank you,
Ok thanks, that’s helpful to know that it isn’t just an issue with the map.

Thanks,

I will defer to [redacted] on what was shared beforehand.

It is not a software issue – we are working through the potential [redacted] with USBP and as soon as we have it resolved, we will be sure to pass it along.
Hi

Just to confirm, there have not been any updates made to this map since we last shared with staff, correct?

Do we know if the issue with [redacted] is just in the mapping software or is there [redacted]? I can explain to staff that we are working to correct the issue with the map but in the meantime ask that they ignore the [redacted] if we’ve confirmed that the issue is with the map and a [redacted] does not exist in the field.

Thank you,

Hi – Attached is the map. Please note that we are still addressing the area in [redacted] that shows levees and walls. We are working with USBP to resolve this.
Good Morning,

Thank you again for the assistance with the levee wall photos. Are we still tracking to have an updated map to share with the staff this morning?

Thanks again,

[Redacted]

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

HI – We are working this. Photos are coming shortly. Maps will be in the am.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

[Redacted]
Staff has asked if we will have something to share tonight. Are we still tracking to have the updated map and pictures for them for this evening?

Thanks again,

---

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 3:14:41 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C), [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Stand by. We’ll get something.

---

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 3:14 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C), [b] (6), (b) (7)(C), [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Is there an updated map that reflects that?

---

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 3:06:27 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C), [b] (6), (b) (7)(C), [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

The [b] (7) wall has been removed -

---

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 2:55 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Thanks!!! We’ll send the MR394 map and follow up with USBP.
Appreciate your help,

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:45 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C), [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

– USBP was supposed to answer the [b] (7)(E) requirement question. I would follow up with them. As far as answering [b] (6) question, the second map MR 394 should do it. I would not send the O1_O3 map.

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:27 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: ‘flevee map’

Removing [b] (6)

You had recently provided, and we shared with the staff the attached maps with the proposed wall and levee wall. Not looking to add to the workload, I can resend either of these maps to the staff, per this new request.

My one question was did we find out why it looks like a [b] (7)(E) in [b] (7)(E) on both of these maps?

Thanks again,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:09 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: ‘flevee map’

Many thanks for getting on the line today. Do you have any good maps of the current or proposed flevee? Apologize if we already have this somewhere. If so, please forward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Distance (mi.)</th>
<th>4/4 Miles</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Zone Breakdown**

**Project Breakdown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-1</th>
<th>(b) (7)(E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levee Proposed Wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(b) (7)(E)*

BW11 FOIA CBP 003995
02 is not part of the fy17 build

Thank you, I know this wasn’t an easy undertaking and appreciate you taking the time to highlight the changes. I think these maps will help clarify some confusion for the staff.

Separate from the levee fence/wall, the first two maps include the O-1 and O-3 segments of the non-levee fence. Do you have the map of the of the O-2 segment that we could add?

Thank you,
Attached is the requested map. Please accept apologies for the delay, it took longer to break out the sections than expected.

The attached map shows the following:
The Teal color is the proposed barrier.
The maps highlight the modification in proposed barrier by showing the added sections in highlighted green.
The segment that was removed is the barrier on the south levee in where the new segment is a part of another segment, we are showing the new segment length in the green box, and the total segment length in the teal box.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

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

From:
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 1:33 PM
To:
Cc:
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

All –

In speaking with we are producing a new set of maps that clearly show what has changed. We are targeting a 2 pm completion time for those maps.

**I will be heading out soon, so please – contact or in my absence**

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:32 PM  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: 'fleevee map'

Thank you,

Unfortunately, because it was not conveyed to OCA that the “updated map” reflected a change in the USBP requirements, that was not communicated to the staff and so there will be further confusion. Additionally, B1 and C1 briefed the staff and members on a request based on a requirement that included the [REDACTED] Has this updated requirement been briefed to leadership?

Thank you,

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:29 PM  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: 'fleevee map'

> – Per our conversation, to discuss the operational requirements, please reach out to [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:13 PM  
To: [REDACTED]  
Cc: [REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: 'fleevee map'
can you please call me?

Attached, please let me know if you need anything else.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Thank you — I know folks are working as fast as possible but I was told by the staff that they need a response within the next few minutes. Is there anything we can provide on the mileage or the mileage if not the whole answer?

Thank you!
I realize it is 11:59 and you asked for this by noon – know that we are working as fast as we can to get you an update and will send asap.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Thank you!

– we are looking at it now, stay tuned.
All,

Staff has pointed out that the zone project breakdown, attached here, which was provided by Chief Vitiello to accompany USBP’s narrative includes mileage for each zone. This was circulated on March 23 as a getback to a conference call. They are questioning the mileage of [b] (7)(E) now that the updated map has eliminated the [b] (7)(E). They have also pointed out that the zone project breakdown ends at [b] (7)(E) and the map clearly show proposed wall into [b] (7)(E).

Can we update this chart or provide them with an accurate mileage breakout by zone? They are working to justify spending in the bill and need to be able to explain where these projects are located. We need to provide staff a response as soon as possible, by Noon the latest.

Thank you,

[Signature]

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 10:32 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘fleevee map’
Importance: High

Here is a more zoomed in version of that map so hopefully the zones are broken out a bit more clearly for you. Please let me know if you need anything else 😊
Thank you!

Updated map attached
Thank you, and would you have time now to walk through the zones and segments on the RGV section (pg. 72-82) of the attached maps? I’m at

I’m just looking to be able to say to staff that existing pedestrian fence is segments and that is “fleeve” because they are confused by the labels of pedestrian existing, proposed barrier and then the labels used in the request.

Thank you,

Hi –

Yes to both of your questions.

We will have an updated map by 10 am and cc’d here, is available to walk you through the map labels as well. Please let us know when you are free and what # she can reach you at.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
Good Morning All,

Staff has indicated they need to provide their leadership with a response on the appearance of the levee fences in by this morning at 10 am. Have you made any progress with USBP or do we need to elevate this with their leadership this morning?

Additional the staff is very confused regarding the difference between the segment labels and the zones. Can we walk through the various segments of existing and planned fencing in RGV shown in the attached maps this morning so that we can try and provide some clarity on that front and hopefully avoid a fire drill phone request from the staff?

Thank you,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Ok thanks, that’s helpful to know that it isn’t just an issue with the map.

Thanks,
From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 1:58 PM  
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

I will defer to [b](b) (6), (b) (7)(C) on what was shared beforehand.

It is not a software issue – we are working through the [b] (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) with USBP and as soon as we have it resolved, we will be sure to pass it along.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)  
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office  
Facilities Management and Engineering  
Office of Facilities and Asset Management  
[b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 1:45 PM  
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Hi [b](b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Just to confirm, there have not been any updates made to this map since we last shared with staff, correct?

Do we know if the issue with [b] (b) (7) is just in the mapping software or is there potentially a [b] (b) (7)?

I can explain to staff that we are working to correct the issue with the map but in the meantime ask that they ignore the [b] (b) (7) if we’ve confirmed that the issue is with the map and a [b] (b) (7) does not exist in the field.

Thank you,

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

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 1:37 PM  
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Subject:
Hi – Attached is the map. Please note that we are still addressing the area in that shows levees and walls. We are working with USBP to resolve this.

Good Morning,

Thank you again for the assistance with the levee wall photos. Are we still tracking to have an updated map to share with the staff this morning?

Thanks again,
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

HI – We are working this. Photos are coming shortly. Maps will be in the am.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 5:33 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Staff has asked if we will have something to share tonight. Are we still tracking to have the updated map and pictures for them for this evening?

Thanks again,

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 3:14:41 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Stand by. We’ll get something.

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 3:14 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Is there an updated map that reflects that?
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 3:06:27 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

The [b] (7) wall has been removed -

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 2:55 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Thanks! We'll send the MR394 map and follow up with USBP.

Appreciate your help,

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:45 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

– USBP was supposed to answer the [b] (7) layer requirement question. I would follow up with them. As far as answering [b] (6) question, the second map MR 394 should do it. I would not send the O1_O3 map.

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:27 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: FW: 'flevee map'

Removing [b] (6)
You had recently provided, and we shared with the staff the attached maps with the proposed wall and levee wall. Not looking to add to the workload, I can resend either of these maps to the staff, per this new request.

My one question was did we find out why it looks like a (b) (7)(E) on both of these maps?

Thanks again,
Thank you, I know this wasn’t an easy undertaking and appreciate you taking the time to highlight the changes. I think these maps will help clarify some confusion for the staff.

Separate from the levee fence/wall, the first two maps include the O-1 and O-3 segments of the non-levee fence. Do you have the map of the O-2 segment that we could add?

Thank you,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Attached is the requested map. Please accept apologies for the delay, it took longer to break out the sections than expected.

The attached map shows the following:
The Teal color is the proposed barrier.
The maps highlight the modification in proposed barrier by showing the added sections in highlighted green.
The segment that was removed is the barrier on the south levee in the green box, and the total segment length in the teal box.
Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

---

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 1:33 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

All –

In speaking with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) we are producing a new set of maps that clearly show what has changed. We are targeting a 2 pm completion time for those maps.

**I will be heading out soon, so please – contact (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) or (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) in my absence**

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:32 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Thank you,

Unfortunately, because it was not conveyed to OCA that the “updated map” reflected a change in
the USBP requirements, that was not communicated to the staff and so there will be further confusion. Additionally, B1 and C1 briefed the staff and members on a request based on a requirement that included the [b] (7)(E). Has this updated requirement been briefed to leadership?

Thank you,

[Name]

---

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 12:29 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

-- Per our conversation, to discuss the operational requirements, please reach out to

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

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:13 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

can you please call me?

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 12:09 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

Attached, please let me know if you need anything else.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Thank you – I know folks are working as fast as possible but I was told by the staff that they need a response within the next few minutes. Is there anything we can provide on the mileage or the mileage in if not the whole answer?

Thank you!

I realize it is 11:59 and you asked for this by noon – know that we are working as fast as we can to get you an update and will send asap.
From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:39 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Thank you!

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:38 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

– we are looking at it now, stay tuned.

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:16 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'
Importance: High
All,

Staff has pointed out that the zone project breakdown, attached here, which was provided by Chief Vitiello to accompany USBP’s narrative includes mileage for each zone. This was circulated on March 23 as a getback to a conference call. They are questioning the mileage of [b] (7)(E) now that the updated map has eliminated the [b] (7)(E). They have also pointed out that the zone project breakdown ends at [b] (7)(E) and the map clearly show proposed wall into [b] (7)(E).

Can we update this chart or provide them with an accurate mileage breakout by zone? They are working to justify spending in the bill and need to be able to explain where these projects are located. We need to provide staff a response as soon as possible, by Noon the latest.

Thank you,

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 10:32 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Here is a more zoomed in version of that map so hopefully the zones are broken out a bit more clearly for you. Please let me know if you need anything else 😊

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 10:19 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Thank you!
Updated map attached

Thank you, and would you have time now to walk through the zones and segments on the RGV section (pg. 72-82) of the attached maps? I’m at existing pedestrian fence is segments and that is “flevee” because they are confused by the labels of pedestrian existing, proposed barrier and then the labels used in the request.

Thank you,
Hi –

Yes to both of your questions.

We will have an updated map by 10 am and cc’d here, is available to walk you through the map labels as well. Please let us know when you are free and what # she can reach you at.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Good Morning All,

Staff has indicated they need to provide their leadership with a response on the appearance of the levee fences in by this morning at 10 am. Have you made any progress with USBP or do we need to elevate this with their leadership this morning?

Additional the staff is very confused regarding the difference between the segment labels and the zones. Can we walk through the various segments of existing and planned fencing in RGV shown in the attached maps this morning so that we can try and provide some clarity on that front and hopefully avoid a fire drill phone request from the staff?

Thank you,
From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Subject: RE: ‘fleevee map’

Ok thanks, that’s helpful to know that it isn’t just an issue with the map.

Thanks,

[redacted]

I will defer to [redacted] on what was shared beforehand.

It is not a software issue – we are working through the potential [b] with USBP and as soon as we have it resolved, we will be sure to pass it along.
Hi

Just to confirm, there have not been any updates made to this map since we last shared with staff, correct?

Do we know if the issue with [redacted] is just in the mapping software or is there potentially a [redacted] as well? I can explain to staff that we are working to correct the issue with the map but in the meantime ask that they ignore the [redacted] if we’ve confirmed that the issue is with the map and a [redacted] does not exist in the field.

Thank you,

[redacted]

Hi – Attached is the map. Please note that we are still addressing the area in [redacted] that shows levees and walls. We are working with USBP to resolve this.

[Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)]
[Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office]
[Facilities Management and Engineering]
[Office of Facilities and Asset Management]
Good Morning,

Thank you again for the assistance with the levee wall photos. Are we still tracking to have an updated map to share with the staff this morning?

Thanks again,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

HI – We are working this. Photos are coming shortly. Maps will be in the am.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

We are working this. Photos are coming shortly. Maps will be in the am.
Staff has asked if we will have something to share tonight. Are we still tracking to have the updated map and pictures for them for this evening?

Thanks again,

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 3:14:41 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Stand by. We’ll get something.

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

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 3:14 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Is there an updated map that reflects that?

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 3:06:27 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

The [b] (7) wall has been removed -

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

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 2:55 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'
Thanks. We’ll send the MR394 map and follow up with USBP.

Appreciate your help,

From:  
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:45 PM  
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: ‘fleeve map’

– USBP was supposed to answer the requirement question. I would follow up with them. As far as answering the question, the second map MR 394 should do it. I would not send the O1_O3 map.

From:  
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:27 PM  
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: FW: ‘fleeve map’

Removing

You had recently provided, and we shared with the staff the attached maps with the proposed wall and levee wall. Not looking to add to the workload, I can resend either of these maps to the staff, per this new request.

My one question was did we find out why it looks like a in on both of these maps?

Thanks again,

Office of Congressional Affairs  
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Many thanks for getting on the line today. Do you have any good maps of the current or proposed flevee? Apologize if we already have this somewhere. If so, please forward.
Thank you,

I’m going through the maps and trying to add up the segment mileage to make sure they match the attached updated zone-project breakout that was provided earlier. Can you give me a quick call? My direct is (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

My math may be off but I got 377 miles for (b) (7)(E), not the 362 miles included in this updated zone breakout. For (b) (7)(E), the 15 miles of (b) (7)(E) is labeled both as part of the original request and then as “difference” in the lime green. I think there may just be two labels, where it should just be labeled as a “difference.”

Thank you,

(b) (6)

Since we are not considering O-2 in the FY17 plan, we don’t have it in that map set. Here is the standalone map.

Thanks,

(b) (6)
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Thank you, I know this wasn’t an easy undertaking and appreciate you taking the time to highlight the changes. I think these maps will help clarify some confusion for the staff.

Separate from the levee fence/wall, the first two maps include the O-1 and O-3 segments of the non-levee fence. Do you have the map of the O-2 segment that we could add?

Thank you,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 3:34 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
(b) (6)  
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Attached is the requested map. Please accept apologies for the delay, it took longer to break out the sections than expected.

The attached map shows the following:
The Teal color is the proposed barrier.
The maps highlight the modification in proposed barrier by showing the added sections in highlighted green.
The segment that was removed is the barrier on the south levee in (b) (7)(E)
Where the new segment is a part of another segment, we are showing the new segment length in the green box, and the total segment length in the teal box.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

---

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 1:33 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

All –

In speaking with [redacted], we are producing a new set of maps that clearly show what has changed. We are targeting a 2 pm completion time for those maps.

**I will be heading out soon, so please – contact [redacted] or (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) in my absence**

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:32 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'
Thank you,

Unfortunately, because it was not conveyed to OCA that the “updated map” reflected a change in the USBP requirements, that was not communicated to the staff and so there will be further confusion. Additionally, B1 and C1 briefed the staff and members on a request based on a requirement that included the [b](7)(E). Has this updated requirement been briefed to leadership?

Thank you,

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 12:29 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) (C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘fleeve map’

— Per our conversation, to discuss the operational requirements, please reach out to [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) (C)

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:13 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘fleeve map’

[b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
can you please call me?
From: [b](6), [b](7)(C)  
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 12:09 PM  
To: [b](6), [b](7)(C)  
Cc: [b](6), [b](7)(C)  
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Attached, please let me know if you need anything else.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)  
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office  
Facilities Management and Engineering  
Office of Facilities and Asset Management  

From: [b](6), [b](7)(C)  
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:06 PM  
To: [b](6), [b](7)(C)  
Cc: [b](6), [b](7)(C)  
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Thank you — I know folks are working as fast as possible but I was told by the staff that they need a response within the next few minutes. Is there anything we can provide on the mileage or the mileage in [b](7)(E) if not the whole answer?

Thank you!

From: [b](6), [b](7)(C)  
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 12:00 PM  
To: [b](6), [b](7)(C)  
Cc: [b](6), [b](7)(C)  
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map'
I realize it is 11:59 and you asked for this by noon – know that we are working as fast as we can to get you an update and will send asap.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From:  
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:39 AM  
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Thank you!

– we are looking at it now, stay tuned.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Importance: High

All,

Staff has pointed out that the zone project breakdown, attached here, which was provided by Chief Vitiello to accompany USBP’s narrative includes mileage for each zone. This was circulated on March 23 as a getback to a conference call. They are questioning the mileage of now that the updated map has eliminated the. They have also pointed out that the zone project breakdown ends at and the map clearly show proposed wall into

Can we update this chart or provide them with an accurate mileage breakout by zone? They are working to justify spending in the bill and need to be able to explain where these projects are located. We need to provide staff a response as soon as possible, by Noon the latest.

Thank you,

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 10:32 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Here is a more zoomed in version of that map so hopefully the zones are broken out a bit more clearly for you. Please let me know if you need anything else 😊
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Thank you!

Updated map attached

Thank you, and would you have time now to walk through the zones and segments on the RGV section (pg. 72-82) of the attached maps? I’m at [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

I’m just looking to be able to say to staff [b] (7)(E) existing pedestrian fence is segments [b] (7)(E) and that is “flevee” because they are confused by the labels of pedestrian existing, proposed barrier and then the labels used in the request.
Hi –

Yes to both of your questions.

We will have an updated map by 10 am and cc’d here, is available to walk you through the map labels as well. Please let us know when you are free and what she can reach you at.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Good Morning All,

Staff has indicated they need to provide their leadership with a response on the appearance of the fences in by this morning at 10 am. Have you made any progress with USBP or do we need to elevate this with their leadership this morning?

Additional the staff is very confused regarding the difference between the segment labels and the zones. Can we walk through the various segments of existing and planned fencing in RGV shown in the attached maps this morning so that we can try and provide some clarity on that front and
hopefully avoid a fire drill phone request from the staff?

Thank you,

[Redacted]

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 2:09 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: 'fleevee map'

Ok thanks, that’s helpful to know that it isn’t just an issue with the map.

Thanks,

[Redacted]

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 1:58 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: ‘fleevee map’

I will defer to [Redacted] on what was shared beforehand.

It is not a software issue – we are working through the potential [Redacted] with USBP and as soon as we have it resolved, we will be sure to pass it along.
Hi

Just to confirm, there have not been any updates made to this map since we last shared with staff, correct?

Do we know if the issue with \( \text{(b) (7)(E)} \) is just in the mapping software or is there potentially a \( \text{(b) (7)(E)} \) ? I can explain to staff that we are working to correct the issue with the map but in the meantime ask that they ignore the \( \text{(b) (7)(E)} \) if we’ve confirmed that the issue is with the map and a \( \text{(b) (7)(E)} \) does not exist in the field.

Thank you,

Hi — Attached is the map. Please note that we are still addressing the area in \( \text{(b) (7)(E)} \) that shows levees and walls. We are working with USBP to resolve this.
Good Morning,

Thank you again for the assistance with the levee wall photos. Are we still tracking to have an updated map to share with the staff this morning?

Thanks again,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

HI – We are working this. Photos are coming shortly. Maps will be in the am.
Staff has asked if we will have something to share tonight. Are we still tracking to have the updated map and pictures for them for this evening?

Thanks again,
Thanks for the info. We'll send the MR394 map and follow up with USBP.

Appreciate your help,

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:45 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

– USBP was supposed to answer the [b] (7)(E) requirement question. I would follow up with them. As far as answering [b] (6) question, the second map MR 394 should do it. I would not send the O1_O3 map.

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:27 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: ‘flevee map’

Removing [b] (6)

You had recently provided, and we shared with the staff the attached maps with the proposed wall and levee wall. Not looking to add to the workload, I can resend either of these maps to the staff, per this new request.

My one question was did we find out why it looks like a [b] (7)(E) in [b] (7)(E) on both of these maps?

Thanks again,
Many thanks for getting on the line today. Do you have any good maps of the current or proposed flevee? Apologize if we already have this somewhere. If so, please forward.
### Zone Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Distance (mi.)</th>
<th>4/4 Miles</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>(b) (7)(E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levee Proposed Wall</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forgive me, I see what you did with the labelling. I was counting the\[b\] \(7\)\[E\] twice. This all lines up with the updated breakout.

Thank you for all of your assistance,

[80x723]

[\(b\) \([6], \(b\) \(7\)\[C\)]

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
\[b\) \([6], \(b\) \(7\)\[C]\]

Thank you.

I’m going through the maps and trying to add up the segment mileage to make sure they match the attached updated zone-project breakout that was provided earlier. Can you give me a quick call? My direct is \[b\) \([6], \(b\) \(7\)\[C]\]

My math may be off but I got [\(b\) \(7\)\[E\]] miles for \[b\] \(7\)\[E\] not the [\(b\) \(7\)\[E\]] miles included in this updated zone breakout. For \[b\) \(7\)\[E\] the [\(b\) \(7\)\[E\]] miles for \[b\) \(7\)\[E\] is labeled both as part of the original request and then as “difference” in the lime green. I think there may just be two labels, where it should just be labeled as a “difference.”

Thank you,
Since we are not considering O-2 in the FY17 plan, we don’t have it in that map set. Here is the standalone map.

Thanks,

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

Thank you, I know this wasn’t an easy undertaking and appreciate you taking the time to highlight the changes. I think these maps will help clarify some confusion for the staff.

Separate from the levee fence/wall, the first two maps include the O-1 and O-3 segments of the non-levee fence. Do you have the map of the O-2 segment that we could add?

Thank you,
Attached is the requested map. Please accept apologies for the delay, it took longer to break out the sections than expected.

The attached map shows the following:
The Teal color is the proposed barrier.
The maps highlight the modification in proposed barrier by showing the added sections in highlighted green.
The segment that was removed is the barrier on the south levee in [b (7)C].

Where the new segment is a part of another segment, we are showing the new segment length in the green box, and the total segment length in the teal box.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,
All –

In speaking with [REDACTED] we are producing a new set of maps that clearly show what has changed. We are targeting a 2 pm completion time for those maps.

**I will be heading out soon, so please – contact [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] in my absence**

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [REDACTED] Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:32 PM
To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Thank you,

Unfortunately, because it was not conveyed to OCA that the “updated map” reflected a change in the USBP requirements, that was not communicated to the staff and so there will be further confusion. Additionally, B1 and C1 briefed the staff and members on a request based on a requirement that included the [REDACTED]. Has this updated requirement been briefed to leadership?

Thank you,

From: [REDACTED] Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 12:29 PM
To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Thank you,
– Per our conversation, to discuss the operational requirements, please reach out to

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:13 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

(can you please call me?)

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:09 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Attached, please let me know if you need anything else.

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:06 PM
Thank you — I know folks are working as fast as possible but I was told by the staff that they need a response within the next few minutes. Is there anything we can provide on the mileage or the mileage in if not the whole answer?

Thank you!

I realize it is 11:59 and you asked for this by noon — know that we are working as fast as we can to get you an update and will send asap.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Thank you!
From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 11:38 AM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'fleeve map'

– we are looking at it now, stay tuned.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:16 AM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'fleeve map'
Importance: High

All,

Staff has pointed out that the zone project breakdown, attached here, which was provided by Chief Vitiello to accompany USBP’s narrative includes mileage for each zone. This was circulated on March 23 as a getback to a conference call. They are questioning the mileage of [b] (7)(E) now that the updated map has eliminated the [b] (7)(E). They have also pointed out that the zone project breakdown ends at [b] (7)(E) and the map clearly show proposed wall into [b] (7)(E)

Can we update this chart or provide them with an accurate mileage breakout by zone? They are working to justify spending in the bill and need to be able to explain where these projects are located. We need to provide staff a response as soon as possible, by Noon the latest.

Thank you,
Here is a more zoomed in version of that map so hopefully the zones are broken out a bit more clearly for you. Please let me know if you need anything else 😊

Thank you!

Updated map attached
From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 9:36 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Thank you, and would you have time now to walk through the zones and segments on the RGV section (pg. 72-82) of the attached maps? I’m at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

I’m just looking to be able to say to staff existing pedestrian fence is segments (b) (7)(E) and that is “flevee” because they are confused by the labels of pedestrian existing, proposed barrier and then the labels used in the request.

Thank you,

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 9:24 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Hi (b) (7)(E) –

Yes to both of your questions.

We will have an updated map by 10 am and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) cc’d here, is available to walk you through the map labels as well. Please let us know when you are free and what # she can reach you at.
Good Morning All,

Staff has indicated they need to provide their leadership with a response on the appearance of the fences by this morning at 10 am. Have you made any progress with USBP or do we need to elevate this with their leadership this morning?

Additional the staff is very confused regarding the difference between the segment labels and the zones. Can we walk through the various segments of existing and planned fencing in RGV shown in the attached maps this morning so that we can try and provide some clarity on that front and hopefully avoid a fire drill phone request from the staff?

Thank you,
Ok thanks, that’s helpful to know that it isn’t just an issue with the map.

Thanks,

[redacted]

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 1:58 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

I will defer to [redacted] on what was shared beforehand.

It is not a software issue – we are working through the potential [redacted] with USBP and as soon as we have it resolved, we will be sure to pass it along.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 1:45 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Hi [redacted]

Just to confirm, there have not been any updates made to this map since we last shared with staff, correct?
Do we know if the issue with [redacted] is just in the mapping software or is there potentially a [redacted]?

I can explain to staff that we are working to correct the issue with the map but in the meantime ask that they ignore the [redacted] if we’ve confirmed that the issue is with the map and a [redacted] does not exist in the field.

Thank you,

From:
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 1:37 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Hi – Attached is the map. Please note that we are still addressing the area in [redacted] that shows levees and walls. We are working with USBP to resolve this.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)  
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office  
Facilities Management and Engineering  
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [redacted]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 10:59 AM  
To: [redacted]  
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Good Morning,

Thank you again for the assistance with the levee wall photos. Are we still tracking to have an updated map to share with the staff this morning?

Thanks again,

From: [redacted]
HI – We are working this. Photos are coming shortly. Maps will be in the am.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Staff has asked if we will have something to share tonight. Are we still tracking to have the updated map and pictures for them for this evening?

Thanks again,

Stand by. We’ll get something.
Is there an updated map that reflects that?

The [b](7)(E) has been removed -

Thanks We’ll send the MR394 map and follow up with USBP.

Appreciate your help,

– USBP was supposed to answer the [b](7)(E) requirement question. I would follow up with them. As far as answering [b](6) question, the second map MR 394 should do it. I would not
send the O1_O3 map.

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:27 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: 'flevee map'

Removing (b) (6)

You had recently provided, and we shared with the staff the attached maps with the proposed wall and levee wall. Not looking to add to the workload, I can resend either of these maps to the staff, per this new request.

My one question was did we find out why it looks like a [b] (7)(E) in [b] (7)(E) on both of these maps?

Thanks again,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:09 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: 'flevee map'

Many thanks for getting on the line today. Do you have any good maps of the current or proposed flevee? Apologize if we already have this somewhere. If so, please forward.
Since we are not considering O-2 in the FY17 plan, we don’t have it in that map set. Here is the standalone map.

Thanks,

--------

Thank you, I know this wasn’t an easy undertaking and appreciate you taking the time to highlight the changes. I think these maps will help clarify some confusion for the staff.

Separate from the levee fence/wall, the first two maps include the O-1 and O-3 segments of the non-levee fence. Do you have the map of the O-2 segment that we could add?

Thank you,

--------

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Attached is the requested map. Please accept apologies for the delay, it took longer to break out the sections than expected.

The attached map shows the following:
The Teal color is the proposed barrier.
The maps highlight the modification in proposed barrier by showing the added sections in highlighted green.
The segment that was removed is the barrier on the south levee in green.

Where the new segment is a part of another segment, we are showing the new segment length in the green box, and the total segment length in the teal box.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

------------------
From: [mailto: cbp.dhs.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 1:33 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

All –

In speaking with [mailto: cbp.dhs.gov] we are producing a new set of maps that clearly show what has changed. We are targeting a 2 pm completion time for those maps.
**I will be heading out soon, so please – contact [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) in my absence**

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:32 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Thank you,

Unfortunately, because it was not conveyed to OCA that the “updated map” reflected a change in the USBP requirements, that was not communicated to the staff and so there will be further confusion. Additionally, B1 and C1 briefed the staff and members on a request based on a requirement that included the [b] (7)(E). Has this updated requirement been briefed to leadership?

Thank you,

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 12:29 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) – Per our conversation, to discuss the operational requirements, please reach out to

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:13 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

from:
can you please call me?

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:09 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

attached, please let me know if you need anything else.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:06 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Thank you — I know folks are working as fast as possible but I was told by the staff that they need a response within the next few minutes. Is there anything we can provide on the mileage or the mileage in [b] (7) [E] if not the whole answer?

Thank you!

From: (b) (6), (b) (7) [C]
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 12:00 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7) [C]
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7) [C]

Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

I realize it is 11:59 and you asked for this by noon – know that we are working as fast as we can to get you an update and will send asap.

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

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
(b) (6), (b) (7) [C]

From: (b) (6), (b) (7) [C]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:39 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7) [C]
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7) [C]

Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Thank you!

From: (b) (6), (b) (7) [C]
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 11:38 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7) [C]
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7) [C]
Subject: RE: ‘fleevee map’

we are looking at it now, stay tuned.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:16 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

All,

Staff has pointed out that the zone project breakdown, attached here, which was provided by Chief Vitiello to accompany USBP’s narrative includes mileage for each zone. This was circulated on March 23 as a getback to a conference call. They are questioning the mileage of [b] (7)(E) now that the updated map has eliminated the [b] (7)(E). They have also pointed out that the zone project breakdown ends at [b] (7)(E) and the map clearly show proposed wall into [b] (7)(E)

Can we update this chart or provide them with an accurate mileage breakout by zone? They are working to justify spending in the bill and need to be able to explain where these projects are located. We need to provide staff a response as soon as possible, by Noon the latest.

Thank you,

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 10:32 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Here is a more zoomed in version of that map so hopefully the zones are broken out a bit more clearly for you. Please let me know if you need anything else 😊

Thank you!

Updated map attached
Thank you, and would you have time now to walk through the zones and segments on the RGV section (pg. 72-82) of the attached maps? I’m at

I’m just looking to be able to say to staff existing pedestrian fence is segments and that is "flevee" because they are confused by the labels of pedestrian existing, proposed barrier and then the labels used in the request.

Thank you,

Hi –

Yes to both of your questions.

We will have an updated map by 10 am and cc’d here, is available to walk you through the map labels as well. Please let us know when you are free and what # she can reach you at.
From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 8:50 AM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C), [b] (6), [b] (7)(C), [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C), [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’
Importance: High

Good Morning All,

Staff has indicated they need to provide their leadership with a response on the appearance of the fences in by this morning at 10 am. Have you made any progress with USBP or do we need to elevate this with their leadership this morning?

Additional the staff is very confused regarding the difference between the segment labels and the zones. Can we walk through the various segments of existing and planned fencing in RGV shown in the attached maps this morning so that we can try and provide some clarity on that front and hopefully avoid a fire drill phone request from the staff?

Thank you,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
[b] (6), [b] (7)(C)

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 2:09 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C), [b] (6), [b] (7)(C), [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C), [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Ok thanks, that’s helpful to know that it isn’t just an issue with the map.

Thanks,
From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 1:58 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

I will defer to [b] (6) on what was shared beforehand.

It is not a software issue – we are working through the potential [b] (7) with USBP and as soon as we have it resolved, we will be sure to pass it along.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
[b] (6), [b] (7)(C)

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 1:45 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Hi [b]

Just to confirm, there have not been any updates made to this map since we last shared with staff, correct?

Do we know if the issue with [b] (7) is just in the mapping software or is there potentially [b] (7)?
I can explain to staff that we are working to correct the issue with the map but in the meantime ask that they ignore the [b] (7) if we’ve confirmed that the issue is with the map and and [b] (7) does not exist in the field.

Thank you,
Hi – Attached is the map. Please note that we are still addressing the area that shows levees and walls. We are working with USBP to resolve this.

Good Morning,

Thank you again for the assistance with the levee wall photos. Are we still tracking to have an updated map to share with the staff this morning?

Thanks again,
HI – We are working this. Photos are coming shortly. Maps will be in the am.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Staff has asked if we will have something to share tonight. Are we still tracking to have the updated map and pictures for them for this evening?

Thanks again,

Stand by. We’ll get something.

BW11 FOIA CBP 004066
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Is there an updated map that reflects that?

---

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 3:06:27 PM  
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

The [b] (7)(E) has been removed -

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 2:55 PM  
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Thanks We’ll send the MR394 map and follow up with USBP.

Appreciate your help,

---

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:45 PM  
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

– USBP was supposed to answer the [b] (7)(E) requirement question. I would follow up with them. As far as answering the question, the second map MR 394 should do it. I would not send the O1_03 map.

---

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:27 PM
Removing (b)(6)

You had recently provided, and we shared with the staff the attached maps with the proposed wall and levee wall. Not looking to add to the workload, I can resend either of these maps to the staff, per this new request.

My one question was did we find out why it looks like a (b)(7)(E) in (b)(7)(C) on both of these maps?

Thanks again,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Many thanks for getting on the line today. Do you have any good maps of the current or proposed flevee? Apologize if we already have this somewhere. If so, please forward.
WARNING: This document is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (FOUO). It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). It is to be controlled, stored, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to FOUO information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid "need-to-know" without prior approval of an authorized DHS official.
Attached is the requested map. Please accept apologies for the delay, it took longer to break out the sections than expected.

The attached map shows the following:
The Teal color is the proposed barrier.
The maps highlight the modification in proposed barrier by showing the added sections in highlighted green.
The segment that was removed is the barrier on the south levee in [b] [7][E]

Where the new segment is a part of another segment, we are showing the new segment length in the green box, and the total segment length in the teal box.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

[ensored]

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

From: [mailto: cbp.dhs.gov cbp.dhs.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 1:33 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

All –

In speaking with [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) we are producing a new set of maps that clearly show what has changed. We are targeting a 2 pm completion time for those maps.

**I will be heading out soon, so please – contact [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) or [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) in my absence**

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

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Thank you,

Unfortunately, because it was not conveyed to OCA that the “updated map” reflected a change in the USBP requirements, that was not communicated to the staff and so there will be further confusion. Additionally, B1 and C1 briefed the staff and members on a request based on a requirement that included the [b](7)(E). Has this updated requirement been briefed to leadership?

Thank you,

– Per our conversation, to discuss the operational requirements, please reach out to [b](6), [b](7)(C)

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
[b](6), [b](7)(C)
From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:13 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Can you please call me?

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:09 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Attached, please let me know if you need anything else.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:06 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Thank you – I know folks are working as fast as possible but I was told by the staff that they need a response within the next few minutes. Is there anything we can provide on the
mileage or the mileage in [b] (7)(E) if not the whole answer?

Thank you!

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 12:00 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

I realize it is 11:59 and you asked for this by noon – know that we are working as fast as we can to get you an update and will send asap.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:39 AM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Thank you!

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 11:38 AM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

– we are looking at it now, stay tuned.
All,

Staff has pointed out that the zone project breakdown, attached here, which was provided by Chief Vitiello to accompany USBP’s narrative includes mileage for each zone. This was circulated on March 23 as a getback to a conference call. They are questioning the mileage of [b] (7)(E) now that the updated map has eliminated the [b] (7)(E). They have also pointed out that the zone project breakdown ends at [b] (7)(E) and the map clearly show proposed wall into [b] (7)(E).

Can we update this chart or provide them with an accurate mileage breakout by zone? They are working to justify spending in the bill and need to be able to explain where these projects are located. We need to provide staff a response as soon as possible, by Noon the latest.

Thank you,

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

Here is a more zoomed in version of that map so hopefully the zones are broken out a bit more...
clearly for you. Please let me know if you need anything else 😊

Subject: RE: 'fleevee map'

Thank you!

Subject: RE: 'fleevee map'

Updated map attached
Thank you, [b] and [b] would you have time now to walk through the zones and segments on the RGV section (pg. 72-82) of the attached maps? I’m at [b]  

I’m just looking to be able to say to staff [b] existing pedestrian fence is segments [b] and that is “flevee” because they are confused by the labels of pedestrian existing, proposed barrier and then the labels used in the request.

Thank you,

Hi –

Yes to both of your questions.

We will have an updated map by 10 am and [b] cc’d here, is available to walk you through the map labels as well. Please let us know when you are free and what # she can reach you at.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
Good Morning All,

Staff has indicated they need to provide their leadership with a response on the appearance of the fences by this morning at 10 am. Have you made any progress with USBP or do we need to elevate this with their leadership this morning?

Additional the staff is very confused regarding the difference between the segment labels and the zones. Can we walk through the various segments of existing and planned fencing in RGV shown in the attached maps this morning so that we can try and provide some clarity on that front and hopefully avoid a fire drill phone request from the staff?

Thank you,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Ok thanks, that’s helpful to know that it isn’t just an issue with the map.

Thanks,
I will defer to [omitted] on what was shared beforehand.

It is not a software issue – we are working through the potential [omitted] with USBP and as soon as we have it resolved, we will be sure to pass it along.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Hi [omitted]

Just to confirm, there have not been any updates made to this map since we last shared with staff, correct?

Do we know if the issue with [omitted] is just in the mapping software or is there potentially a [omitted] I can explain to staff that we are working to correct the issue with the map but in the meantime ask that they ignore the "[omitted] if we’ve confirmed that the issue is with the map and if [omitted] does not exist in the field.

Thank you,
Hi – Attached is the map. Please note that we are still addressing the area in that shows levees and walls. We are working with USBP to resolve this.

Good Morning,

Thank you again for the assistance with the levee wall photos. Are we still tracking to have an updated map to share with the staff this morning?

Thanks again,
HI – We are working this. Photos are coming shortly. Maps will be in the am.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Staff has asked if we will have something to share tonight. Are we still tracking to have the updated map and pictures for them for this evening?

Thanks again,

Stand by. We’ll get something.

Is there an updated map that reflects that?
Dear [Name],

The [b] (7)(E) has been removed.

Thanks. We’ll send the MR394 map and follow up with USBP.

Appreciate your help,

[The next email is redacted.]

– USBP was supposed to answer the (7)(E) requirement question. I would follow up with them. As far as answering (b) (6) question, the second map MR 394 should do it. I would not send the O1_O3 map.

Best,

[The next email is redacted.]

Best,

[The last email is redacted.]
Removing (b) (6)

You had recently provided, and we shared with the staff the attached maps with the proposed wall and levee wall. Not looking to add to the workload, I can resend either of these maps to the staff, per this new request.

My one question was did we find out why it looks like a [b] (7)(E) in [(b) (7)(E)] on both of these maps?

Thanks again,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:09 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: 'flevee map'

Many thanks for getting on the line today. Do you have any good maps of the current or proposed flevee? Apologize if we already have this somewhere. If so, please forward.
In regards to past environmental considerations associated with wall/levee in RGV, we relocated over 200 Sable palms, several cultural sites were documented through our cultural resource surveys and we attempted to avoid them where possible. In addition there were many wetlands areas identified through our initial surveys and we implemented Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as sediment and erosion control to minimize impacts to wetlands during construction. Some of the prior segments were constructed on the Lower Rio Grande National Wildlife Refuge and lands used for agricultural purposes. CBP strategically installed within these areas to allow for continued access to these areas.

New levee/wall construction in RGV would likely encounter similar environmental considerations and CBP would address them in a similar manner.

Hi,

Thank you sending. One concern I have with using this general response is that the levee wall isn’t necessarily reliant on the prototype process. We know we are building a levee wall in this location.

Understanding that each project is unique, based on past levee wall projects in RGV, some in these same zones, is there any environmental considerations we can point to having done as the types of
options or considerations that might be made or could be made in the process? We can certainly caveat that each project, land parcel and situation is unique and not all options utilized in the past would be applicable or viable in the proposed projects.

We believe the staff wants to be supportive of these wall projects and include the funding for them but we are looking for information to help their members be more comfortable with them as well.

Thank you,

[Redacted]

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2017 10:57 AM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Hi —

Happy Friday. Please see the Q&A below and let us know if this works. We developed Q&As for Wall Prototype construction that likely need to be updated based on wall prototype schedule. My understanding is that the Q&As are with the Department for approval to be posted on CBP.gov. The idea is that CBP can direct external stakeholders to this information.

Thanks,

[Redacted]

Q49: What environmental impacts does DHS anticipate as a result of border wall construction?

A49: At this early stage, DHS cannot reasonably forecast what the environmental impacts of a wall might be. As noted, however, DHS is committed to responsible environmental stewardship. That means that DHS will continue to assess potential impacts, coordinate with
relevant stakeholders, and to the extent possible, offset or mitigate potential impacts.

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2017 7:10 AM  
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) ; (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Subject: RE: 'fleee map'  

(b) (6) we will get you a response today  

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 5:45 PM  
To: (b) (6); (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) ; (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Subject: RE: 'fleee map'  

All,  

Staff appreciated the additional maps and has asked about mitigating environmental impacts.  

Specifically, "Given that the barrier is solid concrete on the bottom, and it will be connecting existing segments along the border near wildlife areas, are there any plans to mitigate impact on wildlife in terms of allowing movement across the border?"

Could you please provide a brief response?

Thank you,
Since we are not considering O-2 in the FY17 plan, we don’t have it in that map set. Here is the standalone map.

Thanks,

------------------
From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 3:52 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) >
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Thank you, I know this wasn’t an easy undertaking and appreciate you taking the time to highlight the changes. I think these maps will help clarify some confusion for the staff.

Separate from the levee fence/wall, the first two maps include the O-1 and O-3 segments of the non-levee fence. Do you have the map of the O-2 segment that we could add?

Thank you,

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

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Attached is the requested map. Please accept apologies for the delay, it took longer to break out the sections than expected.

The attached map shows the following:
The Teal color is the proposed barrier.
The maps highlight the modification in proposed barrier by showing the added sections in highlighted green.
The segment that was removed is the barrier on the south levee in [b](7)(C)

Where the new segment is a part of another segment, we are showing the new segment length in the green box, and the total segment length in the teal box.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

____________________

From: [b](6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 1:33 PM
To: [b](6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b](6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘fleevee map’

All –

In speaking with [b](7)(E), we are producing a new set of maps that clearly show what has changed.
We are targeting a 2 pm completion time for those maps.

**I will be heading out soon, so please – contact [b](6), (b) (7)(C) in my absence**

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Thank you,

Unfortunately, because it was not conveyed to OCA that the “updated map” reflected a change in the USBP requirements, that was not communicated to the staff and so there will be further confusion. Additionally, B1 and C1 briefed the staff and members on a request based on a requirement that included the [b](7)(E). Has this updated requirement been briefed to leadership?

Thank you,

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:32 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

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

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

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

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

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

[b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
can you please call me?

Attached, please let me know if you need anything else.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Thank you – I know folks are working as fast as possible but I was told by the staff that they need a response within the next few minutes. Is there anything we can provide on the
mileage or the mileage if not the whole answer?

Thank you!

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 12:00 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

I realize it is 11:59 and you asked for this by noon – know that we are working as fast as we can to get you an update and will send asap.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:39 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Thank you!

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 11:38 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

– we are looking at it now, stay tuned.
All,

Staff has pointed out that the zone project breakdown, attached here, which was provided by Chief Vitiello to accompany USBP’s narrative includes mileage for each zone. This was circulated on March 23 as a getback to a conference call. They are questioning the mileage of [b](7)(E) now that the updated map has eliminated the [b](7)(E). They have also pointed out that the zone project breakdown ends at [b](7)(E) and the map clearly show proposed wall into [b](7)(E).

Can we update this chart or provide them with an accurate mileage breakout by zone? They are working to justify spending in the bill and need to be able to explain where these projects are located. We need to provide staff a response as soon as possible, by Noon the latest.

Thank you,

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:16 AM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’
Importance: High

Here is a more zoomed in version of that map so hopefully the zones are broken out a bit more
clearly for you. Please let me know if you need anything else 😊

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 10:19 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'fleevee map'

Thank you!

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 9:53 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'fleevee map'

Updated map attached

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 9:53 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'fleevee map'

Updated map attached
Thank you, and would you have time now to walk through the zones and segments on the RGV section (pg. 72-82) of the attached maps? I’m at [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)

I’m just looking to be able to say to staff [b] (7)(E) existing pedestrian fence is segments [b] (7)(E) and that is “fleee” because they are confused by the labels of pedestrian existing, proposed barrier and then the labels used in the request.

Thank you,

Hi —

Yes to both of your questions.

We will have an updated map by 10 am and [b] (8), (b) (7)(C) cc’d here, is available to walk you through the map labels as well. Please let us know when you are free and what # she can reach you at.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management
[b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Good Morning All,

Staff has indicated they need to provide their leadership with a response on the appearance of the fences by this morning at 10 am. Have you made any progress with USBP or do we need to elevate this with their leadership this morning?

Additional the staff is very confused regarding the difference between the segment labels and the zones. Can we walk through the various segments of existing and planned fencing in RGV shown in the attached maps this morning so that we can try and provide some clarity on that front and hopefully avoid a fire drill phone request from the staff?

Thank you,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Ok thanks, that’s helpful to know that it isn’t just an issue with the map.

Thanks,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
I will defer to [REDACTED] on what was shared beforehand.

It is not a software issue – we are working through the potential [REDACTED] with USBP and as soon as we have it resolved, we will be sure to pass it along.

Hi [REDACTED]

Just to confirm, there have not been any updates made to this map since we last shared with staff, correct?

Do we know if the issue with [REDACTED] is just in the mapping software or is there potentially a [REDACTED]?

I can explain to staff that we are working to correct the issue with the map but in the meantime ask that they ignore the [REDACTED] if we’ve confirmed that the issue is with the map and [REDACTED] does not exist in the field.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
Hi – Attached is the map. Please note that we are still addressing the area in that shows levees and walls. We are working with USBP to resolve this.

Good Morning,

Thank you again for the assistance with the levee wall photos. Are we still tracking to have an updated map to share with the staff this morning?

Thanks again,
HI – We are working this. Photos are coming shortly. Maps will be in the am.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Staff has asked if we will have something to share tonight. Are we still tracking to have the updated map and pictures for them for this evening?

Thanks again,

Stand by. We’ll get something.

Is there an updated map that reflects that?
From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 3:06:27 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘fleevee map’

The (b) (7)(E) has been removed -

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 2:55 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘fleevee map’

Thanks (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) We’ll send the MR394 map and follow up with USBP.

Appreciate your help,

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:45 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘fleevee map’

– USBP was supposed to answer the (b) (7)(E) requirement question. I would follow up with them. As far as answering (b) (6) question, the second map MR 394 should do it. I would not send the O1_O3 map.

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:27 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: ‘fleevee map’
Removing (b) (6)

You had recently provided, and we shared with the staff the attached maps with the proposed wall and levee wall. Not looking to add to the workload, I can resend either of these maps to the staff, per this new request.

My one question was did we find out why it looks like a [b] (7)(C) in [b] (7)(C) on both of these maps?

Thanks again,

[redacted]

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:09 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: 'flevee map'

Many thanks for getting on the line today. Do you have any good maps of the current or proposed flevee? Apologize if we already have this somewhere. If so, please forward.
Ok, this is a complicated story. I’m going to give you all the details here so that you can decide on a course of action and tell us how we can help.

I received two emails with RGV data (both attached):
Email from [name] on Friday with GIS data and a table – the table information is NOT the same as the GIS data.
Email from [name] today with the same GIS, a table, and a map – the table in this email DOES match the GIS data.

So – attached are maps that show the GIS data and the table from the second email (also shown below). We have no idea on the source of data for table in [name] email. Please don’t use that data.

These maps are not for distribution. They provide a visual of the data for your understanding. If you want maps that you can send out, please let me know and I will reformat with our FOIA, Legend, Date, tracking info, etc.

Here’s what you can see:

Yellow with labels = RGV-proposed alignments highlighted as per the table. The labels are either (b) (7)(E) as in the table.
Green = other RGV-proposed fence locations that are not called out
Green polygons = Federal Land (it’s all National Wildlife Refuge)
Orange = RGV-proposed secondary fence (you can see on page 3 where they realigned O-3, but did not move the secondary to correlate)
Black lines that look like train tracks = levee (start on page 4)
We have also added the Station names and the Zone numbers (they are kind of hard to see).

As with all our PDFs, the data are divided into layers. You can expand the layer menu on the left side, and use the eye icon on and off.

For the record:
(b) (7)(E) O-1
(b) (7)(E) O-2
(b) (7)(E) O-3
Their mileages for these segments match ours.

Again – please don’t redistribute, these maps would qualify as “embarrassing.”
Thanks,

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

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 1:03 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

This data matches what they sent previously, with one exception – they have moved O-1, 2, and 3 BACK to the previously determined alignments.

To recap the O’s:
There was the original planned alignments (2008)
Then work with IBWC and Sector couple years ago adjusted those alignments (these are the ones we have been using).
Data from RGV 2 weeks ago proposed alternate alignments, which they confirmed as accurate during a Friday call between GIS teams,
And then the data share they sent Friday evening moved their proposed alignments back to the IBWC/Sector agreed-on alignments.

That may only make sense to me, but there you have it.

We are creating a map of the information provided below so that you can see it, and use it this week.

Thanks,

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

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 1:03 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Subject: RE: Border Fence

This data matches what they sent previously, with one exception – they have moved O-1, 2, and 3 BACK to the previously determined alignments.

To recap the O’s:
There was the original planned alignments (2008)
Then work with IBWC and Sector couple years ago adjusted those alignments (these are the ones we have been using).
Data from RGV 2 weeks ago proposed alternate alignments, which they confirmed as accurate during a Friday call between GIS teams,
And then the data share they sent Friday evening moved their proposed alignments back to the IBWC/Sector agreed-on alignments.

That may only make sense to me, but there you have it.

We are creating a map of the information provided below so that you can see it, and use it this week.

Thanks,
– See the attached. Can the Baker team lay this GIS info into a map we can look at of RGV quickly on Monday? It doesn’t have to be pretty right away, just viewable.
(b) (7)(E)
For the Hill brief this week on the budget, we need a couple of maps to lay into the slides. That said, they don’t need to have any alignment in them. All we need is:

1. A map of RGV sector that shows the station AORs. We’ll need one map that highlights the border (like the blue line you did for the BIS a couple of weeks back) in Rio Grande City, McAllen and Weslaco AORs. We’ll need a second map that highlights the same, except this time just Rio Grande City AOR. I would use the same map view as you did for the BIS slide you did for me a couple weeks ago on both of these. I’ve attached it as a reminder. We’re going to use it again, so we want to keep the look consistent.

2. We’re also going to need another map of another sector much like the one I described here for RGV. Problem is, I won’t know which other sector and which stations with in the sector until tomorrow morning. As soon as I know, I’ll send a follow up.

If this makes no sense at all because it’s Sunday and yikes…well, we can talk in the AM. We have the first pre-brief of what’s supposed to be a complete deck at 3PM tomorrow, which means we’ll need to lay these slides in by about 130 in order to get them printed and be at RRB in time.

Thanks,

Chief of Staff
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Mobile:
PDF gives a good snapshot of Fridays changes.

We identified a wall/fence that lies in conjunction with the existing levee and also includes the old O1-O3 project. The O1, O2 and O3 project totals and is the only new wall identified in Zones New proposed
Levee wall totals **(b)(7)(E)** miles in Zone **(b)(7)(E)**. The only zone identified for **(b)(7)(E)** is Zone **(b)(7)(E)**, which is the beginning of the floodway and is on the south levee.

*There are additional fencing requirements in the zones identified, however because they do not run in conjunction with the levee, they were not included.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Breakdown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Breakdown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**v/r**

"It is only when we become aware or are reminded that our time is limited that we can channel our energy into truly living"  
- Ludovico Einaudi

---

From: 
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 8:09 PM 
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Border Fence

Ok thanks. Let's get that before 0800 on Monday, please.

Thanks for the good, quick work this afternoon, too.
Sir,

(b) (7)(E) has (b) (7)(E) on the floodway. I don’t have the exact measurement but its roughly (b) (7)(E).

Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

Did we call for any of the areas of (b) (7)(E) to have (b) (7)(E)?

DCPA

Below and attached is the revised document with levee miles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Project/zone</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Levee Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>O-2</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respectfully,

Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." -- Brian Tracy

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2017 5:30 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Subject: Border Fence
Importance: High

DCPA

Below and attached are the Fence mileage broken down by zone. Also attached are the shapefiles to go with the tasker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Project/zone</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
<td>(b) (7)(E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respectfully,

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Operations Officer
RGV Sector/Tactical Infrastructure
(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

"Become the kind of leader that people would follow voluntarily, even if you had no title or position." -- *Brian Tracy*
(b) (7)(E)
I am sure you've seen this but just in case.

All,

Staff appreciated the additional maps and has asked about mitigating environmental impacts.

Specifically, "Given that the barrier is solid concrete on the bottom, and it will be connecting existing segments along the border near wildlife areas, are there any plans to mitigate impact on wildlife in terms of allowing movement across the border?"

Could you please provide a brief response?

Thank you,

Since we are not considering O-2 in the FY17 plan, we don’t have it in that map set. Here is the standalone map.

Thanks,
Thank you, I know this wasn’t an easy undertaking and appreciate you taking the time to highlight the changes. I think these maps will help clarify some confusion for the staff.

Separate from the levee fence/wall, the first two maps include the O-1 and O-3 segments of the non-levee fence. Do you have the map of the highlighted green. Do you have the map of the O-2 segment that we could add?

Thank you,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Attached is the requested map. Please accept apologies for the delay, it took longer to break out the sections than expected.

The attached map shows the following:
The Teal color is the proposed barrier.
The maps highlight the modification in proposed barrier by showing the added sections in highlighted green.
The segment that was removed is the barrier on the south levee in [b](7)(E).

Where the new segment is a part of another segment, we are showing the new segment length in the green box, and the total segment length in the teal box.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks,

[b] (6)

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

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 1:33 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6)
Subject: RE: 'fleevee map'

All –

In speaking with [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) we are producing a new set of maps that clearly show what has changed. We are targeting a 2 pm completion time for those maps.

**I will be heading out soon, so please – contact (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) or (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) in my absence**

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:32 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

[b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Thank you.

Unfortunately, because it was not conveyed to OCA that the “updated map” reflected a change in the USBP requirements, that was not communicated to the staff and so there will be further confusion. Additionally, B1 and C1 briefed the staff and members on a request based on a requirement that included the [b](7)(E). Has this updated requirement been briefed to leadership?

Thank you,

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 12:29 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

– Per our conversation, to discuss the operational requirements, please reach out to [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)

[b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 12:13 PM
To: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C) [b] (6), [b] (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

can you please call me?
Attached, please let me know if you need anything else.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

Thank you — I know folks are working as fast as possible but I was told by the staff that they need a response within the next few minutes. Is there anything we can provide on the mileage or the mileage in if not the whole answer?

Thank you!
Subject: RE: 'fleeve map'

I realize it is 11:59 and you asked for this by noon – know that we are working as fast as we can to get you an update and will send asap.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:39 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘fleeve map’

Thank you!

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 11:38 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘fleeve map’

— we are looking at it now, stay tuned.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 11:16 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

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

Staff has pointed out that the zone project breakdown, attached here, which was provided by Chief Vitiello to accompany USBP’s narrative includes mileage for each zone. This was circulated on March 23 as a getback to a conference call. They are questioning the mileage of [b](7)(E) now that the updated map has eliminated the [b](7)(E). They have also pointed out that the zone project breakdown ends at [b](7)(E) and the map clearly show proposed wall into [b](7)(E).

Can we update this chart or provide them with an accurate mileage breakout by zone? They are working to justify spending in the bill and need to be able to explain where these projects are located. We need to provide staff a response as soon as possible, by Noon the latest.

Thank you,

[Name]

---

From: [b](6), [b](7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 10:32 AM
To: [b](6), [b](7)(C)
Cc: [b](6), [b](7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

Here is a more zoomed in version of that map so hopefully the zones are broken out a bit more clearly for you. Please let me know if you need anything else 😊

[b](6), [b](7)(C)
Business Operations
OFAM / BPAM PMO
[b](6), [b](7)(C)

From: [b](6), [b](7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 10:19 AM
To: [b](6), [b](7)(C)
Cc: [b](6), [b](7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

[b](6), [b](7)(C)
Thank you!

Updated map attached

Ashley, would you have time now to walk through the zones and segments on the RGV section (pg. 72-82) of the attached maps? I’m at

I’m just looking to be able to say to staff existing pedestrian fence is segments and that is “flevee” because they are confused by the labels of pedestrian existing, proposed barrier
and then the labels used in the request.

Thank you,

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 9:24 AM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C), [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C), [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Hi —

Yes to both of your questions.

We will have an updated map by 10 am and [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) cc’d here, is available to walk you through the map labels as well. Please let us know when you are free and what # she can reach you at.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 8:50 AM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C), [b] (6), (b) (7)(C), [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C), [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’
Importance: High

Good Morning All,

Staff has indicated they need to provide their leadership with a response on the appearance of the [b] (7)(E) levee fences in [b] (7)(E) by this morning at 10 am. Have you made any progress with USBP or do we need to elevate this with their leadership this morning?

Additional the staff is very confused regarding the difference between the segment labels and the
zones. Can we walk through the various segments of existing and planned fencing in RGV shown in the attached maps this morning so that we can try and provide some clarity on that front and hopefully avoid a fire drill phone request from the staff?

Thank you,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Ok thanks, that’s helpful to know that it isn’t just an issue with the map.

Thanks,

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

I will defer to [redacted] on what was shared beforehand.

It is not a software issue – we are working through the potential [redacted] with USBP and as soon as
we have it resolved, we will be sure to pass it along.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 1:45 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Hi

Just to confirm, there have not been any updates made to this map since we last shared with staff, correct?

Do we know if the issue with [b] (7) is just in the mapping software or is there potentially a [b] (7) ?
I can explain to staff that we are working to correct the issue with the map but in the meantime ask that they ignore the [b] (7)(E) if we’ve confirmed that the issue is with the map and a [b] (7) (E) does not exist in the field.

Thank you,

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2017 1:37 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Hi – Attached is the map. Please note that we are still addressing the area in [b] (7)(E) that shows levees and walls. We are working with USBP to resolve this.

Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 1:45 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C) [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: ‘flevee map’

Hi

Just to confirm, there have not been any updates made to this map since we last shared with staff, correct?

Do we know if the issue with [b] (7) is just in the mapping software or is there potentially a [b] (7) ?
I can explain to staff that we are working to correct the issue with the map but in the meantime ask that they ignore the [b] (7)(E) if we’ve confirmed that the issue is with the map and a [b] (7) (E) does not exist in the field.

Thank you,
Good Morning,

Thank you again for the assistance with the levee wall photos. Are we still tracking to have an updated map to share with the staff this morning?

Thanks again,

[signature]

Office of Congressional Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

From: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 6:42 PM
To: [b] (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: RE: 'flevee map'

HI – We are working this. Photos are coming shortly. Maps will be in the am.

[signature]
Director, Business Operations Division (Acting)
Border Patrol & Air and Marine Program Management Office
Facilities Management and Engineering
Office of Facilities and Asset Management

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Staff has asked if we will have something to share tonight. Are we still tracking to have the updated map and pictures for them for this evening?

Thanks again,
Thanks We’ll send the MR394 map and follow up with USBP.

Appreciate your help,

---

– USBP was supposed to answer the requirement question. I would follow up with them. As far as answering question, the second map MR 394 should do it. I would not send the O1_O3 map.

---

Removing

You had recently provided, and we shared with the staff the attached maps with the proposed wall and levee wall. Not looking to add to the workload, I can resend either of these maps to the staff, per this new request.

My one question was did we find out why it looks like a on both of these maps?

Thanks again,
From: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 2:09 PM  
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
Subject: 'flevee map'

Many thanks for getting on the line today. Do you have any good maps of the current or proposed flevee? Apologize if we already have this somewhere. If so, please forward.
EAC Kolbe – Please find attached the proposed VPOTUS deck with your changes from this morning. Please note that there are two versions of the same slide in the back-up. This is due to the on-going discussion with OMB regarding the 18 settlement with regard to the San Diego secondary (wall v. steel bollard). We created both and will delete the unnecessary slide once we’ve come to consensus with OMB.

TPs will be coming later this afternoon.

Kathryn,  
No problem. We're on it.  
V/r Karl

Karl, Please take the lead to pull together this briefing for VPOTUS in support of C1. Appreciate if you could get something to our office by 2pm.

Note that C1 only wants a few charts and some talking points. Recommending pulling from the S1 briefing & adding a slide on the migration decline, prepared by BP.

Karla, Appreciate your help with the migration portion of this VPOTUS briefing. Our communications team can support as needed.

VR, KK

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

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Yes. He prefers a few key charts and TPs. He asked the team to pull something succinct together. Can we get something by COB Monday?

VR

From: KOLBE, KATHRYN
Sent: Saturday, May 6, 2017 1:45:39 PM
To: FRIEL, MICHAEL J; BORKOWSKI, MARK S
Cc: VITIELLO, RONALD D (USBP); CALVO, KARL H.; PROVOST, CARLA (USBP)
Subject: FW: VPOTUS - Event for Next Week

Have you reached out to C1 to discuss? We may be able to start with the S1 brief we gave several weeks ago.

VR, KK

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

From: KOLBE, KATHRYN
Sent: Saturday, May 6, 2017 8:30 AM
To: FRIEL, MICHAEL J; BORKOWSKI, MARK S
Cc: VITIELLO, RONALD D (USBP); CALVO, KARL H.; BORKOWSKI, MARK S; PROVOST, CARLA (USBP)
Subject: RE: VPOTUS - Event for Next Week

Received thanks for the heads up – we'll start working it.

Kathryn L. Kolbe
Executive Assistant Commissioner
Enterprise Services
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Wednesday or Thursday is the window we’ve heard.

Thanks for the hard work. When is the brief?

V/R

Good evening,
We were tasked by DHS to prepare a C1 briefing on the Wall and Southwest Border Migration (decline).
The attached and below is provided for your review/approval.
Very respectfully,

Director, Media Division
Office of Public Affairs
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

FY17 Budget

- The bill provides approximately $12.3 billion in appropriated funding for CBP, which is $1.3 billion above the FY 2016 revised enacted level.

- The net increase over FY 2016 is primarily the result of a $772 million increase in border security enhancements, including investments in border security technology, replacement barriers and tactical infrastructure, as well as improvements to CBP’s hiring capabilities, related to the FY 2017 Budget Amendment Request.

- Border security enhancements include:
  - Nearly $300 million for the replacement of 40 miles of outdated or deteriorating fencing with
operationally proven designs. Such designs include concrete-reinforced steel bollard wall with CBP will leverage this funding to enhance operational effectiveness in high priority areas along the Southwest Border. (The levee wall and steel bollard wall designs shown at the press briefing are components of CBP’s existing toolkit.)

- Approximately $150 million funds investment in tactical infrastructure along the Southwest border, to include an enhanced network of U.S. Border Patrol roads and gates to secure critical access points along existing barriers.
- $170 million to accelerate deployment of border security technologies to support U.S. Border Patrol agents and CBP officers in detecting, tracking, identifying, and classifying items of interests along the nation’s borders and at ports of entry.

- These border security enhancements underscore CBP’s commitment to efficient, effective and smart border enforcement by combining the capabilities of a wall, personnel and technology.

- Congress approved DHS and CBP to re-program $20M to commence wall planning and to award the construction of four to eight prototypes. Planning includes use of US Army Corps of Engineers and architecture and engineering support for real estate, environmental and wall design efforts.

- CBP is currently evaluating the locations for the replacement mileage. CBP will deploy existing designs of border barrier based on the operational requirements and terrain at each location.

- The gates will be located along existing barriers, CBP will deploy existing designs of border barrier based on the operational requirements and terrain at each location.

- CBP will deploy additional surveillance systems at high-risk locations along Southwest border to improve situational awareness, rapid response, and agent safety.

### Southwest Border Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAC</td>
<td>6,707</td>
<td>7,349</td>
<td>7,188</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>29,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Units</td>
<td>13,115</td>
<td>15,588</td>
<td>16,139</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>59,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,183</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,213</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,251</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,581</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,196</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,129</strong></td>
<td><strong>210,309</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAC</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Units</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>5,135</td>
<td>3,869</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>20,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,529</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,151</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,175</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,892</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,807</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,404</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,651</strong></td>
<td><strong>76,609</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- CBP saw a 5 percent decrease in individuals apprehended along the Southwest border, as well as those found inadmissible at ports of entry on the Southwest border in April compared to the previous month. This also represents a 68 percent decrease over the same period last year.

- Based on historic trends, CBP expects a seasonal uptick in apprehensions and inadmissibles in the coming summer months.

- In April, a total of 11,129 individuals were apprehended between ports of entry on our Southwest border.
border, compared with 12,193 in March and 18,754 in January. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2016, USBP apprehended 408,870 individuals along our Southwest border, compared to 331,333 in FY15, and 479,371 in FY14.

- In April, a total of 4,651 people presenting themselves at ports of entry on the Southwest border were deemed inadmissible compared to 4,404 in March and 4,807 in February. In FY16, 150,825 were deemed inadmissible compared to 114,486 in FY15 and 90,601 in FY14.

- Since the Administration’s implementation of Executive Orders to enforce immigration laws, the drop in apprehensions shows a marked change in trends.

- As directed in DHS Secretary Kelly's memoranda implementing the President’s executive orders, CBP will remain committed to carrying out fair, impartial and humane enforcement of the nation’s immigration laws. CBP will remain vigilant to respond to any changes in trends, as numbers of illegal crossings typically increase between March and May.

### Border Wall

**RFP/Procurement**

- In response to Executive Order 13767: Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements, CBP is releasing two RFPs to acquire multiple conceptual wall design(s) with the intent to construct multiple prototype(s). Two RFPs will allow CBP to evaluate each design category independently allowing for the best concrete wall designs and the best alternative wall designs for award, construction and evaluation.

- One RFP solicits concepts for reinforced concrete wall designs and the other solicits alternative designs other than reinforced concrete. Proposals that result from both RFPs must meet the minimum U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) requirements as stipulated in the Statements of Work.

- The number of proposals submitted is in the low 100s.

- Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 15.505(f) prohibits us from releasing information regarding bidders and any materials submitted.

- Information about the number and identity of vendors/proposals is competition sensitive as we believe it could compromise the integrity of the procurement process or limit the Government’s ability to ensure we have the best possible proposals from participating vendors. Consequently, we do not make a list of vendors publicly available. Furthermore, the proposals themselves contain information that is proprietary to each vendor and we are legally obligated to protect that proprietary intellectual property. As a result, we cannot release the formal proposals.

- CBP anticipates awarding fixed-price multiple award Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts. An IDIQ is a contracting vehicle that affords the government flexibility in the provision of an indefinite quantity of supplies or services during a fixed period of time.

- The IDIQs will allow for future task-order awards as needed in the areas of wall construction or other tactical infrastructure required by the U.S. Border Patrol along the southwest border. However, the primary intent of the IDIQ contracts is to allow for evaluation of prototype designs from industry which could be used to meet Executive Order 13767.

**Prototypes**

- Prototyping is an industry-tested approach to define the best solution when considering a new product or methodology. Through the construction of prototypes, CBP will partner with industry to identify the best means and methods to construct border wall before making a more substantial investment in construction.

- CBP expects to award multiple contracts for prototype construction in summer 2017 with a 30-day period of performance from issuance of Notice to Proceed. The prototypes will inform the final design standard which will likely continue to evolve to meet USBP’s requirements. Any and all prototypes will be designed to deter illegal entry into the United States.
CBP anticipates constructing 4-8 prototypes in the San Diego Sector Area of Responsibility because of site accessibility to construct and the ability to evaluate wall as part of a larger, existing border infrastructure system. The site selection was based, in large measure, on considerations such as accessibility and the ability to evaluate wall as part of a larger, existing border security system.

Prototypes will be asked to meet minimum specifications for border security. As a result, CBP anticipates that some border wall prototypes may remain in place after construction. However, final determinations will not be made until after prototype construction and evaluation has occurred.

CBP is currently working to refine its prototype estimate. Regarding follow-on costs, CBP is currently working to refine its estimate for up to approximately  miles of wall being considered for initial rate construction. However, any more specific cost estimate information will be considered procurement sensitive.

Design
CBP will leverage the lessons learned from prototype construction to develop a standard border wall design for future construction as part of a border wall system. This standard will be developed collaboratively and will account for Administration priorities, USBP operational requirements, cost effectiveness, constructability and durability.

Several criteria are considered to include durability, constructability, aesthetics, and innovative design are all important considerations in choosing design.

Each wall prototype will be 30 feet long and between approximately 18 and 30 feet high. CBP anticipates initial rate construction to begin subsequent to prototype construction and include up to approximately  additional miles of wall, subject to the availability of funding.

Environmental
CBP has worked with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) on previous border infrastructure projects. These consultations resulted in the development of environmental best management practices which are implemented during project design and construction to reduce potential impacts on wildlife. For example, in order to address the needs and concerns of FWS, Bureau of Land Management, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, and local ranchers, CBP designed and installed a “Game Friendly Fence,” in the Normandy-style vehicle fence that was installed in the Station Area of Responsibility to keep cattle from moving north-south but allowing deer and other large ungulates safe unimpeded passage in key movement corridors.

CBP is currently assessing its options with respect to environmental compliance for prototype construction. At this time, no decisions have been made as to whether CBP.

DHS is committed to responsible environmental stewardship. Thus, as was the case with past projects covered by a waiver, DHS evaluated the potential impacts of the border infrastructure that is planned for the project area. Among other things, DHS performed and reviewed environmental surveys, coordinated with state and federal stakeholders, and analyzed potential impacts.

DHS has concluded that the currently planned prototype project will not result in significant environmental impacts. As a result, for this particular project, DHS is not planning for mitigation. DHS’ commitment to responsible environmental stewardship will be carried forward with the construction of additional border infrastructure.

Land Use
CBP does not anticipate any additional land acquisition will be required to construct wall prototypes. However, until the solicitation process is complete and the prototypes have been selected, CBP cannot rule out the need to acquire additional property or land.

At this early stage, DHS does not know whether it will need to.
Senator Minority Report on Border Wall Cost Estimates

- At this time, any estimates of the total border wall cost are premature as there are many variables that are currently unknown.

- All historical dollar amounts noted in CBP’s briefing to the Hill are associated with costs for legacy fence, acquisitions, U.S. Army Corps of Engineer expenses, etc. from the 2008 time period at specific locations. Costs cannot, and should not be used to extrapolate future cost estimates for other locations.

- The $2.6 billion highlighted in the FY 2018 Budget Blueprint is to assist CBP with a range of investments to support the implementation of the Executive Order on Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements. This figure supports the high priority border security technology and tactical infrastructure, including funding to plan, design and construct the border wall. Specific details will accompany the release of the complete budget in mid-May.

- CBP is taking a measured approach based on the U.S. Border Patrol’s operational requirements and partnering with industry to determine potential border barrier solutions. However, until prototypes are completed and evaluated and design determinations are made, CBP cannot provide a more detailed estimate of the total cost of border barrier system.

Tohono O’odham Nation’s Concerns

- CBP is committed to implementing the President’s Executive Order on border security and immigration enforcement improvements, which directs CBP to construct a border wall, deploy technology and hire additional border agents in order to secure the southwest border. We also remain committed to consulting with the Tohono O’odham Nation regarding CBP’s efforts to secure the border. As we have experienced in border communities such as San Diego, California, Nogales, Arizona, and El Paso, Texas, border security improvements, including physical barriers on the border, have proven to significantly reduce illegal cross border activity in those areas, as measured by arrests and drug seizures.

Rio Grande Valley

Condemnation

- A condemnation action is one in which the federal government literally sues the land; in fact the name (aka "style") of these cases are "United States vs. 1.23 acres situate in XYZ county of Texas." The nature of the matter is such that landowners are referred to as "interested parties," because they are not being sued individually, their interest is in being justly compensated as an outcome of the lawsuit against the property.

- Condemnation at its essence is a three step process:
  - File a "Declaration of Taking" (DT): Once the DT is filed in federal court, and the monies representing the Government's estimate of just compensation are deposited - the Government owns title to the land.
  - Court Issues a "Possession Order": Issuance of a possession order gives the Government permission to use the property, i.e. fence could be constructed at that point - which is usually shortly after the DT is filed.
  - Court Renders a "Final Judgment": This is the final step, and it does not occur until all ownership issues are resolved and just compensation is determined. As stated, all of the final judgments issued to date have been the result of successful settlements with the landowners, not jury trials.

Background on Condemnation during Pedestrian Fence 225 Project

- In order to construct primary pedestrian fence along the southwest border through the Pedestrian Fence 225 (PF225) project, CBP had to execute approximately 400 land acquisitions. Of the 400 acquisitions, 330 condemnations were required.

- Texas’ Rio Grande Valley Sector area of responsibility has had and will continue to have unique real estate acquisition challenges. In order to construct PF225 in RGV, CBP executed
280 land acquisitions, 273 of which required condemnation.

- Most cases in RGV were "adversarial" in that the government and the landowners could not reach agreement on just compensation during negotiations (105 cases) and others were "unopposed" in that the government and landowners reached agreement with respect to just compensation (168 cases), but condemnation was required to clear title issues associated with the property.

- To date, no condemnation actions have resulted in trials; all have been settled before the trial stage of the process was necessary.

- CBP already “owns” the properties over which “open” cases are being litigated. The ongoing litigation is to resolve ownership, just compensation, and what owners receive what portion of that just compensation.

**Complexity of Real Estate in RGV**

- There are distinct reasons why the RGV Sector of Texas carried the majority of the necessary acquisitions and subsequently most of the condemnations:
  - **No “Roosevelt Reservation”:** In the western states (CA, AZ & NM), the government was able to construct within a 60 foot proximity of the border due to a 1907 Executive Order known as the Roosevelt Reservation.
  - **Fence Swath North of the River:** For legal and practical reasons, the fence construction had occurred well north of the river in most instances to bring it out of the 100-year flood plain. This introduced the added complexity of the fence dividing peoples’ property, as CBP decided early on not to acquire the thousands of acres of property left to the riverside of the fence. This was land that owners still derive economic use from, usually through farming. In turn, the government had to provide legal access to their “riverside remainder” property through a series of gates, and the government had to compensate owners for diminished value to their property. These factors associated with the thousands of acres of “riverside remainder” properties, “legal access” led to the “adversarial” nature of the real estate negotiations in many cases.
  - **Public Landownership Records:** Unlike in the majority of the country, land records are notoriously deficient in the counties that make up RGV. Their record keeping system is antiquated, and when records are located by the U.S. Army Corps and contracted title companies have, they inevitably turn out not to be current and accurate. Therefore, the government has no choice but to use the condemnation process to resolve ownership, so the actual owners can receive their proper portion of the total amount of just compensation for the property.
  - **Compressed Timeframe:** Land acquisition for PF225 had a compressed timeframe during which land had to be acquired in order to meet the 12/31/2008 fence construction goal. Under normal circumstances, the government would have taken 2+ years up front to complete land surveys and the detailed investigatory work required to identify and locate unrecorded owners such as heirs of deceased owners whose estates were not properly probated. However, under the circumstances we were compelled to move forward and condemn the land and satisfactorily resolve “actual” ownership after the fact. In doing so, CBP negotiated with “apparent” landowners based on publically available records.

**Recent Declaration of Taking Filed in RGV**

- In January 2017, a letter was sent by the DOJ on behalf of CBP to a woman in Texas. The letter was misinterpreted as an expression of intent that the Government requires their land to construct the new “Border Wall.”

- A recent news article in the Texas Observer reported that Ms., a Texan whose ailing mother, Ms., purportedly owns a small parcel of land with her siblings near the Rio Grande, was informed by the “Declaration of Taking” letter sent by DOJ that her 1.2 acres was worth $2,900.

- In fact, the letter and accompanying documents (including a copy of a “Declaration of Taking”) that Ms. received pertains to an older land condemnation case that is one of over 90 such cases remaining open and unresolved from the initial PF225 land acquisition effort that commenced in 2008.
In other words, this issue concerns land acquisition for old fence, not new fence.

- This matter involves a condemnation action filed in the Southern District of Texas in 2008 for PF225. In this particular instance, fence was never constructed at this location. CBP believes this contributed to Ms. [b] misunderstanding that it was a letter regarding new wall, because there is no standing fence here.

- This portion of planned PF225 fence is one of three fence segments known as segments O-1, O-2 and O-3 in RGV where there is no levee infrastructure. Therefore, the planned fence fell within the 100-year floodplain. By virtue of a 1970 Treaty with Mexico, any construction in the floodplain was precluded without Mexico’s consent due to diversion of flood waters into Mexico when the Rio Grande River rises.

- Land acquisition efforts were subsequently paused and condemnation cases were “stayed” while CBP coordinated with U.S. International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) to establish a new fence alignment that would reduce flood water diversion to near zero. Although CBP later received IBWC concurrence, fence was never constructed in O1-O3 because there was no funding available.

- As has been ongoing for the past several years, DOJ is attempting to resolve the condemnation cases still pending from 2008. To do so, the Government must do its due diligence to identify involved landowners. Identification of landowners in this region of the Texas has proven extremely difficult, as court-held property records have proven notoriously incomplete and incorrect.

- The property acquired by the Government that is at issue here are a perpetual road easement, a temporary access easement, a second temporary access easement, and a third temporary access easement. USACE originally believed this property was owned by the City of Roma and was one large tract. However, upon further research of property records it was found that the property was actually 25 separate parcels, owned by 52 individuals.

- In response to the obvious confusion this was creating between condemnation actions filed in 2008 and any possible future condemnation actions as part of the wall project, per our request, DOJ modified the template for these letters to clarify that the notice is not part of any new wall project and is related to condemnation actions filed in 2008.

- CBP conducts monthly conference calls involving DOJ, OCC, USACE, BPAM, and RGV Sector to continually update stakeholders on the status of the cases and next landowners to be identified. CBP will ensure all appropriate stakeholders are included on the monthly calls.

From: FRIEL, MICHAEL J
Sent: Thursday, May 04, 2017 5:30 PM
To: >
Cc: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: FW: Event for Next Week

FYSA. Will get to work on a package for review by COB tomorrow.
Good afternoon,

We have been asked to plan an event for VPOTUS next week to highlight border security at the White House. Currently, we are looking at CBP apprehension numbers for the month of April and an update on wall RFP followed by a spray and brief VPOTUS and S1 statements. Targeting Wednesday or Thursday next week.

Can you pull together details and talkers for your areas?

Can you provide guidance on messaging?

This is very preliminary at this point, more to follow.

Thanks!

Director of Communications
Department of Homeland Security