

Date: 6/30/2003 1:42 PM

Sender:

To:

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

bcc:

Priority: Normal

Subject: TCA PDT Env. Working Group meeting minutes from 24 June 2003

Please find attached the meeting minutes from the Tucson Sector PDT Environmental Working Group meeting held on 24 June 2003. Also attached is the QA/QC checklist discussed during the meeting. Should you have any questions, comments, or proposed corrections please reply directly back to this e-mail.

<<062403EWG.pdf>> <<062403EWGSignin.pdf>> <<QA QC Check List.doc>>

(b)(6)



062403EWGSignin.
pdf



062403EWG.pdf



QA QC Check
List.doc

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

EA/EIS DOCUMENT QUALITY STANDARD

Subject Area	Area Considered and Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
Cover Sheet Title of Proposed Action, Responsible Agency, Agency Point of Contact, (provide street and email address) and Preparing Organization.						
Signature Page. Include Preparer, Reviewer, and Official Approver. All EIS's shall include an Abstract and Executive Summary						
1.0 Purpose and Need The Purpose and Need statement defines the range of reasonable alternatives. Purpose. Briefly, answer the question, why is the action being purposed. Example: To provide urgent facilities to detain illegal aliens. Need: Briefly answer the question what is the underlying reason (need) for the action. Example: Need to support the enforcement program.						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
1.1 Scope of Project To orient the reader, describe the geographic area (state, county) that will be affected and the scope of the environmental analysis (e.g. cleanup, mission implementation, construction project, realignment etc.)						
1.2 Public Involvement Describe/Document public involvement opportunities and the process followed, such as public notices, NOIs, NOAs, scoping/efforts, Public meetings, news releases and public review of the document, others. Note: The purpose is to inform the public on participation opportunities and document the accomplishment of that fact.						
1.3 Framework for Analysis Identify, in bullet form, all relevant statutes, Executive Orders and applicable regulations. (this sets the stage for conducting the analysis)						
2.0 Description of the Proposed Action Describe the proposed action in sufficient detail for a meaningful analysis. Answer the questions who, what, when and where? Describe the specifics of the proposed action and associated activities. Include drawings, footprints, or other necessary graphics.						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
3.0 Alternatives Considered The alternative determination analysis will be conducted to provide a rigorous, thorough and comprehensive identification of a <i>reasonable</i> range of alternatives. Provide a complete and accurate description of alternatives considered. The narrative must provide a clear choice among alternatives.						
3.1 The alternatives section discusses all alternatives considered including those eliminated from detailed study and providing the specific reasons for their elimination.						
Provide a decision matrix defining alternatives considered, components required to achieve the "purpose and Need" and whether the required components were present in each alternative						
Have the alternatives considered been within the jurisdiction of the agency to implement.						
Does the Alternative Analysis include the "No Action" alternative?						
Does the alternative analysis lead to the identification of a preferred alternative that will meet the Purpose and Need						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
4.0 Affected Environment and Consequences Succinctly, but completely, describe the environment of the area to be affected by resource category, clearly establishing baseline data against which the analysis is conducted. Present the consequences, adverse and beneficial, following each resource category for direct, indirect and cumulative effects as shown in the following guidance. Make concluding impact statements (analysis) which have supporting baseline data described in the resource category. The following list of resources is provided as a checklist to assist the preparer in identifying the relevant resources. Others to be identified by the preparer may also be relevant. The preparer must use professional judgment in determining which resources are relevant to the analysis.						
Organization Example (for each resource area) 4.X Resource 4.X.1 Describe conditions at the project site and in the Region of Influence (ROI). 4.X.2 Consequences Preferred Action Direct effects Indirect effects Cumulative effects Each Alternative Same No Action Same						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
4.1. Land Use Describe project site and contiguous and surrounding land use within the Region of Influence. Community long range plans serve as the baseline for the cumulative effect analysis. This is the geographic setting, land, and air space use. Include recreation areas, parks, conservation areas, prime farmlands, timberlands, etc.						
4.2 Aesthetic and Visual Resources Answer question, how project impacts Street scene, seascape, skyline, or whatever pertinent conditions are. Provide digital photos of project site and adjacent areas.						
4.3 Geology/Soils/Topography Geologic structure, aquifers, seismicity. If discussed provide supporting maps and graphics.						
4.4 Hydrology Drainage, storm water, erosion. If discussed provide supporting maps and graphics.						
4.5 Water Resources Groundwater and Surface water Sources, quantities, quality, availability, uses and rights. If discussed provide supporting maps and graphics. (Note: potable water is treated in the infrastructure section)						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
4.6 Biological Resources						
Vegetation Types of ecosystems (e.g. hardwood forest)						
Wildlife and aquatic resources Mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish management programs if present (hunting, fishing, trapping, etc.)						
Threatened and Endangered Species Federally listed or proposed for listing and critical habitat. If discussed provide supporting maps and graphics.						
Note: Endangered Species Act, Section 7. If the proposed action will potentially impact on critical habitat or threatened/endangered species, the preparer will officially coordinate the proposed action by letter with the US Fish and Wildlife Service, document their response and include the correspondence chain in the Appendix. The affected environment discussion will contain a separate section dealing with this issue, which discuss the results of this coordination. Document the fact if none are present as well.						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
<p>Note: Wetlands, riparian areas, tidelands, navigable waters:</p> <p>If the proposed action will or could impact wetlands, the preparer will coordinate with the appropriate US Army Engineer District to determine if the proposed action affects a regulated wetland or navigable water. The response and chain of correspondence will be included in the Appendix. If these regulated areas are present, appropriate maps and descriptions will be included. The document must distinguish between "wetlands determination" and "wetlands delineation". Determination refers only to nature and type; Delineation refers to specific quantities. State in the "Permits Required" section if a permit is required. If discussed provide supporting maps and graphics.</p>						
<p>Note: Coastal Zone Management</p> <p>The preparer will coordinate with the appropriate state Coastal Zone Management authority to determine if the proposed action is consistent with the approved Coastal Zone development plan. Results of this coordination and chain of correspondence will be included in the Appendix and described the results and conditions in a separate section in the Affected Environment discussion. If discussed provide supporting maps and graphics.</p>						
<p>4.7 Floodplains</p> <p>Describe the floodplain (100 yr, 500 yr), include a map if needed, in the project area, and describe impacts created by the project in the consequences. If discussed provide supporting maps and graphics.</p>						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
4.8 Air Quality Include climate, rainfall, and wind if necessary to conduct air quality or other analysis. Keep climate discussion brief.						
Identify the Air Quality Control Region, and attainment status.						
Describe the ambient conditions, background emission sources, stationary and mobile.						
Note: Let the analysis determine compliance with the State Implementation Plan (SIP). Include a Record of Non-Applicability, if appropriate, in the appropriate Appendix.						
4.9 Noise Existing sources, stationary and mobile, identify applicable codes, ordinances, and management plan. Identify potential noise impacts and the anticipated noise threshold levels from project. If discussed identify noise sensitive receptors with supporting maps and graphics.						
4.10 Cultural Resources Identify historic building, sites and archaeological sites, Native American assets. Include state or tribal resources.						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
Note: In compliance with the NHPA Section 106, coordinate the proposed action and determinations with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Document the results in the text and include the chain of correspondence in the Appendix. Any action, which adversely affects these resources, requires consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) as well. The results of Programmatic Agreements and Memoranda of Agreements will be described in the text and the documents included in the Appendix.						
Note: Determine if Native American (Tribal Preservation Officer) coordination is required. Include the chain of correspondence in the appendix and discuss the process in the text.						
4.11 Infrastructure available Potable water Wastewater Treatment Electric power supply Natural gas supply Fuel oil, coal Solid waste disposal Describe the distance to nearest source, supply capacity, average daily use, alternatives for supply and waste systems, and available capacity to accommodate the proposed action/alternatives.						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
4.13 Roadways/Traffic Describe the roadway network serving the project area. Include existing traffic conditions; discuss levels of operation in accepted units. Evaluate impacts of imposing the traffic increase of the project upon that baseline data.						
4.14 Hazardous Materials Describe storage, handling, use, disposal, contaminated sites and status of cleanup Special Hazards. Asbestos, Radon, Lead-base paints, PCBs, UST and AST, Unexploded Ordnance.						
Note: The requirements of CERCLA, CERFA, FFCA, RCRA, and EO 12088 will be addressed in an Environmental Due Diligence Study. Due diligence requires, at a minimum, preparation of an environmental assessment called a "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment" or simply a "Phase I". If the Phase I study indicates the likely presence of a "recognized environmental condition", a "Phase II" characterization study must also be conducted.						
4.15 Socioeconomic Identify economic Region of Influence (ROI) Demographics should include minority and low-income populations, employment, housing, schools, shops, whatever is relevant in the ROI. Evaluate economic impacts to the ROI generated by implementing the project.						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
4.16 Environmental Justice and Protection of Children EO 12898 Using minority and low-income populations data generated above identify and evaluate disproportionate impacts upon these resources. Evaluate impacts to children, if any.						
4.17 Health and Human Safety Identify and evaluate various stressors potentially affecting health and safety. Document relevant chemical, physical, behavioral, or psychological stressors. Document and evaluate safety and accident hazards.						
4.18 Permits/Regulatory Authorizations Include all permits and authorizations required for implementing, operating, and/or maintaining the proposed action.						
4.19 Sustainability and Greening In accordance with EO 12780, of October 1991, briefly discuss the ability to incorporate sustainability and greening in daily operations. Discussion should be focused on: Solid waste reduction and recycling Methods of energy conservation Source reduction and pollution prevention						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
4.20 Cumulative Impacts This section summarizes overall cumulative effects. Specific cumulative effects have been included with each resource category. Evaluate effects of proposed action/alternatives superimposed on past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Develop data in the Land Use Section that describes past, present and future use of the contiguous areas. Identify land use trends (future) in the project ROI. These data become the baseline for conducting the cumulative impact analysis.						
4.21 Environmental Design Considerations/Mitigation This section shall be developed based on a hierarchy of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applying Best Management Practices (BMP), 2. Avoiding and minimizing, to the maximum extent practicable, impacts to endangered species, wetlands and historic/cultural resources 3. "In Kind" mitigation, (e.g., 9 acres of wetlands will be created to offset destruction of 3 acres by fill material. Note: All mitigation efforts shall be based on industry established BMP's, conservation measures in USFWS Recovery Plans, and recommendations/permit requirements from regulatory agencies.						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
4.22 Comparison/Decision Matrix of Potential Impacts Develop a matrix, setup on "X" and "Y" axis to identify impacts by alternatives, define if temporary or permanent impact, whether impact is insignificant, significant, or beneficial, and mitigation strategy proposed. Note: The matrix should present a clear one-page summary of all alternatives in relation to impact and mitigation. The matrix will combine the facts established in Section 4.20 and 4.21 and present the decision maker with the tools to evaluate the temporary/permanent impacts and all costs, direct and indirect, associated with the alternatives.						
5.0 References This section should provide a bibliographical information of sources cited in the document. Normally only references that can be reasonably obtained by the public are cited.						
6.0 List of Preparers The list of preparers should be diverse enough to ensure a multidiscipline approach to the environmental and socioeconomic analyses.						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Subject Area	Area Considered, Fully Disclosed	Not Considered Relevant to Analysis (Explain in remarks)	Inadequately Disclosed	Not Disclosed	Not Required	Remarks
7.0 List of Individuals and Agencies Consulted List individual names, agencies, and organizations (if any) contacted for data and information in support of the analysis whether or not a response was received. Only contacts outside the preparing agency are listed.						
Appendix: Provide copies of all official correspondence sent or received from resource regulatory agencies for the project or operation.						
Finding of No Significant Impact The FONSI is a separate, brief document, usually no longer than two pages, presenting reasons why the proposed action would not significantly affect the human environment. It documents the decision that an EIS is not required. 1. Name the action 2. Brief description of the selected (preferred) action 3. Brief discussion of likely effects 4. Reasoning behind the determination of no significant effects. 5. Identify avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures implemented for the project.						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

<p>Record of Decision (ROD)</p> <p>Final step in the EIS process. It is a concise public document that sets forth the decision, identifies the alternatives and factors considered, the preferred alternative and any mitigation measures to lessen impacts to the environment. It summarizes major issues and effects balanced by the agency in reaching a decision. The ROD shall be submitted to HQ INS for signature.</p>						
<p>Administrative Record</p> <p>The Administrative Record is the entirety of all written information, including emails and Fax transmittals, obtained, and relied upon during the NEPA process. At the completion of the process, The Administrative Record should be compiled in logical organization and provided to the proponent and/or INS Facilities and Engineering for retention.</p>						

INS
Facilities and Engineering Division
NEPA Quality Standard and Quality Assurance Checklist

Agency Managing Project _____ Identification Number _____ Project Title & Date _____

Document Quality Assurance Checklist		YES	No	Additional Comments/Remarks
1.	Has the INS document format, organization and quality standard have been followed.			
2.	Is each section is specific to the topic and does not mix subjects.			
3.	Was the document prepared with an interdisciplinary team of subject matter experts, as shown in list of preparers.			
4.	Has the document has been edited for one voice, written in layman's language, error free.			
5.	Is subject baseline data sufficient to support analysis/findings statements and the purpose and need for the project.			
6.	Have all conclusions and /findings statements been supported by baseline data and correspondence .			
7.	Has all extraneous data or text been removed from the document.			
8.	Have tutorials been avoided, and only narrative necessary to support analysis has been included.			
9.	Does the document contains sufficient site plans, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping, graphics and digital photos to accurately represent the project site/s and all biologically sensitive areas and wetlands in and immediately adjacent to the project footprint, access roads, and construction support areas.			
10.	Have GIS mapping data, digital photos and Global Positioning Systems (GPS) coordinates used to develop the supporting graphics. Have coordinates and mapping been provided in an electronic format that was previously coordinated with the Facilities and Engineering (F&E) Division GIS administrator.			

Agency Project Manager Signature _____ Date _____

Project Proponent Representative Signature _____ Date _____

DATE: 6/24/03 TIME: 8:30

LOCATION: HDR - Phoenix

INS - US BORDER PATROL BORDER BARRIER PROJECTS
TCA PDT ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP
MEETING CHECK IN AND SIGN IN

TUCSON SECTOR

☐
☐
☐
☐

(b)(6)

NOGALES STATION

☐
☐
☐

(b)(6)

DOUGLAS STATION

☒
☒
☐
☐

(b)(6)

SONOITA STATION

☐

(b)(6)

NACO STATION

☐
☐
☐
☐

(b)(6)

CASA GRANDE STATION

☐

(b)(6)

CONSULTANT TEAM

HDR

☐
☐
☒

(b)(6)

IMC

☐

(b)(6)

BAKER

☐
☐
☐
☐

(b)(6)

GSRC

☒
☐

(b)(6)

Kleinfelder

☐
☐

(b)(6)

BPSCC

☐
☐
☐

(b)(6)

DHS

☒
☒
☒
☐

(b)(6)

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

☐
☒
☒
☒
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐

(b)(6)

IBWC

☐
☐

(b)(6)

JTF-6

☐
☐
☐

(b)(6)

AZ NATIONAL GUARD

☐
☐
☐

(b)(6)

OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

USFS

☐
☐

(b)(6)

OTHER

NAME:

(b)(6)

AFFILIATION:

ADDRESS:

E-MAIL:

PHONE:

FAX:

(b)(6)

DATE: 6/24/03 TIME: 8:30

LOCATION: HDR - Phoenix

INS – US BORDER PATROL BORDER BARRIER PROJECTS
TCA PDT ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP
MEETING CHECK IN AND SIGN IN

NAME: _____
ADDRESS: _____ E-MAIL: _____
PHONE: _____ FAX: _____

NAME: _____ AFFILIATION: _____
ADDRESS: _____ E-MAIL: _____
PHONE: _____ FAX: _____

NAME: _____ AFFILIATION: _____
ADDRESS: _____ E-MAIL: _____
PHONE: _____ FAX: _____

NAME: _____
ADDRESS: _____ E-MAIL: _____
PHONE: _____ FAX: _____

NAME: _____ AFFILIATION: _____
ADDRESS: _____ E-MAIL: _____
PHONE: _____ FAX: _____

**BORDER BARRIER SYSTEM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
TUCSON SECTOR
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
NOGALES, SONOITA, DOUGLAS, AND NACO STATIONS**

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

Due to lack of time, all of the projects listed were not reviewed. The status of these projects, prior to this meeting, in a format created by (b)(6) is attached to these minutes.

SUMMARY OF DHS ACTIVITIES (HQ)

Due to lack of time, all of the projects listed were not reviewed. The status of these projects, prior to this meeting, in a format created by (b)(6) is attached to these minutes.

SUMMARY OF ITEMS TO BE PRESENTED TO THE PDT

Due to lack of time a summary of items to present to the full PDT was not developed

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE
1. Update report names within the AERC data base and forward that information to the EWG	(b)(6)
2. Provide transitional statement within the data base for the Naco-Douglas Corridor Supplemental EA	
3. 8 July 2003 conference call	
4. Review Existing QA/QC Checklist	

NEXT MEETINGS

**8 July 2003 Conference Call – 8:00 mst (11:00 eastern, 10:00 Dallas)
22 July 2003 Prior to the Next PDT - Tucson Station, 8:30 am
19 August 2003 HDR - Phoenix, 8:30 am**

**BORDER BARRIER SYSTEM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
TUCSON SECTOR
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
NOGALES, SONOITA, DOUGLAS, AND NACO STATIONS**

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

Attached: The following was contained in the meeting agenda as backup material.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

The Department of Homeland Security and U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) have created and assembled Border Barrier Project Delivery Teams (PDT) for Tucson Sector. The PDT is tasked with identifying border infrastructure projects that are necessary to allow the USBP to gain and maintain control of the international borders; plan, design and schedule these projects; obtain and manage funding of such projects; and develop priority lists and budgets for future years. The PDT is comprised of representatives from Headquarters, Department of Homeland Security; USBP Stations, Sector and Headquarters; Architect-Engineer Resource Center (AERC); U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and various contractors who specialize in program management and planning, engineering design and construction and environmental issues.

The primary mission of the PDT Environmental Working Group (EWG) is to advise the full PDT in order to ensure that projects are planned and constructed in compliance with all environmental regulations. Principal environmental statutes and regulations that will affect Department of Homeland Security and USBP projects include, but are not limited to:

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969
- Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1970, as amended
- Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1990, as amended
- Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended
- National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966

The guidance and technical advice that is expected from the EWG at both the planning and implementation stages of a project are presented in the following paragraphs.

The EWG will consider the Acts mentioned above and other pertinent regulations, as appropriate, when providing recommendation for project alternatives, estimated costs, and schedules. Engineering designs will be reviewed to identify potential environmental issues (e.g., wetlands, National Historic Districts, etc.) that will need to be considered during subsequent versions of the engineering designs.

MEMBERS & ROLES

**BORDER BARRIER SYSTEM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
TUCSON SECTOR
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
NOGALES, SONOITA, DOUGLAS, AND NACO STATIONS**

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

MEMBERS		ROLE
(b)(6)	DHS Project manager	HQ Updates
	DHS Environmental Representative	Member – HQ Updates
	USBP Tucson Sector Designee	Member
	AERC Project Manager	Chairperson
	DHS Western Region Environmental Representative	Member - Regional Updates
	AERC Environmental Representative	Member - Administrative Record
	AERC Environmental Representative	Member
	JTF-6 Environmental Representative	Member
	GSRC – Environmental Contractor	Member – Summary of PDT & Non-PDT Activities
	HDR – Program Management Contractor	Member - agenda & minutes

The EWG will inform the PDT as early in the planning process as possible, of any major Federal regulations that will require compliance and, more importantly, any major impediments for the project to proceed relative to these regulations. Specific guidance that will be considered include, that is not limited to the following:

- **NEPA.** The EWG will advise the PDT whether a site- or project-specific Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), or Programmatic and

**BORDER BARRIER SYSTEM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
TUCSON SECTOR
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
NOGALES, SONOITA, DOUGLAS, AND NACO STATIONS**

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

Supplemental NEPA documents are appropriate for the project(s) or program(s) being considered by the PDT. The EWG will also assist in the developing the alternatives to be considered, identify potential mitigation requirements and evaluate potential public perception/controversy.

- **CWA.** The EWG will identify potential permitting requirements and schedule for Section 404/401 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) permits for the proposed project(s). The EWG will also identify and recommend alternatives to avoid or minimize impacts to wetlands and identify potential compensation requirements for unavoidable impacts.
- **CAA.** The EWG will identify projects that occur within non-attainment areas, and, where such situations do occur, evaluate the potential requirement for conformity analysis. The EWG will also assist in the identification of potential emission sources and alternatives.
- **ESA.** The EWG will identify potentially affected species and critical habitat that occur within the project region. This should not be construed as site-specific identification; rather the EWG will use available databases to advise the PDT about the protected species that could be encountered. The EWG will also assist in the identification of potential alternatives to avoid adverse effects and advise the PDT about the possible costs, schedules delays, conservation and mitigation measures and anticipated outcome of required Section 7 consultation.
- **NHPA.** The EWG will consult with the PDT regarding the schedule, costs and potential impediments to compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA. The EWG will also assist in the identification of affected Native American Nations and, where appropriate, assist in Federal coordination requirements with the Nations and the State Historic Preservation Office.

EWG MEETING MINUTES

It is imperative that all PDT members remain informed. Sub-sets of the PDT, such as the EWG, meet as necessary to coordinate individual parts of the overall project. Within 3 working days of each meeting minutes are produced that document environmental discussions via e-mail. The e-mail will be distributed to all members of the PDT EWG and to appropriate HQ staff.

**BORDER BARRIER SYSTEM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
TUCSON SECTOR
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
NOGALES, SONOITA, DOUGLAS, AND NACO STATIONS**

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date and Time: 24 June 2003 at 8:30 am

Meeting Location: HDR - Phoenix

Distribution Date: 30 June 2003

Distributor: (b)(6)

Distribution:

(b)(6)

MEETING PURPOSE

PDT EWG Meeting

ATTENDEES

See Attached.

PREVIOUS ACTION ITEMS STATUS

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	STATUS
None		
(Please see NEW ACTION items)		

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

This is the first meeting of the Environmental Working Group (EWG). Focus of this meeting was organization, tracking of documents, updating projects, and development of a forum for discussion and recommendations to the full Project Delivery Team (PDT). Attached to these minutes are the written discussion of the purpose, members, and member roles.

Discussions included the need to prepare comprehensive documents that include all projects associated with an area and the need for a systemic approach.

MEMBERS

**BORDER BARRIER SYSTEM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
TUCSON SECTOR
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
NOGALES, SONOITA, DOUGLAS, AND NACO STATIONS**

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

The table below depicts the revised membership and their roles pursuant to the discussions within the EWG.

MEMBERS		ROLE
(b)(6)	DHS Project manager	HQ Updates
	DHS Environmental Representative	Member – HQ Updates
	USBP Tucson Sector Designee	Member
	USACE Project Manager	Chairperson
	DHS Western Region Environmental Representative	Member - Regional Updates
	AERC Environmental Representative	Member – Environmental Administrative Record – Point of Contact on Future Documents
	AERC Environmental Representative	Member
	JTF-6 Environmental Representative	Member
	GSRC – Environmental Contractor	Member – Summary of PDT & Non-PDT Activities
	HDR – Program Management Contractor	Member - agenda & minutes

**BORDER BARRIER SYSTEM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
TUCSON SECTOR
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
NOGALES, SONOITA, DOUGLAS, AND NACO STATIONS**

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

EWG MEETING MINUTES

EWG meeting minutes and the role of the current environmental updates from GSRC was discussed. Based on these discussions and the desire for a unified document from the EWG the present environmental update produced by GSRC subsequent to each PDT meeting will be forwarded to HDR for inclusion in the EWG meeting minutes.

FLOW PATH AND ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

Per (b)(6) the QA/QC checklist must be filled out on documents transmitted to HQ from AERC or GSRC

Comments from the public have been going to (b)(6) and then forwarded to Fort Worth. POC will be the USACE as the clearinghouse. (b)(6) will serve as POC for TCA PDT documents.

The USACE (b)(6) will be the keeper of the Administrative Record for Environmental Projects.

Major issues that could be controversial should be discussed in a meeting or telephone conference call. E-mails and official comment correspondence should avoid using inflammatory or controversial language or phrases that could be used against the agency in the event litigation occurs.

The DHS HQ should be identified as the lead agency on title page; however, only the POC's phone number and address should be provided, not DHS HQ or RO.

The Project Manager/POC should handle inquiries about NEPA documents from the general public. Inquiries from journalists should be referred to (b)(6) or the HQ BOR PIO. (b)(6) and/or the PIO will coordinate the appropriate response with team members.

(b)(6) suggested that e-mails regarding documents have the title of the document in the subject to facilitate correct responses and increase efficiency.

SUMMARY OF NON-PDT ACTIVITIES (REGIONAL)

Due to lack of time, all of the projects listed were not reviewed. The status of these projects, prior to this meeting, in a format created by (b)(6) is attached to these minutes.

SUMMARY OF PDT ACTIVITIES (INFRASTRUCTURE)

(b)(6) suggested that a note be added, or transitional statement, for the incorporation of the proposed Naco & Douglas EAs in the Naco Douglas Corridor SEA. (b)(6) will update the projects and project titles.

***BORDER BARRIER SYSTEM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
TUCSON SECTOR
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
NOGALES, SONOITA, DOUGLAS, AND NACO STATIONS***

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

SUMMARY OF NON-PDT ACTIVITIES (REGIONAL)

ACTION Number	3	AERC Project Number	225	STATE	AZ
ACTION Type	EIS	DOCUMENT ENV Number			
DOCUMENT TITLE					
PROJECT	EIS and Associated Tasks - USBP Yuma and Tucson Sectors, AZ (DO 007)				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for USBP Yuma and Tucson Sectors				
SUMMARY	Public comment period extended until February 7, 2003				
AERC POC	(b)(6)		DHS REGIONAL POC	(b)(6)	
USACE POC			DHS FAE POC		
CONTRACTOR POC			USBP POC		
CONTRACTOR	Gulf South Research Corporation				
NOI	01-Sep-00				
NOA	11/18/2002				
Scoping	Oct-Nov 2000				
Preliminary Draft	4 preliminary drafts				
Reviewed Date	extended to 14 feb				
DRAFT	<p>During a 22 April 2003 conference call it was decided to issue a revised draft PEIS that only address potential infrastructure in a cumulative manner. GSRC was tasked with preparing a comment resolution letter informing recipients of the USBP's decision. GSRC prepared and submitted a draft resolution letter on May 17, 2003 to (b)(6) for review. (b)(6) will submit the resolution letter the week of June 9, 2003. The revised draft PEIS will be submitted for internal review in mid-July.</p>				
FINAL	The revised draft PEIS should be available for public notice by the 3rd week of August.				
FONSI	N/A				
ROD					

ACTION Number	2	AERC Project Number	255	STATE	AZ
ACTION Type	EA	DOCUMENT ENV Number			
DOCUMENT TITLE					
PROJECT	RVS for USBP Tucson Sector (DO 050)				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Environmental Assessments for RVS sites in Naco, Douglas and Nogales Stations				
SUMMARY	Naco and Douglas: Final EA and FONSI signed 01/07/03. Nogales: Additional biological and cultural resources surveys are required for the access roads to 3 Nogales sites. Waiting for CR clearance from SHPO for Crawford Hill site. Need to modify the contract for separate EA for Crawford Hill and for the 3 access roads.				
AERC POC	(b)(6)		DHS REGIONAL POC	(b)(6)	
USACE POC			DHS FAE POC		
CONTRACTOR POC			USBP POC		
CONTRACTOR	Gulf South Research Corporation				
NOI	N/A				
NOA	Naco (Draft) 10/01/02; Naco (Final) 01/24/03; Crawford Hill (Draft) 10/22/02; Crawford Hill (Final) 11/15/02.				
Scoping	N/A				
Preliminary Draft	Naco-PDEA submitted 07/08/02; Nogales-PDEA submitted 08/13/02; Crawford Hill-PDEA submitted 09/18/02.				
Reviewed Date	Naco-DEA public review from 9/30/02 to 10/30/02; Crawford Hill public review from 10/22/02 to 11/06/02.				
DRAFT	Naco-DEA submitted 09/25/02; Crawford Hill DEA submitted 10/02/02.				
FINAL	Naco-PFEA submitted 11/05/02; Naco-Revised PFEA submitted 11/13/02; Naco-FEA submitted 01/03/03; Crawford Hill-PFEA submitted 10/30/02; Crawford Hill-FEA submitted 11/13/02.				
FONSI	Naco-FONSI signed 01/07/03; Crawford Hill-FONSI signed 11/08/02				
ROD	N/A				

ACTION Number	4	AERC Project Number	497	STATE	AZ
ACTION Type	EA	DOCUMENT ENV Number			
DOCUMENT TITLE					
PROJECT	EA for Rescue Beacons - Tucson/Yuma Sectors				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	EA for placement and operation of rescue beacons to aid in rescue of UDA's who face death or severe dehydration.				
SUMMARY	EA complete for 8 beacons off the Tohono O'odham Nation on BLM, Cabeza Prieta Nat'l Wildlife Refuge, Organ Pipe Cactus Nat'l Monument. 10 Beacons on T.O.N. are being handled under separate EA. The comment period was extended until June 10, 2003. Currently addressing comments and working with the US Fish and Wildlife Service to resolve the BO issue raised by the BLM.				
AERC POC	(b)(6)		DHS REGIONAL POC	(b)(6)	
USACE POC			DHS FAE POC		
CONTRACTOR POC			USBP POC		
CONTRACTOR	Gulf South Research Corporation TO0079				
NOI	N/A				
NOA	5/16/2003				
Scoping	N/A				
Preliminary Draft					
Reviewed Date	extended to June 16, 2003				
DRAFT	The review period ended on June 10, 2003.				
FINAL	The preliminary final EA will be submitted to the client no later than June 17, 2003. The final will be submitted to the client no later than June 23, 2003.				
FONSI	Anticipate the FONSI being signed no later than June 20, 2003.				
ROD	N/A				

ACTION Number	22	AERC Project Number	498/497	STATE	AZ
ACTION Type	EA	DOCUMENT ENV Number			
DOCUMENT TITLE					
PROJECT	Eas are part of Operation Desert Grip II and Rescue Beacons for Tucson/Yuma Sectors				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Preliminary Draft EA for Ten Rescue Beacons and Four Temporary Camp Details on the Tohono O'odham Nation USBP Tucson Sector, AZ				
SUMMARY	This document was separated from the original due to delays on the Nation. To accommodate the other portions of the project, these were separated out.				
AERC POC	(b)(6)		DHS REGIONAL POC	(b)(6)	
USACE POC			DHS FAE POC		
CONTRACTOR POC			USBP POC		
CONTRACTOR			Gulf South Research Corporation		
NOI	N/A				
NOA	Holding due to political problems on the Nation.				
Scoping	NA				
Preliminary Draft	30-May-03				
Reviewed Date	6-Jun-03				
DRAFT	Holding due to political problems on the Nation. This will go to the TON public for five days.				
FINAL					
FONSI					
ROD	NA				

ACTION Number	5	AERC Project Number	499	STATE	AZ
ACTION Type	EA	DOCUMENT ENV Number			
DOCUMENT TITLE					
PROJECT	Temporary USBP Checkpoints on the (b) (7)(E) in the Tucson Sector and Ajo and Casa Grande AO's.				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	EA for placement and operation of three temporary USBP checkpoints on the (b) (7)(E)				
SUMMARY	EA is being completed for four checkpoints (three on the (b) (7)(E) Checkpoints used to identify and apprehend any UDAs or drug traffickers. These checkpoints occur along (b) (7)(E) and County Roads (b) (7)(E) within the (b) (7)(E)				
AERC POC	(b)(6)		DHS REGIONAL POC	(b)(6)	
USACE POC			DHS FAE POC		
CONTRACTOR POC			USBP POC		
CONTRACTOR	Gulf South Research Corporation DACA63-00-D-0004 T.O. (082)				
NOI	N/A				
NOA	On hold until uses issues are resolved on the (b) (7)(E)				
Scoping	N/A				
Preliminary Draft	On hold				
Reviewed Date					
DRAFT	The preliminary draft EA for one temporary checkpoint off the (b) (7)(E) will be submitted for internal review no later than June 16, 2003				
FINAL	Anticipate submitting the draft EA for public review no later than June 30, 2003 for a 30-day public review period.				
FONSI					
ROD	N/A				

ACTION Number 6 AERC Project Number 503 STATE AZ

ACTION Type EA

DOCUMENT ENV Number

DOCUMENT
TITLE

PROJECT

EA/EBS

PROJECT
DESCRIPTION

Nogales BPS

SUMMARY

Draft EA has been submitted for public review. The Phase I ESA is in the draft stage.

AERC POC

N/A at this time

DHS REGIONAL POC

USACE POC

(b)(6)

DHS FAE POC

(b)(6)

CONTRACTOR POC

USBP POC

CONTRACTOR

Gulf South Research Corporation TO0080

NOI

N/A

NOA

Scoping

N/A

Preliminary Draft

Due 12 May 03

Reviewed Date

DRAFT

Public comment period extended to June 30, 2003 by (b)(6) Letters sent by (b)(6) and USACE.

FINAL

FONSI

ROD

N/A

ACTION Number	I	AERC Project Number	51	STATE	AZ
ACTION Type	BA	DOCUMENT ENV Number			
DOCUMENT TITLE					
PROJECT	Biological Assessments for USBP Daily Operations Tucson and Yuma Sectors, AZ (DO 043)				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Biological Assessments for USBP Daily Operations Tucson and Yuma Sectors				
SUMMARY	<p>Yuma Sector BA: Awaiting comments from the USFWS. Tucson Sector BA: Tentative meeting with USFWS set for 24 January 2003 in Phoenix, AZ. Meeting was conducted at the FWS office in Tucson and covered both Biological Assessments. According to (b) (6) we are at the top of the list once they complete the BOs for the military remanded BAs. FWS owes us a letter requesting an extension; (b) (6) will follow up on that letter.</p>				
AERC POC	(b) (6)	DHS REGIONAL POC	(b) (6)		
USACE POC		DHS FAE POC			
CONTRACTOR POC		USBP POC			
CONTRACTOR	Gulf South Research Corporation				
NOI	N/A				
NOA	N/A				
Scoping					
Preliminary Draft					
Reviewed Date					
DRAFT	Yuma--9/27/02; Tucson 10/24/02				
FINAL	<p>The Revised Final BA will be submitted for internal review NLT 6/19/03. Pending Gov't comments, the Revised Final BA should be available for submittal to the USFWS by 3rd wee of July. (b) (6) has not completed the Draft BO for the Yuma Sector as of 6/12/03.</p>				
FONSI	N/A				
ROD	N/A				

ACTION Number	19	AERC Project Number	498	STATE	SW
ACTION Type	EA	DOCUMENT ENV Number			
DOCUMENT TITLE					
PROJECT	EA, Operation Desert Grip II				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Southwest US				
SUMMARY	Draft submitted for 30-day public review. The review period has been extended until June 16, 2003.				
AERC POC	N/A at this time	DHS REGIONAL POC	(b)(6)		
USACE POC	(b)(6)	DHS FAE POC			
CONTRACTOR POC		USBP POC			
CONTRACTOR	Gulf South Research Corporation TO0078				
NOI	N/A				
NOA					
Scoping	N/A				
Preliminary Draft					
Reviewed Date					
DRAFT	Public comment extended to 6/16/2003				
FINAL	Anticipate submitting a preliminary final for internal review no later than June 30, 2003.				
FONSI					
ROD	N/A				

***BORDER BARRIER SYSTEM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
TUCSON SECTOR
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
NOGALES, SONOITA, DOUGLAS, AND NACO STATIONS***

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

SUMMARY OF PDT ACTIVITIES (INFRASTRUCTURE)

ACTION Number	7	AERC Project Number	218	STATE	AZ
ACTION Type	EA	DOCUMENT ENV Number			
DOCUMENT TITLE					
PROJECT	Environmental Assessment for 31-mile Enforcement Zone Infrastructure System, Naco, AZ (INS AERC--GSA Contract Order No. DACA63-02-F-0005)				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Environmental Assessment to address implementation of a 31-mile border enforcement system through a combination of infrastructure components (roads, fences and lights)				
SUMMARY	Technical review and coordination. Project being coordinated through the Tucson PDT. Comments to the Preliminary Draft have been provided. Public scoping meeting held 18 November 2002. PDT decided, based on guidance from HQ, to combine Naco and Douglas into a Supplemental EA for the Naco-Douglas Corridor. Draft SEA was distributed for public review on 7 Feb 03; comment period was extended from 7 May to 30 June. BA needs to be initiated.				
AERC POC	N/A at this time	DHS REGIONAL POC	(b) (6)		
USACE POC	(b) (6)	DHS FAE POC	(b) (6)		
CONTRACTOR POC	(b) (6)	USBP POC	(b) (6)		
CONTRACTOR	Gulf South Research Corporation				
NOI	N/A				
NOA	5/7/2003				
Scoping					
Preliminary Draft	Naco-Douglas EAs combined into one; Due 3-12-03				
Reviewed Date	PDEA 3/13/03 to 3/26/03; DSEA released 5/72003				
DRAFT	Public Review Extended to June 30, 2003 by (b) (6) Letter sent by (b) (6) and USACE				
FINAL	PFEA 7/10/03 FEA 8/04/03				
FONSI	Expected around 8/20/03				
ROD	N/A				

ACTION Number	20	AERC Project Number	255	STATE	AZ
ACTION Type	E	DOCUMENT ENV Number			
DOCUMENT TITLE					
PROJECT	Nogales Infrastructure Improvements (INS AERC--GSA Contract Order No. DACA63-02-F-0207)				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Environmental Assesment for RVS sites, 1 mile of pedestrian fence, 2 miles of patrol roads and the continued use of 60 portable lights				
SUMMARY	Draft EA submitted for public comment on May 9, comment period extended to 30 June,				
AERC POC	(b) (6)	DHS REGIONAL POC	(b) (6)		
USACE POC		DHS FAE POC			
CONTRACTOR POC		USBP POC			
CONTRACTOR	Gulf South Research Corporation				
(b) (7)(E)	N/A				
(b) (7)(E)	Nogales Draft 5/9/03				
Scoping	N/A				
Preliminary Draft	25-Apr-03				
Reviewed Date	2-May-03				
DRAFT	9-May-03				
FINAL	Awaiting comments from public review				
FONSI					
ROD	N/A				

***BORDER BARRIER SYSTEM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
TUCSON SECTOR
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION
NOGALES, SONOITA, DOUGLAS, AND NACO STATIONS***

ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING GROUP

SUMMARY OF DHS ACTIVITIES (HQ)

None were presented, as this was the first meeting of the EWG. Time constraints prevent a full discussion of these items.