



# Reimbursable Fee Agreements

Fourth Semiannual

*June 23, 2015*

Fiscal Year 2015 Report to Congress



Homeland  
Security

*U.S. Customs and Border Protection*

# Message from the Deputy Commissioner of CBP

June 23, 2015

I am pleased to present the following report, "Reimbursable Fee Agreements," which has been prepared by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP).



The report has been compiled pursuant to Section 560 of Division D of the *Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013* (P.L. 113-6) and accompanying Senate Report 112-169. This is the fourth semiannual response to the requirements. This report discusses the procedures that CBP implemented after selection of the five partners for reimbursable fee agreements and the steps CBP took subsequent to the December 31, 2013 deadline to implement the five executed agreements. It also discusses the measures taken to fully implement the program and provides an overview of program activity as of December 31, 2014.

Pursuant to congressional requirements, this report is being provided to the following Members of Congress:

The Honorable John R. Carter  
Chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Lucille Roybal-Allard  
Ranking Member, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

The Honorable John Hoeven  
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen  
Ranking Member, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security

I would be pleased to respond to any questions you may have. Please do not hesitate to contact my office at (202) 344-2001 or the Department's Chief Financial Officer, Chip Fulghum, at (202) 447-5751.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. McAleenan', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Kevin K. McAleenan  
Deputy Commissioner  
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

# Executive Summary

Section 560 of the *Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013* (P.L. 113-6) authorized the Commissioner of CBP to enter into five reimbursable fee agreements for certain CBP services by December 31, 2013. The entities selected for these partnerships are: Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport (DFW); City of El Paso, Texas; South Texas Assets Consortium; City of Houston Airport System (HAS); and Miami-Dade County. All agreements were finalized by the statutory deadline. CBP implemented a “soft” launch at DFW on December 21, 2013, and full implementation at all locations began on January 26, 2014.

Program impacts have been positive overall. Through December 2014, CBP was able to provide an additional 18,400 CBP officer assignments at the request of Section 560 partners, which resulted in primary lanes and booths being open for an additional 52,500 hours and CBP being reimbursed \$6 million in costs associated with the provision of those CBP services.

The authority granted by Section 560 complements CBP’s broader Office of Field Operations Resource Optimization Strategy as it identifies alternate funding sources to support enhanced services at U.S. ports of entry (POEs). Over the past several years, CBP has seen record increases in passenger and cargo volumes, which have quickly outpaced its ability to sufficiently staff POEs. CBP has also seen an increase in requests for additional CBP services that have the potential for significant economic benefit; however, the increased requests place an even greater demand on resources. This program allows stakeholders to request the increased level of service they desire CBP to provide through a reimbursable fee agreement, which CBP will then consider.

The reimbursable fee agreements authorized under Section 560 allow CBP to staff workload increases and accommodate requests for additional services necessary to effectively secure the Nation’s borders, enforce federal immigration and drug laws, and facilitate legitimate trade and travel. Additionally, CBP understands the importance of transparency in this program and is monitoring its implementation against performance measures, such as comparing baseline processing rates at participating POEs from previous years to the processing rates during time periods when reimbursable services under this program are provided.



# Reimbursable Fee Agreements Fourth Semiannual Report

## Table of Contents

I.	Legislative Language.....	1
II.	Background .....	2
III.	Data Report.....	3
A.	Notifications.....	3
B.	Requests Received.....	4
C.	Selection Process .....	4
D.	Implementation .....	6
E.	Current Status.....	8
F.	Congressional Notification and Ongoing Reporting.....	13
IV.	Conclusion.....	15
V.	Appendix: List of Acronyms.....	16

# I. Legislative Language

This document was compiled pursuant to the language set forth in Senate Report 112-169 accompanying the *Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013* (P.L. 113-6).

Senate Report 112-169 states:

CBP shall provide semiannual reports to the Committee on each request received, the reasons for its approval or denial, the anticipated and actual revenue received, and the service provided, including number of CBP officers funded.

## II. Background

Section 560 of P.L. 113-6 authorized the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to enter into no more than five reimbursable fee agreements for certain CBP services upon the request of an interested party. Such agreements may not be used to perform services outside of the United States and may only cover a period of up to 5 years. The agreements may be used to provide new CBP services at locations not currently serviced by CBP or to enhance CBP services at locations where such services are already provided. However, in already existing CBP-serviced air ports of entry (POEs), the agreement can only provide for the payment of overtime services. In addition, Section 560 agreements may cover customs- and immigration inspection-related services; however, these agreements cannot be used to reimburse CBP for any agriculture-related services.

Reimbursable fee agreements are an example of public-private partnerships that were developed as part of CBP Office of Field Operations' (OFO) Resource Optimization Strategy at Ports of Entry, originally submitted to Congress on April 10, 2013. The Resource Optimization Strategy at Ports of Entry was designed to address the increased demands on CBP's existing resources and enhance services to interested stakeholders in all of CBP's operational environments. These partnerships represent a "win-win" option as they help CBP carry out its national security mission, while at the same time helping private and public entities develop new opportunities to expedite the legitimate flow of people and goods, which is vital to the U.S. economy.

### III. Data Report

The following data section discusses OFO's efforts, as of December 31, 2014, to implement this authority and comply with all of the legislative requirements.

#### A. Notifications

On May 7, 2013, a public notice with general information about Section 560 of P.L. 113-6 was published on [www.cbp.gov](http://www.cbp.gov), inviting interested parties to submit a request for consideration to be selected as one of five reimbursable service agreements.

On May 7, 2013, the CBP Office of Congressional Affairs sent an email regarding CBP's public notice to the following Congressional Committees:

- Senate Committee on Appropriations;
- House Committee on Appropriations;
- Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs;
- House Committee on Homeland Security;
- Senate Committee on Finance;
- House Committee on Ways and Means;
- Senate Judiciary Committee; and
- House Judiciary Committee.

On that same day, the Office of Congressional Affairs also reached out to Congressional offices that either: (1) had constituents who were requesting consideration under Section 560; or (2) had previously contacted CBP regarding its authority under Section 560 to advise them of CBP's public notice.

On May 9, 2013, the CBP Office of Trade Relations notified its public trade stakeholders of CBP's authority under Section 560 of the Act with a brief statement and a link to the public notification on [www.cbp.gov](http://www.cbp.gov).

On May 21, 2013, with the assistance of the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, CBP provided notification of this authority to state, local, and tribal stakeholders.

Periodically and upon request, OFO, through the Office of Congressional Affairs, provided program status updates to Congressional Committees and individual Member offices, including a formal briefing to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on October 24, 2013 and briefing the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee staff on September 30, 2014.

## B. Requests Received

On May 3, 2013, CBP established a dedicated email address devoted to receiving stakeholder inquiries and requests to enter into reimbursable service agreements. The email address was provided during CBP's stakeholder outreach initiatives and displayed prominently on the public-facing [www.cbp.gov](http://www.cbp.gov) website. Applicants were instructed to submit requests for consideration not later than May 31, 2013, along with a detailed description of the request.

At the close of the application process, CBP received requests for services from 16 interested parties. Those applicants, in the order in which the requests were received, were:

- Melbourne (Florida) International Airport;
- City of El Paso, Texas;
- Miami-Dade County (a joint proposal between Miami-Dade Aviation Department and Port Miami);
- Cruise Maine USA (on behalf of the Maine Port Authority);
- Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport (DFW);
- Jay Peak Resort Vermont;
- State of Hawaii Department of Transportation;
- Broward County, Florida (a joint proposal between Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood International Airport and Port Everglades);
- City of Houston Airport System (HAS);
- Gavin de Becker & Associates, Inc. (manages a VIP suite at Los Angeles International Airport);
- South Texas Assets Consortium (STAC);
- Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport;
- Vermont Agency of Transportation;
- Aircraft Service International Group (ground handling service provider at John F. Kennedy International Airport);
- Signature Flight Support (for Van Nuys Airport in Los Angeles); and
- Chicago Department of Aviation.

## C. Selection Process

In early June 2013, CBP convened a panel of senior OFO Field and Headquarters managers, in addition to advisors from various CBP offices. These officials were selected based on their extensive knowledge of CBP operations in diverse operational environments, their management experience in administration of programs with external

partners, and their proven capacity for sound judgment. The panel ranked each applicant's submission using a combination of both objective and carefully vetted decision criteria and each panel member's subject matter expertise. The decision criteria were developed to assess the benefits of each proposal to CBP, the requesting parties, and the surrounding communities. The criteria included the following factors:

- Potential impact on current CBP operations;
- Existence of a viable funding source;
- Community concerns;
- Health and safety issues;
- Ability to receive support from other government agencies;
- Community and economic benefits;
- Feasibility of instituting the request in a timely manner; and
- Representation of each modal environment.

On July 8, 2013, the panel presented its final recommendations of the five highest rated requests for review and concurrence by CBP's Acting Commissioner at the time. The recommendations were accepted and CBP sent notifications of its tentative selections on August 2, 2013. Each applicant received a letter apprising them of their status. Non-selectees were made aware that if any of the tentatively selected parties removed themselves from consideration, or if it were determined that an agreement could not be reached between CBP and one of the tentative selectees, CBP would seek to enter into an agreement with the next most highly ranked party on the list of applicants. This would enable CBP to maximize the benefits of Section 560 by entering into the five agreements authorized by the law.

For these reasons, the five selections remained tentative and subject to change if circumstances affected a location's suitability for this program at any point before the signing of agreements. The tentative selectees, in no particular order, were:

- DFW;
- City of El Paso, Texas;
- STAC;
- HAS; and
- Miami-Dade County.

Each of the five selectees proposed plans to use CBP's reimbursable service agreement authority to increase CBP officer overtime assignments either at the primary inspection booths in air POEs or at the primary pedestrian/vehicle lanes at land POEs.

On December 19, 2013, CBP's then-Acting Commissioner held a signing ceremony at CBP Headquarters along with representatives of each of the five signatory partners, formally finalizing their selections and executing the reimbursable service agreements.

## D. Implementation

On August 12, 2013, CBP implemented an Integrated Project Team (IPT) from among various CBP offices including the Office of Chief Counsel, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Administration, Office of Information and Technology, Office of Public Affairs, as well as OFO's directorates of Mission Support; Operations; and Planning, Program Analysis, and Evaluations. The IPT was created to bring each agreement to fruition and ensure that the commensurate administrative and technological CBP infrastructures are developed in support of the program. The IPT was also charged with providing the metrics necessary to monitor the operational impact at each location, implementing administrative mechanisms to provide program overtime and staffing management oversight, and developing a new billing and collections model to meet CBP and selectee needs. CBP has also designated a team of OFO liaisons at each respective Field Office to assist in the implementation and maintenance of the program over its five-year duration.

CBP also developed protocols with the selectees to guide the local implementation of this program, including establishing daily or weekly meetings to discuss baseline levels of service at each affected POE and to develop plans for implementing this program. Baseline data represented the levels of service provided by CBP at each location over the previous fiscal year and provided a frame of reference for the stakeholders regarding CBP resource availability, workload volumes, and peak workload hours where supplemental overtime funding could be most effectively applied. In late August 2013, CBP management from the affected field offices began conducting these meetings with the tentative selectees. This effort provides the stakeholders with an opportunity to identify the most appropriate days, times, and events to request increased levels of services in order to maximize the program's effectiveness and best meet the stakeholders' needs.

Understanding the significance of transparency for this program, CBP provided unprecedented levels of disclosure to its program partners, including wait time analysis of passenger composition breakdowns and commensurate staffing availability. These ongoing efforts will not only continue to be critical for both parties in identifying where increased services may be applied, but exemplifies CBP's commitment to the partnership principle of the program.

Stakeholders may request reimbursable services from CBP electronically via program mailboxes established for each participating POE. CBP reviews each request and, based on the availability of resources and impact on overall operations, determines whether it

may accommodate the request. Procedures are also in place to address ad hoc or urgent requests that arise outside of the more routine requests received through the regularly established meetings described above.

## **1. Billing and Hours**

CBP's Office of Administration and Office of Information and Technology have created exclusive system codes to track all CBP officer hours assigned and worked under this program. CBP also implemented an electronic billing and collections process wherein invoices are transmitted to the stakeholders after each billing activity cycle (two pay periods) via the U.S. Department of the Treasury's "Pay.gov" system. Remittances are transferred electronically by the stakeholders into a dedicated CBP account.

In addition, metrics reports coinciding with each billing activity cycle are produced by CBP and provided to each stakeholder showing how the additional service hours requested were applied and the costs for those hours. Each cycle report contains a series of standardized measurements to demonstrate the comparative impact of the requested services, such as wait time reductions, increased volume throughput, new or increased workload resulting from the program, and any other impacts in the operational areas where appropriate (e.g., secondary processing, baggage control, egress/exit points, etc.).

## **2. Standard Operating Procedures**

OFO established standard operating procedures to ensure that all participating POEs maintain uniform guidelines and procedures for the management and execution of the reimbursable fee agreements within OFO for requesting, tracking, and reporting of Section 560 assignments.

In addition, OFO deployed a centralized Section 560 Work Ticket Log on an internal CBP secure website that allows program managers at CBP Headquarters to review and extract work ticket data input by CBP staff at the POEs in real time. CBP also performs weekly and billing cycle-end audits to validate Section 560 overtime work ticket data against headquarters billing systems.

As a new agency program, a training regime was developed by the IPT for the CBP field office and POE managers overseeing and operating the program. The team traveled to each location to deliver the program training through the month of January 2014.

CBP implemented a soft launch at DFW on December 21, 2013. Full implementation at all locations began on January 26, 2014. Since that time, OFO has been working with field operators and headquarters administrative support offices to update the standard operating procedures as efficiencies and "lessons learned" have been identified to improve program management.

## E. Current Status

To align CBP's requirement for timely reimbursement of program costs with the program metrics reporting, CBP designed the program billing and reporting cycles to cover two federal pay periods. For example, the first activity cycle covered Calendar Year 2013 Pay Periods 25-26 (December 15, 2013–January 11, 2014); and the second activity cycle covered Calendar Year 2014 Pay Periods 01-02 (January 12–February 8, 2014).

Electronic bills (e-bills) are sent to the stakeholders two weeks after the end of a cycle, which equals the time required to complete the administrative processing of the relevant CBP payroll functions. The individual metrics reports are provided to each stakeholder along with the e-bills. Each stakeholder has 15 days to remit its payment to CBP via Pay.gov. Failure to remit timely payments may result in denial of additional service requests, termination of the agreement, or may subject the stakeholder to certain non-contractual remedies for non-payment in the form of a penalty and interest assessments.

If an entity does not request reimbursable services within an activity cycle, CBP will not generate an e-bill or a metrics report for that stakeholder. Further, with respect to stakeholder reporting, the impact of reimbursable services will typically be proportionate to the level of additional services requested. For example, if a stakeholder submits only a single request for additional services on one day in the four-week billing cycle, there will likely not be a measurable impact to processing rates related to the program as compared to the processing rates during the same timeframe in the year prior to the provision of reimbursable services.

To date, all requested services under the reimbursable fee agreements have been for processing by CBP officers on an overtime basis; there have been no requests to fund additional officers under any other cost structure (e.g., permanent positions or temporary duty assignments including travel).

Table 1 overviews the total Section 560 reimbursable costs, bills issued, assignments, and hours provided by CBP to each stakeholder based on their requests over the first year of the program.

**Table 1**  
**Section 560 Financial Reimbursement and Utilization Summary of Overtime Hours Provided**  
**(December 21, 2013-December 13, 2014)**

<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Total Reimbursed</b>	<b>Total 560 Bills Issued<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Total 560 Overtime Hours Provided</b>	<b>Total Overtime Assignments</b>
DFW	\$2,279,736.64	13	19,085	4,918
City of El Paso, Texas	\$982,173.36	12	9,584.5	3,251
Miami-Dade County	\$1,557,546.40	12	13,665.25	5,848
HAS	\$1,152,950.68	7	9,021	4,143
STAC	\$125,225.42	6	1,178.5	247
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,097,632.50</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>52,534.25</b>	<b>18,407</b>

## 1. Section 560 Program Summaries

### Dallas/Fort-Worth International Airport

DFW was the first stakeholder to begin requesting Section 560 overtime assignments in December 2013, and maintains the highest rate of usage among Section 560 members. DFW’s requests focus on primary processing positions, but it has also requested other services such as those for positions in secondary, egress (exit control), and supervisors for services provided after hours.

Program metrics reporting for the period of December 2013 through December 2014, as compared to the same time period last year, indicated that at DFW<sup>2</sup>:

- Passenger volume increased by 11 percent;
- Arriving flights increased by 4 percent;
- Average wait time decreased by 44 percent; and
- Flights processed in less than 60 minutes increased by 18 percent.

### Houston Airport System for George Bush Intercontinental Airport

HAS began requesting Section 560 overtime services in March 2014, and has steadily increased its rate of requests for usage by December 2014.

<sup>1</sup> This report consists of 13 billable periods; stakeholders were not sent bills during periods when they did not request reimbursable services.

<sup>2</sup> DFW deployed the Automated Passport Control (APC) kiosks in late October 2013 and implemented other passenger processing efficiency initiatives, such as “One Stop” and “Express Connect” in addition to its participation in the 560 program.

Program metrics reporting for the period of March 2014 through December 2014, as compared to the same time period in 2013, indicated that for HAS<sup>3</sup>:

- Passenger volume increased by 13 percent;
- Arriving flights increased by 3 percent;
- Average wait time decreased by 26 percent; and
- Flights processed in less than 60 minutes increased by 4 percent.

#### Miami-Dade County for Miami-Aviation Department

Miami-Dade County for the Miami-Aviation Department originally submitted a single request in January 2014, but since has increased Section 560 usage between Terminals D (or North) and J (or South) with the majority of reimbursable services being requested for Terminal D.

Program metrics reporting for the period of January 2014 through December 2014, as compared to the same time period in 2013, indicated that at Miami International Airport<sup>4</sup>:

- Passenger volume increased by 5 percent in Terminal J, and by 1 percent in Terminal D;
- Arriving flights decreased by 4 percent in Terminal J, and increased by 2 percent in Terminal D;
- Average wait time decreased by 19 percent in Terminal J, and by 22 percent in Terminal D;
- Total flights processed in less than 60 minutes increased by 11 percent.

#### Miami Seaport

The port authority at Miami Seaport began requesting Section 560 services in October 2014 to process passengers and crew members aboard a casino/cruise vessel that travels to Bimini in the Bahamas several times each week, arriving at Miami Seaport at a time when CBP personnel are typically ending work shifts.

Program metrics reporting for the period of October 2014 through December 2014 for the Miami Seaport show that:

- The vessel was processed 25 times with hours requested and fulfilled by Section 560 services; and
- 4,399 passengers and 452 crew members were processed.

---

<sup>3</sup> HAS deployed 20 APC kiosks in 2013, and implemented other passenger processing efficiency initiatives such as “One Stop” and “Express Connect” in addition to its participation in the 560 program.

<sup>4</sup> Miami-Dade County for the Miami-Aviation Department deployed 30 APC kiosks in Terminal D (North) in December 2013. Six APC kiosks were deployed in Terminal J (South) in May 2014.



### The City of El Paso, Texas

The City of El Paso, Texas, requested recurring Section 560 daily assignments in January 2014<sup>5</sup> at the Paso Del Norte and Ysleta bridges in support of three processing modes: Pedestrians, Commercial vehicles (COVs), and Private/Non-commercial vehicles (POVs).

Program metrics reporting for the period of January 2014 through December 2014, as compared to the same time period in 2013, indicated that overall at the two Port of El Paso bridges:

- POV volume increased by 21 percent, and Passengers increased by 14 percent;
  - Wait times increased by 11 percent overall, but decreased by 12 percent during 560 hours;
- Pedestrian volume increased by 14 percent,
  - Wait times increased by 11 percent overall, but decreased by 42 percent during 560 hours;
- COV volume increased by 4 percent, while average wait time decreased by 9 percent;
  - 1.6 percent of COV volume was processed during 560 hours.

### South Texas Assets Consortium

The majority of the 240 reimbursable hours requested in 2014 were for bridges under the Hidalgo/Pharr Area POE, specifically at the Pharr and Anzalduas bridges for certain holidays, such as the Easter Holy Week. A single service request at Rio Grande City was for COV traffic only. To date, the CBP Port Director at Rio Grande City has denied three of STAC's Section 560 requests for services at the Rio Grande City Bridge. The reimbursable requests were for CBP customs inspection-related services, but the nature of the commercial shipments also necessitated the presence of a CBP agriculture specialist. These requests were denied because the POE did not have an agriculture specialist available to complete the desired commercial processing.

To date, no requests for Section 560 services have been received for the bridges in Laredo or Cameron County (Brownsville).

## **2. Factors Impacting 560 Results**

Generally, processing wait times have decreased overall at locations that have utilized 560 reimbursable hours in concentrated areas. However, there were extenuating factors that impacted positive processing results at certain locations. For example, significantly

---

<sup>5</sup> The City's request extended CBP's "All Lanes Initiative" for private vehicles only on certain days based on the City's own program budget, and also split budgeted hours to include processing at commercial lanes and for pedestrians.

increased flight and passenger volume impacted operations at the air POEs during busy seasonal travel seasons (Spring Break, World Cup and summer travel, and the winter holidays). Although certain timeframes are traditionally known for increased workload, these episodes consequently result in extended increased processing times.

Land border POEs also experienced increased workloads and processing times during peak travel periods, such as the Easter Holy Week, Cinco de Mayo, and the Mexican Labor Day. Other unplanned factors also impacted port operations, such as the influx of unaccompanied minors, family units, and migrants seeking asylum arriving at the border, particularly in South Texas.

### **3. Reimbursable Services Program Overview for 2015**

The *Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014* (P.L. 113-76) expanded CBP's reimbursable authority under Section 559 of Division F to allow for new reimbursable services agreements at U.S. POEs, as well as broadened the authority to include agriculture and border security services. On March 31, 2014, CBP announced the open application season for parties interested in entering into a reimbursable services agreement under this new authority, after which CBP received 25 applications, including one from STAC.

STAC applied to enter into a Section 559 agreement with CBP specifically to meet its interests in requesting additional agriculture services from CBP's Agriculture Specialists, which was not possible under the Section 560 authority and the leading cause for its limited and sporadic usage of the program. On December 23, 2014, the Commissioner of CBP and STAC entered into a new Section 559 reimbursable services agreement, which supplanted its Section 560 agreement and all its annexes.

As a result, CBP's reimbursable service program reporting as required in the Senate Report 112-169 will no longer include STAC. STAC will be included under reporting as required by Section 559 of the *Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014*.

## **F. Congressional Notification and Ongoing Reporting**

Section 560(h) of Section D of P.L. 113-6 requires CBP to notify the following Congressional committees at least 15 days prior to finalizing any agreement:

- Senate Committee on Appropriations;
- House Committee on Appropriations;
- Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs;
- House Committee on Homeland Security;
- Senate Committee on Finance;
- House Committee on Ways and Means;

- Senate Judiciary Committee; and
- House Judiciary Committee.

On December 4, 2013, the CBP Office of Congressional Affairs notified these Congressional Committees of CBP's intentions to enter into reimbursable service agreements under Section 560 with the selected partners and provided copies of each agreement to be signed.

On December 30, 2013, CBP submitted the first semiannual report on "Reimbursable Fee Agreements" to the Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees on Homeland Security. The second and third semiannual reports have been submitted as well.

CBP will continue to provide courtesy updates to the above-listed Congressional committees and interested Member offices – specifically those offices with constituents who represent Section 560 stakeholders and those Members who previously contacted CBP regarding this authority.

## IV. Conclusion

CBP faces an increasingly complex and expanding mission. It continues to see record increases in passenger and cargo volumes, which are outpacing its ability to staff POEs sufficiently and are increasing wait times. Requests for increased services have the potential to provide significant economic benefits, but will ultimately place even greater demands on CBP services. Reimbursable service agreements are a tool to assist CBP and public or private entities in addressing these increasing demands by making resources more readily available where they are greatly needed.

OFO has developed appropriate metrics for analyzing staffing needs based on each stakeholder's desired level of service under this program and is also reporting metrics on the reimbursable services after each billing cycle when services are requested. OFO will continue to refine these processes as the program matures over the fiscal years, particularly with the expansion of CBP's reimbursable services program under Section 559 of Division F of the *Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014* (P.L. 113-76) that added 16 new agreements, including STAC's transfer out of Section 560.

CBP looks forward to providing ongoing updates and briefings to any interested Members or Committees of Congress.

## V. Appendix: List of Acronyms

<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>APC</b>	Automated Passport Control
<b>CBP</b>	U.S. Customs and Border Protection
<b>COV</b>	Commercial Vehicles
<b>DFW</b>	Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport
<b>HAS</b>	City of Houston Airport System
<b>IPT</b>	Integrated Project Team
<b>OFO</b>	Office of Field Operations
<b>POE</b>	Port of Entry
<b>POV</b>	Private/Non-commercial Vehicles
<b>STAC</b>	South Texas Assets Consortium