MAIL

From:	padinare.unnikrishna@ibwc.gov
To:	Apurba Borah, Lori Kuczmanski, Isela Canava
CC:	Sally Spener, Jose Nunez
Subject:	Fwd: Re: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act levee repairs
Date:	13-Mar-2017 15:26
Attachments:	TEXT.htm *(excluded from export)*
Creation Date:	13-Mar-2017 15:26
Store Date:	13-Mar-2017 22:57
Status:	replied
Box Type:	received
Folder:	Sally Spener Home > Mailbox
Message Id:	58C6BA2B.$$$.$$$.200.2000047.1.6D683.1

All

Dr. Borah and I will draft a response.

Sally notes correctly the inaccuracy in the statement of Mr. Nicol of March 10.
Our GIS maps need to be updated to reflect the latest status. Terms such as 'certified' need to be explained in a footnote on these maps.
For current updates on the status of the levee certification and accreditation, we need to refer also to our Citizens Forum meetings where we provide updates.
There are reaches that are complete and submittals made and are into the comment, response cycle; others such as Reach 1 where the construction is complete and as-builts are awaited for FEMA submittal; and others such as Reach 2 where the design updates are being evaluated.

Thanks
Unni

>>> Isela Canava 3/10/2017 10:51 AM >>>
Dr. Unni,
Please see email below from Sally.

Thanks,
Isela

>>> Sally Spener 3/10/2017 10:37 AM >>>
Lori and Isela,

I received a couple of inquiries from the Sierra Club and Audubon about the Hidalgo County levees. According to them, Hidalgo County officials say there are still deficient Rio Grande levee segments in Hidalgo County so the county is seeking DHS funds for a levee-wall in the deficient areas. See forwarded email chain. Mr. Nicol's statement in his 3/10 message is not accurate. Also, the GIS levee maps on our web page have not been updated since May 2016, which adds to the confusion. I have also attached the latest schedule discussing the status of the projects.

[redacted] b (5) [redacted]

[redacted] b (5) [redacted]."

I am on annual leave starting today and won't be back until March 20. Can you get together on this to respond?

[redacted] b (5) [redacted]

Sally E. Spener, Foreign Affairs Officer

IBWC, U.S. Section
Headquarters
(915) 832-4175
(915) 693-4280 Fax
"Excellence Through Teamwork"

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY
The information contained in this electronic message and any attachment(s) to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. You are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, disclosure, and/or distribution of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently destroy along with any attachments without reading, forwarding, saving, or disclosing them.

>>> Lower Rio Grande Valley Sierra Club <lrgvsierraclub@gmail.com> 3/10/2017 7:29 AM >>>
Thank you for your help with this. Just to be clear, is it accurate to say that 1) all of the river levees in Hidalgo County were either rebuilt as part of DHS's levee-border wall project or were repaired using American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds, and 2) for the river levees (but not necessarily the interior levees) IBWC has submitted certification to FEMA.

There would still be issues of drainage, as you mention in your earlier email, but the levees themselves are no longer in need of repair.

Sorry to belabor this, but I want to make certain that I do not misrepresent the current situation.

Thanks,

Scott Nicol
Lower Rio Grande Valley Sierra Club

On Fri, Mar 3, 2017 at 5:00 PM, Sally Spener <Sally.Spener@ibwc.gov> wrote:

In many communities, during non-flood conditions, local rainfall from the land side of the levee drains into the river via gates in the levee. However, during flood operations, the gates are closed to prevent the flooded river from flowing out onto the land side of the levees. There needs to be a plan for how to handle the land side runoff during these conditions, such as by pumping it over the levee. The drainage infrastructure varies among the communities but this is the general idea of how there needs to be a local drainage plan in order for FEMA to accredit a flood control system. We can fix the levees but there are still other flood control concerns that need to be addressed by local jurisdictions.

Sally E. Spener, Foreign Affairs Officer

IBWC, U.S. Section
Headquarters
(915) 832-4175
(tel:(915)%20832-4175)
(915) 693-4280
(tel:(915)%20693-4280) Fax
"Excellence Through Teamwork"

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY
The information contained in this electronic message and any attachment(s) to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. You are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, disclosure, and/or distribution of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently destroy along with any attachments without reading, forwarding, saving, or disclosing them.
>>> Lower Rio Grande Valley Sierra Club <lrgvsierraclub@gmail.com> 3/3/2017 3:45 PM >>>
Thank you very much. One last question: could you clarify what drainage issues on the 'land side of the levees' could be? Does this mean for instance drainage ditches that channel water away from the levee? Or is there something about the land side of the levee itself?

Thanks,

Scott Nicol

On Fri, Mar 3, 2017 at 3:36 PM, Sally Spener <Sally.Spener@ibwc.gov> wrote:

Dear Mr. Nicol:
"Certification Submitted" means that the USIBWC has submitted documentation to FEMA indicating that USIBWC certifies the levee as meeting FEMA criteria. In that sense, the levee rehabilitation part of the accreditation process is complete. FEMA accreditation also depends on local communities addressing local drainage issues on the land side of the levees. In the Lower Rio Grande Valley, we are still in the construction phase on the North Floodway (Mercedes) and Union Pacific Railroad Crossing in Hidalgo County but, of course, this is the interior floodway, not the river levee.

Sally E. Spener, Foreign Affairs Officer

IBWC, U.S. Section
Headquarters
(915) 832-4175
(tel:(915)%20832-4175)
(915) 693-4280
(tel:(915)%20693-4280) Fax
"Excellence Through Teamwork"

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY
The information contained in this electronic message and any attachment(s) to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. You are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, disclosure, and/or distribution of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently destroy along with any attachments without reading, forwarding, saving, or disclosing them.
>>> Lower Rio Grande Valley Sierra Club <lrgvsierraclub@gmail.com> 3/3/2017 1:14 PM >>>
Thank you, Ms. Spener. Can you please tell me what "Certification Submitted" on the maps means? Does this mean that the levee is fully rehabilitated? Or is there work still to be done? How do we know if FEMA has accredited the levees?

Since the LRGV maps are from May, could you tell me if there is still construction going on in the Hidalgo County levees closest to the river in any segment?

Thank you,

Scott Nicol

On Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 5:59 PM, Sally Spener <Sally.Spener@ibwc.gov> wrote:

Dear Mr. Nicol:

For the status of our Rio Grande levee rehabilitation projects, with maps, please go to our web site at:
https://www.ibwc.gov/GIS_Maps/levee-rehab-status_tabbed.html

Sally E. Spener, Foreign Affairs Officer

IBWC, U.S. Section
Headquarters
(915) 832-4175
(tel:(915)%20832-4175)
(915) 693-4280
(tel:(915)%20693-4280) Fax
"Excellence Through Teamwork"

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY
The information contained in this electronic message and any attachment(s) to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. You are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, disclosure, and/or distribution of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are prohibited from sharing, copying, or otherwise using or disclosing its contents. If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and permanently destroy along with any attachments without reading, forwarding, saving, or disclosing them.
>>> Lower Rio Grande Valley Sierra Club <lrgvsierraclub@gmail.com> 2/25/2017 9:28 AM >>>
Hi Sally,

We are trying to learn the final outcome of the levee repairs that were to be funded with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (aka the Stimulus package) funds in Hidalgo County, Texas. Were all of the levees in Hidalgo county that were in need of repair repaired & subsequently FEMA certified, or were there some levees in Hidalgo that are still in need of repair? A map showing the locations of the repairs that were completed would be especially helpful.

Thanks,

Scott Nicol
Lower Rio Grande Valley Sierra Club

MAIL

From:	jose.nunez@ibwc.gov
To:	Ed Drusina
CC:	Padinare Unnikrishna, Russell L Frisbie, Russell Frisbie
Subject:	DHS Border Wall, DC Trip
Date:	14-Mar-2017 17:19
Attachments:	USIBWC Letter, April 1, 2008.pdf [Save] [Open] Pre-Solicitation Notice, February 24, 2017.pdf [Save] [Open] Summary, DC Meeting, March 2017.docx [Save] [Open] TEXT.htm *(excluded from export)* HCDD 1 Letter, February 21, 2017, to DHS.pdf [Save] [Open]
Creation Date:	14-Mar-2017 17:19
Store Date:	14-Mar-2017 22:19
Status:	opened,read
Box Type:	received
Folder:	Ed Drusina Home > Mailbox
Message Id:	58C82614.$$$.$$$.200.200007F.1.509A4.1

Commissioner:

Attached is a brief summary for your use during your meeting with DHS representatives. Also, attached are both letters that made reference to under the summary.

If you have any questions, please let us know. Regards,

Jose

>>> Ed Drusina 3/8/2017 1:57 PM >>>

All,

As you know I will be in DC on the 20th of March to meet with various congressional and agency officials representing different interests all across the SW boundary. Please send Russell and me any personnel you would like me to visit with; projects you see of interest; policies that need to be cleared up with DOS; topics you believe that I should bring up. Also, if you have knowledge of a problem that is developing that may be brought up provide insight into that as well. Add a short description that highlights the issue. I have listed a few of the topics below and personnel that I see as the lead although several of you may also comment. Provide your summaries by next Tuesday

[redacted] b (5)

[redacted]

[redacted] - [redacted]

[redacted]

(b) (3) b(5)

Sincerely,

Edward Drusina, P.E.
Commissioner
USIBWC
"Excellence Through Teamwork"

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY
The information contained in this electronic message and any attachments(s) to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. You are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, disclosure, and/or distribution of the information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately via e-mail, and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER
UNITED STATES SECTION

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION
UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

April 1, 2008

Mr. John Dickson
Director
Office of Mexican Affairs (WHA/MEX)
U.S. Department of State, Room 4258
2201 C Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20520

Dear Mr. Dickson:

By letter dated February 26, 2008, you asked the U.S. Section to provide the U.S. Department of State with a written report assessing whether the proposed 18-foot high combined levee-border wall structure in the Lower Rio Grande Valley would allow for flood flows consistent with existing IBWC Minutes, whether it may cause deflection or obstruction of the normal flow of the river or of its flood flows, and whether Mexico would be adversely affected through any such deflection or obstruction. If the proposed structure could have adverse consequences, you ask for the U.S. Section to provide recommendations on how the project could be modified to prevent such consequences.

In response to your request, I have enclosed the Report Assessing the Proposed Levee-Border Wall in Light of International Commitments of the 1970 Boundary Treaty and the Lower Rio Grande Flood Control Project prepared by U.S. Section staff.

To summarize the report's findings, [redacted] b (5)

Should you have any questions about the report, please do not hesitate to contact me at 915-832-4157.

Sincerely,

[redacted] b (6)

Carlos Marin, P.E.
Commissioner

Enclosure(s)
As stated

The Commons, Building C, Suite 310 • 4171 N. Mesa Street • El Paso, Texas 79902
(915) 832-4100 • (FAX) (915) 832-4190 • http://www.ibwc.state.gov

REPORT ASSESSING THE PROPOSED LEVEE-BORDER WALL IN LIGHT OF INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS OF THE 1970 BOUNDARY TREATY AND THE LOWER RIO GRANDE FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, United States Section

March 31, 2008

Introduction

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is working to install fencing along the U.S.-Mexico border to hinder the illegal entry into the United States of vehicles, persons, and contraband. The U.S. Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC) has been in discussions with DHS regarding installation of fencing on or near the USIBWC Rio Grande flood control levee in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of South Texas. At the urging of local government leaders in South Texas and members of the region's Congressional delegation, the USIBWC and DHS have also been considering a proposal to install a type of floodwall incorporated into the river side of the U.S. levee that would serve the dual purpose of providing flood protection and enhancing border security by hindering illegal crossings into the United States. The wall, as envisioned by its proponents, would be 18 feet tall.

The U.S. Department of State by letter dated February 26, 2008 from John Dickson, Director, Office of Mexican Affairs, requested that the USIBWC provide a written report assessing whether the proposed 18-foot high combined levee-fence structure in the Lower Rio Grande Valley would allow for flood flows consistent with existing IBWC Minutes, whether it may cause deflection or obstruction of the normal flow of the river or of its flood flows, and whether Mexico would be adversely affected through any such deflection or obstruction. If the proposed structure could have adverse consequences, the Department of State requests that USIBWC provide a recommendation on how the project could be modified to prevent such consequences. This report intends to address the Department of State's requests.

Executive Summary

[redacted]

b (5)

[redacted]

b (5)

International Commitments for the Lower Rio Grande Flood Control Project

The United States and Mexico first agreed to a coordinated project for flood control in the Lower Rio Grande in 1932. Prior to that time, works were constructed separately by entities in each country and there was no internationally-coordinated plan. The United States proposed such a plan in 1931. The proposed plan contemplated a maximum flood of 240,000 second feet at Rio Grande City, with 112,000 second feet to be diverted into interior floodways in the United States, 40,000 second feet into Mexico, and 30,000 second feet through the channel of the Rio Grande below Brownsville. Due to the flattening effect on the flood crest caused by the steeper slope resulting from the withdrawal of water at the floodways, this would be equivalent to a flood at Rio Grande City of 187,000 second feet. It further proposed construction and/or improvement of river and floodway levees in both countries.

In July 1931, a flood resulted in discharge of large quantities of water to the Mexican side because of the inadequate physical condition of the U.S. floodways. It was presumed that Mexico would not object to a plan that provided for construction and operation of floodways in the United States that could handle larger volumes of water. As Colonel Crecelius wrote in December 1931, in his Special Report on Flood Control Investigations, Lower Rio Grande, "the proposed plans...would proceed along lines calculated to minimize the opportunity for protest on the part of Mexico which might otherwise result from the construction, operation and maintenance of a larger levee system only deflecting excessive quantities of floodwaters onto lands in Mexico. By the operation, under control of a Federal agency, of the proposed floodways of suitable capacity to take care of large quantities of water through the United States as proposed in this plan and estimated, international complications are avoided." The Crecelius Report also made note of exceptional agricultural development in the United States at the time while similar Mexican lands were largely undeveloped. This statement alludes to conditions that continued to exist in coming decades where levee construction was left to each country to determine the level of protection that it required in specific areas.

Upon review of the 1931 proposal, the Mexican Foreign Office did express concern about the need to better control lower flood discharges. As a result, further consideration was given and in 1932 the proposed plan was amplified to provide for the construction of two diversion dams.

The Preliminary Report on Flood Control Plans, Lower Rio Grande, September 3, 1932, by International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, contained three major recommendations:

"(1) That the two countries agree in general principle to the plan submitted as amplified to include the construction of two international diversion structures in the Rio Grande.

(2) That because of the emergencies which exist, each Section of the Commission be authorized to proceed without delay in the construction, operation and maintenance of such floodways as are located within their territory.

(3) That the two countries proceed with the development of an agreement providing for the construction, operation and maintenance by the International Boundary Commission of the two international diversion structures and for such regulations as may be deemed necessary and desirable for the control of floodway operations."

A series of letters exchanged in October 1932 among the two Sections of the Commission, the Mexican Foreign Office, and the U.S. Department of State indicate that the two countries approved Recommendation 2. However, Mexico withheld approval of the other recommendations regarding construction of diversion dams pending conclusion of a final agreement on equitable distribution of international waters (what later became the 1944 Water Treaty).

The 1932 agreement set the stage for international cooperation in the Lower Rio Grande Flood Control Project. The basic premise was that most of the floodwaters would be diverted into floodways in the United States and Mexico, leaving relatively small volumes of water in the Rio Grande. For this reason, subsequent agreements focused on the equitable diversion of floodwaters into the interior floodways of each country and the structures necessary to effect and convey such diversions. The international agreements give relatively little consideration to improvements designed to convey floodwaters along the river itself.

Article 6 of the Treaty Relating to the Utilization of Waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande, known as the1944 Water Treaty, directed the Commission to prepare plans for flood control works on the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Texas to the Gulf of Mexico. It also established that such works are subject to the approval of the two Governments: "Each Government agrees to construct, through its Section of the Commission, such works as may be recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments." This article suggests that Rio Grande flood control works cannot be constructed in one country unless approved by both Governments.

Minute No. 182, Approval of "Joint Report on Engineering Conference on Studies, Investigations and Procedures for the Planning of Works to be Built in Accordance with the Treaty of February 3, 1944," approved in 1946, and the related Joint Report broadly discuss engineering recommendations related to implementation of the 1944 Water Treaty. The Joint Report states, "A flood control project consisting of levees along the river and interior floodways is under construction jointly by the United States and Mexico to afford partial flood protection to the Lower Rio Grande Valley." Other documents indicate that works contemplated for the United States in the 1932 plan were constructed from fiscal year 1934 through fiscal year 1953.

Minute No. 187, Determinations as to Site and Required Capacities of the Lowest Major International Storage Dam to be Built on the Rio Grande, in Accordance with the Provisions of Article 5 of the Treaty Concluded February 3, 1944, approved in 1948, discussed the required flood control capacity for Falcon Reservoir in light of considerations related to the floodways of the International Flood Control Project.

Minute No. 196, Modification of the Original Plan for the Lower Rio Grande International Flood Control Project, approved in 1951, and the related Joint Report of the Principal Engineers, constituted the agreement for construction of Anzalduas Diversion Dam. The Joint Report states, "Estimates have not been developed for any new levees or improvements to existing levees or floodways that may be required, or irrigation diversion facilities since it appears that to the extent required these should be built by and at the expense of the country in which the works are located." Recommendation 5 of the Joint Report restates this point as, "Any additional levees or improvements to existing levees or floodways, and any irrigation diversion facilities which each country may desire to construct, be constructed by and at the entire expense of the country in which the work is located."

[redacted]

b (5)

Minute No. 212, Improvement of the Channel of the Lower Rio Grande, approved in 1962, provided for periodic clearing of the Lower Rio Grande channel to maintain its conveyance capacity.

In 1962, F.P. Brown prepared a Review of Lower Rio Grande Flood Control Project. This review was apparently conducted in light of flooding that occurred in 1958 and completion of construction of Anzalduas Dam in 1962. According to the report, following the 1958 flood, improvements were made to the U.S. system in 1958-1961. Presumably these improvements were carried out pursuant to the general guidelines of Minute No. 196. In describing 1962 conditions, Brown writes, "The United States river levee below Anzalduas is generally several feet above the Mexican levee, and as occurred in 1958, overflow would take place into the Mexican floodway...." Brown also indicates that the existing Mexican river levees are "now considered adequate by its authorities since Mexico's interim design criteria based upon 100,000, c.f.s..." [redacted]

b (5)

A Memorandum dated October 22, 1962 (author unnamed) that is an appendix of the Brown Report states that during the 1958 flood, the U.S. levees were threatened but there was no serious damage. However, the Mexican river levees between Anzalduas Dam and Brownsville were either overtopped by the floodwaters or intentionally breached to reduce flow in the river at Brownsville-Matamoros.

In September 1967, Hurricane Beulah struck the Lower Rio Grande Valley causing widespread flooding in both countries. By January 1968, U.S. Commissioner J.F. Friedkin had prepared the Recommended Plan for Repairs and Improvements, Lower Rio Grande Flood Control Project, Texas. The 1967 flood indicated a serious deficiency in the project due to "the inability to control flows into the United States floodways to safe amounts..." Immediately after the flood, "The understanding was reached that the two countries should proceed at the earliest practical date to provide the joint works in the main river channel, and the unilateral works required in each country to effect positive controlled diversions to its floodways of 50% of the waters in the main channel in excess of the safe capacity of the river downstream at the cities of Brownsville, Texas, and Matamoros, Tamaulipas."

The 1968 Report indicated the adoption of a design flood of "250,000 cfs with a high margin of safety on levees for urban areas and a margin for rural areas, as follows:

a) 5 feet of freeboard on the levees for protection of Mercedes and other urban areas which would provide protection against a 270,000 cfs flood with about 3.5 feet of freeboard remaining.

b) 3 feet of freeboard along all other levees, except as noted in c) below, which would protect against a 270,000 cfs flood with about 1.5-foot of freeboard remaining.

c) 2 feet of freeboard on the levees along the North Floodway downstream from Highway 77 bridge where there is less development."

[redacted]

b (5)

The plan also recommended alteration of floodway inlets to control flow into the U.S. floodways, improvement of the U.S. river levees downstream of Anzalduas Dam for 35 miles to the Mexican floodway, construction of a new diversion dam (Retamal), and other works on the interior floodways.

In a January 19, 1968 presentation to local authorities in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, Commissioner Friedkin discussed the recommended plan for the United States, as discussed above. He also discussed Mexico's plans as consisting of construction of storage dams on the San Juan and Alamo Rivers, joint construction of a diversion dam with the U.S. (Retamal), construction of a bridge across Mexico's main floodway (parts of Mexico were cut off during the 1967 flood), and strengthening of Mexican levees to protect the City of Reynosa.

Minute No. 238, Improvement of the International Flood Control Works of the Lower Rio Grande, and the related Joint Report of the Principal Engineers, approved in 1970, established a design flood of 250,000 cfs at Rio Grande City, provided for construction of Retamal Dam (some 40 years after it was originally proposed), and specified that each country would divert 105,000 cfs into its interior floodway. Given the greater volume of the design flood than that previously used, levee improvements were also necessary. Resolution 7 of Minute 238 states, "That each Government proceed to construct, operate and maintain at its own expense the improvement of the levees in its respective territory." b (5) [redacted]

b (5) [redacted]

Considerations under the 1970 Boundary Treaty

The Treaty to Resolve Pending Boundary Differences and Maintain the Rio Grande and Colorado River as the International Boundary (1970 Boundary Treaty) resolved pending boundary differences between the two countries, established a means of determining the location of the international boundary where it is formed by the Colorado River or Rio Grande, authorized the Commission to maintain and restore the river channels as the international boundary, and tasked the Commission with preventing construction of works along the Colorado River and Rio Grande that would obstruct or deflect the normal or flood flows of the rivers.

Article IV (A) and (B) states:

"A. Each Contracting State, in the limitrophe sections of the Rio Grande and the Colorado River, may protect its bank against erosion and, where either of the rivers has more than one channel, may construct works in the channel or channels that are completely within its territory in order to preserve the character of the limitrophe channel provided, however, that in the judgment of the Commission the works that are to be executed under this paragraph do not adversely affect the other Contracting State through the deflection or obstruction of the normal flow of the river or of its flood flows.

B. (1) Both in the main channel of the river and on adjacent lands to a distance on either side of the international boundary recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments, each Contracting State shall prohibit the construction of works in its territory which, in the judgment of the Commission, may cause deflection or obstruction of the normal flow of the river or of its flood flows.

(2) If the Commission should determine that any of the works constructed by one of the two Contracting States in the channel of the river or within its territory causes such adverse effects on the territory of the other Contracting State, the Government of the Contracting State that constructed the works shall remove them or modify them and, by agreement of the Commission, shall repair or compensate for the damages sustained by the other Contracting State."

(b) (5)

b (5)

[redacted]

[redacted]

b (5)

[redacted]

Conclusion

[redacted]

b (5)

[redacted]

b (5)

Lege[redacted]

[redacted]

b (5)

b (5)

b (5)

Design-Build Structure

Solicitation Number: 2017-JC-RT-0001
Agency Department of Homeland Security
Office Customs and Border Protection
Location Procurement Directorate - IN

Original Synopsis
Feb 24, 2017
11 34 am

Solicitation Number:
2017-JC-RT-0001

Notice Type:
Presolicitation

Synopsis:
Added Feb 24, 2017 11 34 am

The Dept. of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) intends on issuing a solicitation in electronic format on or about March 6, 2017 for the design and build of several prototype wall structures in the vicinity of the United States border with Mexico. The procurement will be conducted in two phases, the first requiring vendors to submit a concept paper of their prototype(s) by March 10, 2017, which will result in the evaluation and down select of offerors by March 20, 2017. The second phase will require the down select of phase 1 offerors to submit proposals in response to the full RFP by March 24, 2017, which will include price. Multiple awards are contemplated by mid-April for this effort. An option for additional miles may be included in each contract award.

Contracting Office Address:
6650 Telecom Drive
Intech Two, Suite 100
Indianapolis, Indiana 46278
United States

Place of Performance:
To Be Determined

United States

Primary Point of Contact:
John P Callahan,

Secondary Point of Contact:
Richard A Travis,

GENERAL INFORMATION

Notice Type:
Presolicitation

Posted Date:
February 24, 2017

Response Date:
-

Archiving Policy:
Manual Archive

Archive Date:
-

Original Set Aside:
N/A

Set Aside:
N/A

Classification Code:
99 – Miscellaneous

NAICS Code:
236 – Construction of Buildings/236220 – Commercial and Institutional Building Construction

DHS Border Fence Projects
March 2017

As we have all learned by watching the news and reading several news artilces, DHS has been directed by our new administration to start erecting border fences on the gaps along the international boundary. We have provided DHS with the number of miles that we share with Mexico including those in the Pacific Ocean and Gulf of Mexico. DHS issued a solicitation asking interested Consultants to submit concept papers some of the Design-Build Fence Projects; refer to the attached solicitation. According to my conversations with [redacted] b (5), the height of the border wall [redacted] b (5) .

[redacted] b (5)

[redacted] b (5)

HIDALGO COUNTY DRAINAGE DISTRICT No. 1
RAUL E. SESIN, PE, CFM
General Manager, Floodplain Administrator

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

DAVID L. FUENTES	EDUARDO "EDDIE" CANTU	RAMON GARCIA	JOE M. FLORES	JOSEPH PALACIOS
Board Member	Board Member	Chairman of the Board	Board Member	Board Member

February 21, 2017

Hon. Congressman Michael McCaul
Chairman of Homeland Security
Attn: John F. Kelly
Secretary of Homeland Security
Department of Homeland Security
Washington, D.C. 20528

RE: Continued Partnership for Protecting the US/Mexico Border ~ Border Levee Strengthening & Security Infrastructure Project
DHS – CBP-08-112-001 (Including Amendments A001 ~ A004)

Hon. Congressman McCaul:

On behalf of the citizens of Hidalgo County, I want to express our gratitude to the Federal Government, more specifically the Department of Homeland Security, for the work done to date under the joint grant agreement titled "Hidalgo County Border Infrastructure Improvement Program" dated 05/02/2008. To date, the "Border Levee Strengthening & Security Infrastructure Project", that resulted from the above referenced program, has served a dual purpose in providing over 20 miles of much needed flood protection against waters from the Rio Grande River, while at the same time providing border security to our great nation as identified on Exhibit A attached. The original intent was to complete approximately 50 miles of a river protective levee/wall for the entire length of Hidalgo County which is the most populous county along the Texas/Mexico border.

The estimated cost to complete the 50 mile program is projected to be just over $611,567,856.63. This active and open program to date has been awarded a total of $232,640,656.63 of which the local participation by Hidalgo County Drainage District No.1 consisted of $58,166,594 and a DHS contribution of $174,474,062.63. This funding was utilized to successfully complete the above referenced 20 miles of the Federal Border Infrastructure Project.

Based on the "Hidalgo County Levee Rehabilitation Project Economic Impact Study" prepared in April 2009 by the University of Texas Pan American, it was determined this $232,640,653 expenditure created a stimulus of over $317,000,000 of economic impact to the area, and created over 3,000 jobs. This was a tremendous boost to the economy of Hidalgo County in 2008 and 2009 when the rest of Texas and the Country experienced a severe economic downturn. Using a similar method of analysis, it is projected that Phase II would create over $500,000,000 of economic impact and over 5,000 new jobs. Needless to say, this would be a tremendous economic stimulus and jobs program for Hidalgo County and the Nation.

902 N. Doolittle Road • Edinburg, Texas 78542 | Office 956 292.7080 • Fax 956 292.7089

HIDALGO COUNTY DRAINAGE DISTRICT No. 1
RAUL E. SESIN, PE, CFM
General Manager, Floodplain Administrator

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

DAVID L. FUENTES	EDUARDO "EDDIE" CANTU	RAMON GARCIA	JOE M. FLORES	JOSEPH PALACIOS
Board Member	Board Member	Chairman of the Board	Board Member	Board Member

In order to complete this program, the partnership between Hidalgo County Drainage District No.1 and DHS needs to be continued via the preparation and approval of Amendment #5 to the previously referenced Grant Agreement. Amendment #5 needs to increase the total federal share from $174,474,062.63 to $553,401,262.63 for a net increase of **$378,927,200**. With the approval of Amendment #5, the continued partnership between DHS and Hidalgo County would result in an approximate **90/10 cost sharing breakdown for the $611,567,856.63 program.**

As I am sure you would agree, securing our borders is the responsibility of the Federal Government, however, due to the importance of protecting our borders for illegal immigration, as well as from flood waters from the Rio Grande River, we feel that the continued partnership is essential to protecting the State of Texas, as well as the United States.

Sincerely,

(b) (6) [redacted]

Hon. Ramon Garcia
Chairman of the Board

Attachments (Exhibit 1 ~ Overall Hidalgo County Levee Gap Exhibit)

cc:
Hon. Senator John Cornyn ~ of Texas (R)
Hon. Senator Ted Cruz ~ of Texas (R)
Hon. Congressman Henry Cuellar ~ 28th District of Texas (D)
Hon. Congressman Vicente Gonzalez ~ 15th District of Texas (D)
Hon. Congressman Filemon Vela ~ 34th District of Texas (D)
Hon. Speaker Paul Ryan ~ Wisconsin's 1st Congressional District (R)
Hon. Chairman Kevin Brady ~ Texas's 8th Congressional District (R)
Hon. Majority Whip Steve Scalise ~ Louisiana 1st Congressional District (R)
Hon. Senator Thom Tillis ~ of North Carolina (R)
Hon. Congressman/Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy ~ 23rd District of California (R)
Hon. Greg Abbott ~ Governor of Texas (R)
Hon. Dan Patrick ~ Lt. Governor of Texas (R)
Hidalgo County Commissioners Court / HCDD1 Board of Directors (D)
Commissioner Edward Drusina ~ IBWC
Raul E. Sesin, P.E., CFM, HCDD1 General Manager

APPROVED BY HIDALGO COUNTY DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 1 BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON: 2/21/17

902 N. Doolittle Road • Edinburg, Texas 78542 | Office 956 292.7080 • Fax 956 292.7089
www.hcdd1.org

MAIL

From:	ed.drusina@ibwc.gov
To:	Jose Nunez
Subject:	Re: DHS Border Wall, DC Trip
Date:	16-Mar-2017 11:20
Creation Date:	16-Mar-2017 11:14
Store Date:	16-Mar-2017 22:18
Status:	accepted,opened,read
Box Type:	sent
Folder:	Ed Drusina Home > Sent Items
Message Id:	58CA7515.USIBWC.ELP.200.200001A.1.481B6.1

Good it thanks

Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 16, 2017, at 11:13 AM, Jose Nunez <Jose.Nunez@ibwc.gov> wrote:
>
> Commissioner:
>
> Attached is the letter of no objection that we issued for Border Fence Segments O-1, O-2, and O-3. Also, attached is the agreement that we entered with DHS for the reviews of their Boder Fence Projects. Recommend [redacted] b (5) [redacted]
>
> Every effort will be made to expedite our review of their submittals. Thanks
>
> Jose
>
> >>> Jose Nunez 3/14/2017 5:19 PM >>>
> Commissioner:
>
> Attached is a brief summary for your use during your meeting with DHS representatives. Also, attached are both letters that made reference to under the summary.
>
> If you have any questions, please let us know. Regards,
>
> Jose
>
>
>
>
>
> >>> Ed Drusina 3/8/2017 1:57 PM >>>
> All,
>

> As you know I will be in DC on the 20th of March to meet with various congressional and agency officials representing different interests all across the SW boundary. Please send Russell and me any personnel you would like me to visit with; projects you see of interest; policies that need to be cleared up with DOS; topics you believe that I should bring up. Also, if you have knowledge of a problem that is developing that may be brought up provide insight into that as well. Add a short description that highlights the issue. I have listed a few of the topics below and personnel that I see as the lead although several of you may also comment. Provide your summaries by next Tuesday

>

> [redacted] b (5)

>

>

>

>

>

> Sincerely,

>

> Edward Drusina, P.E.

> Commissioner

> USIBWC

> "Excellence Through Teamwork"

>

> STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

> The information contained in this electronic message and any attachments(s) to this message are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. You are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, disclosure, and/or distribution of the information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately via e-mail, and destroy all copies of this message and any

attachments.

> <USIBWC, February 15, 2012, No Objections.pdf>

> <IBM08A0017.pdf>