ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED/ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

This communication might contain communications between attorney and client, communications that are part of the agency deliberative process, or attorney-work product, all of which are privileged and not subject to disclosure outside the agency or to the public. Please consult with the Office of Chief Counsel, U.S. Customs and Border Protection before disclosing any information contained in this email.
Dear Brian, [REDACTED], and Deputy Commissioner Perez,

It was a great pleasure meeting with you a few weeks ago. Please find attached our responses to the items in the CBP checklist for the proposed [REDACTED] wall extension that We Build the Wall (WBTW) has proposed to build at the [REDACTED] area in New Mexico and give to CBP. I have also attached a hydro analysis and other supporting documents. We will meet virtually all of the CBP requirements; and where we propose slight modifications, it is because of special circumstances at the [REDACTED] site.

Please let me know as soon as possible if you need any additional information prior to granting us permission to proceed. As I may have mentioned in our meeting, we have much of the heavy equipment in the area already. We will save nearly half a million dollars in mobilization costs if we can proceed soon – ideally by October 11 if possible.

Thanks again for meeting with us. We look forward to constructing and donating a gift to CBP that meets all of your operational needs and greatly improves the security what is currently a heavily-trafficked border area.

Yours,

Kris Kobach
General Counsel,
We Build the Wall
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September 18, 2019

We Build The Wall
P.O. Box 131567
Houston, TX 77219-1567

Attn: (b)(6)
Legal Counsel, We Build The Wall

RE: Bollard Project: (b)(7)(E) New Mexico
Subject: Drainage Report for (b)(7)(E)

Greetings,

Please be advised that upon completion of this Project all of the off-property drainage patterns and capacity at this site will continue to allow for the free passage onto, through and continuing downslope from this site. No significant volumes of drainage will be blocked by the installation of the new bollard fence and the small amount of additional on-site drainage that sheet flows from the new road surface to the south will not significantly increase the volumes handled by the existing washes.

Our review of the topography indicates that there are three small watersheds, each of which will contribute flow to drainages that will cross south into Mexico. We will construct low-flow crossings at the three identified outlet locations. The length of these low-flow crossings will be determined by the volume of flow calculated for the 50 year event to pass through the spacing in the bollard fence system. Each watershed will drain to its own corresponding low-flow crossing.

Thank you for your time regarding this issue. Please feel free to call if you have any questions or require any additional information.

Regards,

Civil Engineer

Cc: (b)(6) President, FSG, TGR
i = 3.23 inches/hour for the 50 year 30 minute event. Please see attached table from NOAA Atlas 14, Volume 1, Version 5.

Velocity over sand & gravel bottom (slope average 5-15%) is determined to be 4 ft./sec.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCR area</th>
<th>surface</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A (ac.)</th>
<th>Q (cfs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>rocky soil</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>rocky soil</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>rocky soil</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The peak flow rates for these three watersheds has been determined as listed above for the 50 year event. These flow rates will be handled by the existing washes and tributaries and will pass through the bollards at the appropriately sized low-flow crossings.
(b) \((7)(E)\)
(b) (7)(E)
(b) (7)(E)
TOTAL \((\text{(b)} \,(7)(E))\) PANELS = \((\text{(b)} \,(7)(E))\) EACH

Panel Sequence Per Profile
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CL FENCE PROFILE
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 PROFILE GRADES AND PANEL INFORMATION

FISHER INDUSTRIES
### Average recurrence interval (years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-min</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>17.92</td>
<td>24.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-min</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>22.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-min</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>25.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-min</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-hr</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>14.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-hr</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-hr</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-hr</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-hr</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-hr</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-day</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-day</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-day</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-day</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-day</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-day</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-day</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-day</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-day</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PDS-based point precipitation frequency estimates with% confidence intervals (in inches/hour)*

1. Precipitation frequency (PF) estimates in this table are based on frequency analysis of partial duration series (PDS).
2. Numbers in parentheses are PF estimates at lower and upper bounds of the 90% confidence interval. The probability that precipitation frequency estimates (for a given duration and average recurrence interval) will be greater than the upper bound (or less than the lower bound) is 5%. Estimates at upper bounds are not checked against probable maximum precipitation (PMP) estimates and may be higher than currently valid PMP values.

Please refer to NOAA Atlas 14 document for more information.
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), (b) (7)(E)
Dear [b](6);(b)(7)(C], and Deputy Commissioner Perez,

It was a great pleasure meeting with you a few weeks ago. Please find attached our responses to the items in the CBP checklist for the proposed [b](7)(E] wall extension that We Build the Wall (WBTW) has proposed to build at the [b](7)(E] area in New Mexico and give to CBP. I have also attached a hydro analysis and other supporting documents. We will meet virtually all of the CBP requirements; and where we propose slight modifications, it is because of special circumstances at the [b](7)(E] site.

Please let me know as soon as possible if you need any additional information prior to granting us permission to proceed. As I may have mentioned in our meeting, we have much of the heavy equipment in the area already. We will save nearly half a million dollars in mobilization costs if we can proceed soon – ideally by October 11 if possible.

Thanks again for meeting with us. We look forward to constructing and donating a gift to CBP that meets all of your operational needs and greatly improves the security what is currently a heavily-trafficked border area.

Yours,

Kris Kobach
General Counsel,
We Build the Wall
Sir,

The team has reviewed the We Build The Wall (WBTW) checklist. I appreciate your patience as we’ve carefully gone through each of the items. Below are the following issues captured by the team:

1. **Real Estate:** CBP does not concur with WBTW’s assessment. DHS does not own all of the land in this area. Additionally, access roads are an agreement between private landowners and DHS, and would not be transferable to WBTW. WBTW would need to obtain separate access with private land owners. Documentation is needed for real estate. The attached document is CBP’s assessment on land ownership.

2. **Environmental:** WBTW needs to provide documentation on all environmental findings and agreements with SHPO. Previous project environmental impacts (i.e. 2008) or similar projects in the area (i.e. WBTW project at [b](7)(E)) cannot be used as justification for environmental clearance. All environmental clearances must be project site specific. The statement in the checklist regarding contaminants is not acceptable and needs to be conducted by WBTB.

3. The wall should be offset [b](7)(E) as noted in the checklist

4. The wall should be [b](7)(E) as noted in the checklist

5. IBWC coordination is required and not noted in the checklist, to include hydrology coordination and international boundary survey’s prior to construction.

6. Gates are required at all IBWC monuments per TI standards (2 to 3 monuments may be in this area)

7. It was stated that fill sections will be filled with “processed fill” – need confirmation that this will be “certified clean fill” as per environmental needs.

8. Need an explanation on the “N/A” response from WBTW regarding Procurement process.

9. Need explanation on how WBTW will [b](7)(E)

Please consider these concerns and let me know if you have time to discuss.

Have a great weekend,

_Brian Martin_

_U.S. Border Patrol_

_Chief of Strategic Planning and Analysis_

_Washington, DC_
Brian,

Just left you a voicemail touching base. Please give me a call when you have a chance. Thanks.

Kris

Kris,

Thank you for the call this morning. As I’m sure you can understand, we are extremely busy right now, however we appreciate all the work your team has put into the documents. Our projects team and legal are currently reviewing the documents you sent over. We will be meeting mid-next-week and will be able to follow up after we have determined a path forward.

Thank you for your patience.

Brian

Dear Brian, and Deputy Commissioner Perez,

It was a great pleasure meeting with you a few weeks ago. Please find attached our responses to the items in the CBP checklist for the proposed wall extension that We Build the Wall (WBTW) has proposed to build at the area in New Mexico and give to CBP. I have also attached a hydro analysis and other supporting documents. We will meet virtually all of the CBP requirements; and where we propose slight modifications, it is because of special circumstances at the site.
Please let me know as soon as possible if you need any additional information prior to granting us permission to proceed. As I may have mentioned in our meeting, we have much of the heavy equipment in the area already. We will save nearly half a million dollars in mobilization costs if we can proceed soon – ideally by October 11 if possible.

Thanks again for meeting with us. We look forward to constructing and donating a gift to CBP that meets all of your operational needs and greatly improves the security what is currently a heavily-trafficked border area.

Yours,

Kris Kobach
General Counsel,
We Build the Wall

Brian Martin
U.S. Border Patrol
Chief of Strategic Planning and Analysis
Washington, DC
O-(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
M-(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
From: Program Management Office  
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
Subject: Wall Deliverables - Formal Letter of Intent re (b)(7)(E) has been changed  
Date: Thursday, February 13, 2020 4:20:57 PM

**Formal Letter of Intent re (b)(7)(E) has been changed**

Modify my alert settings  
View Formal Letter of Intent re (b)(7)(E)  
View Wall Deliverables  
Mobile View

Date Tasked: 2/10/2020  
Deliverable Title: Formal Letter of Intent re (b)(7)(E) Project  
Originator: Other  
Originator (if other):  
Deliverable Type: Data Call(s)  
Groups Assigned: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
Responsible Party: Acquisition, Real Estate, Environmental; Communication and Reporting; Director / Deputy Director  
Progress/Completion: In-Progress Completed  
Internal Due Date: 2/13/2020 5:00 PM  
External Due Date: 2/13/2020 5:00 PM  
Turnaround Time: Between 3-5 days  
BW PMO Submission Date: 2/13/2020 2:00 PM  
Completion Time: On Time  
FOIA: Number of Pages Reviewed:  
Progress/Completion Comments: 2/10 - with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for individual review  
Archived Updates:  
Deliverable Description:  

All,  

I just cross referenced what we drafted before for requirements of design/construction/ENV/acceptance and the letter outlines all of those provisions.  

Let us know if it would be helpful to set up a call to discuss, but it sounds like they are willing to work with us all along the way.  

Adding [b](6);[b](7)(C) on the [b](6);[b](7)(C) technology.  

Thanks,  

[Senior Communications Analyst]  
[Agile Group]  
[Infrastructure Portfolio]  
[Program Management Office Directorate]
United States Border Patrol

Subject: Fwd: Formal Letter of Intent re: WBTW Project

All - We have received an official donation offer from WBTW that needs to be thoroughly and thoughtfully adjudicated in as expeditious a manner as possible. After speaking with [REDACTED] (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

From OFAM:
The OFO DAP Branch Chief is [REDACTED] (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) and the POCs are [REDACTED] (b)(6),(b)(7)(C). The office of Chief Counsel POC is [REDACTED] (b)(5).

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: "kkobach@gmail.com" <kkobach@gmail.com>
Date: February 7, 2020 at 9:48:50 PM EST
To: "MARTIN, JERRY B" <(REDACTED)>(b)(6),(b)(7)(C) (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) (b)(6),(b)(7)(C)
Cc: [REDACTED] (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
Subject: Formal Letter of Intent re: WBTW Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of DHS. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact the CBP Security Operations Center with questions or concerns.

Brian,

Please find attached We Build the Wall’s formal letter of intent. Attachments include:
As we discussed at our meeting last week, we would appreciate it if you team could review this package as quickly as possible. The NM SHPO has 30 days to review our report to them—a period that commenced on February 5, 2020. If your review could be completed within the same period, by March 6, that would be ideal.

Thanks for your work on this. We look forward to contributing to our nation’s border security and to advancing CBP’s mission.

Kris
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(b) (7)(E), (b) (5)
(b) (7)(E), (b) (5)
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(b) (5), (b) (7)(E)
Deputy Commissioner,

Per our discussion this morning, we have reviewed the materials submitted by WBTW. While they’ve undertaken a lot of effort, their materials are incomplete. As a result, we have developed the attached email to help articulate, with greater specificity, exactly what is required to adjudicate their donation package. Given that this is now directly related to the donation and delegated authority for accepting donations rests with the front office, would you like to be the one to send this? If so, the attached Ready-to-Send email can be for your use. If not, I will send it.

If you’d like to discuss, I am standing by.

VR,

Brian Martin
U.S. Border Patrol
Chief of Strategic Planning and Analysis
Washington, DC
Dear Mr. Kobach:

Thank you for your recent communication regarding We Build the Wall’s (WBTW) proposed donation of border wall. It is my understanding that WBTW, a private entity, would like to start construction on approximately 7(E) of border wall in 7(E) New Mexico. Upon completion, WBTW would like to donate this wall as a gift to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). CBP has reviewed the information WBTW has provided to date regarding the proposed donation. To the extent that WBTW intends to make a formal donation offer to CBP, set out below is the additional information that should be included in the submission. CBP would require this information in order to consider and potentially act upon WBTW’s donation offer.

SUBMISSION PROCESS

In order to make a formal offer of donation or gift, WBTW must first submit a formal letter of intent to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and CBP. In order to properly evaluate WBTW’s gift, CBP needs the information required by DHS Form 112-02. For your convenience, enclosed is a copy of DHS Form 112-02. Those requirements include a detailed description of the gift along with any donor’s name and address, as well as any past, present, or pending matters and activities involving the Department and the circumstances regarding donation of the gift. Additionally, the Department’s gift acceptance policies further require the donor’s estimate of the gift’s value, which for non-cash gifts should be the gift’s estimated market value.

In addition to the items listed above, WBTW’s submission should address the items listed below. The items listed below will assist CBP in its evaluation of WBTW’s gift and/or any CBP authorization to construct on federal land that is under CBP’s administrative jurisdiction. From our previous discussions, we understand WBTW has offered to design and construct all real estate and environmental documentation and permitting for the proposed project and will ensure the donation meets the U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) operational requirements.

ALIGNMENT MAP

WBTW must provide an alignment map that is sufficiently identifies the location the proposed border wall segment. The map will allow CBP to evaluate the proposed location relative to United States Border Patrol (USBP) operations. It is CBP’s understanding, based on materials previously submitted by WBTW, that the proposed 7(E) wall project is 7(E) (Location coordinates – Start: 7(E) Stop: 7(E)). For your convenience, enclosed you will find a map that shows CBP’s understanding of the proposed project location. WBTW’s submission should confirm this understanding and show precisely where the proposed wall will be situated.

DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION

As a part of its submission, WBTW must confirm that the proposed wall segment will adhere to the USBP Tactical Infrastructure (TI) Design Standards as the design criteria for the wall design and that WBTW will consult with USBP on any design and construction questions to ensure the wall meets the operational requirements of USBP.

Those design standards include the following requirements or conditions:

Design
Construction

- All wall should be constructed in accordance with the TI Design Standards.
- Regular communication with USBP personnel, to include providing a high-level milestone schedule, to ensure construction does not adversely impact operations.
- Consultation with USBP subject matter experts prior to start of design to discuss and incorporate such items as wall alignment, design criteria, construction criteria into the design.
- Consultation with USBP subject matter experts during preliminary design and prior to design completion to receive feedback regarding design progress.
- Regular meetings with USBP subject matter experts on a weekly basis but no less than once per month throughout construction of the wall to discuss progress, construction testing, questions and issues encountered by the contractor.

REAL ESTATE & ENVIRONMENTAL

WBTW’s submission should also address real estate and environmental issues, to include the following:

Environmental

- Regarding the need for 404 permits under the Clean Water Act, WBTW has stated that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) “has no interest” in the proposed project areas, as there are no Waters of the United States that are within the proposed project area or elsewhere that will be affected by the proposed project. WBTW cites to a “hydro analysis” that was performed in making this determination.
  - WBTW should include a copy of the hydrological analysis and/or any delineation survey that was performed and copies of the correspondence with USACE showing its determination that no 404 or other Clean Water Act permits are required.
- WBTW has already provided CBP with the results of cultural/historical assessment that has been performed concerning the proposed project area.
• WBTW should provide any correspondence or feedback it has received from the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer concerning such assessment and the potential impacts of the proposed project.

  - As to other potential environmental obligations, as has been discussed, CBP may be required to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, or other environmental statutes in accepting a gift or authorizing construction on federal property. WBTW’s donation intent should discuss whether it has the ability to assist with such compliance by CBP. Such assistance would likely come in the form of, among other things, providing project information, conducting additional resource surveys of the project area, or providing a consultant to assist in the preparation of required environmental documents.

CONSTRUCTION CLOSE-OUT

Finally, as a part of its submission WBTW should include or discuss the items that will be provided once construction is complete.

• Final construction close-out package shall be provided by the construction contractor prior to acceptance of the project and consideration for acceptance by CBP. The construction close out package shall include, but not be limited to:
  - Results of all materials testing conducted by a third party consultant.
  - Certification that quality assurance was conducted by an independent third party consultant and associated documentation.
  - Shop and fabrication drawings.
  - Final as-built plans certified by the contractor including, but not limited to, final surveyed location of the wall, plans, profiles, notes and details.

ENCLOSURES:

1. DHS GIFT DONATION FORM 112-02
2.  {0} {7}(E) MAP
3.  PROJECT RENDERING

Should you have questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out to our team – Chief Martin or DXD CCed here – who will address your questions and coordinate any additional communications with me.
Project Rendering

(b) (7)(E), (b) (5)
NM Alignment Map
Once again with attachment...

Deputy Commissioner Perez,

VR,

Brian Martin  
U.S. Border Patrol  
Chief of Strategic Planning and Analysis   
Washington, DC  

O: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
M-(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Kris,

I will be in the office Monday and can meet with you at that time. I presume you're ok to meet at the Reagan Building. Let me know when you arrive and I'll escort upstairs.

VR,

Brian

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 24, 2020, at 11:50 AM, Kris Kobach <kkobach@gmail.com> wrote:

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of DHS. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact the [CBP Security Operations Center](mailto:CBPSecurityOperationsCenter) with questions or concerns.

Brian,

I apologize for the late notice, but I will be at the White House for some meetings Monday morning (the 27th). I was hoping that we could meet on Monday afternoon in the 1:00 pm hour if that works for you. Just wanted to bring you up to date on everything concerning the proposed [wall project](mailto:[wall project]).

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may try to reach you as well to schedule this meeting.

Feel free to invite [and](mailto:[and]) any others on your team as well.

Thanks.

Kris

*Brian Martin*
*U.S. Border Patrol*
*Chief of Strategic Planning and Analysis*
*Washington, DC*
FYSA

From: Kris Kobach <kkobach@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 26, 2020 2:41 PM
To: MARTIN, JERRY B • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Subject: WBTW updated response to CBP checklist re "Project"

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of DHS. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact the CBP Security Operations Center with questions or concerns.

Dep. Cmmr. Perez, Brian, and 

Please find attached our updated checklist. The historical/archaeological study of the site has been completed and is being sent to the NM SHPO. There was no adverse impact found. See attached letter. At this point, we believe we are completely in alignment with CBP objectives, and all relevant information has been provided. Hopefully we can get to "yes" very soon. We are eager to break ground and close this serious gap in the El Paso Sector.

Brian, I look forward to meeting with you tomorrow.

Yours,

Kris
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>ANSWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ownership - N/A (land is already owned by DHS according to county records).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Roosevelt Reservation - The western portion of the parcel is wider than the Roosevelt Reservation; the eastern portion is the same width as the Reservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Access - DHS is the agency that owns the parcel; no other agency controls access to parcel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Private land deed of transfer - N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Title Search - N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Staging area - The wider western portion of the parcel will be the staging area. It is already owned by DHS. No other agency permission is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Private land deed of transfer - N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Private land temporary easement - N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Private land permanent easement - N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rio Grande River flood impact - N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Permits re waters of the United States - USACE has no interest in site; no waters of the United States exist on site or are affected. No Section 404 permit needed. See also hydro analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NEPA - No federal or state permits are required on this site. Historical/archaeological impact site survey and report has been completed. Report is being sent to SHPO. No adverse historical/archaeological impact will occur as a result of barrier construction on the site. See letter attached. There are two minor boundary markers in the affected section of border. WBTW will provide gates to boundary markers if requested by CBP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Environmental site assessment for contaminants - This property is already owned by DHS. Any existing contaminants would already be a matter of DHS responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CBP TI design standards - Agreed; WBTW will construct to CBP TI design standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ICC IBC risk category - Agreed; engineer will do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Load combinations - Agreed; engineer will do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Offset from border - We will meet CBP requirement of 1.5' offset from national border; unless CBP desires 3' offset to accommodate two minor border monuments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Height - We will meet CBP requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Color - The wall will not be painted, in order to match existing adjacent wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ponding - Agreed; ponding will not occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Deterrent to under-digging - Agreed; spacing between bollards will be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Spacing - Agreed; spacing between bollards will be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Drainage - Agreed to a, b, and c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>No levee walls - N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Foundation design - Agreed. We will overexcavate and recompact on grade-and-cut sections. Fill sections will be made with processed fill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Debris removal - Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Coordination with USBP Wall PMO - Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Design report - Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Contractor meeting with Wall Program Team - Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Closeout package - a. We will use licensed third party. B. Agreed. C. Agreed. D. We will provide final redlined as built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Congressionally imposed restrictions - Agreed. A. N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Gifts - Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>DHS gifts - Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Procurement process - N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Time to cross - Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Deterrent to under-digging - Agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Agent access - We will meet requirements a., b., and c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Surveillance interoperability - We will meet requirements a. and b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Reliability - The wall system will significantly exceed the objective of 20 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Report for the Archaeological Survey of a Section of Proposed Border Wall near New Mexico

The archaeological survey of the proposed border wall location was conducted January 17th, 2020. The area inventoried extends though the portion of wall next slated for construction will be built

No archaeological sites were found, but there are three historic border monuments in the surveyed area:

Monument is an obelisk of stone and concrete with a smooth plastered concrete surface on a square concrete pedestal, all recently repainted white (Figure 1). The obelisk portion tapers from a wide base to a pyramidal top. Cast metal plaques in English and Spanish are/were embedded into the north and south faces (the north one is absent). The number inscribed into the east and west faces. Fragments of cement plaster and expanded metal litter the surrounding area.

Monument is an obelisk on square pedestal of cast concrete, all recently painted silver. The obelisk has parallel vertical sides and a pyramidal top. Cast metal official plaques in English and Spanish are riveted and embedded in the north and south faces (Figure 2). Separate plaques below are embossed with language admonishing against destruction are of cast metal similarly attached, and the number is embossed on its east face.

Monument is a cast-iron obelisk bolted to a square concrete pedestal. The obelisk has slightly tapering sides and pyramidal top and plaques identical to those of Monument. The number is embossed on the east face only (Figure 3). The obelisk and top of the pedestal are painted silver while the pedestal remains raw concrete. The number is painted black. 

Monument was erected in the 1850s as part of a survey to mark and map the U.S.’s southern border following the signing of the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the conclusion
of the Mexican-American War. The effort resulted in 54 boundary survey maps finalized during the 1856-1857 Joint Boundary Commission meetings in Washington, D.C. A total of 52 such monuments were built between El Paso and San Diego.

When disputes over the exact location of the border became more frequent, a boundary resurvey was conducted between 1891-1894. An initial reconnaissance found that some of the previously established monuments were missing or in disrepair. The international resurvey team installed 206 additional monuments and employed a lettering sequence to avoid confusion with the existing monument numbers. Monument (b) (7)(E) are two of these monuments.

The New Mexico State Historic Preservation Office has determined that the monuments are eligible for listing in the National Register because of their representation of the events surrounding the establishment of the boundary following the Gadsden Purchase and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo as well as subsequent events that took place along the border, for their distinctive obelisk form, and for the information that can be gleaned about past historical events in locations where there are camps or other archaeological sites associated with those events. Because the monuments are considered eligible, they need to be protected during any proposed undertaking or their damage or destruction mitigated in some way.

Monuments (b) (7)(E) lie along the route of the currently planned border wall, while Monuments (b) (7)(E) lie beyond the end of the section (Figure 4). As has been implemented elsewhere, the plan for this segment is to build the wall 3 feet north of the actual border line (and, hence, 3 feet north of the monuments), with gates installed to provide access to the monuments. In this instance, because the monuments will remain undamaged and because there are no associated archaeological materials of any kind (e.g., the remains of a campsite associated with their construction) in the immediate vicinity, the monuments will experience no adverse physical impacts as a result of the construction of the wall.

The wall will adversely impact the monuments’ integrity to some degree because it will change their setting, feeling, and association (though not their location, design, materials, or workmanship), but because they represent only a small proportion of the overall number of border monuments (even just of those in New Mexico), the impact is not sufficient to render the international border and the monuments not eligible for listing in the National Register, nor is it irreversible, so the overall impact is unlikely to be something that would require additional mitigation steps. With that said, it should be noted that upon review of the final survey report, the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Office may have additional requirements regarding protection of the monuments during construction of the wall.
Figure 4: Map of project findings. IOs 1 and 2 mark discoveries of an isolated can and tin cup that are historic but not sufficient to be considered archaeological sites requiring protection.
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Re: Meeting Monday?

Kris,
I will be in the office Monday and can meet with you at that time. I presume you’re ok to meet at the Reagan Building. Let me know when you arrive and I’ll escort upstairs.

VR,

Brian

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 24, 2020, at 11:50 AM, Kris Kobach <kkobach@gmail.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of DHS. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact the CBP Security Operations Center with questions or concerns.

Brian,

I apologize for the late notice, but I will be at the White House for some meetings Monday morning (the 27th). I was hoping that we could meet on Monday afternoon in the 1:00 pm hour if that works for you. Just wanted to bring you up to date on everything concerning the proposed wall project. I may try to reach you as well to schedule this meeting.

Feel free to invite and any others on your team as well.

Thanks.

Kris
Good Morning Kris,

Now that the holidays are behind us, I am checking in on the message below to make sure you don’t have questions with the position and next steps addressed in the email. Let me know if I can answer anything for you.

Best,

Kris,
In response to your inquiry last week about [b](7)(E) the attorneys and I touched base again today. It

As to the criteria DHS/CBP would use to evaluate WBTW’s donation package, including any aspect that would include construction in the Roosevelt Reservation, I would point you back to the checklist we provided to WBTW during our August 27, 2019 meeting. The checklist provides detailed recitation of the factors DHS/CBP would consider in evaluating the donation package. For example, to the extent that WBTW will be constructing on private land, DHS/CBP would be looking at things like evidence of ownership, whether Phase I environmental assessment has been formed, what it shows, etc. It also goes without saying that construction should meet DHS/CBP operational requirements. Here again, the checklist we previously provided includes a detailed recitation of the design specifications that would guide DHS/CBP’s evaluation of the proposed donation.

Let me know if you have any questions once you’ve had some time to digest.

Best,

---

Thanks for the update. Let’s circle back next week.

Kris

---

From: kkobach@gmail.com <kkobach@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 6, 2019 12:08 PM
To: [b](6);[b](7)(C) <[b](6);[b](7)(C)>
Cc: MARTIN, JERRY B <[b](6);[b](7)(C)>
Subject: RE: Follow Up

From: kkobach@gmail.com <kkobach@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 6, 2019 10:03 AM
To: kkobach@gmail.com
Cc: MARTIN, JERRY B <[b](6);[b](7)(C)>
Subject: RE: Follow Up
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Kris – Thanks for the chat yesterday. As discussed, I did reach out to our attorneys (b)(5). They have put their heads together but need some more time in order to provide a complete answer. I wanted to get you an interim response but we expect to have more to share next week.

Thanks,

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2019 9:34 AM
To: kkobach@gmail.com
Cc: MARTIN, JERRY B (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: Follow Up

Good Morning Kris –

Following up on your call with Deputy Commissioner Perez, do you have a few minutes today or tomorrow we could schedule to chat about (b)(7)(E).

Best,

[Redacted]

Deputy Executive Director, Strategic Planning & Analysis
U.S. Border Patrol
Desk: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Mobile: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
This communication might contain communications between attorney and client, communications that are part of the agency deliberative process, or attorney work product, all of which are privileged and not subject to disclosure outside the agency or to the public. Please consult with the Office of Chief Counsel, U.S. Customs and Border Protection before disclosing any information contained in this email.

From: [b](6);(b)(7)(C) • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, January 8, 2020 9:09 AM
To: PEREZ, ROBERT E <(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Cc: SCOTT, RODNEY S • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) PROVOST, CARLA (USBP)
• (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HASTINGS, BRIAN S • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) MARTIN, JERRY B • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) FALK, SCOTT K (OCC)
• (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) SMITH, FREDERICK B (OCC) • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) MONTES, JOSEPH A. <joseph.a.montes@cbp.dhs.gov>
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Sir – Per our discussion last week,
Best,

Robert E. Perez
Deputy Commissioner
U.S. Customs & Border Protection

---

Sir — A couple follow ups on the content below.

Got it! Once we have a better idea of likely path forward, we’ll need to more specifically quantify the miles potentially impacted. Thanks.

REP

Robert E. Perez
Deputy Commissioner
U.S. Customs & Border Protection
First, I sent a follow up email to Kris Kobach this morning with you in the blind as discussed. I will let you know if we hear anything. My guess is with the holidays they’ve been focused on other things, but we’ll keep a close eye on this and follow up with text/call next week if we still don’t hear anything back.

Best,

Sir – As promised, OCC has provided the latest.
Sir - We have not heard reply from WBTW. Given the holidays our plan is to check back at week’s end if nothing has been received.

More to come shortly.

Thanks,

Get Outlook for iOS

Chief – checking if you’ve heard back from WBTW on this. Also, any update on the RGV activity? Thanks.
Kris,

In response to your inquiry last week about the attorneys and I touched base again today. It

As to the criteria DHS/CBP would use to evaluate WBTW’s donation package, including any aspect that would include construction in the Roosevelt Reservation, I would point you back to the checklist we provided to WBTW during our August 27, 2019 meeting. The checklist provides detailed recitation of the factors DHS/CBP would consider in evaluating the donation package. For example, to the extent that WBTW will be constructing on private land, DHS/CBP would be looking at things like evidence of ownership, whether Phase I environmental assessment has been formed, what it shows, etc. It also goes without saying that construction should meet DHS/CBP operational requirements. Here again, the checklist we previously provided includes a detailed recitation of the design specifications that would guide DHS/CBP’s evaluation of the proposed donation.

Let me know if you have any questions once you’ve had some time to digest.

Best,

From: kkobach@gmail.com <kkobach@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 6, 2019 12:08 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Thanks for the update. Let’s circle back next week.

Kris

---

From: [b](6);(b)(7)(C) - [b](6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, December 6, 2019 10:03 AM
To: kkobach@gmail.com
Cc: MARTIN, JERRY B - [b](6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Kris – Thanks for the chat yesterday. As discussed, I did reach out to our attorneys. They have put their heads together but need some more time in order to provide a complete answer. I wanted to get you an interim response but we expect to have more to share next week.

Thanks,

---

From: [b](6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2019 9:34 AM
To: kkobach@gmail.com
Cc: MARTIN, JERRY B - [b](6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: Follow Up

Good Morning Kris –

Following up on your call with Deputy Commissioner Perez, do you have a few minutes today or tomorrow we could schedule to chat about [b](7)(E)

Best,

---

[b](6);(b)(7)(C)
Deputy Executive Director, Strategic Planning & Analysis
U.S. Border Patrol
Desk: [b](6);(b)(7)(C)
Mobile: [b](6);(b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Get Outlook for iOS

From: PEREZ, ROBERT E • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Monday, December 30, 2019 8:23:57 AM
To: MARTIN, JERRY B • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Cc: SCOTT, RODNEY S • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) PROVOST, CARLA (USBP)
    HASTINGS, BRIAN S • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Chief [REDACTED] — checking if you’ve heard back from WBTW on this. Also, any update on the RGV activity? Thanks.

REP

Robert E. Perez
Deputy Commissioner
U.S. Customs & Border Protection

Kris,

In response to your inquiry last week about [REDACTED] the attorneys and I touched base again today. [REDACTED]

As to the criteria DHS/CBP would use to evaluate WBTW’s donation package, including any aspect that would include construction in the Roosevelt Reservation, I would point you back to the checklist we provided to WBTW during our August 27, 2019 meeting. The checklist provides detailed recitation of the factors DHS/CBP would consider in evaluating the donation package. For example, to the extent that WBTW will be constructing on private land, DHS/CBP would be looking at things like evidence of ownership, whether Phase I environmental assessment has been formed, what it shows, etc. It also goes without saying that construction should meet DHS/CBP operational requirements. Here again, the checklist we previously provided includes a detailed recitation of the design specifications that would guide DHS/CBP’s evaluation of the proposed donation.

Let me know if you have any questions once you’ve had some time to digest.

Best,
Thank you for the update. Let's circle back next week.

Kris

Kris – Thanks for the chat yesterday. As discussed, I did reach out to our attorneys. They have put their heads together but need some more time in order to provide a complete answer. I wanted to get you an interim response but we expect to have more to share next week.

Thanks,

Good Morning Kris –

Following up on your call with Deputy Commissioner Perez, do you have a few minutes
today or tomorrow we could schedule to chat about...
Thanks and concur with your suggested path forward.

REP

Robert E. Perez
Deputy Commissioner
U.S. Customs & Border Protection

Sir – OCC & OGC have done their work. Mind, I intend to send Kris the email below today. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Best,
Thanks please keep me updated as we make progress on this.

REP

Robert E. Perez
Deputy Commissioner
U.S. Customs & Border Protection
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Sir,

(b) (5), (b) (7)(E)

Best,

From: PEREZ, ROBERT E <(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)}
Thanks - early next week would be best. Much appreciated.

REP

Robert E. Perez
Deputy Commissioner
U.S. Customs & Border Protection

On Dec 6, 2019, at 11:05 AM, wrote:

Sir – In speaking with OCC this morning,

Best,

Kris – Thanks for the chat yesterday. As discussed, I did reach out to our attorneys. They have put their heads together but need some more time in order to provide a complete answer. I wanted to get you an interim response but we expect to have more to share next week.

Thanks,
Good Morning Kris—

Following up on your call with Deputy Commissioner Perez, do you have a few minutes today or tomorrow we could schedule to chat about [redacted].

Best,

[Redacted]
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Kris – Thanks for the chat yesterday. As discussed, I did reach out to our attorneys. They have put their heads together but need some more time in order to provide a complete answer. I wanted to give you an interim response but we expect to have more to share next week.

Thanks,

Good Morning Kris –

Following up on your call with Deputy Commissioner Perez, do you have a few minutes today or tomorrow we could schedule to chat about...

Best,

Deputy Executive Director, Strategic Planning & Analysis
U.S. Border Patrol
Desk: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Mobile: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Kris – Thanks for the chat yesterday. As discussed, I did reach out to our attorneys.
They have put their heads together but need some more time in order to provide a complete answer. I wanted to get you an interim response but we expect to have more to share next week.

Thanks,

---

Good Morning Kris –

Following up on your call with Deputy Commissioner Perez, do you have a few minutes today or tomorrow we could schedule to chat about [b](7)/[C]

Best,

---

Deputy Executive Director, Strategic Planning & Analysis
U.S. Border Patrol
Thanks - please keep me updated as we make progress on this.

REP

Robert E. Perez
Deputy Commissioner
U.S. Customs & Border Protection

Sir,

(b) (5), (b) (7)(E)
Best,

REP

Robert E. Perez
Deputy Commissioner
U.S. Customs & Border Protection

On Dec 6, 2019, at 11:05 AM, wrote:

Sir – In speaking with OCC this morning,
Kris — Thanks for the chat yesterday. As discussed, I did reach out to our attorneys. They have put their heads together but need some more time in order to provide a complete answer. I wanted to get you an interim response but we expect to have more to share next week.

Thanks,

Good Morning Kris —

Following up on your call with Deputy Commissioner Perez, do you have a few minutes today or tomorrow we could schedule to chat about?

Best,
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), (b) (7)(E)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
Thanks - early next week would be best. Much appreciated.

REP

Robert E. Perez
Deputy Commissioner
U.S. Customs & Border Protection

On Dec 6, 2019, at 11:05 AM, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) wrote:

Sir – In speaking with OCC this morning, (b)(5) ...
interim response but we expect to have more to share next week.

Thanks,

Good Morning Kris –

Following up on your call with Deputy Commissioner Perez, do you have a few minutes today or tomorrow we could schedule to chat about?

Best,

Deputy Executive Director, Strategic Planning & Analysis
U.S. Border Patrol

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2019 9:34 AM
To: kkobach@gmail.com
Cc: MARTIN, JERRY B <(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)>
Subject: Follow Up
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
From: PEREZ, ROBERT E
Sent: Friday, December 6, 2019 11:21 AM
To: MARTIN, JERRY B; PROVOST, CARLA; SCOTT, RODNEY S
Cc: (USBP)
Subject: Re: Follow Up

Thanks - early next week would be best. Much appreciated.

REP
Robert E. Perez
Deputy Commissioner
U.S. Customs & Border Protection

On Dec 6, 2019, at 11:05 AM, [b](5) wrote:

Sir – In speaking with OCC this morning, [b](5)

Best,
[b]
Kris – Thanks for the chat yesterday. As discussed, I did reach out to our attorney. They have put their heads together but need some more time in order to provide a complete answer. I wanted to get you an interim response but we expect to have more to share next week.

Thanks,

Good Morning Kris –

Following up on your call with Deputy Commissioner Perez, do you have a few minutes today or tomorrow we could schedule to chat about?

Best,
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), (b) (7)(E)
From: PEREZ, ROBERT E • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, December 6, 2019 11:21 AM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Cc: MARTIN, JERRY B • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) PROVOST, CARLA (USBP)
  • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) SCOTT, RODNEY S
  • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
  • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
  • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: Re: Follow Up

Thanks [b][censored] - early next week would be best. Much appreciated.

REP

Robert E. Perez
Deputy Commissioner
U.S. Customs & Border Protection

On Dec 6, 2019, at 11:05 AM, [b][censored] wrote:

Sir – In speaking with OCC this morning, [b][censored] wrote:

Best,

[b][censored]

[b][censored]

Desk: [b][censored]
Mobile: [b][censored]

From: [b][censored]
Sent: Friday, December 6, 2019 11:03 AM
To: 'kkobach@gmail.com' <kkobach@gmail.com>
Cc: MARTIN, JERRY B • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Kris – Thanks for the chat yesterday. As discussed, I did reach out to our attorneys [b][censored]. They have put their heads together
but need some more time in order to provide a complete answer. I wanted to get you an interim response but we expect to have more to share next week.

Thanks,

Good Morning Kris –

Following up on your call with Deputy Commissioner Perez, do you have a few minutes today or tomorrow we could schedule to chat about?

Best,

[contact information]