either potential or on-going criminal actions.

6.1.1.3 At no time shall any CBP personnel furnish any statement or information to influence the outcome of a trial. Spokespersons may, however, make public the following information after coordinating with the appropriate entities (except for minors):

6.1.1.3.1 the name, age, residence, employment, marital status, and similar background information of the defendant(s); for minors only name and age may be released.

6.1.1.3.2 the substance or text of the charge, if not sealed, such as a complaint, indictment or information;

6.1.1.3.3 the identity of the investigating and/or arresting agency(s); and

6.1.1.3.4 the circumstances immediately surrounding an arrest or seizure, including the time and place of the incident, resistance, pursuit, possession and use of weapons, and, if deemed appropriate, a description of physical items seized at the time of arrest.

6.1.2 CBP will refrain from making available the following information:

6.1.2.1 observations about a defendant’s character;

6.1.2.2 statements, admissions, confessions, or alibis attributable to a defendant;

6.1.2.3 details of investigative techniques and intelligence information or of the refusal by the defendant to submit to such techniques;

6.1.2.4 statements concerning the identity, credibility, or testimony of prospective witnesses; and

6.1.2.5 statements concerning evidence or argument in the case, whether or not it is anticipated that such evidence or argument will be used at trial (however, this generally does not include quantities or types of contraband seized);

6.1.2.6 any opinion as to the accused’s guilt, or as to the possibility of a plea of guilty to the offense charged, or as to the possibility of a plea to a lesser offense;

6.1.2.7 names of juvenile offenders; and

6.1.2.8 staffing levels of specific enforcement units.

6.1.3 There may be situations in which these proscriptions will limit the release of information which would not be prejudicial under the particular circumstances. If a CBP official believes that in the interest of the fair administration of justice, the law enforcement process, or the homeland security needs of the United States, information beyond these guidelines should be released in a particular case, he or she shall request the permission of the Commissioner or
designee and, if the matter is to be referred or has been referred for prosecution, he or she will coordinate with the appropriate Department of Justice officials to do so. CBP officials may also consult with the Office of Chief Counsel for legal advice in such circumstances.

6.2 MEDIA REQUESTS TO PHOTOGRAPH SUSPECTS

6.2.1 Photographing of suspects/detainees by news organizations in public places or in transit is neither encouraged nor discouraged, but the individuals in CBP custody shall not be posed. Upon request of the media, mug shots of individuals in CBP custody may be provided in the interest of public safety, (i.e. to assist in the apprehension fugitives, developing investigative leads, crime deterrence, etc.) To ensure the integrity of investigations and judicial process, requests for mug shots should be coordinated with the appropriate law enforcement agency.

6.2.2 When news organizations arrive at the scene of an enforcement action in progress without prior CBP knowledge, CBP personnel shall not interfere with photographing suspects in public places or in transport. Generally, other than by reasons of judicial order or the specific need to take reasonable steps to limit activity of the news media if such activity will endanger the safety of CBP personnel or the public, or reveal CBP law enforcement techniques. CBP personnel should not prevent the lawful efforts of the news media to photograph, tape, record, or televise an enforcement action from outside a designated perimeter as long as the CBP-controlled area has not been breached.

6.2.3 Decisions to allow any photographing, videotaping or filming by the media at CBP facilities shall be made in consultation with the appropriate Public Affairs Specialist and with the concurrence and control of the appropriate CBP supervisor.

6.2.4 Detention of persons or media and/or the detention of recording equipment, film or notes are prohibited unless the owner or operator of such materials has violated federal law, unlawfully breached the security of a CBP facility, or has endangered the safety of CBP personnel.

6.3 CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS – ARRESTS, SEIZURES, SEARCH WARRANTS,-surveillance

6.3.1 In cases in which a search warrant is to be executed, no advance information shall be provided to the news media about actions to be taken by law enforcement personnel, nor shall media representatives be invited to be present.

6.3.2 If the media arrive at the scene of enforcement actions, the officer in charge (or designee) or the OPA representative shall be the only authorized spokespersons within the previously stated guidelines. Authorized spokespersons may provide public information after safeguarding the integrity of the enforcement action and ensuring the safety and protecting the identity of participating law enforcement officers.

6.4 CIVIL PROCEEDINGS
6.4.1 Guidelines for civil cases (information concerning fines, penalties, and forfeitures cases) in 19 C.F.R. 103.32 (and, to the extent the matter has been referred and is handled by the Department of Justice, in coordination with the appropriate Justice Department officials acting pursuant to 28 C.F.R. 50.2 (c) or successor regulations) shall be followed.

6.4.2 It is the policy of CBP to seek to deter violations of 19 USC §1592 and other customs and immigration laws by making known, when appropriate, general information about penalty and forfeiture actions taken by the agency.

6.4.3 After the assessment of a civil penalty, payment of a mitigated amount or judicial action, the identity of the violator; the section of the law violated and the nature of the violation; the amount of the penalty assessed; the loss of government revenue; the mitigated amount (if applicable); the amount of money paid; the alleged violator’s right to seek mitigation; judicial review or appeal from a penalty assessed; and other information available under FOIA or other laws may be disclosed to the public after consulting the operational office involved and in accordance with existing CBP protocol regarding the release of information under FOIA by the appropriate OPA personnel or field manager.

6.4.4 Public disclosure of any other item of information concerning such cases, whether open or closed, shall only be made in conformance with the procedures provided in the Freedom of Information Act and other laws, as appropriate.

6.5 WHISTLEBLOWER ACT

6.5.1 CBP officials designated as spokespersons may comment on allegations made by declared whistleblowers. However, the quantity and type of information for potential release will be determined on a case-by-case basis by OPA personnel. This policy requires employees not to disclose information protected by the Privacy Act in personnel or investigative files.

6.6 RIDE-ALONG REQUESTS

6.6.1 All requests by the media to ride along in CBP aircraft and vessels must be approved in advance by the operational office HQ leadership.

6.6.1.1 Media ride-alongs on CBP conveyances are prohibited during the execution of arrest and search warrants. All other ride-along requests shall be handled on a case-by-case basis. Media related requests shall be coordinated in advance with the appropriate Public Affairs personnel. All ride-along requests shall include a signed “hold harmless” agreement. Approval of ride-along requests on CBP aircraft is contingent on applicable federal regulations regarding non-essential passengers on government law enforcement aircraft.

6.6.3 Approval of a ride-along request must take into consideration the following criteria:

6.6.3.1 safety consideration regarding individuals and activities involved;
6.6.3.2 protection of sensitive law enforcement information, investigative techniques, and the identity of law enforcement personnel involved; and

6.6.3.3 media consent to embargo publication or broadcast pending completion of appropriate investigative matters resulting from a law enforcement action occurring during the ride-along.

6.7 CRISIS COMMUNICATIONS

6.7.1 Each CBP office, in creating their incident/emergency response plans and continuation of operations plan should ensure that their appropriate public affairs specialists are aware of the plan and understands his/her role as the communicators to the media during a crisis. Operational managers and public affairs specialists shall report incidents to their respective chains of command as quickly as possible.

6.7.2 Crises may include, but are not limited to: terrorist attacks; incidents that could be construed as terrorist-related; shooting incidents; the use or threatened use of explosives; mass deaths of illegal immigrants; ambush killings and assassinations; taking of hostages; kidnapping; hijacking; theft of weapons; mass demonstrations; sabotage; other forms of violence; and natural disasters.

6.7.3 In the event of a crisis or incident, and in accordance with the Incident Command System, it is essential to identify a local spokesperson as soon as possible and that Headquarters officials, the designated local spokesperson and the principal field officer/public affairs specialist are distributing the same information (speaking with one voice). Proposed responses to media queries shall be coordinated as soon as possible with the appropriate public affairs specialist and Headquarters. The OPA is responsible for coordinating release of information with the DHS Office of Public Affairs. Overseas, host governments and the U.S. Department of State have primary responsibility for managing incidents that involve U.S. citizens or property, including possible attacks on U.S. Government agencies or installations.

6.7.4 Further coordination should be affected with appropriate state/local entities that have a jurisdictional interest in the incident.

6.7.5 Principal field officers/public affairs specialists should consider establishing a joint information center near the scene, consistent with safety requirements.

6.8 ACCIDENTS AND INCIDENTS

6.8.1 Principal field officers and/or public affairs specialists shall ensure the timely coordination and release of accurate information released to the media as soon as possible after an accident involving CBP aircraft or vessels; or after serious vehicle accidents involving CBP personnel. This is to prevent or dispel rumors that could promote misinformation in media reports.

6.8.2 The names of all injured or deceased accident victims will be withheld pending
notification of next of kin. Depending on the nature of the incident, and unless there are exigent circumstances to the contrary, following notification of next of kin, names of CBP employees may be released along with job title and duty station. Such release will be coordinated with impacted operational offices.

6.8.3 If news media arrive at the scene of an accident, the officer in charge or OPA personnel shall be the only official(s) authorized to release official information. The integrity of the incident site must be preserved and any exposed classified or law enforcement sensitive material immediately will be removed prior to permitting news media photography.

6.8.4 The following information may be released unless otherwise deemed law enforcement sensitive:

6.8.4.1 a general description of the type of accident (crash, mid-air collision, etc.);

6.8.4.2 the time and general location;

6.8.4.3 the aircraft’s or vessel’s departure point and destination (unless classified or foreign country sensitivities precludes release);

6.8.4.4 the number of crew members and passengers on board or persons in vehicle(s);

6.8.4.5 the type of aircraft, vessel or vehicle and its general purpose;

6.8.4.6 unclassified facts about the mission of the vehicle, aircraft or vessel when the accident occurred, such as training flight, patrol, surveillance, etc.; and

6.8.4.7 the fact that a board of officials, including local CBP representatives, will investigate the accident. No speculation about the cause of the accident shall be released, even if it appears obvious. Release of information concerning aircraft accidents, during and following a field investigation, shall be made only by the lead investigative agency or the investigator-in-charge.

6.8.4.8 Information that could reveal law enforcement tactics, eliminate the element of surprise, or endanger lives may not be released.

6.9 INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

6.9.1 The Office of International Affairs (INA) and other CBP offices with employees abroad or conducting international training programs abroad may, at their discretion and with the concurrence of appropriate U.S. embassy personnel, provide information about such programs and training to the media. When such events occur, CBP personnel abroad will inform the OPA prior to the disclosure of information, when possible. In the event that notification to the OPA cannot be made in advance, the Office of International Affairs will notify the OPA as soon as possible of any such media event.
6.9.2 The Office of International Affairs, will ensure timely coordination of major international events. News releases by OPA will be coordinated with the State Department, foreign country administrations, and the Office of International Affairs.

7. MEASUREMENT

7.1 The OPA will accurately and efficiently provide information regarding CBP policies and activities to the public through interaction with accredited media, production of brochures, pamphlets, and other internal and external publications, and operation and review of interactions with the public and other stakeholders. Effective communication begins with effective planning and continues throughout the project. Some of the following methods will be used to track effectiveness of communications: web tracking; user surveys and questionnaires; telephone surveys; user observation; focus group feedback; and feedback cards.

8. NO PRIVATE RIGHTS CREATED

8.1 The procedures set forth in this directive are for CBP internal use only and create no private rights, benefits, or privileges for any private person or party.

[Signature]

Acting Commissioner
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Thank you for sending this statement.

CBP statement attributable to a CBP spokesperson:

The U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) has identified requirements to construct more than 700 miles of border barriers along the Southwest border. These requirements have been prioritized against currently identified funding sources to enable construction in locations where border barriers will most impact border security operations. Approximately 43 miles of new barrier construction has already been completed in high priority locations, across varied terrain and topography, with many more miles underway.

Fisher Industries has advised USBP that they have initiated construction activities on private property in the approximate area of a USBP border barrier requirement that was not prioritized under current funding. It is not uncommon for vendors to undertake demonstrations of their capabilities utilizing their own resources. We encourage all interested vendors to compete for border barrier contracts through established mechanisms to ensure any construction is carried out under relevant federal authorities and meets USBP operational requirements for border barrier.

With regard to how the U.S. Border Patrol intends to operate in the area in which the private border barrier has been erected, our posture remains as it always has - committed to completing our border security mission regardless of the terrain, topography, and infrastructure in a given location. Our agents will continue to patrol in pursuit of operational control of the Southwest border.
This project is not connected to our efforts. Please reach out to the company leading construction for any information related to their endeavor. Thank you.

From: (b)(6) (NBCUniversal) (b)(6) 5
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 8:13 AM
To: (b)(6); (b)(7) >; @NBC Uni News Digital Desk (b)(6) nbcuni.com>
Cc: (b)(6); (b)(7) > (b)(6); (b)(7) 0
Subject: NBC News inquiry: Private group builds mile of border wall near El Paso

Hello,

My name is (b)(6) and I’m with NBC News. I am reaching out because we are seeing videos from a private group associated with Brian Kolfage who have been able to build a portion of their “border wall” near El Paso. Would your agency be able to verify this claim? Is this portion of the wall constructed with metal slates and a mile long?

Kolfage also shared this video below showing the construction of a portion of the wall. Can your agency confirm the authenticity of this video?

https://www.facebook.com/Brian.Kolfage.ir/videos/365817830712299/?__xts__%5B0%5D=68.ARCUCLc0ttW1-817Y7ZVDrFw24XK3rC3heN011GmlUS4AACiE01jkd_IA3PF0g4eunRB1bdzkbK_B7pWoU_6HCnlIGiUPZtTpu5elg9QdLVa2-Bqlzpxo9vmVcZHqUHlmqy-eMii5MDe-mfS1ebcoOx4ngeTCzqfd3H3gyENJCTvK_LR26cri-c_fWT9ybGpiCorM0t9Tm3A3PUsStmVgZm3N6QF610D9yWCuEhWJxVExnHg6FVqjYBGrjheRTAj-kcHDMv-0FTnOkMmSC-zAUsGhHJ-AWT_tOZH363qMGpFQRQm3-NjYTld9ReHB5pU4tbxk414TliyTF11vWLaLkMl KLx48Nvmb7E03x&t_n=-R

Thank you for the help and we hope to hear back.

(b)(6)
Director of Social Newsgathering
(Direct (b)(6)
(Mobile (b)(6)
(Team line (b)(6)

(b)(6)
NBC NEWS
Dear GoFundMe Customer,

Thank you for confirming that you would like your donation to go to We Build The Wall Inc., the new 501(c)(4) organization created to manage the money raised on Brian Kolfage's campaign: [https://www.gofundme.com/TheTrumpWall](https://www.gofundme.com/TheTrumpWall)

If you believe you have received this message in error, please reply to this email to reach our team.

Thank you,
Mark,

Following up on your meeting recap, below is some additional information to assist with the concerns expressed by Senator Hoeven. I am going to go ahead and add this to our timeline now that this has been raised as a concern. Not sure exactly what was promised on what “follow-up” consisted of, but the below demo, as well as sharing the documents Fisher provided at the briefings to the Border Wall Program and to OA have been shared with USACE as well. If you get any insight on his expectations please let us know and I would be happy to follow up.

(As confirmed by the USACE Fort Worth Office)

Three technical USACE personnel were invited and attended a Fisher Industries Demonstration in Coolidge, AZ on 16 April 2019. Other attendees noted by the USACE participants included: Mr. Kevin Cramer - ND Senator, Mr. Bill Cassidy - LA Senator, Ms. Debora Lasko - AZ Congresswoman, Mr. John Rutherford - FL Congressman, Mr. Andy Briggs - AZ Congressman, Mr. Matt Gaetz - FL Congressman, Mr. John Joyce - PA Congressman, Mr. Pete Stauber - MN Congressman, Mr. Dusty Johnson - SD Congressman, and Mr. Kris Kobach - former Kansas State Secretary.

The agenda for the domination included:
* Fisher's Patent-Pending Fence Installation System Demo
* Presentation of three stage border security system
  * Physical Barrier
  * Infrastructure
  * Technology
* Fisher Industries construction presentation
* Tour of Stinger Steel facilities

(As confirmed by the CBP Border Wall Program)

Two CBP personnel attended a similar demonstration at the same location on or about 13 March 2019. Congressional representation was also present but CBP did not speak to anyone.

Thanks,
PMP
Business Operations Director
Border Wall Program Management Office
United States Border Patrol
Program Management Office Directorate
Desk
Cell Phone
Just got off the call with Senator Hoeven.

He was concerned because, after he spoke to us last, we connected with the Fisher info to the Corps. The Corps never got anything from us. Senator Hoeven wants to know why. I told him I’d ask you and then get back to him.

I did tell him that I believed the Corps was aware, since Fisher had bid on contracts and we had done an assessment of their proposals. He said that he and his staff have gotten the material forwarded to the Corps so he knows they now have it but he’d still like to know why we didn’t follow through.

Can you help me track that down?

Thanks,
Mark
Here’s the email.

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Border Patrol Agent
Public Affairs Office
Rio Grande Valley Sector

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

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 12:11 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: We Build The Wall GoFundMe

H (b)(6);(b)(7)(C),

Good afternoon. Following up on my call, here is the tweet from the leader of the We Build the Wall organization:

https://twitter.com/BrianKolfage/status/1089938257725607941

Brian Kolfage and other organizers are in the Valley this week and say they will meet with landowners about privately constructing sections of border wall.

Would it be possible to get a statement from CBP about whether Kolfage and other organizers are meeting with any CBP officials today? And would it also be possible to get a statement about CBP’s position on whether private landowners or groups should build border wall?

Thanks,
(b)(6)
The information contained in this communication is intended for the use of the designated recipients named above. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The Associated Press immediately by telephone at (b) (6) and delete this email. Thank you.
Received

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 4, 2019, at 16:41 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) wrote:

Sorry, we just aren’t in a position to speak to those issues at this point.

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

Sounds good. Just was checking since she’s down there. Appreciate it.

I stand by the “we don’t have anything beyond that” from earlier email...

ALCON, here’s the statement that we’re currently using to address the questions about our involvement with this project.
CBP statement attributable to a CBP spokesperson:

The U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) has identified requirements to construct more than 700 miles of border barriers along the Southwest border. These requirements have been prioritized against currently identified funding sources to enable construction in locations where border barriers will most impact border security operations. Approximately 43 miles of new barrier construction has already been completed in high priority locations, across varied terrain and topography, with many more miles underway.

Fisher Industries has advised USBP that they have initiated construction activities on private property in the approximate area of a USBP border barrier requirement that was not prioritized under current funding. It is not uncommon for vendors to undertake demonstrations of their capabilities utilizing their own resources. We encourage all interested vendors to compete for border barrier contracts through established mechanisms to ensure any construction is carried out under relevant federal authorities and meets USBP operational requirements for border barrier.

With regard to how the U.S. Border Patrol intends to operate in the area in which the private border barrier has been erected, our posture remains as it always has - committed to completing our border security mission regardless of the terrain, topography, and infrastructure in a given location. Our agents will continue to patrol in pursuit of operational control of the Southwest border.

From (b)(6)(b)(7)(C) (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, June 4, 2019 1:57 PM
To (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)
Cc (b)(6)(b)(7)(C) (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)
Subject: FW: Private border fence

I hope you had a good trip last week. See below. Anything we can share to add context? FYI, she’s down there right now. Thanks.

From (b)(6)@wsj.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 4, 2019 1:53 PM
To (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)
Subject: Re: Private border fence

And to follow up, the land owner here tells me that he is selling the land where the new private wall was built is being sold to the folks at We Build the Wall, with a provision in that contract that they must pursue a sale to the federal government for $1. Is there any ongoing negotiations with We Build the Wall to purchase that property and the accompanying infrastructure? And just in case you can share more, is there any current plan for U.S. Border Patrol or any other U.S. government employee to monitor the cameras and sensors in place along the wall line? Thanks much.
Cheers

Immigration Reporter
The Wall Street Journal
Los Angeles

Twitter

On Fri, May 31, 2019 at 2:36 P wrote:

Hey, sorry, have been slammed all week. The statement below is all I have at this time, attributable to a CBP official. We don’t have anything beyond that.

And I have a ticket in for the phone. It calls out but doesn’t let external numbers in. Frustrating.

Bes

CBP Statement:

The U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) has identified requirements to construct more than 700 miles of border barriers along the Southwest border. These requirements have been prioritized against currently identified funding sources to enable construction in locations where border barriers will most impact border security operations. Approximately 43 miles of new barrier construction has already been completed in high priority locations, across varied terrain and topography, with many more miles underway.

Fisher Industries has advised USBP that they have initiated construction activities on private property in the approximate area of a USBP border barrier requirement that was not prioritized under current funding. It is not uncommon for vendors to undertake demonstrations of their capabilities utilizing their own resources. We encourage all interested vendors to compete for border barrier contracts through established mechanisms to ensure any construction is carried out under relevant federal authorities and meets USBP operational requirements for border barrier.

With regard to how the U.S. Border Patrol intends to operate in the
area in which the private border barrier has been erected, our posture remains as it always has - committed to completing our border security mission regardless of the terrain, topography, and infrastructure in a given location. Our agents will continue to patrol in pursuit of operational control of the Southwest border.

From (b)(6) @wsj.com>
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 1:32 PM
To: (b)(6); (b)(7) C
Subject: Re: Private border fence

Following up on this. Also, your number still doesn’t work. And need to add to the below, Kris Kobach at We Build the Wall said yesterday that the fence comes complete with lights, cameras and sensors and they will turn over “a turnkey operation” to you with a “smart fence.” So, will CBP be accepting this “turnkey operation” and if so, what is the procedure for accepting a $6 million to $8 million piece of infrastructure that you neither built, oversaw or asked for?

Thanks.

(b)(6)

Immigration Reporter

The Wall Street Journal

Los Angeles

Twitter (b)(6)

On Tue, May 28, 2019 at 12:50 P @wsj.com> wrote:

Thanks for your help with this. As I mentioned, I am trying to run down a few things on the stretch of fencing/wall being built in New Mexico, just east of Monument 1.
Will CBP have any roll in securing the privately-built structure? I know there is a maintenance team responsibility for fence/wall repairs in the area, will those efforts include this structure?

Will this structure inhibit or otherwise impact the Border Patrol’s access to the stretch of border where this structure has been built?

Thanks in advance for your help.

Cheers

Immigration Reporter
The Wall Street Journal
Los Angeles
Evolved Situation Report

National Media Presence

January 29, 2019, 1230 hrs.

(b)(7)(E), Texas (Zon *****)

GPS Coordinates: (b)(7)(E)

SIR: Pending

INITIAL

SITUATION:

On January 29, 2019, at approximately 1230 hrs., Agents assigned to Zon ******* contacted the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area. Agents stated that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording during the apprehension of a group of aliens on ******* and ******* Mr. Darby stated that he was escorting a group of Congressional members but had intentionally not notified the Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office. Mr. Darby also stated that he had authorization to be in the area from a gentlemen by the name of *******

TIMELINE:

1230 hrs. Agents assigned to Zon ******* contacted the Tactical Operations Center
Good afternoon RGV PAO personnel.

FYSA.

Evolving Situation Report
National Media Presence
January 29, 2019, 1230 hrs.

Texas (Zon

GPS Coordinates
SIR: Pending
INITIAL

SITUATION:
On January 29, 2019, at approximately 1230 hrs., Agents assigned to Zone [redacted] contacted the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area. Agents stated that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording during the apprehension of a group of aliens on [redacted] an [redacted] Mr. Darby stated that he was escorting a group of Congressional members but had intentionally not notified the Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office. Mr. Darby also stated that he had authorization to be in the area from a gentlemen by the name of [redacted]
TIMELINE:

1230 hrs. Agents assigned to Zone contacted the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area.

1232 hrs. SBP responded to the area for further inquiry.

1240 hrs. Agents advised that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording and interviewing aliens apprehended near an

1240 hrs The Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office and the Rio Grande Valley Sector Operations Center were notified.

Updates to follow

This ESR was reviewed and approved by W
From: RGVOPCEN
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 2:32 PM
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)
Cc: RGVOPCEN
Subject: RG (b)(7)(E) ESR: Media Presence i (b)(7)(E) (Initial)

ALCON,

Please see below ESR (initial) regarding Media Interest reported by the (b)(7)(E), Texas Border Patrol Station.

Regards,

RGV OPCEN

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 1:18 PM
To: (b)(7)(E) ESR (b)(7)(E) TOC (b)(7)(E)
Subject: FW: RGV (b)(7)(E) ESR: Media Presence i (b)(7)(E) (Initial)
Importance: High

Evolving Situation Report

National Media Presence i (b)(7)(E)

January 29, 2019, 1230 hrs.

(b)(7)(E), Texas (Zon

GPS Coordinates (b)(7)(E)

SIR: Pending

INITIAL

SITUATION:

On January 29, 2019, at approximately 1230 hrs., Agents assigned to Zon...
contacted the 

Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area. Agents stated that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording during the apprehension of a group of aliens on an
Evolution Situation Report

National Media Presence

January 29, 2019, 1230 hrs.

(b)(7)(E) Texas (Zone

GPS Coordinates (b)(7)(E)

SIR: (b)(7)(E)

FINAL

SITUATION:

On January 29, 2019, at approximately 1230 hrs., Agents assigned to Zone (b)(7)(E) contacted the (b)(7)(E) Tactical Operations Center (TAC-TOC) concerning media presence in the area. Agents stated that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording during the apprehension of a group of aliens on (b)(7)(E) and (b)(7)(E). Mr. Darby stated that he was escorting a group of Congressional members but had intentionally not notified the Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office. Mr. Darby also stated that he had authorization to be in the area from a gentlemen by the name of (b)(6).

FINAL

1330 hrs  Media Interest Significant Incident Report (b)(7)(E) generated

1400 hrs
Good afternoon RGV PAO personnel.

FYSA.

Evolving Situation Report
National Media Presence i (b)(7)(E)
January 29, 2019, 1230 hrs.
(b)(7)(E) Texas (Zone (b)(7)(E))
GPS Coordinates (b)(7)(E)
SIR: Pending
INITIAL
SITUATION:
On January 29, 2019, at approximately 1230 hrs., Agents assigned to Zone contacted the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area. Agents stated that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording during the apprehension of a group of aliens on . Mr. Darby stated that he was escorting a group of Congressional members but had intentionally not notified the Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office. Mr. Darby also stated that he had authorization to be in the area from a gentlemen by the name of.

TIMELINE:
1230 hrs. Agents assigned to Zone contacted the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area.
1232 hrs. SBP responded to the area for further inquiry.
1240 hrs. Agents advised that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording and interviewing aliens apprehended near .
1240 hrs. The Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office and the Rio Grande Valley Sector Operations Center were notified.

Updates to follow

This ESR was reviewed and approved by W.
Evolving Situation Report

National Media Presence i (b) (7)(E)

January 29, 2019, 1230 hrs.

[Redacted] Texas (Zone [Redacted])

GPS Coordinates: (b) (7)(E)

SIR: (b) (7)(E)

FINAL

SITUATION:

On January 29, 2019, at approximately 1230 hrs., Agents assigned to Zone [Redacted] contacted the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area. Agents stated that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording during the apprehension of a group of aliens on [Redacted] and [Redacted] Mr. Darby stated that he was escorting a group of Congressional members but had intentionally not notified the Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office. Mr. Darby also stated that he had authorization to be in the area from a gentlemen by the name of (b) (6)

FINAL

1330 hrs Media Interest Significant Incident Report (b) (7)(E) generated

1400
From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on behalf of RGVOPCEN
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 4:55 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RG ESR: Media Presence i (FINAL)

ALCON,

Below is an ESR (final) regarding a National Media Presence reported by the Texas Border Patrol Station.

Regards,

RGV OPCEN

---

Evolving Situation Report
National Media Presence i (b)(7)(E)
January 29, 2019, 1230 hrs.
Texas (Zon (b)(7)(E)
GPS Coordinates (b)(7)(E)
SIR: (b)(7)(E) FINAL

SITUATION:
On January 29, 2019, at approximately 1230 hrs., Agents assigned to Zona (b)(7)(E) contacted the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area. Agents stated that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording during the apprehension of a group of aliens on (b)(7)(E) Mr. Darby stated that he was escorting a group of Congressional members but had intentionally not notified the Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office. Mr. Darby also stated that he had authorization to be in the area from a gentlemen by the name of (b)(6)

FINAL
1330 hrs Media Interest Significant Incident Report generated (b)(7)(E)
1400 hrs Media Outlet left the area without further incident.

TIMELINE:
1230 hrs Agents assigned to Zona (b)(7)(E) contacted the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area.
1323 hrs SBP (b)(7)(C) responded to the area for further inquiry.
1240 hrs Agents advised that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording and interviewing aliens apprehended near


1240 hrs  The Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office and theRio Grande Valley Sector Operations Center were notified.
1330 hrs  Media Interest Significant Incident Repor (b)(7)(E) generated
1400 hrs  Media Outlet cleared the area without further incident.

No further updates anticipated

This ESR was reviewed and approved by W (b)(6),(b)(7)(C)
Below is an ESR (final) regarding a National Media Presence reported by the Texas Border Patrol Station.

Regards,

RGV OPCEN

Evolving Situation Report

National Media Presence i

January 29, 2019, 1230 hrs.

Texas (Zone

GPS Coordinates

SIR:

FINAL

SITUATION:

On January 29, 2019, at approximately 1230 hrs., Agents assigned to Zone contacted the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area. Agents stated that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording during the apprehension of a group of aliens on and Mr. Darby stated that he was escorting a group of Congressional members but had intentionally not notified the Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office. Mr. Darby also stated that he had authorization to be in the area f
From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 10:19 AM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: FW: (U//LES) CASE SUPPORT [b](7)(E) FYSA - Militia Activity

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 9:07 AM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(7)(E)
Subject: (U//LES) CASE SUPPORT [b](7)(E) FYSA - Militia Activity

Respectfully,
(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), (b)(7)(E)

This message contains information intended only for the addressee named above. If you believe you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately.

WARNING: This document is designated FOR UNCLASSIFIED//OFFICIAL USE ONLY (U//FOUO). It may contain information that is LAW ENFORCEMENT-SENSITIVE (LES) and exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (SU5CS52). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to FOUO information, and is not to be released to the public or personnel who do not have a valid need to know without prior approval from the CB [b](7)(E).
Situational Awareness Only

(b) (7)(E), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C), (b) (7)(E)

CONFIDENTIAL NOTICE: This is a CONFIDENTIAL LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMUNICATION. DO NOT disseminate, distribute, use or copy this communications if you have received this message in error and/or are not the intended recipient. DESTROY all copies of the original and contact the sender by reply e-mail or by calling the
From: (A)Special Operations Supervisor  
Communications Branch  
RGV Sector HQ  
O (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
C  

Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 10:25 AM  
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
Subject: FW: RG ESR: Media Presence i (FINAL)  

On Behalf Of RGVOPCEN  

Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 3:55 PM  
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
Subject: RG ESR: Media Presence i (FINAL)  
Importance: High  

ALCON,  

Below is an ESR (final) regarding a National Media Presence reported by the Texas Border Patrol Station.  

Regards,  

RGV OPCEN  

Evolving Situation Report  
National Media Presence i  
January 29, 2019, 1230 hrs.  
(b)(7)(E), Texas (Zone 
SITUATION:
On January 29, 2019, at approximately 1230 hrs., Agents assigned to Zone contacted the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area. Agents stated that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording during the apprehension of a group of aliens on an Mr. Darby stated that he was escorting a group of Congressional members but had intentionally not notified the Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office. Mr. Darby also stated that he had authorization to be in the area from a gentlemen by the name of.

FINAL
1330 hrs Media Interest Significant Incident Report generated
1400 hrs Media Outlet left the area without further incident.

TIMELINE:
1230 hrs Agents assigned to Zone contacted the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) concerning media presence in the area.
1232 hrs SBP responded to the area for further inquiry.
1240 hrs Agents advised that Breitbart News Reporter Brandon Darby was actively recording and interviewing aliens apprehended on The Rio Grande Valley Sector Public Affairs Office and the Rio Grande Valley Sector Operations Center were notified.
1330 hrs Media Interest Significant Incident Report generated
1400 hrs Media Outlet cleared the area without further incident.

No further updates anticipated

This ESR was reviewed and approved by W
Respectfully,

This message contains information intended only for the addressee named above. If you believe you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately.

WARNING: This document is designated FOR UNCLASSIFIED//OFFICIAL-USE-ONLY (U//FOUO). It may contain information that is LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE (LES) and exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to FOUO information, and is not to be released to the public or personnel who do not have a valid need to know without prior approval from the CB (b)(7)(E).
From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(C) (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)  
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 8:54 AM  
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)  
Subject: RE: LINE TOUR REQUEST

Thank

Office: (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)  
Cellular: (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)  
HSDN (SIPR): (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)  
Address: 8901 Montana Ave, El Paso, TX 79925

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)  
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 8:53 AM  
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(C) (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)  
Subject: RE: LINE TOUR REQUEST

Sir,

I’ll get back to you by noon. About to walk into a meeting.

Thanks,

From: (b)(6)(b)(7)(C) (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)  
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 8:43 AM  
To: (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)  
Cc: (b)(6)(b)(7)(C)  
Subject: FW: LINE TOUR REQUEST  
Importance: High
Dave

Office: (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)
Cellular: (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)
HSDN (SIPR): (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)
Address: 8901 Montana Ave, El Paso, TX 79925

From: (b)(6);(b)(7);(C) (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2019 7:19 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7);(C) (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)
Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7);(C) (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)
Subject: Fwd: LINE TOUR REQUEST

Please see the below ride along request for David Clark for tomorrow for your review and approval.

He will be in town for the Santa Teresa new wall event tomorrow and is asking for a ride along after the event.

Your thoughts?

Assistant Chief Patrol Agent
Strategic Communications
U.S. Border Patrol - El Paso Sector
8901 Montana Ave.
El Paso, TX 79925

(b)(6);(b)(7);(C) - Office
(b)(6);(b)(7);(C) - Cell

Begin forwarded message:

From: (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)
Date: May 29, 2019 at 6:42:37 PM MDT
To: (b)(6);(b)(7);(C) (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)
Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)
Subject: LINE TOUR REQUEST

Good afternoon Sir,
STN received a phone call requesting information on how to set up a line tour for Sheriff David Clarke. The caller was (b)(6) who is currently the head of security for the “We Build the Wall” project at monument one. His number is (b)(6).

Sheriff Clarke is scheduled to be in the El Paso area for the next couple of days attending several events. Sheriff Clarke requested a line tour to see the realities faced by agents on a daily basis. Sheriff Clarke has several events scheduled throughout the day and requested the line tour (if possible) be scheduled during the evening hours. I’ve provided your contact information and he will call you shortly with specifics regarding the request.

Below is a quick Wikipedia biography on Sheriff Clarke

David Alexander Clarke Jr. is an American former law enforcement official who served as Sheriff of Milwaukee County, Wisconsin from 2002 to 2017. In 2002, Clarke was appointed to the position by Governor Scott McCallum and later elected that same year to his first four-year term. He was reelected in November 2006, 2010 and 2014.[1] Although registered and elected as a Democrat in a heavily Democratic county, many of Clarke’s political views align with those of conservative Republicans.

He resigned as sheriff in August 2017.[4] A vocal supporter of President Donald Trump, Clarke was considered for a role in the Trump administration. After resigning as Sheriff of Milwaukee County, Clarke joined the super PAC America First Action as a spokesman and senior advisor, serving until February 2019.

Clarke was born in Milwaukee, one of five children of Jeri and David Clarke Sr. His father was a paratrooper with the 2nd Ranger Infantry Company. Clarke Jr. attended Marquette University High School where he played for the varsity basketball team. After finishing high school, Clarke took classes at the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee but dropped out during his first year when he got a job driving beer trucks.

His career in law enforcement began in 1978 at the Milwaukee Police Department (MPD). He "rose through the ranks at a slow but steady pace in his 24 years with the department." Clarke was a patrol officer for eleven years and then a homicide detective; he was promoted to lieutenant of detectives in 1993 and captain in 1999.

In 1999, Clarke received a B.A. in Management of Criminal Justice from Concordia University Wisconsin's School of Adult and Continuing Education. In January 2002, Milwaukee County Sheriff Leverett F. (Lev) Baldwin resigned midway through his term to take a pension payout. Clarke was one of ten applicants for the position, and Governor Scott McCallum appointed him on March 19, 2002. He was elected to a full term later in 2002, and was reelected in 2006, 2010, and 2014.
Watch Commander
Santa Teresa Border Patrol Station
El Paso Sector
Ofc (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Cell: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

(6)(6);(7)(C)
Attorney
Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
9434 Viscount Blvd.
El Paso, Texas 79925
(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
(main line)
(direct line)

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 8:54 AM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: LINE TOUR REQUEST

Thank (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).

Office: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Cellular: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
HSDN (SIPR) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Address: 8901 Montana Ave, El Paso, TX 79925

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 8:53 AM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: LINE TOUR REQUEST
Sir,

I’ll get back to you by noon. About to walk into a meeting.

Thanks,

From: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)  (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 8:43 AM
To: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
Subject: FW: LINE TOUR REQUEST
Importance: High

(b)(5)

Thanks.

Office: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
Cellular: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
HSDN (SIPR): (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
Address: 8901 Montana Ave, El Paso, TX 79925

From: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2019 7:19 PM
To: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)  (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)  (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
Subject: Fwd: LINE TOUR REQUEST

Please see the below ride along request for David Clark for tomorrow for your review and approval.

He will be in town for the Santa Teresa new wall event tomorrow and is asking for a ride along after the event.

Your thoughts?

(b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
Assistant Chief Patrol Agent
Strategic Communications
U.S. Border Patrol - El Paso Sector
8901 Montana Ave.
Good afternoon Sir,

STN received a phone call requesting information on how to set up a line tour for Sheriff David Clarke. The caller was [redacted], who is currently the head of security for the “We Build the Wall” project at monument one. His number is [redacted].

Sheriff Clarke is scheduled to be in the El Paso area for the next couple of days attending several events. Sheriff Clarke requested a line tour to see the realities faced by agents on a daily basis. Sheriff Clarke has several events scheduled throughout the day and requested the line tour (if possible) be scheduled during the evening hours. I’ve provided [redacted] your contact information and he will call you shortly with specifics regarding the request.

Below is a quick Wikipedia biography on Sheriff Clarke

David Alexander Clarke Jr. is an American former law enforcement official who served as Sheriff of Milwaukee County, Wisconsin from 2002 to 2017. In 2002, Clarke was appointed to the position by Governor Scott McCallum and later elected that same year to his first four-year term. He was reelected in November 2006, 2010 and 2014. Although registered and elected as a Democrat in a heavily Democratic county, many of Clarke’s political views align with those of conservative Republicans.

He resigned as sheriff in August 2017. A vocal supporter of President Donald Trump, Clarke was considered for a role in the Trump Administration. After resigning as Sheriff of Milwaukee County, Clarke joined the super PAC America First Action as a spokesman and senior advisor, serving until February 2019.

Clarke was born in Milwaukee, one of five children of Jeri and David Clarke Sr. His father was a paratrooper with the 2nd Ranger Infantry Company. Clarke Jr. attended Marquette University High School where he played for the varsity basketball team. After finishing high school, Clarke took classes at the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee but dropped out during his first year when he got a job driving beer trucks.

His career in law enforcement began in 1978 at the Milwaukee Police Department (MPD). He "rose through the ranks at a slow but steady pace in his 24 years with the department." Clarke was a patrol officer for eleven years and then a homicide detective; he was promoted to lieutenant of detectives in 1993 and captain in 1999.
In 1999, Clarke received a B.A. in Management of Criminal Justice from Concordia University Wisconsin's School of Adult and Continuing Education. In January 2002, Milwaukee County Sheriff Leverett F. (Lev) Baldwin resigned midway through his term to take a pension payout. Clarke was one of ten applicants for the position, and Governor Scott McCallum appointed him on March 19, 2002. He was elected to a full term later in 2002, and was reelected in 2006, 2010, and 2014.
FW: LES CASE SUPPORT FYSA - Militia Activity

Situational Awareness Only

(b) (7)(E)
Thank — see ya on the line

Thank You Respectfully,

(A) Division Chief
Law Enforcement Operations Division
Big Bend Sector

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 12:22 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Texas Minutemen Meeting

He did not come or at least has not come by the station. The Sheriff is out of town, but was going to have a Deputy provide a ride along. If I get any feedback, I’ll pass it along.

Thank You

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 12:21 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Texas Minutemen Meeting

How did Sheriff Clarke’s visit go? Anything of interest?

Thank You Respectfully,

(A) Division Chief
Good morning. I just spoke with (b)(6). He stated that former Sheriff Clarke is flying into Midland today and they would like to know if Border Patrol will provide him with a tour. I let him know I had not heard back from my request last week and that I was sending it up the chain again.

The question came up with regards to their map request as well. I hadn’t heard anything back, so I informed them we couldn’t provide maps as they are for LEO use.

Thank you.

Good morning. I had a message left for me regarding a phone call for (b)(6) of the Texas Minutemen. It was regarding the ride along request for David Clarke. Is this something Border Patrol will entertain? I plan to call back this morning and wanted to provide him with information. The request was originally for yesterday, other than that, I do not have any more specifics at this time.

Thank you.

Good morning. It was very nice to speak with (b)(6) this morning. (b)(6) has his requested ride along with Border Patrol this morning and it went very well. (b)(6) was very impressed with the staff and the work we do. He also expressed that his ride along will be published in their newsletter. (b)(6) plans to request a ride along with Border Patrol in the future.

Thank you.
Good afternoon. I just finished up a visit from [redacted] founder of the Texas Minutemen, and another gentlemen by the name [redacted]. [redacted] is a volunteer that came in from Florida.

At this time they only have permission to be on the land owned by [redacted], which is approximately 185 acres. They did confirm that David A. Clarke is attempting to make it to the area next Tuesday and may be flying into Midland. [redacted] stated they plan to have Sheriff Hughes provide a tour for Mr. Clarke, but also asked if Border Patrol could provide a tour. I informed them I would route that through our chain of command. In addition to Mr. Clarke [redacted] stated they are making contact with other people that support their cause and bring as much attention to the area as they can.

The entire conversation was good.

Thank you.

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2019 2:55 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Texas Minutemen Meeting

Thank You. Please ensure the rules of engagement are reiterated at musters. Also, notify us of any contact or issues.

Thank You Respectfully,

[b6][b7][C]
Division Chief
Law Enforcement Operations Division
Big Bend Sector

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 25, 2019, at 12:54 PM [redacted] wrote:

Good afternoon. I received a call from [redacted], the Terrell County landowner that will be allowing the Texas Minutemen to patrol his property. He informed me he there are currently three members of the Texas Minutemen at his ranch and that they are anticipating approximately 10 more in a week or so. [b6] also informed me that former Milwaukee county Sheriff, David A. Clarke will be in the area next week to meet with him as well as the Sheriff. [b6] asked if we could provide him with maps of the area to provide to the Minutemen. I told him we didn't generate those here and I would
Good afternoon. Below is what I sent regarding the meeting. Will this work or do you want me to put it in another format?

Thank you.

Good afternoon. This morning at approximately 10:45 A.M., Terrell County landowner and Texas Minutemen found stopped by the station. property is located approximately and an additional The portion leading up property is considered a county road. Additionally, the entrance property has a sign title . informed me that he contacted due to recently viewing an illegal alien alone and a subsequent event when he had a satellite phone stolen, which he attributed to an illegal alien mentioned that he was once a Marshall in Wise County, Texas, and that he was also a Vietnam Veteran. When mentioned that he was from Wise County seemed surprised and mentioned that he lives in Wise County. This demonstrated to me they were not very familiar with one another.

introduced himself and spoke of his past border activities in Arizona, New Mexico and Texas informed me he had approximately 20 individuals interested in coming to Terrell County and they planned to be here the second week in January. Additionally stated that he will vet all volunteers in order to keep the “Rambos” out.

I informed both gentlemen the best thing they can do is be our eyes and ears when they are out and the importance of communication with us if they encountered anyone as well as for officer safety. I explained the liabilities they could face when interacting with anyone they encounter. I also encouraged them to allow us to execute any law enforcement action. Both gentlemen acknowledged that they understood an stated that they will be in static positions and would advise of
any activity. Before leaving I asked that they contact me before they return to the area, which they agreed to do.

Both men were cordial and respectful.

(b) (6) were planning to visit the Sheriff after leaving my office.

I will be provide the above information to the Sheriff Hughes as well as local TPWD Game Wardens and DPS Troopers.

Thank you.

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

United States Border Patrol

Sanderson, Texas
Office

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 2:55 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Texas Minutemen Meeting

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

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Big Bend Sector
United States Border Patrol
(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

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

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) >
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 1:52 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Texas Minutemen Meeting

Yes Sir, I agree.

(b)(5)

Thank you.

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 1:48 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Texas Minutemen Meeting

Thanks for the AAR (b)(5)

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Big Bend Sector
United States Border Patrol
(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

(b)(5);(b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 12:40 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: FW: Texas Minutemen Meeting
Chief

Former Sheriff Clarke did not have any contact with the Sanderson Station.

Thank You Respectfully,

(A) Division Chief
Law Enforcement Operations Division
Big Bend Sector

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 12:22 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Texas Minutemen Meeting

He did not come or at least has not come by the station. The Sheriff is out of town, but was going to have a Deputy provide a ride along. If I get any feedback, I’ll pass it along.

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 12:21 PM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: Texas Minutemen Meeting

How did Sheriff Clarke’s visit go? Anything of interest?

Thank You Respectfully,
Good morning. I just spoke with [redacted] He stated that former Sheriff Clarke is flying into Midland today and they would like to know if Border Patrol will provide him with a tour. I let him know I had not heard back from my request last week and that I was sending it up the chain again.

The question came up with regards to their map request as well. I hadn’t heard anything back, so I informed them we couldn’t provide maps as they are for LEO use.

Thank you.

Good morning. I had a message left for [redacted] of the Texas Minutemen. It was regarding the ride along request for David Clarke. Is this something Border Patrol will entertain? I plan to call [redacted] back this morning and wanted to provide him with information. The request was originally for yesterday, other than that, I do not have any more specifics at this time.

Thank you.

Good afternoon [redacted] and I just finished up a visit from [redacted] founder of the Texas Minutemen, and another gentleman by the name [redacted] is a volunteer that came in from Florida.

At this time they only have permission to be on the land owned by [redacted] which is approximately 185 acres. They did confirm that David A. Clarke is attempting to make it to the area next Tuesday and may be flying into Midland [redacted]
stated they plan to have Sheriff Hughes provide a tour for Mr. Clarke, but also asked if Border Patrol could provide a tour. I informed them I would route that through our chain of command. In addition to Mr. Clark stated they are making contact with other people that support their cause and bring as much attention to the area as they can.

The entire conversation was good.

Thank you.

---

From: (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)  
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2019 2:55 PM  
To: (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)  
Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7);(C)  

Subject: Re: Texas Minutemen Meeting  

Thank You. Please ensure the rules of engagement are reiterated at musters. Also, notify us of any contact or issues.

Thank You Respectfully,

---

(b)(6);(b)(7);(C)  
(A) Division Chief  
Law Enforcement Operations Division  
Big Bend Sector  

On Jan 25, 2019, at 12:54 PM (b)(6);(b)(7);(C) > wrote:

Good afternoon. I received a call from , the Terrell County landowner that will be allowing the Texas Minutemen to patrol his property. He informed me that there are currently three members of the Texas Minutemen at his ranch and that they are anticipating approximately 10 more in a week or so also informed me that former Milwaukee county Sheriff, David A. Clarke will be in the area next week to meet with him as well as the Sheriff asked if we could provide him with maps of the area to provide to the Minutemen. I told him we didn’t generate those here and I would have to send the request up the chain, but I didn’t believe it would be possible and the Texas Militia also plan to start a GoFundMe page asking for support for fuel and what not.

Thank you.
Good afternoon. Below is what I sent regarding the meeting. Will this work or do you want me to put it in another format?

Thank you.

Good afternoon. This morning at approximately 10:45 A.M., Terrell County landowner and Texas Minutemen found stopped by the station and an additional The portion leading up has a sign titled The property is considered a county road. Additionally, the entrance has a sign and a subsequent event when he had a satellite phone stolen, which he attributed to an illegal alien mentioned that he was once a Marshall in Wise County, Texas, and that he was also a Vietnam Veteran. Who mentioned that he was from Wise County seemed surprised and mentioned that he lives in Wise County. This demonstrated to me they were not very familiar with one another.

introduced himself and spoke of his past border activities in Arizona, New Mexico and informed me he had approximately 20 individuals interested in coming to Terrell County and they planned to be here the second week in January. Additionally stated that he will vet all volunteers in order to keep the “Rambos” out.

I informed both gentlemen the best thing they can do is be our eyes and ears when they are out and the importance of communication with us if they encountered anyone as well as for officer safety. I explained the liabilities they could face when interacting with anyone they encounter. I also encouraged them to allow us to execute any law enforcement action. Both gentlemen acknowledged that they understood an stated that they will be in static positions and would advise of any activity. Before leaving I asked that they contact me before they return to the area, which they agreed to do.

Both men were cordial and respectful.
(b)(6) an (b)(6) were planning to visit the Sheriff after leaving my office.

I will provide the above information to the Sheriff Hughes as well as local TPWD Game Wardens and DPS Troopers.

Thank you.
You're welcome.

Thank you for sharing with us.

Respectfully,

This message contains information intended only for the addressee named above. If you believe you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately.

WARNING: This document is designated FOR UNCLASSIFIED//OFFICIAL USE ONLY (O//FOUO). It may contain information that is LAW-ENFORCEMENT-SENSITIVE (LES) and exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to FOUO information, and is not to be released to the public or personnel who do not have a valid need to know without prior approval from the CBP.
Dear original donor to our GoFundMe Campaign to build the wall,

GoFundMe just told me that they still haven't heard from you whether or not you still want to support our project to build the wall. Your contribution will be automatically refunded unless you use the email address you're receiving this email from to tell GoFundMe that you want to OPT-IN by clicking on ***THIS LINK***

Our team just wrapped up our first visit to the border and I can tell you that we're going to start building segments of wall very soon. We've assembled an incredible team that includes people like General Spalding, John Moran, Eric Prince, Tom Tancredo, Sheriff David Clarke, angel Mom Mary Ann Mendoza, and Kris Kobach. Today we just announced two more incredible additions by adding Breitbart's Border and Cartel Chronicles Director Brandon Darby and Baseball Legend Curt Schilling!

We hope that you are seeing all the progress our team is making and choose to have your generous contribution support this historic project.

We are working hard to EARN YOUR SUPPORT!

To make sure your contribution counts please check the email address you received this email on and enter it into GoFundMe's OPT-IN form that you can find on the link below:

Click HERE to tell GoFundMe that you still want to build the wall!

If you have any questions, you can email us at info@webuildthewall.us and we will do our best to answer those for you.

Thank you and God Bless,
Brian Kolfage
President, WeBuildTheWall

WeBuildTheWall, Inc. | PO Box 131567, Houston, TX 77219-1567
From:       
Sent:       
To:         
Subject:   Fwd: Complimentary Reception Invitation from the El Paso County Republican Party - THIS THURSDAY

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From:       
Date:       
Subject:   Fwd: Complimentary Reception Invitation from the El Paso County Republican Party - THIS THURSDAY

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: El Paso County Republican Party <elpasogophq@gmail.com>
Date: July 21, 2019 at 6:17:49 PM MDT
To:         
Subject:   Complimentary Reception Invitation from the El Paso County Republican Party - THIS THURSDAY
Reply-To: <elpasogophq@gmail.com>

Your El Paso County Republican Party invites you to attend this reception as our guests to show a big El Paso welcome to the national headliners and speakers:

SYMPOSIUM AT THE WALL
Thursday, July 25, 2019
6:00PM - 9:30PM
1000 Brickland Rd., Sunland Park, NM
(Site of the newly constructed border wall - WE BUILD THE WALL)*

SEE BULLETS BELOW*
Come meet, shake hands, have a glass of wine, take selfies, and talk with the likes of:

**Stephen K. Bannon**, Citizens of the American Republic

**Brian Kolfage**, We Build the Wall

**Kris Kobach**, We Build the Wall

**Candace Owens**, Turning Point, Conservative Activist

**Sheriff David Clarke**, Former Sheriff, Milwaukee, WI

**Congressman Louis Gohmert (R TX)**

*And more!*

**SUBMIT REGISTRATION BY CLICKING HERE!!!**

**NOTE YOU ARE ATTENDING BY INVITATION OF THE EL PASO COUNTY REPUBLICAN PARTY.**

You will receive prompt email confirmation.

- Symposium’s temporary shelter incorporates full bathroom facilities, artificial turf and Refrigerated Air.
- Complementary meals served daily between symposium seminar sessions.
- Symposium program updates will follow by email
- El Paso County Republican Party – Symposium Hotline: (915) 400-4653
  Directions and site map are on Registration form.

**GET MORE DETAILED INFORMATION BY CLICKING HERE!**
Copyright © 2019 El Paso County Republican Party, All rights reserved.
You are receiving this e-mail because you signed up via e-mail, web site, or at GOP head quarters.

Our mailing address is:
El Paso County Republican Party
120 Paragon
Suite 220
El Paso, TX 79912

Add us to your address book.

Want to change how you receive these emails?
You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list.

mailchimp
 Added additional media info re: wall symposium!  See below!

Please see below for draft weekly. The two highlights are reminders to circle back with following the PMR. Holding off on updating the card until we hear back from him!

Please let me know if you have any questions or further updates!

Best,

(b)(5), (b)(7)(E)
(b) (5), (b) (7)(E), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b) (7)(E), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b) (7)(E)
WARNING: This document is LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE and is designated FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (FOUO). It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with Department of Homeland Security policy relating to FOUO information, and is not to be released to the public or personnel who do not have a valid "need to know" without prior approval.
Please make sure the 4th floor is aware

Carla L. Provost
Chief
U. S. Border Patrol

On Jul 25, 2019, at 1:32 PM, MARTIN, JERRY > wrote:

Chief and Deputy,

For your visibility, We Build The Wall has scheduled a Border Wall Symposium today through Saturday at the Sunland Park project location. Below is a list of today’s speakers and events. You’ll notice that Brandon Judd will be present as will high ranking members of Congress and Donald Trump Jr.. On a related note, we have completed the assessment on this property and will be ready to tee up with our recommendation within the next week or so.

VR

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

Here’s the email chain below on the symposium, but I also copied out the website agenda for today that shows Judd as a speaker for ease.

08:30
Welcome Kris Kobach
08:45
The Current Crisis: Facts, Figures and Analysis
Introduction by Kris Kobach
10:00
Defending America and Her Border  Brandon Judd, border patrol agents  Introduction by Kris Kobach
11:15
The Wall We Built Brian Kolfage  Introduction by Brian Kolfage
11:30
The Politics of Immigration  Introduction by Brian Kolfage
12:15
Buffet Lunch
12:30
Keynote Speakers Introduction by Brian Kolfage
13:30
The Grassroots Fight for Border Security  Introduction by Brian Kolfage
13:45
Open Border Churches: Human Traffickers Hiding behind the Crossing  Introduction by Congressman Tom Tancredo
14:30
Every Town, a Border Town: The Impact of Immigration on American Cities Sheriff Clarke, Mary Ann Mendoza, Steve Ronnebeck, Congressman Tom Tancredo  Introduction and discussion led by John Fredricks
15:45
Using Citizen Journalism to Drive the National Narrative  Typical Liberal  Introduction and Moderated by Brian Kolfage
16:45
A Nation of Legal Immigrant  Introduction by Brian Kolfage

From  
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 4:24 PM
To: MARTIN, JERRY  SINGLETON, RUYNARD R
Cc
Subject: FW: We Build the Wall-Planned Event

FYSA
Please see email traffic below from Santa Teresa station in regard to a “Wall Symposium” that is scheduled to take place at the new wall that was built by Fisher (We Build the Wall) group. Below is the website that was provided to me by their Foreman Mike Furey, that lists the attendees and a countdown.

THanks

http://thewallsymposium.com/

From: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Program Manager
Border Wall Program Management Office
United States Border Patrol
Program Management Office Directorate

Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 9:02 AM
To: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Subject: We Build the Wall-Planned Event

As requested, I reached out to (b)(6) and he confirmed that an event was taking place Thursday-Saturday at the site of the new wall at the area. He was unwilling to share details so I contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who reached out to the site foreman. (b)(6) was just informed by the foreman that FOX News will cover a “Wall Symposium” on Thursday at 1800 hours. Present at this event will be some high ranking member of congress, Donald Trump Jr. is expected to be present as well. There is an active attempt to keep this event concealed and without direct contact with the We Build the Wall folks we seem to be out of the loop. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has requested a schedule/timeline of events which the foreman has already indicated that he would share. (b)(6) will forward these to us as soon as he gets it.

Deputy Patrol Agent In Charge
Santa Teresa Border Patrol Station

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
Added a sentence for RG below based on PMR discussions.

From: (b)(5)(b)(7)(C)
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2019 8:20 AM
To: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
Cc: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) BORDERWALLTASKS (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)
Subject: REVIEW: Border Wall Weekly (22-26 July)

For your review updated based on the PMR but I do not have final confirmation from on content. I have 3 notes for him that I want to verify. All my comments are incorporated.

(b)(5), (b)(7)(E)
(b) (5), (b) (7)(E), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
(b) (5), (b) (7)(E)
(b) (5), (b) (7) (E)
WARNING: This document is LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE and is designated FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (FOUO). It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and
disposed of in accordance with Department of Homeland Security policy relating to FOUO information, and is not to be released to the public or personnel who do not have a valid "need to know" without prior approval.
From: Rebecca Rizzuti <rebecca.rizzuti@ibwc.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 25, 2019 3:10 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Jose Nunez <jose.nunez@ibwc.gov>; Padinare Unnikrishna <padinare.unnikrishna@ibwc.gov> (b)(6)
Subject: USIBWC requests of WBTW

This message classified as Official - SBU

Thanks for the call yesterday

I’m following up on our homework which was to provide to CBP the list of requests we are making of WBTW for their gate:

a. The attached PDF titled (USIBWC Comments for Bollard Gate Proposal BACKCHECK COMMENTS 07-10-2019.pdf” lists in detail some of the technical information we are asking of them (ie, drainage reports, hydraulic analyses, design drawings etc.) and some other items we are requesting from them. This is our most recent list of requests made to them. Also, at the end of this document, you will find photos depicting the encroachments into Mexico. The following items are in the PDF, but I thought we’d highlight them to you as these are less technical in nature.
   i. Documents that reflect that WBTW conducted requested consultation with NM Env. Dept., NM SHPO, USFWS, USACE.
   ii. Mechanize the gate.
   iii. Plan for desilting of drainage ponds
   iv. Plan for maintenance of the gate
v. Liability insurance or other financial commitment to cover injuries or damages caused by the
gate or caused by defect in design.
vi. We are also requesting that WBTW remove the encroachments into Mexico. This is more
involved that just removing rocks as at least one of the encroachments looks like it is used to
support the base of the gate. So, it seems like it is part of the structure. The attached PDF titled
“Protective Works Above AD CAD new Mexico Central 9.21.pdf” depicts the location of the
encroachments on a map. The attached PDF titled “Anexo Escrito Recorrido 20190604” are the
pictures provided to us regarding the encroachments.

2) Attached PDF titled “2019_6_20 Demand Letter to IBWC re Private Border Wall” is the ACLU’s demand letter to
the USIBWC. This lays out the basis of their potential legal claims.

3) With regard to our suggestion to CB

Respectfully,

Rebecca A. Rizzuti
Assistant Legal Adviser, USIBWC
4171 N. Mesa, Bldg C-100
El Paso, TX 79902
(915) 832-4729 (OFFICE)
(915) 832-4729 (CELL)

This message is classified as Official - SBU by Rebecca.Rizzuti on Thursday, July 25, 2019 1:08:16 PM
June 20, 2019

SENT VIA EMAIL

Matt Myers
Chief Counsel
U.S. International Boundary and Water Commission

Rebecca Rizzuti
Attorney
U.S. International Boundary and Water Commission

RE: Unlawful private border gate on federal levee road in Sunland Park, New Mexico

Dear Mr. Myers and Ms. Rizzuti:

We write with serious concern about the unlawful private border gate (“gate”) that has been constructed on a federal levee road in Sunland Park, New Mexico, by the extremist group We Build the Wall (“WBW”) and an associated group of vigilantes (together, “the applicants”). As a threshold matter, the U.S. International Boundary and Water Commission (“IBWC”) must deny the permit application for the already constructed gate; otherwise, the agency risks violating several laws that apply to the permit, as discussed below. We also urge the IBWC to coordinate with the U.S. Attorney for the District of New Mexico and other federal and state agencies to prevent the applicants from continuing to take, and trespass on, federal land; stop the applicants from continuing to harm local air, water, and economic environments, as well as threaten the area’s imperiled species; require the applicants to immediately remove the gate to redress these violations and harms; and compel the applicants to pay for environmental remediation.1

The applicants’ brazenly unlawful conduct sets a dangerous precedent.

Days ago, the extremist group WBW built a privately funded border gate on a federal levee road in Sunland Park, New Mexico. In building a giant steel gate, WBW worked alongside a group of vigilantes who recently held migrant families seeking asylum at gunpoint in Southern New

1 We encourage the IBWC and U.S. Attorney for the District of Mexico to investigate other potential federal violations, including impeding federal employees from their work obligations through force, threat, and intimidation, and depredation of government property.
The applicants built the gate without obtaining a legally required federal permit from IBWC. The gate on federal land closes the gap in a longer wall that the applicants recently constructed on private land. The applicants constructed the longer wall on private land without first obtaining a permit from the City of Sunland Park. When the gate’s steel door is closed, as it was for several days, it blocks the only remaining entry point from the United States to International Boundary Monument One (“Monument One”), a public monument and park area that are included on the National Register of Historic Places (Number 74001195).

The applicants’ unlawful conduct sets a dangerous precedent. They and their extremist supporters have repeatedly acted with impunity threatening public officials, journalists, and asylum seekers with violence while publicly flouting state and federal laws. The applicants now pledge to repeat what they have done in Sunland Park elsewhere along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Although the applicants’ conduct is unprecedented, the answer to their permit request is not a difficult one: the IBWC treaties, the U.S. Constitution, and federal law require the IBWC to deny the permit. Granting the permit application or a modified version of it would violate the law, condone the applicants’ unlawful conduct, and embolden the applicants to continue taking, and trespassing on, federal land along the U.S.-Mexico border.

I. IBWC’s fundamental treaty and other legal obligations require that the agency deny the permit application.

The IBWC’s fundamental purpose is to apply binational treaties and provide Mexico and the United States with “binational solutions” to questions about the international boundary and waters between the two countries. The IBWC’s mission is “to apply the rights and obligations which the Governments of the United States and Mexico assume under the numerous boundary and water treaties and related agreements, and to do so in ways that benefits the social and economic welfare of the peoples on the two sides of the boundary and improves relations between the two countries.” The IBWC’s authority over activities in the Rio Grande Basin,

---


6 The letter writers acknowledge and thank ACLU of New Mexico Legal Assistant Elsa Goossen and ACLU Border Rights Center Legal Intern Eden Klein for their significant contributions to this letter.

where the gate is located, derives from binational treaties, U.S. statutes implementing those treaties, and binational minutes. Additionally, the U.S. Secretary of State has delegated the administration of certain lands to the IBWC. The Secretary of State’s delegated powers also appear to give the IBWC the authority “to issue revo[re]vocable licenses for public or private use for irrigation or other structures or uses not inconsistent with the use of such lands made, or to be made, by the United States, across any lands retained by the United States, and to execute all necessary leases, title instruments, and conveyances, in order to carry out the provisions of this section.”

The IBWC’s Realty and Asset Management Office has established specific criteria for applicants who wish to build on IBWC-administered land. Among other requirements, the Realty and Asset Management Office requires applicants to provide “resource agency statements” from the appropriate Historic Preservation officer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Those statements must indicate that the resource agencies have no objections to the proposed construction. Additionally, the IBWC has established construction criteria requiring that the IBWC review and approve gates on levee roads before they are constructed or installed.

An unlawful gate built without a permit and without the required agency assessments and statements is at odds with the IBWC’s fundamental purpose, treaty obligations, and rules all of which legally require the IBWC to protect the integrity of the Rio Grande, prevent flooding, and ensure easy access to IBWC diversion dams and other structures, including the American

---


12 Id.


14 Id.

Diversion Dam, which is blocked when the gate is closed. Because of where it is built, the gate may increase the risk of flooding and may negatively affect the Rio Grande—serious concerns that the Mexican IBWC has raised. The IBWC may not unilaterally consider a permit application without resource agency statements addressing a number of serious defects in the gate’s purpose and structure:

1. **The gate serves no legitimate purpose that would justify a permit from the IBWC, whose authority is limited.** According to your office, the IBWC typically reviews and approves permits for utility firms wishing to extend their utility poles over federal land, and farmers wishing to use water for irrigation. These activities, which require easements or permits from the IBWC, are consistent with the utilities’ and farmers’ legitimate business purposes, delivering utilities and irrigating crops. Moreover, in considering permits for these legitimate activities, the IBWC must still assess whether the activity may undermine its flood prevention activities. Although we have not seen a copy of the permit application (we are currently requesting it under the Freedom of Information Act), it appears that the American Eagle Brick Company and WBW’s interest in building the gate is exclusively to block people from crossing a federal road. American Eagle Brick and WBW have no legal authority to block people from passing on a federal road and may not request a permit to do so. If the American Eagle Brick Company wishes to block people from entering its property, it must use its own resources to obtain a permit and erect a fence on the perimeter of its own land to accomplish that purpose. It may not take a federal road, which is unnecessary for this private purpose.

2. **The gate implicates the First Amendment to the Constitution and the National Historic Preservation Act and several federal environmental laws—federal laws that the IBWC cannot unilaterally waive.** The IBWC may not waive the Constitution or its own rules in considering a permit application, nor can it ignore federal laws which require that the permit applicants obtain the requisite agency statements assessing compliance with federal historic preservation and environmental laws from the appropriate Historic Preservation officer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The applicants must obtain these statements before the permit application is considered to be complete. The IBWC must require WBW to supplement its request with these required agency determinations.

3. **The IBWC has no authority to grant a permit for an unlawful gate ex post facto.** None of the IBWC’s rules or federal law authorize the IBWC to exempt the gate from the permit process or to provide a permit for a gate that was built without complying with the agency review processes under the IBWC’s own rules. If the IBWC violates its own rules and exempts the gate from other agencies’ review processes, not only will it embolden

---

16 Brian Kolfage, @BrianKolfage, Twitter (June 15, 2019, 5:50 PM), https://twitter.com/BrianKolfage/status/1140059150040408064.

extremists to take federal property for private purposes and construct without permits, it will also expose the IBWC to legal liability and set a dangerous precedent.

II. The unlawful gate raises serious concerns under the First Amendment.

Monument One has significant binational historical and cultural significance. School children and teachers often visit the monument park on field trips. Families picnic, jog, recreate, and celebrate their bicultural identities in the park. And for decades, people have gathered at the Monument to celebrate bicultural identity and unity. These expressive activities are protected under the First Amendment. The Supreme Court and Courts of Appeals have consistently interpreted the First Amendment broadly to protect not only written and spoken words, but also other expressive activities and symbolic speech that communicate ideas, such as picketing and leafleting, refusing to salute or burning the American flag, wearing black armbands, engaging in a sit-in in a public reading room of a library, and sharing food with unhoused people in a park.

When it locked the gate for several days, WBW unilaterally locked border residents out of their own culture and history. WBW and American Eagle Brick have wrongly claimed on several occasions that they either own or control portions of the federal levee road and a federal easement. Just days ago, a private vigilante and WBW supporter who manages the American Eagle Brick Company threatened and harassed ACLU staff who tried to visit Monument One. The manager appears to have directed his employees to block the staffers from walking along the federal levee road easement under the railroad tracks, an area that is necessary to pass

---


25 Fort Lauderdale Food Not Bombs v. City of Fort Lauderdale, 901 F.3d 1235, 1238 (11th Cir. 2018).

26 ACLU of New Mexico, @aclunn (June 7, 2019, 4:00 pm), Twitter, https://twitter.com/ACLUNM/status/1137132269364162560.
in order to reach Monument One. When the staffers arrived at the entrance to Monument One, they tried to open the large steel WBW gate and could not because it was locked.

Under the First Amendment, streets and parks “have immemorially been held in trust for the use of the public, and, time out of mind, have been used for purposes of assembly, communicating thoughts between citizens, and discussing public questions.”27 The Supreme Court recently observed that “a park is a traditional public forum for speeches and other transitory expressive acts[.]”28 “In these quintessential public forums, the government may not prohibit all communicative activity.”29 While the government may impose “content-neutral restrictions on the time, place, or manner of speech in a public forum[,]” those restrictions must meet three criteria. “First, the regulations may not delegate overly broad licensing discretion to a government official. Second, the scheme must be narrowly tailored to serve a significant governmental interest. And third, it must leave open ample alternatives for communication.”30

In speaking with your office, it is unclear how the IBWC or U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) will manage access to Monument One: this presents a serious problem under the First Amendment. The IBWC may not, for example, require that would-be visitors who wish to exercise their First Amendment rights at Monument One apply in advance for a permit to pass the gate that would almost certainly violate the first criterion (“overly broad licensing authority”) under the time-place-manner analysis.

Second, the IBWC has vaguely claimed that “security concerns” now require the gate to be closed at “night[.]”31 Given that the public has had free and unfettered access to Monument One since 1855, it is unclear why “security concerns” now require an unlawful gate to be closed on federal land at night. It is also unclear when a person may access Monument One to engage in protected First Amendment activities because IBWC has not informed the public about the hours when the gate will be open and Monument One will be accessible. Moreover, the applicants have openly and publicly claimed that private “guards and security” will be posted at the gate when it is open, raising concerns that they may continue to interfere with public access to Monument One.32 The current uncertainty about public access raises serious concerns under the second criterion (that restrictions must be “narrowly tailored to serve a significant government interest”).

31 IBWC, “Private Gate on Federal Property to be Locked at Night” (June 11, 2019), https://www.ibwc.gov/Files/Press_Release_061119_2.pdf
Finally, when the gate is closed and locked, as it was for many days, despite the IBWC’s demands that it remain open, there is no “alternative[] for communication.” Monument One is a significant place for First Amendment activity because it celebrates the very bicultural identity that the gate attacks. The gate blocks access to Monument One from the United States. If the IBWC does not enforce its legal obligation to keep the gate open, it will prevent people from having access to Monument One. Celebrating one’s bicultural identity across the Rio Grande in El Paso or on the federal levee road in front of the unlawful gate the two public areas that are closest to Monument One when the gate is closed are not appropriate alternatives to Monument One.

III. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies, including the IBWC, to undertake a detailed review process in which the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, state and local government officials, and the public are entitled to meaningfully participate.

The IBWC has no unilateral authority under federal law to issue a permit for a private border gate on federal land that blocks U.S. public access to Monument One, which is on the National Register of Historic Places. Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, any “project, activity, or program funded in whole or in part under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of a Federal agency” including activities “requiring a Federal permit, license, or approval” is an “undertaking[.]” The permit application proposing a gate construction project that would block access to Monument One is an “undertaking” under Section 106. Because the gate is an undertaking, the IBWC has a legal obligation to “take into account the effect of the undertaking on any historic property” and “afford the [Advisory] Council [on Historic Preservation] a reasonable opportunity to comment with regard to the undertaking.” In other words, the IBWC may not unilaterally permit the gate construction without first consulting with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and allowing it an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed permit.

The New Mexico state historic preservation officer, representatives of Sunland Park, and members of the public are also all entitled to meaningfully participate in the Section 106 review process. Specifically, under Section 106, the IBWC “shall . . . initiate consultation with the appropriate [state historic preservation or tribal historic preservation] officer or officers [SHPO/THPO]” and “should consult with the SHPO/THPO in a manner appropriate to the agency planning process for the undertaking and to the nature of the undertaking and its effects on historic properties.” Additionally, federal law entitles a “representative of a local government with jurisdiction over the area in which the effects of an undertaking may occur” to

35 Id. § 306108.
36 36 C.F.R. §§ 800.1–800.13 (regulations governing the Section 106 process).
37 Id. § 800.3 (emphasis added).
participate in the Section 106 process as a consulting party. Finally, Section 106 requires the IBWC to provide notice and an opportunity for the public to comment because “[t]he views of the public are essential to informed Federal decisionmaking in the section 106 process.” Specifically, the IBWC “official shall seek and consider the views of the public in a manner that reflects the nature and complexity of the undertaking and its effects on historic properties, the likely interest of the public in the effects on historic properties, confidentiality concerns of private individuals and businesses, and the relationship of the Federal involvement to the undertaking.” In short, Section 106 requires that the IBWC engage state and local government officials and the public in reviewing how the proposed permit, if granted, would affect Monument One.

Because the gate, when closed, prevents U.S. public access to Monument One, the IBWC should not grant the permit because it would fundamentally alter the character of, and would block public access to, Monument One. What is more, the permit applicants’ conduct both in building the gate without a permit and in defying the IBWC’s demands that the gate remain unlocked so as not to prevent access to Monument One indicates that the IBWC cannot trust that the applicants will abide by any requirements that the IBWC might impose in conditionally approving the permit. Under the NHPA, the IBWC cannot approve the permit.

IV. The Antideficiency Act may prohibit the IBWC or any other federal agency from accepting the gate as a donation or a gift.

The permit applicants have boasted that they have given or intend to give the gate keys to the U.S. Border Patrol. We understand that the IBWC currently has the keys to the already constructed gate. If the IBWC or the Border Patrol accepts the wall or the gate as a gift or as a donation even tacitly, by accepting keys to take control over it the government will likely violate the Antideficiency Act. The Antideficiency Act prohibits the government from accepting voluntary services for the United States. The purpose of the law is to prevent the U.S. government from spending money that Congress has not appropriated for it to spend. In essence, the law prevents executive agencies from making an end run around the constitutional separation of powers. Because Article I of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power of the purse, an executive agency like the IBWC or the Department of Homeland Security may not overstep its constitutional authority in accepting gifts or donations for construction projects that Congress did not fund through its appropriations process. To erect the gate on federal land, WBW put a

38 Id. § 800.2(c)(3).
39 Id. § 800.2(d).
40 Id.
41 Aaron Martinez, “Privately funded wall built at El Paso: ‘Why wouldn’t we allow it?’ land owner asks,” EL PASO TIMES (May 27, 2019, 12:39 p.m., updated at 5:48 p.m.), https://www.elpasotimes.com/story/news/immigration/2019/05/27/privately-funded-border-wall-goes-up-near-el-paso-gofundme-money/1251156001/ (quoting former Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach, “We built the wall and then hand the keys to the Border Patrol and say ‘Here. Happy Memorial Day.’”)
number of its employees and contractors to work for several days. Congress appropriated no federal money for the gate and the U.S. government did not compensate WBW for its labor in constructing the gate. By allowing the group to construct its gate on federal property, the IBWC is benefitting from unpaid, voluntary services, and appears to be violating the Antideficiency Act.43

V. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, the IBWC must evaluate the environmental, social, and economic impacts of the gate construction and consider reasonable alternatives.

Under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (“NEPA”), the IBWC must evaluate the environmental, social, and economic impacts of the gate and consider reasonable alternatives to the gate itself including no action, or not permitting the gate whatsoever. As “our basic national charter for protection of the environment,”44 NEPA’s purpose is to “foster excellent action,” and “is intended to help public officials make decisions that are based on understanding of environmental consequences, and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment.”45 Specifically, NEPA requires federal agencies like the IBWC to prepare an environmental impact statement (“EIS”) for all “major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.”46 Federal regulations implementing NEPA require the IBWC to evaluate the environmental, social, and economic impact of any major federal action it intends to take including issuing a permit for a gate on federal land as well as preferable alternatives to that action.47 The IBWC has no authority to exempt a gate construction project on federal land from NEPA.48

Under Tenth Circuit law, when private entities propose major actions on federal land, the private entities’ actions are subject to NEPA if federal approval is a prerequisite to taking that action. “[C]onstruction . . . activities” on federal land requiring permits are precisely the kind of major actions by nonfederal actors that are subject to NEPA.49 The IBWC’s own regulations align with

43 31 U.S.C. § 1342 (“An officer or employee of the United States Government or of the District of Columbia government may not accept voluntary services for either government or employ personal services exceeding that authorized by law except for emergencies involving the safety of human life or the protection of property.”)

44 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1(a).

45 Id. § 1500.1(c).

46 42 U.S.C. § 4332(C).

47 Id.


49 Sierra Club v. Hodel, 848 F.2d 1068, 1089 (10th Cir. 1988), overruled on other grounds by Vill. of Los Ranchos De Albuquerque v. Marsh, 956 F.2d 970 (10th Cir. 1992) (NEPA “regulations establish that major federal action encompasses not only actions by the federal government but also actions by nonfederal actors with effects that may be major and which are potentially subject to Federal control and responsibility. Nonfederal major federal action refers, inter alia, to activities regulated or approved by
the Tenth Circuit’s view that private construction projects on federal land implicate the agency’s compliance with NEPA: “[a]ctions planned by a private applicant or non-federal entities prior to or concurrent with the initiation of the Section’s studies, or involving an existing project shall be handled . . . in accordance with [Council on Environmental Quality] CEQ Regulations[.]” The CEQ regulations mandate that IBWC do the following, among other requirements:

1. “Apply NEPA early in the process.”
2. Engage in an “early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action.”
3. Prepare an environmental impact statement or assessment.
4. In preparing the EIS or EA (Environmental Assessment), consider a “range of alternatives[,]” including “the alternative of no action.”
5. In preparing the EIS or EA, discuss the purpose and need for the project.
6. Publish the draft environmental impact statement and solicit public comment.
7. Assess and consider the public’s comments both individually and collectively and respond to the comments.
8. Circulate the final environmental impact statement.

The gate implicates several potential environmental impacts, including but not limited to the surrounding communities’ air and land quality, as well as economic conditions related to the Monument. Here, the IBWC’s consideration of the permit application constitutes a federal agency action that is subject to NEPA compliance. At a bare minimum, then, the IBWC may not

federal agencies, including approval of specific projects such as construction ... activities located in a defined geographic area. Such approval may occur through permit or other regulatory decision as well as federal and federally assisted activities. A leading commentator has observed: [T]he distinguishing feature of federal involvement is the ability to influence or control the outcome in material respects. The EIS process is supposed to inform the decision-maker. This presupposes he has judgment to exercise. Cases finding federal action emphasize authority to exercise discretion over the outcome.) (internal citations and quotation marks omitted).


51 40 CFR § 1501.2.
52 Id. § 1501.7.
53 Id. § 1501.4(b).
54 Id. § 1505.1(e).
55 Id. § 1502.14(d).
56 Id. §§ 1502.13, 1508.9(b).
57 Id. § 1503.1.
58 Id. § 1503.4.
59 Id. § 1502.19.
approve the permit application before it completes an EA to evaluate the impacts of the project and determine whether a full-blown EIS is necessary, and a separate Finding of No Significant Impact (“FONSI”). However, because the project implicates several of the NEPA “significance factors” that govern when an EIS is necessary—including, e.g., the precedential nature of this project; the risk to meaningful access to Monument One; and many other threatened legal violations— it is apparent that the IBWC could not approve the permit application before it prepares an EIS.

VI. The gate raises serious concerns under the Endangered Species Act.

The gate and permit application raise serious concerns under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (“ESA”). Numerous imperiled species are located near or around the gate, including the Mexican gray wolf that has been shown in the vicinity of the gate and the U.S.-Mexico border.

The ESA is the “most comprehensive legislation for the preservation of endangered species ever enacted by any nation.” The ESA’s purpose is to conserve and protect endangered and threatened species and their ecosystems. The primary mechanism by which the ESA achieves its purpose is by making it “unlawful for any person” to “take any [endangered or threatened] species within the United States” or to “cause to be committed” any “take[.]” The ESA broadly defines the meaning of “take” as “to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, collect, or attempt to engage in any such conduct.” The U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico have likewise interpreted “take” “as broad as possible” including “every conceivable way in which a person can ‘take’ or attempt to ‘take’ any fish or wildlife.” The ESA establishes broad liability both for people who directly take and for government employees and officials who permit others to take endangered or threatened species.

Moreover, as a federal agency, IBWC has a separate ESA obligation to ensure that any activity it undertakes or approves is not likely to jeopardize any listed species or critical habitat. To meet this requirement, IBWC must consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (“FWS”) and prepare a Biological Assessment to address species impact issues. At minimum, IBWC must

60 See 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27 (listing factors for determining whether an EIS must be prepared).
62 16 U.S.C. § 1531(b)
63 Id. § 1538(a)(1)(B), (g).
64 Id. § 1532(19).
67 Id. § 1536(a)(2).
obtain FWS’ concurrence that the project is not likely to adversely affect species. If any adverse effects may occur, IBWC must also obtain a full Biological Opinion from FWS detailing those effects and the steps that must be taken to mitigate them. What IBWC may not do, however, is approve the permit application without complying with these critical processes designed to protect the Nation’s endangered and threatened species.

Specifically, according to GPS telemetry data from wolf scientists, the Mexican gray wolf has been shown to have crossed the U.S.-Mexico border near the location of the gate. The Mexican gray wolf is one of the most imperiled mammals in North America, and its survival depends on its ability to travel freely across the U.S.-Mexico border in order to mate with wolves in their non-natal population and thus increase the genetic diversity of the animals comprising both populations. The gate constitutes a physical obstruction to the Mexican gray wolf and its ability to cross the border and thus triggers the IBCW’s consultation obligations under the ESA.

VII. The petition applicants likely violated the Clean Air Act and New Mexico’s State Implementation Plan in failing to control fugitive dust while constructing the gate and the fence.

The permit applicants boast that they excavated “200,000 cubic yards” of earth in Sunland Park, Doña Ana County. Their unlawful and hasty construction project likely violated New Mexico’s State Implementation Plan (“SIP”) under the federal Clean Air Act (“CAA”) in failing to control fugitive dust. The fugitive dust rule specifically applies to construction and construction activities in Doña Ana and Luna Counties.

The federal CAA is designed to preserve and improve the quality of ambient air in the United States in order to protect people’s health and the environment. To accomplish the CAA’s mandate, the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) promulgates National Ambient Air Quality Standards (“NAAQS”). The CAA requires each state, in turn, to establish its own SIP to comply with the NAAQS. Three years ago, the EPA required “[a]ll states having areas with historically documented or known seasonal events” affecting ambient air quality “to develop a mitigation plan.” Historically documented or known seasonal events include the seasonal dust that comes with high winds in Doña Ana and Luna Counties. In response to the EPA’s mandate

68 Id.
69 Original data from Mexico Procuraduría Federal de Protección al Ambiente (PROFEPA), as relayed to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on or about Jan. 27, 2017.
70 We Build the Wall, “A Job Well Done With A Lot More To Come,” YouTube (June 13, 2019), https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=1&v=jWdOmVzBWLI.
72 42 U.S.C. § 7409(a), (b).
73 Id. § 7410(a)(1).
74 40 C.F.R. § 51.930(b)(1).
under the CAA, the New Mexico Environment Department promulgated a fugitive dust rule and mitigation plan.\textsuperscript{75} This rule prohibits people from “caus[ing] or allow[ing] visible emissions from fugitive dust sources that: A. pose a threat to public health; B. interfere with public welfare, including animal or plant injury or damage, visibility or the reasonable use of property.”\textsuperscript{76} The YouTube video of the fugitive dust alone raises serious questions about the applicants’ compliance with the fugitive dust rule.\textsuperscript{77} Additionally, under the rule, “[t]he owner or operator of a fugitive dust source shall develop and maintain a dust control plan.”\textsuperscript{78} It is not clear that the applicants and their supporters including the American Eagle Brick company have a dust control plan or are complying with it.

If the IBWC permits the gate, it would likely violate the CAA, specifically as implemented in New Mexico under the fugitive dust rule.

VIII. The applicants have likely violated the Clean Water Act in failing to obtain the requisite permit.

We understand that the IBWC is requiring the applicants to provide a stormwater runoff study. This is required under the Clean Water Act (“CWA”). But a study is not enough under the CWA. The CWA’s fundamental purpose is to “restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters.”\textsuperscript{79} To achieve its purpose, the CWA prohibits any person from discharging any pollutant from a point source into navigable waters, unless they receive a permit that authorizes them to do so.\textsuperscript{80} The word “pollutant” “means dredged spoil, solid waste, incinerator residue, sewage, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical... materials, he at, wrecked or discarded equipment, rock, sand, cellar dirt and industrial, municipal, and agricultural waste discharged into water.”\textsuperscript{81} Anyone who seeks to discharge any pollutant into navigable waters must apply for and comply with the terms and limits of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) permit.\textsuperscript{82} Failing to comply with the NPDES permit process is also a violation of the CWA.\textsuperscript{83}


\textsuperscript{76} N.M. Code R. 20.2.23.109.

\textsuperscript{77} We Build the Wall, “A Job Well Done With A Lot More To Come,” YouTube (June 13, 2019), https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=1&v=jWdOmVzBWLI.

\textsuperscript{78} N.M. Code R. 20.2.23.112.

\textsuperscript{79} 33 U.S.C. § 1251(a).

\textsuperscript{80} Id. §§ 1311(a) (“the discharge of any pollutant by any person shall be unlawful”), 1342 (permits), 1362(12) (defining the discharge of any pollutant).

\textsuperscript{81} Id. § 1362(6).

\textsuperscript{82} Id. §§ 1311(a), 1342(a)(1)

\textsuperscript{83} Id. § 122.41(a) (“Any permit noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act and is grounds for enforcement action.”).
applicants have constructed a giant steel gate that is just feet away from the Rio Grande. It appears that the applicants have yet to conduct a stormwater runoff study, let alone obtain an NPDES permit. Given the proximity of the gate to the Rio Grande, the construction project raises serious questions about the applicants’ compliance with the NPDES permit process and the CWA.

IX. The gate and fence construction’s proximity to the American Smelting and Refining Company’s El Paso Smelter Superfund site raises serious concerns under all of the environmental laws discussed in this letter.

Ten years ago this month, on June 5, 2009, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas approved a settlement providing for a $52 million trust to clean up the American Smelting and Refining Company (“ASARCO”) in El Paso, Texas.\(^{84}\) The Court approved the settlement under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (“CERCLA” or “Superfund”)\(^{85}\) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (“RCRA”).\(^{86}\) The IBWC participated in the claims process for the ASARCO Superfund, specifically raising concerns about the cost of “the need to address metals-contaminated groundwater emanating from the former ASARCO El Paso smelter complex in connection with proposed construction projects on the American Canal, a man-made waterway connected to the Rio Grande River in El Paso, Texas.”\(^{87}\) The fund provides for “an allowed general unsecured claim of $19,000,000” for the U.S. government to ensure the remediation of the soil and address groundwater contamination.\(^{88}\) The proximity of the ASARCO Superfund site to the large-scale construction project raises serious concerns about the movement of metals-contaminated soil. In considering the permit application, the IBWC must also consider serious, site-specific contamination that may stem from the ASARCO Superfund’s contamination of soil and groundwater on IBWC-managed land.

IBWC Should Coordinate with Federal and State Agencies to Stop Unlawful Conduct and Require Remediation.

The applicants’ unlawful conduct is breathtaking: twice, they have engaged in major construction projects in Sunland Park without first obtaining necessary permits under state and federal law. If the government continues to permit the applicants’ conduct to go unchecked, it will set a dangerous precedent, emboldening the applicants and other extremist groups to take federal land for their own private purposes while violating a myriad of federal laws. The IBWC should coordinate with federal agencies, including the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the District of New Mexico and the U.S. Department of Justice, to prevent the applicants from continuing to


\(^{85}\) 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601 *et seq.*

\(^{86}\) 42 U.S.C. §§ 6901 *et seq.*

\(^{87}\) *In re ASARCO LLC*, No. 05-21207, 2009 WL 8176641, at *34.

\(^{88}\) *Id.*
violate federal laws, prevent them from blocking access to Monument One, and require them to
remove the gate and remediate the environment.

We are deeply concerned with the secrecy shrouding what should be a public permitting process.
We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter further. Please contact us with any
questions.
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Maria Martínez Sánchez
Staff Attorney
ACLU of New Mexico
P.O. Box 566
Albuquerque, NM 87103
Office: (505) 266-5915 Ext. 1004
msanchez@aclu-nm.org

Shaw Drake
Policy Counsel
Border Rights Center
American Civil Liberties Union of Texas
P.O Box 8306
Houston, TX 77288-8306
sdrake@aclutx.org

Kevin Bixby
Executive Director
Southwest Environmental Center
275 North Main Street
Las Cruces, NM 88001
kevin@wildmesquite.org

Jean Su
Staff Attorney & Energy Director
Center for Biological Diversity
1411 K St NW, Suite 1300
Washington, DC 20005
Office: 202-849-8399
jsu@biologicaldiversity.org

Howard Crystal
Senior Attorney
Center for Biological Diversity
1411 K St NW, Suite 1300
Washington, DC 20005
Office: 202-849-8399
hcrysratal@biologicaldiversity.org

CC:

Senator Udall
Alyson_Sincavage@tomudall.senate.gov
Michelle_Kavanaugh@tomudall.senate.gov

Senator Heinrich
Rebecca_Avitia@heinrich.senate.gov
Alex_Eubanks@heinrich.senate.gov

Representative Torres Small
Nayomi.Valdez@mail.house.gov
Felipe.Galvis-Delgado@mail.house.gov

Representative Haaland
cynthia.hull@mail.house.gov

Representative Luján
alanna.purdy@mail.house.gov

Representative Escobar
susie.byrd@mail.house.gov

Jennie Lusk, Assistant Attorney General and Civil Rights Bureau Chief, New Mexico Attorney General
jlusk@nmag.gov

Senator Joseph Cervantes
joseph@cervanteslawnm.com

Representative Raymundo Lara
raymundo.lara@nmlegis.gov

Jeff Pappas, PhD, New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer and Director
jeff.pappas@state.nm.us

Sunland Park Mayor Javier Perea
javier.perea@sunlandpark-nm.gov

Councilor Jessica Avila, City of Sunland Park, NM District 1
jessica.avila@sunlandpark-nm.gov

Councilor Daisy Lira, City of Sunland Park, NM District 2
daisy.lira@sunlandpark-nm.gov

Councilor Bertha A. Salmon, City of Sunland Park, NM District 3
bertha.salmon@sunlandpark-nm.gov

Councilor Carolina Renteria, City of Sunland Park, NM District 4
carolina.renteria@sunlandpark-nm.gov

Councilor Olga Nuñez, City of Sunland Park, NM District 5
olga.nunez@sunlandpark-nm.gov

Councilor Donald McBride, City of Sunland Park, NM District 6, Mayor Pro Tem
donald.mcbride@sunlandpark-nm.gov

Steve Dubyk and Jon Lutz, NMED Air Quality Bureau
steve.dubyk@state.nm.us
jon.lutz@state.nm.us
(b) (7)(E)

DESBORDAMIENTO DE AFINE DE TERRENO NATURAL EN TERRITORIO MEXICANO

5.92 m

EUA MÉXICO
Corte de terreno natural en territorio mexicano (b) (7)(E)
(b) (7) (E)
(b) (7)(E)
DESORDEN DE TALUD HACIA TERRITORIO MEXICANO

(b) (7)(E)

MÉXICO EUA
Désbordamiento de enrocamiento estabilizador de talud hacia México

(b) (7)(E), (b) (6)

EUA MÉXICO

(b) (6)