



March 6, 2026

[VIA ONLINE PORTAL](#)

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Customs and Border Protection  
Big Bend Border Patrol Sector

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request: Big Bend Border Wall Construction & Infrastructure Communications

Dear FOIA Officer:

This is a request under the Freedom of Information Act<sup>1</sup> (“FOIA”) from the Center for Biological Diversity (“Center”), a non-profit organization that works to secure a future for all species hovering on the brink of extinction through science, law, and creative media, and to fulfill the continuing educational goals of its membership and the general public in the process.

REQUESTED RECORDS

The Center requests from the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) from January 1, 2025 to the date CBP conducts this search, the:

1. Internal and external communications mentioning, discussing, and/or documenting contracting, planning, or construction of border wall or associated infrastructure in Big Bend National Park or Big Bend Ranch State Park in the Big Bend Border Patrol Sector, including but not limited to the records that contain:
  - a. Budget allocations or reprogramming memos;
  - b. Internal cost estimates;
  - c. Requests for proposals;
  - d. Bid evaluations;
  - e. Contractor communications;
  - f. Environmental assessments or categorical exclusion analyses;
  - g. National Environmental Policy Act waiver analyses,
  - h. Endangered Species Act consultation documents;
  - i. Archaeological and/or cultural resource surveys
  - j. Biological assessments;
  - k. Floodplain analyses;
  - l. Hydrological studies;

---

<sup>1</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 552., *as amended*.

- m. Right-of-entry agreements;
  - n. Easements;
  - o. Memoranda of understanding with the State of Texas;
  - p. Communications mentioning and/or discussing land surveys or boundary determination; and
  - q. Records reflecting invocation or consideration of any statutory waiver authority related to environmental, cultural, or land management laws.
2. Authorizations or draft authorizations for contracting, planning, and/or construction of border wall or associated infrastructure in Big Bend National Park or Big Bend Ranch State Park in the Big Bend Border Patrol Sector.
  3. Maps associated with Items #1 and #2 above.
  4. GIS layers associated with Items #1 and #2 above.
  5. Communications, data, test results, policies, and/or other records about total marijuana, cocaine, methamphetamine, heroin, and fentanyl seized in Big Bend National Park, Big Bend Ranch State Park, and/or Big Bend Border Patrol Sector, including any monthly or annual summaries or statistics relating to such seizures and policies for proper handling and testing of seized drugs.
  6. Any records supporting or discussing the DHS Secretary's designation of the "project area" as an area of high illegal entry. *Please note:* the project area is the area in the vicinity of the US border between GPS points 31.037623, -105.579877 and 29.325866, -104.046466.<sup>2</sup>

**Search terms include:**

- Big Bend + Endangered Species Act or ESA or endangered species
- Big Bend + NPS or park service or National Park Service
- Big Bend + wildlife or plants
- Big Bend + apprehensions
- Big Bend + archaeological or cultural or site
- Big Bend + marijuana or cocaine or methamphetamine or heroin or fentanyl
- Big Bend + wall or contract or construction
- Big Bend + high illegal entry

For this request, the term "records" refers to documents, correspondence (including inter and/or intra-agency correspondence as well as correspondence with entities or individuals outside the

---

<sup>2</sup> As described in 91 Fed. Reg. 7297 (Feb. 17, 2026).

federal government), *emails including attachments*, letters, notes, recordings, telephone records, telephone notes, telephone logs, text messages, chat messages (e.g., Teams, Signal, Whatsapp), minutes, memoranda, comments, files, presentations, consultations, biological opinions, assessments, evaluations, schedules, papers published and/or unpublished, reports, studies, photographs and other images, data (including raw data, GPS or GIS data, UTM, LiDAR, etc.), maps, and/or all other responsive records, in draft or final form.

The Center is willing to receive records on a rolling basis.

### REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED PROCESSING

The Center seeks the expedited processing of this request due to the urgent need for records. Where extreme public concern about potential border wall construction in Big Bend Ranch State Park and Big Bend National Park creates an *urgency to inform the public about an actual or alleged Federal Government activity, if made by a person (the Center) who is primarily engaged in disseminating information, his or her request will be expedited.*

The public interest is therefore served by immediately providing full transparency regarding the Center's FOIA request.

### THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

The purpose of FOIA is to “open agency action to the light of public scrutiny.”<sup>3</sup> FOIA’s “frequently requested record” provision was enacted as part of the 1996 Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments, and requires all federal agencies to give “reading room” treatment to any FOIA-processed records that, “because of the nature of their subject matter, the agency determines have become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records.”<sup>4</sup> Enacted as part of the 2016 FOIA Improvement Act, FOIA’s Rule of 3 requires all federal agencies to proactively “make available for public inspection in an electronic format” “copies of records, regardless of form or format ... that have been released to any person ... and ... that have been requested 3 or more times.”<sup>5</sup> Therefore, we respectfully request that you make available online any records that the agency determines will become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records, and records that have been requested three or more times.

Also under the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, agencies are prohibited from denying requests for information under FOIA unless the agency reasonably believes release of the information will harm an interest that is protected by the exemption.<sup>6</sup> Should you decide to invoke a FOIA exemption, please include sufficient information for us to assess the basis for the exemption, including any interest(s) that would be harmed by release, segregate the exempt portions, and produce the non-exempt portions of such records within the statutory time limit.<sup>7</sup> Please include

---

<sup>3</sup> *Dep’t of the Air Force v. Rose*, 425 U.S. 352, 372 (1976).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* § 552(a)(2)(D)(ii)(I).

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* § 552(a)(2)(D)(ii)(II).

<sup>6</sup> FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 (Public Law No. 114-185), codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(8)(A).

<sup>7</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 552(b).

a detailed ledger which includes:

1. Basic factual material about each withheld record, including the originator, date, length, general subject matter, and location of each item; and
2. Complete explanations and justifications for the withholding, including the specific exemption(s) under which the record (or portion thereof) was withheld and a full explanation of how each exemption applies to the withheld material. Such statements will be helpful in deciding whether to appeal an adverse determination. Your written justification may help to avoid litigation.

This request is not meant to exclude any other records that, although not specially requested, are reasonably related to the subject matter of this request. Agencies must preserve all the records requested herein while this FOIA is pending or under appeal. The agency shall not destroy any records while they are the subject of a pending request, appeal, or lawsuit under the FOIA.<sup>8</sup> If any of the requested records are destroyed, the agency and responsible officials are subject to attorney fee awards and sanctions, including fines and disciplinary action.<sup>9</sup> If you or your office have destroyed or determine to withhold any records that could be reasonably construed to be responsive to this request, the Center asks that you indicate this fact and the reasons therefore in your response.

### FORMAT OF REQUESTED RECORDS

Under FOIA, you are obligated to provide records in a readily accessible electronic format and in the format requested.<sup>10</sup> “Readily accessible” means text-searchable and OCR-formatted.<sup>11</sup> Pursuant to this requirement, we hereby request that you produce all records in an electronic format and in their native file formats. Additionally, please provide the records in a load-ready format with a CSV file index or Excel spreadsheet. If you produce files in .PDF format, then please omit any “portfolios” or “embedded files.” Portfolios and embedded files within files are not readily accessible. Please do not provide the records in a single, or “batched,” .PDF file. We appreciate the inclusion of an index.

---

<sup>8</sup> See *Chambers v. U.S. Dept. of Interior*, 568 F.3d 998, 1004 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (“[A]n agency is not shielded from liability if it intentionally transfers or destroys a document after it has been requested under FOIA or the Privacy Act”).

<sup>9</sup> A court held an agency in contempt for “contumacious conduct” and ordered the agency to pay plaintiff’s costs and fees for destroying “potentially responsive material contained on hard drives and email backup tapes.” *Landmark Legal Found. v. EPA*, 272 F. Supp.2d 59, 62 (D.D.C. 2003); see also *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Dept. of Commerce*, 384 F. Supp. 2d 163, 169 (D.D.C. 2005) (awarding attorneys’ fees and costs because, among other factors, agency’s “initial search was unlawful and egregiously mishandled and ...likely responsive documents were destroyed and removed”), *aff’d in relevant part*, 470 F.3d 363, 375 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (remanding in part to recalculate attorney fees assessed); see also *Jefferson v. Reno*, 123 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2000) (court imposed a \$10,000 fine and awarded attorneys’ fees and costs where finding that an Assistant United States Attorney prematurely “destroyed records responsive to [the] FOIA request while [the FOIA] litigation was pending” and referred him to the Department of Justice’s Office of Professional Responsibility).

<sup>10</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B) (“In making any record available to a person under this paragraph, an agency shall provide the record in any form or format requested by the person if the record is readily reproducible by the agency in that form or format.”).

<sup>11</sup> See *id.*

If you should seek to withhold or redact any responsive records, we request that you: (1) identify each such record with specificity (including date, author, recipient, and parties copied); (2) explain in full the basis for withholding responsive material; and (3) provide all segregable portions of the records for which you claim a specific exemption.<sup>12</sup> Please correlate any redactions with specific exemptions under FOIA.

### RECORD DELIVERY

We appreciate your help in expeditiously obtaining a determination on the requested records. As mandated in FOIA, we anticipate a reply within 20 working days.<sup>13</sup> Failure to comply within the statutory timeframe may result in the Center taking additional steps to ensure timely receipt of the requested materials. Please provide a complete reply as expeditiously as possible. You may email or mail copies of the requested records to:

Ann K. Brown  
Center for Biological Diversity  
P.O. Box 11374  
Portland, OR 97211  
[foia@biologicaldiversity.org](mailto:foia@biologicaldiversity.org)

If you find that this request is unclear, or if the responsive records are voluminous, please email me to discuss the scope of this request.

### REQUEST FOR FEE WAIVER

FOIA was designed to provide citizens a broad right to access government records. FOIA's basic purpose is to "open agency action to the light of public scrutiny," with a focus on the public's "right to be informed about what their government is up to."<sup>14</sup> In order to provide public access to this information, FOIA's fee waiver provision requires that "[d]ocuments shall be furnished without any charge or at a [reduced] charge," if the request satisfies the standard.<sup>15</sup> FOIA's fee waiver requirement is "liberally construed."<sup>16</sup>

The 1986 fee waiver amendments were designed specifically to provide non-profit organizations such as the Center access to government records without the payment of fees. Indeed, FOIA's fee waiver provision was intended "to prevent government agencies from using high fees to discourage certain types of requesters and requests," which are "consistently associated with requests from journalists, scholars, and *non-profit public interest groups*."<sup>17</sup> As one Senator

---

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* § 552(b).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* § 552(a)(6)(A)(i); 21 C.F.R. § 20.41(b).

<sup>14</sup> *NARA v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157, 171 (2004) quoting *U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 773-74 (1989) (internal quotation and citations omitted).

<sup>15</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii).

<sup>16</sup> *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossotti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 2003); *Forest Guardians v. U.S. Dept. of Interior*, 416 F.3d 1173, 1178 (10th Cir. 2005).

<sup>17</sup> *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F. Supp. 867, 872 (D. Mass. 1984) (emphasis added).

stated, “[a]gencies should not be allowed to use fees as an offensive weapon against requesters seeking access to Government information ... .”<sup>18</sup>

#### I. The Center Qualifies for a Fee Waiver.

Under FOIA, a party is entitled to a fee waiver when “disclosure of the information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the [Federal] government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.”<sup>19</sup> The U.S. Department of Homeland (“DHS”) regulations, which governs FOIA requests to CBP, establish the same standard.<sup>20</sup>

Thus, CBP must consider four factors to determine whether a request is in the public interest: (1) whether the subject of the requested records concerns “the operations or activities of the Federal government,” (2) whether the disclosure is “likely to contribute” to an understanding of government operations or activities, (3) whether the disclosure “will contribute to public understanding” of a reasonably broad audience of persons interested in the subject, and (4) whether the disclosure is likely to contribute “significantly” to public understanding of government operations or activities.<sup>21</sup> As shown below, the Center meets each of these factors.

##### A. The Subject of This Request Concerns “The Operations and Activities of the Government.”

The subject matter of this request concerns the operations and activities of CBP. This FOIA request will provide the Center and the public with crucial insight into the impact of the Trump administration’s actions on communities, public lands, wildlife, and natural resources, and whether CBP is fulfilling its legal obligations. It is clear that a federal agency’s compliance with federal laws is a specific and identifiable activity of the government, and in this case it is the executive branch agency of CBP.<sup>22</sup> Thus, the Center meets this factor.

##### B. Disclosure is “Likely to Contribute” to an Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The requested records are meaningfully informative about government operations or activities and will contribute to an increased understanding of those operations and activities by the public.

Disclosure of the records will significantly enhance public understanding of ongoing and potential future CBP operations within Big Bend National Park, Big Bend Ranch State Park,. Responsive records will further show how CBP’s actions are impacting ecological, scenic, recreational, and other values of protected state and federal public land, including uplands, the Rio Grande river, and springs, and associated populations or habitats of threatened and

---

<sup>18</sup> 132 Cong. Rec. S. 14298 (statement of Senator Leahy).

<sup>19</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii).

<sup>20</sup> See 6 C.F.R. § 5.11(k)(i) – (ii).

<sup>21</sup> *Id.* § 20.46(b)(1) – (4).

<sup>22</sup> *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1313 (“[R]easonable specificity is all that FOIA requires with regard to this factor”) (internal quotations omitted).

endangered species and other rare or sensitive plants and wildlife. This includes but is not limited to Mexican long-nosed bat, American black bear, desert bighorn sheep, puma, mule deer, Carmen Mountain whitetail deer, black-capped vireo, yellow-billed cuckoo, Colima warbler, Texas horned lizard, Rio Grande leopard frog, big-bend gambusia, Rio Grande silver minnow, Guadalupe Fescue, Woolly devil, bunched cory cactus, Chisos hedgehog cactus, and Lloyd's mariposa cactus. Once the information is made available, the Center will analyze it and present it to its 1.8 million members and online activists and the general public in a manner that will meaningfully enhance the public's understanding of this topic.

Thus, the requested records are likely to contribute to an understanding of CBP's operations and activities.

C. Disclosure of the Requested Records Will Contribute to a Reasonably Broad Audience of Interested Persons' Understanding of this Subject Matter.

The requested records will contribute to public understanding of whether development of the border wall is consistent with relevant environmental laws. As explained above, the records will contribute to public understanding of this topic.

Activities of CBP generally, and how the agency is communicating and operating concerning border wall construction, are areas of interest to a reasonably broad segment of the public. The Center will use the information it obtains from the disclosed records to educate the public at large about this topic.<sup>23</sup>

Through the Center's synthesis and dissemination (by means discussed in Section II, below), disclosure of information contained in and gleaned from the requested records will contribute to a broad audience of persons who are interested in the subject matter.<sup>24</sup>

Indeed, the public does not currently have an ability to easily evaluate the requested records, which are not currently in the public domain.<sup>25</sup> As the Ninth Circuit observed in *McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Carlucci*, "[FOIA] legislative history suggests that information [has more potential to contribute to public understanding] to the degree that the information is new and supports public oversight of agency operations... ."<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> See *W. Watersheds Proj. v. Brown*, 318 F. Supp.2d 1036, 1040 (D. Idaho 2004) (finding that "WWP adequately specified the public interest to be served, that is, educating the public about the ecological conditions of the land managed by the BLM and also how ... management strategies employed by the BLM may adversely affect the environment").

<sup>24</sup> *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F. Supp. at 876 (benefit to a population group of some size distinct from the requester alone is sufficient); *Carney v. Dept. of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807, 815 (2d Cir. 1994), cert. denied, 513 U.S. 823 (1994) (applying "public" to require a sufficient "breadth of benefit" beyond the requester's own interests); *Cnty. Legal Servs. v. Dept. of Hous. & Urban Dev.*, 405 F. Supp.2d 553, 557 (E.D. Pa. 2005) (in granting fee waiver to community legal group, court noted that while the requester's "work by its nature is unlikely to reach a very general audience," "there is a segment of the public that is interested in its work").

<sup>25</sup> See *Cnty. Legal Servs.*, 405 F. Supp.2d at 560 (because requested records "clarify important facts" about agency policy, "the CLS request would likely shed light on information that is new to the interested public.").

<sup>26</sup> *McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Carlucci*, 835 F.2d 1282, 1286 (9th Cir. 1987). In this connection, it is immaterial whether any portion of the Center's request may currently be in the public domain because the Center

Disclosure of these records is not only “likely to contribute,” but is certain to contribute, to public understanding of what efforts are needed to protect the border lands and the species that inhabit them. The public is always well served when it knows how the government conducts its activities, particularly matters touching on legal questions. Hence, there can be no dispute that disclosure of the requested records to the public will educate the public about this pressing issue.

D. Disclosure is Likely to Contribute Significantly to Public Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The Center is not requesting these records merely for their intrinsic informational value. Disclosure of the requested records will significantly enhance the public’s understanding of how the public and the Center can help mitigate the harm this administration poses, as compared to the level of public understanding that exists prior to the disclosure. Indeed, public understanding will be *significantly* increased as a result of disclosure because the requested records will help reveal more about this important topic. Such public oversight of agency action is vital to our democratic system and clearly envisioned by the drafters of the FOIA. Thus, the Center meets this factor as well.

II. The Center has a Demonstrated Ability to Disseminate the Requested Information Broadly.

The Center is a non-profit organization that informs, educates, and counsels the public regarding environmental issues, policies, and laws relating to environmental issues. The Center has been substantially involved in the activities of numerous government agencies for over 30 years, and has consistently displayed its ability to disseminate information granted to it through FOIA.

In consistently granting the Center’s fee waivers, agencies have recognized: (1) that the information requested by the Center contributes significantly to the public’s understanding of the government’s operations or activities; (2) that the information enhances the public’s understanding to a greater degree than currently exists; (3) that the Center possesses the expertise to explain the requested information to the public; (4) that the Center possesses the ability to disseminate the requested information to the general public; (5) and that the news media recognizes the Center as an established expert in the field of imperiled species, biodiversity, and impacts on protected species. The Center’s track record of active participation in oversight of governmental activities and decision making, and its consistent contribution to the public’s understanding of those activities as compared to the level of public understanding prior to disclosure are well established.

The Center’s work appears in about 4,000 news stories online and in print, radio, and TV per month, including regular reporting in such important outlets as *The New York Times*, *CNN*, *The Washington Post*, *Los Angeles Times*, *USA Today*, National Public Radio, and the Associated Press. Many media outlets have reported on the environmental impact of border wall construction utilizing information obtained by the Center from state and federal agencies. In 2025, more than

---

requests considerably more than any piece of information that may currently be available to other individuals. See *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1315.

2.3 million actions were completed by more than 1.2 million members and supporters, and more than 2.5 million people visited the Center's extensive website, viewing pages more than 4.5 million times. Last year the Center sent over 120,000 printed newsletters to more than 93,000 members. More than 644,000 people follow the Center on Facebook, and there are regular postings regarding the protection of public lands and the species that inhabit them. The Center also has more than 132,000 followers on Instagram. The Center intends to use any or all of these far-reaching media outlets to share with the public information obtained as a result of this request.

Public oversight and enhanced understanding of CBP's duties is absolutely necessary. In determining whether disclosure of requested information will contribute significantly to public understanding, a guiding test is whether the requester will disseminate the information to a reasonably-broad audience of persons interested in the subject.<sup>27</sup> The Center need not show how it intends to distribute the information, because "[n]othing in FOIA, the [agency] regulation, or our case law require[s] such pointless specificity."<sup>28</sup> It is sufficient for the Center to show how it distributes information to the public generally.<sup>29</sup>

### III. Obtaining the Requested Records is of No Commercial Interest to the Center.

Access to government records, disclosure forms, and similar materials through FOIA requests is essential to the Center's role of educating the general public. Founded in 1994, the Center is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit conservation organization (EIN: 27-3943866) with more than 1.8 million members and online activists dedicated to the protection of endangered and threatened species and wild places. The Center has no commercial interest and will realize no commercial benefit from the release of the requested records.

### IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Center qualifies for a full fee waiver. We hope that CBP will immediately grant this fee waiver request and begin to search and disclose the requested records without any unnecessary delays.

If you have any questions, please contact me at foia@biologicaldiversity.org. All records and any related correspondence should be sent to my attention at the address below.

Sincerely,



Ann K. Brown  
Open Government Coordinator  
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

---

<sup>27</sup> *Carney*, 19 F.3d 807.

<sup>28</sup> *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1314.

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*

P.O. Box 11374  
Portland, OR 97211-0374  
[foia@biologicaldiversity.org](mailto:foia@biologicaldiversity.org)