



Final
Volume 2

Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement For Northern Border Activities, Appendices

Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Customs and Border Protection



July 2012

PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A
NORTHERN BORDER PEIS
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

**Appendix A-1
Northern Border
Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
Public Scoping Report**

for

Scoping Activities Performed May-July 2010

Scoping Meetings:

July 12, 2010 – Rochester, NY; Augusta, ME

July 13, 2010 – Erie, PA; Swanton/St. Albans, VT

July 14, 2010 – Massena, NY

July 19, 2010 – Bellingham, WA; Duluth, MN

July 21, 2010 – Bonners Ferry/Naples, ID; Minot, ND;
Detroit/Southfield, MI

July 22, 2010 – Havre, MT

**U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Department of Homeland Security**

Overview of the Scoping Process

U. S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) developed and executed a public scoping process for its four regional Programmatic Environmental Impact Statements (PEISs) for Northern Border operations. “Scoping” of an environmental impact statement is a process of informing diverse stakeholders about an action that an agency is planning and seeking those stakeholders’ feedback on the environmental concerns that that action could generate. The intent of the scoping effort is to adapt the scope of the planned programmatic National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document to ensure that it addresses relevant concerns identified by interested members of the public as well as organizations, Native American tribes, and other government agencies and officials.

CBP’s public scoping efforts consisted of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare PEISs, scoping letters sent to potentially interested stakeholders, a project Web site, a series of public scoping meetings, and display advertisements and public service announcements making the public aware of the meetings and the public scoping program. CBP Public Affairs posted a press release about scoping on the CBP Web site.

A series of 11 public scoping meetings were arranged for the 4 PEIS regions, 6 during the week of July 12-16, 2010 and 5 during the week of July 19-23, 2010. The meetings were held in the evenings. At each public meeting, attendees were given handouts and invited to view a series of informational posters about CBP and northern border security. At each meeting, CBP and contractor personnel made a brief overview presentation of the PEIS effort. CBP representatives presented information on the suite of potential CBP activities. Mangi Environmental provided contract support and presented information on the NEPA process and environmental considerations. Following the presentation, the presenters invited attendees to view the posters again and to dictate their comments to a court recorder set aside to hear them individually.

Any attendee wishing to make a comment could also do so by filling out a comment form and leaving it at the meeting or mailing it in later. CBP and Mangi Environmental also informed scoping meeting attendees, both by meeting handout and in the visual presentation, how they could make comments through the website or e-mail. Approximately an hour after the initial presentation was given, a second presentation with the ensuing opportunities was given if new attendees had arrived at the meeting.

Scoping letters were sent to a mailing list of approximately 1,200 agencies, organizations, and individuals. The letters described the proposed project and invited comments in response. The meetings and letters established a response date of August 5, 2010.

Appendix A presents a list of the newspapers in which display ads were placed. Appendix B presents the text of the display ads, along with the materials, such as handouts, that were made available at the scoping meetings. Appendix C is a compendium of news articles published after the scoping meetings.

Scoping Results

Public Comments

Scoping comments were received at public meetings, as well as through e-mail, faxes, phone calls, and posted letters. Comments received during the scoping process have been organized and annotated using document management software. A total of 223 communications were received during the public scoping process. Mangi Environmental reviewed all the communications and extracted multiple specific comments from each, identifying a total of 500 discrete public scoping comments and organizing them into “comment themes.” Each comment theme was assigned a code that indicated the overall category of comment (alpha code) and the specific issue (numeric code). The 51 resulting comment codes are below as well as attached in Appendix D to this report. These themes and comments were then analyzed to help shape the PEIS scope and issue coverage. Appendix D also identifies how each comment will be handled by CBP in developing the PEIS.

Directory of codes	
I = impact or issue of concern	
<i>Biological</i>	
BI-1 – threatened and endangered species	
BI-2 – wildlife	
BI-3 – vegetation	
BI-4 – avian and land migratory species	
<i>Physical</i>	
PI-1 – geology & sediment conditions	
PI-2 – physical surface and groundwater conditions	
PI-3 –wetland resources	
PI-4 – water quality	
PI-5 – air & climate (including light)	
PI-6 – sustainability	
PI-7 – prime and unique farmland	
<i>Socioeconomic</i>	
SI-1 – recreational fishing and hunting	
SI-2 – cultural recreation, visual studies, and national parks	
SI-3 – noise	
SI-4 – transportation and navigation	
SI-5 – tribal issues	
SI-6 – socioeconomics (anything to do with cost and quality of life)	
SI-6a – commerce concerns	
SI-6b – human health and services (HHS)	
SI-6c – environmental justice	

SI-6d – family concerns
SI-6e – green card concerns
SI-7 – historical issues
SI-8 – conservation easements
SI-9 – privacy/invasive actions concerns
Operations
OI-1 – suggested security actions
OI-2 – port of entry (POE) concerns and border crossing issues
OI-2a – Messina specific
OI-2b – ND International Peace Garden (IPG) specific
OI-2c – St. Albans specific
<u>A = alternatives</u>
A-1 – all suggested alternatives
<u>R = requests</u>
R-1 – request PEIS
R-2 – request comment period extension
R-3 – request general data
R-4 – request scoping period reinitiation
R-5 – request substantial PEIS review period
<u>M = possible mitigation</u>
<u>G = general and/or data on resources</u>
Gm – comments about scoping process
Gf – general CBP-focused comments
G1 – comments about legislators, general Government
<u>C = conceptual</u>
CS – support project
CSa – support for national security reasons
CSb – support for other political reasons
CSc – support for economic reasons
CO – oppose project
COa – oppose for environmental reasons (e.g., too many impacts, too many unknowns)
COb – oppose for political reasons
COc – oppose for economic reasons
CN-1 – support a full, fair evaluation

Summary of Comments

Throughout the following summary of results, comment theme codes are given in parentheses. The reader can use the accompanying summary spreadsheet (Appendix D-Scoping Comments Summary Table) to identify the commenters for specific themes.

Comments were received from the following entities:

- Federal agencies: General Services Administration (GSA), National Park Service (NPS), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), United States Department of Agriculture/Forest Service (USDA/FS), United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and USDA/Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA/NRCS)
- States: Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks Commission; Washington Department of Transportation; Michigan Department of Natural Resources and the Environment; and Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
- Local government: Macomb County, Michigan
- Independent bodies: Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission (Established by treaty between the United States and Canada. It consists of members appointed by the Governor of British Columbia and Mayor of Seattle. It administers a fund created by the treaty to conserve and protect wilderness and wildlife habitat and to enhance recreation opportunities)
- Tribal governments: Mohawk Council of Akwasasne and Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians
- Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs): Wildlife Society, National Parks Conservation Association, Conservation Northwest, Lake Champlain Basin Program, Skagit Audubon Society, plus 16 NGOs represented by Dinah Bear, as follows:
 - Sierra Club
 - Border Ambassadors
 - Center for Biological Diversity
 - Center for Large Landscape Conservation
 - Defenders of Wildlife
 - International League of Conservation Photographers
 - National Immigration Forum
 - No Border Wall
 - Natural Resources Defense Council
 - Pacific Rivers Council
 - Sierra Club, Vermont Chapter
 - Texas Border Coalition
 - United Church of Christ
 - Western Land Exchange
 - Wilderness Watch
 - Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative

Most Frequent Comments

A frequency analysis of the comment themes revealed the following ranking of comment frequency:

- Delays in picking up kids at International Peace Garden at Dunseth (98 total mentions, OI-2b)
- Keep Morses line open, other improvements (39 mentions, OI-2c)
- Various security suggestions (e.g., new technology, standardized frequencies, intelligence, and interagency cooperation) (28 mentions, OI-1)
- Concerns about preserving national parks for conservation and recreational values (24 mentions, SI-2)
- Scoping process complaints (21 mentions, Gm)
- Various CBP policy suggestions (e.g., focus nationally and prevent illegal immigrants and drugs) (19 mentions, Gf)
- Mohawk and Seneca tribes do not recognize U.S.- Canada border (16 mentions, SI-5)
- Slow POEs discourage commerce (16 mentions, SI-6a)

The scoping comments can be grouped into the following categories, each discussed separately below:

1. Comments about the scoping process itself
2. Concerns about impacts on specific natural or human environmental resources
3. Operations- or policy-related comments
4. Location-specific comments
5. Requests

1. Comments about the scoping process itself

Many commenters voiced dissatisfaction with the scoping process conducted by CBP. The concerns included:

- Lack of specificity in the description of the proposed action and alternatives in the NOI. Commenters were frustrated because the lack of clarity and detail in defining what CBP is proposing made commenting difficult;
- Lack of cooperators identified among agencies, tribes, and Canadian government; and,
- Inadequate public notification of the scoping meeting logistics:
 - Notifications provided very short lead times (the first meeting was 6 days after NOI publication);
 - Web site information on meeting times was inadequate for the first seven meetings; and,
 - “Calls to the CBP representative listed in the NOI went unanswered for the first week.”

2. Concerns about impacts on specific natural or human environmental resources

The single most important issue voiced in comments about the natural environment was the concern that CBP’s future actions would threaten ecological, recreational, and wilderness values in public lands along the border.

Sensitive ecological resources specifically mentioned include:

- Species that are state or Federally listed as threatened or endangered (T&E), including grizzly bear, Canada lynx, bull trout, and gray wolf (BI-1);
- Wetlands in the Great Lakes (PI-3);
- Migration corridors for many species that routinely cross the Northern Border (BI-4);
- Aquatic and avian species that could be affected by vehicles or boats (BI-3);
- Invasive species that could be introduced through vehicle or boat patrols (BI-3); and
- Wilderness areas such as Stephen Mather Wilderness in North Cascades National Park, Pasayten Wilderness, and Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Impacts to wilderness values in these areas should be avoided or mitigated, and recreational access should be maintained wherever possible (SI-2). Comments on specific resources and public lands were made by USDA/FS, NPS, and USFWS.

In addition, several commenters expressed concern about the noise (SI-3) as well as light and air pollution (PI-5) created by terrestrial, aerial, and marine patrols and surveillance activities along the border regions. Further, some commenters expressed concern about the visual impacts of new infrastructure (SI-2). Several suggested that mitigation measures must be adopted.

The USDA/NRCS commented that there are many private lands with conservation easements within the 200-mile border swath and that land use changes that CBP may propose as part of a given action should be mindful of easement restrictions.

Many commenters raised concerns about land port of entry (POE) issues. While site-specific concerns are discussed below, it is clear from the overall comments that LPOE issues are the most personal and of greatest direct impact on the lives of people who live near the border. CBP's methods and technologies for processing people and trade as they traverse the border are critical socioeconomic impact-producing factors and, as such, should be included in the scope of this PEIS, assuming that CBP's entire mission of securing the border and facilitating trade and tourism is within the purview of the PEIS. The most frequently expressed concerns were fear of potential LPOE closures (SI-4) and the impact of wait times on daily family and community life (OI-2, 2a, 2b, and 2c).

3. Operations and policy-related comments

Many commenters had specific suggestions, recommendations, or opinions about current and future CBP activities (OI-1 and Gf). Among these were:

- The need for technologies for increased surveillance;
- The need for more cooperation among agencies;
- The use of standardized radio frequencies;
- A focus on smaller checkpoints for intelligence purposes;
- No "Big Brother";
- The need for CBP to stop wasting money and to focus on national, not local, picture;
- The need to focus on preventing illegal immigrants and drugs;
- The importance of not militarizing the border; and,
- That the border is unconstitutional and should be abolished,

4. Location-Specific Comments

Table 1 details the location-specific issues contained in the scoping comments:

Table 1. Location-specific Comments		
Location	Comment summary	Number of comments
Lake of Woods, Boundary Waters	Special preservation necessary, ample wetlands to consider	6
North Cascades National Park and Pasayten Wilderness	Should not bear any negative impacts from CBP actions	4
Lake Erie	Easy access for illegal activities	7
State of Montana Parks	Specific concerns for T&E species, recreational economy	4
Massena POE	Delays crossing border, lost habitat, and tribal relations issues	39
Dunseith POE	Irritant to International Peace Garden traffic because of slow movement at and around POE, even if no border crossing	93
Glacier National Park	Protect resources	8
Braddock Bay	Migratory bird species concerns	1
Niagara Watershed	Niagara Power Project concerns of pollution, commerce affected, and waits at the falls	4
Morses Line POE	Keep it open	53
White Mountain National Forest (NF)	No impacts from CBP tolerated	1
Lake Roosevelt	Special attention to impacts here	1
Colville and Kaniksu NFs	Special attention to impacts here	2
Ross Lake area	What impacts here?	9
St. Croix Island	Avoid all impacts and any actions here	3

5. Requests

The following requests were included among the scoping comments:

- Reinitiate scoping (two requests);
- Extend scoping (R-2, three requests);
- Official request for cooperating agency status-NPS only;
- Notification of availability of PEIS (R-1, 11 requests); and,
- Provide substantial PEIS review and comment period (R-5, one request).

A summary spreadsheet of all comments and a key to comment codes are shown in Appendix D.

Outcomes of Scoping

A major goal of scoping is to help the agency refine its plans as appropriate to ensure that the study responds to relevant concerns. In this instance, CBP determined that several refinements in its plans would enhance the effectiveness of its planned study. These refinements include:

- Preparation of a single nationwide PEIS instead of the earlier preliminary plan to prepare four regional ones. While this makes for a somewhat larger single document, it offers the advantage of less duplication and greater usefulness as a CBP planning tool.
- Publication of an updated Notice, along with letters and other public announcements to inform agencies, the public, and other interested parties about this refinement.
- An affirmation that CBP will welcome comments on the scope of the PEIS at any time, but that the earlier the comments are received, the more useful they will be.
- Coordination between CBP and other major Federal agencies with jurisdiction or expertise to enlist their assistance in the preparation of the PEIS.

Appendix A-2

Public Report on Responses to Comments on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for Northern Border Activities

Duluth, MN: 3-Oct 2011

Massena, NY: 4-Oct 2011

Caribou, ME: 4-Oct 2011

Augusta, ME: 5-Oct 2011

Bottineau, ND: 5-Oct 2011

St. Albans, VT: 6-Oct 2011

St. Albans, VT: 6-Oct 2011

Detroit, MI: 6-Oct 2011

Havre, MT: 6-Oct 2011

Bellingham, WA: 11-Oct 2011

Rochester, NY: 11-Oct 2011

Naples, ID: 13-Oct 2011

National Capital Area (Arlington, VA): 17 Oct 2011

**Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Customs and Border Protection**

1) How were comments addressed?

Comments were addressed according to Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA. CEQ Regulations 40 CFR Part 1500.4 outlines the five ways that an agency is to respond to comments received on an Environmental Impact Statement. They are:

- A. Modify alternatives including the proposed action.
 - B. Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given serious consideration by the agency.
 - C. Supplement, improve, or modify its analyses.
 - D. Make factual corrections.
 - E. Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response.
- 2) How many comments were received on the Draft PEIS for Northern Border Activities?**

Roughly 120 individual letters were received, of which we extracted around 700 comments. Of these comments, approximately 2/3 were determined to be out of scope for incorporation within the PEIS or repetitive of other comments responded to directly within the PEIS.

3) Where can I find responses to the comments I submitted?

Explanations for why comments were determined non-substantive or out of the scope of the PEIS are provided and summarized in Table (A-2.1) of this Appendix. All substantive comments are included in Table (A-2.2) of this Appendix. They are sorted according to the order in which they were received.

4) What key themes emerged from the comments?

There were several themes that emerged repeatedly from the comments received. Major themes and CBP responses are summarized below:

- A. Concerns with impacts to transboundary areas and species.
 - i. CBP is aware of transboundary pacts and treaties between the United States and Canada associated with the project area. Transboundary

Protected Areas have been identified in their associated regional area in PEIS.

- ii. Similarly, CBP is aware of the importance of wildlife corridors and the transborder migration of wildlife. Any proposed action that would have an adverse effect on the transboundary migration of sensitive species (including those listed under the Endangered Species Act), habitats, and wildlife movement, would require consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and will be addressed as part of site specific environmental reviews for individual actions. Coordination with Canadian agencies on transboundary species concerns would necessarily be done through our Federal natural resource management partners and the Department of State.

B. Concerns of potential to build fence.

- i. CBP has no intention of installing 4,000 miles or, any significant fraction thereof, of fencing along the United States and Canadian International Border. It is not a part of any Northern Border strategy under consideration. Fencing for traffic management and deterrence at specific crossing points would be extremely limited relative to the amount of infrastructure north of the border. Fencing, used as a force multiplier, may be installed in selected discrete areas where intrusion control is necessary. Prior to installation of any tactical security infrastructure items, a CBP NEPA planning document would be prepared on the environmental impacts of that specific fence project.

C. Concerns with impacts to cultural resources.

- i. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications, but would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public. Project specific environmental assessments would be prepared prior to initiation of an actual project proposal at a specific location and be subject to additional NEPA and other appropriate environmental reviews and consultation with potentially affected tribes, land-owners, Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources, and the general public. As part of the NEPA process, CBP will comply with the National Historic Preservation Act. CBP retains qualified Archeologists and Architectural Historians to identify cultural resources and historical properties. We have consulted with tribes on the Northern Border PEIS and will consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and affected tribes for any site specific action with the potential to affect cultural and historical resources.

D. Tribal and cultural data and protection concerns.

- i.** CBP will assess and, when appropriate, consult on all construction, maintenance and repair activities that could impact tribes. CBP has invited participation from all individuals, groups, and governments within the study area. Several tribes provided comments during scoping and during the public comment period for the draft PEIS. Approximately 75 tribes are within 100 miles of the border.
- ii.** The U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) has created Public Lands Liaisons and tribal liaisons within their sectors to reach out to various governmental agencies and affected tribes which may be affected by their actions. CBP also has a broader State, Local and Tribal Liaison program to facilitate communication and cooperation with tribes and other governments. CBP and its law enforcement components are attempting to be more responsive to the concerns of local communities in which they interact. Enhanced tribal identification card programs as well as preclearance efforts may reduce issues with transport of important traditional items.

E. Concerns with the cumulative impact analysis.

- i.** CBP's approach to cumulative analysis is reasonable given CBP's small footprint for the area covered. However, CBP will provide additional information on recent historical growth in its activities along the Northern Border to provide meaningful perspective on resource impact trends.

F. Issues with how public outreach was conducted.

- i.** CBP conducted a round of 11 scoping meetings and 13 draft PEIS public meetings across the Northern Border. CBP made efforts to cover as much representative Northern Border territory as it could, given the extent of the area covered in the analysis. CBP could not accommodate meetings in every area that wanted one.
- ii.** CBP conducted two sets of mass mailings to over 1600 libraries and 900 other addressees and placed notifications in local newspapers. Since there are no specific proposed projects at specific sites, CBP sought not to bias its meeting locations based on existing activities. Any comments based on existing knowledge of environmental concerns with CBP activities have been well received in this process. CBP made attempts to mail out to everyone who made a request and all change requests made.
- iii.** Extending the comment period would not further public awareness of CBP activities that could affect their local environment. Despite the size of the document, the 45-day period is sufficient for interested

parties to comment on concerns about potential future impacts within a given regional environment. The PEIS provides broad-based analysis of impacts from proposed alternative approaches to respond potential threat changes within the next five to seven years. CBP is not proposing an action or management plan in the PEIS. It would not and could not take any specific action based upon the analysis in the PEIS or decisions in the ROD. CBP would provide sufficient notice and review times to the public to comment upon future NEPA documents when it does propose actual projects with the potential for significant impacts to the environment.

G. Issues with the selected alternatives.

- i.** The alternatives used in the PEIS were developed to provide CBP decision-makers with a basis for understanding the relative environmental impacts associated with implementing different sets of tools/activities used to facilitate border security along the Northern Border. These alternatives provide a reasonable range of approaches to choose from to meet yet unidentified future threats. The relative environmental impacts that would likely occur from implementing each the alternatives are presented in the PEIS in narrative and tabular form throughout the document. They evidence the different environmental considerations inherent to any strategic approach.
- ii.** The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. Project specific environmental assessments would be prepared prior to initiation of an actual project proposal. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the public.
- iii.** No projects will be initiated without additional NEPA documentation being prepared. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed.
- iv.** All activities depicted within the PEIS would require some additional environmental review. Any item meeting the definition of a major Federal action that is not currently categorically excluded, or otherwise disclosed as not requiring additional environmental review would require at least initiation of an environmental assessment.

H. Issues with the analysis.

- i.** This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. Any proposal for actual projects or activity at a specific location would occur in the future and be subject to additional NEPA and other appropriate environmental reviews and consultation with potentially affected tribes, land-owners, Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources, and the general public. Project specific environmental assessments would be prepared prior to initiation of an actual project proposal. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the public.
 - ii.** No alternative was selected at the time of publication of the Draft PEIS.
 - iii.** Specific contract language for specific actions is not a part of a PEIS. CBP BMPs would address such specific language when required.
 - iv.** No projects will be initiated without additional NEPA documentation being prepared. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed.
- I.** Misconception that the PEIS is related to H.R. 1505 National Security and Federal Lands Protection Act.
 - i.** It should be understood that CBP Protection is not proposing or planning to request any change in legal responsibilities or to further increase its physical presence along the Northern Border. The PEIS is providing a prudent broad look and potential impacts if activity levels needed to change in the future due to a change in the threat environment along the border.

Table A-2.1 Comments Received but Not Incorporated into PEIS

#	Comment	CBP's Response
CULTURAL AWARENESS		
8	<p>The village of St. Regis, or Kanatakon, and the district of Skye must pass through US portion of reservation. The border was drawn through the territory in 1754 by ppl who could not envision the modern scenario with high population, cars, trucks, boats... It is an intrinsic part of the community's philosophy that the US/Canada boundary was never meant to apply to us, and that according to aboriginal laws, we are a singular community, a nation unto ourselves. Outside authorities have dismissed our views; exercised jurisdiction over the divided community; supplanting our traditional gov system with elective gov on both sides of border. <u>Some are believers of Mohawk sovereignty and reject intrusion.</u> Some believe gov has violated the Two Row Wampum, a treaty which assures non-interference in our political, cultural, and economic systems. Even though some (not all) are engaged in the black market, not everyone who believes in the intrusion is, our elected gov helped assist the Integrated Border Enforcement Teams (IBETs) in their crackdown on contraband smuggling.</p>	<p>The issue raised is beyond the scope of analyzing the environmental and related socioeconomic impacts of current and potential/foreseeable future CBP activities along the Northern Border. The PEIS makes no judgment upon the validity of your concerns, but is not the appropriate mechanism for addressing them. Enhanced tribal identification card programs as well as preclearance efforts may reduce issues with transport of important traditional items.</p>
77	<p>Ceremonial gifts-blankets, medicine bundles, horses, moose meat, caribou, seal walrus.</p>	
81	<p>Providing ground penetrating radar devices to tribes or their contractors to assist in location of small pox, t.b., Spanish flu, etc. to tribes</p>	

13	If fencing and ports of entry for the international road are contemplated, it would greatly affect the day-to-day life of Akwesasne residents, especially those who have to travel from one district of the reserve to another for their jobs and regular act. The existing scenario already adds up to an hour of travel time for normal commuting.	The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed. Upon completion of this PEIS, CBP would still have to complete NEPA analysis for any proposed projects that currently would require environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. Any CBP proposals for projects or activities at specific locations would be made in the future and would comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory environmental requirements. At such time, CBP would also conduct other appropriate required environmental reviews and consult with potentially affected tribes and land-owners as well as Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific NEPA analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public.
1150	When viewing the Mohawk Territory, Federal, State and Provincial governments often parcel the land within the confines of each respective agency. This fragmentation needs to be fully considered under NEPA with respect to EJ.	CBP appreciates your concern. However, parceling of land is outside the scope of CBP's jurisdiction and, therefore, also outside the scope of this PEIS.
EXTENT OF TRIBAL CONTACT AND CONSULTATION		
37	To listen to Native American issues as well as other people of the area to realize that this area is different that other parts of the (4000 miles of) Northern Border. (Public meeting should have had a public comment period, so people could hear what others had to say.)	CBP made efforts to cover as much representative Northern Border territory as it could, given the extent of the area covered in the analysis. CBP could not accommodate meetings in every area that wanted one. CBP has invited participation from all individuals, groups, and governments within the study area. Several tribes provided comments during scoping and during the public comment period for the draft PEIS. Approximately 75 tribes are within 100 miles of the border. CBP consults on all construction, maintenance and repair activities that could impact tribal possessions or populations.
76	What involvement has tribes been involved with since the inception of the Homeland Security meeting.	
78	How many tribes are affected by the on-or near border areas and what dialogue has occurred.	
79	What CBP's position on tribal consultation.	

628	It is imperative that we be an integral part of the CBP's effort to fulfill its mission while maintaining a balance with its responsibility to facilitate legitimate trade and travel.	The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed. Upon completion of this PEIS, CBP would still have to complete NEPA analysis for any proposed projects that currently would require environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. Any CBP proposals for projects or activities at specific locations would be made in the future and would comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory environmental requirements. At such time, CBP would also conduct other appropriate required environmental reviews and consult with potentially affected tribes and land-owners as well as Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific NEPA analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public.
TREATMENT OF TRIBES AND MEMBERS OF TRIBES		
445	The EIS contains no info on contacts with or treatment of Native Americans at the border crossings. Treated as less than citizens, and are harassed when there are not real bad guys to chase.	The issue raised is beyond the scope of analyzing the environmental and related socioeconomic impacts of current and potential/foreseeable future CBP activities along the Northern Border. The PEIS makes no judgment upon the validity of your concerns, but is not the appropriate mechanism for addressing them.
614	Mistreatment towards native Americans	CBP seeks to treat all people with respect as it discharges its border security mission.
1161	Both sides of the border can get rude. They take things like medicinal herbs, which we have used since the beginning of time. It is rude because we have a treaty.	Officers are obligated to confiscate undocumented plant and animal materials to safe guard both Canadian and American from potential agricultural infestations. Confiscation of materials by CBP officers is beyond the scope of this PEIS.

CULTURAL RESOURCES		
18	At Akwesasne the border passes through residential areas, gov facility parking lots, a radio station, and sensitive environmental features such as forests, wetlands, and rivers. The border area is rich with archaeological features dating back thousands of years and all must be considered in any enhancements to the existing border enforcement program. Akwesasne would be the most complicated part of the 4,000 mile border between the US and Canada and may very well need its own socio-economic study, cultural resources survey, and environmental impact study. Urge to consult extensively with Mohawk leaders and community members.	The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. Upon completion of this PEIS, CBP would still have to complete NEPA analysis for any proposed projects that would require environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. Any CBP proposals for projects or activities at specific locations would be made in the future and would comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory environmental requirements. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed. At such time, CBP would also conduct other appropriate required environmental reviews and consult with potentially affected tribes and land-owners as well as Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific NEPA analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public.
115	Without details, it is impossible to know if the plan at Niagara Falls/Buffalo NY will benefit or compromise the historic areas, aggravate the health and env., kill thriving communities, resolve or exacerbate existing bi-national transportation problems	
518	In order to appropriately comment, residents need more detailed information on CBP's plans specifically for the Peace Bridge crossing in Buffalo NY, which operates on national protected land and is adjacent to the Prospect Hill-Columbus Park historic district	
626	As the CBP continues to expand its facilities and services, we believe there is great potential for socioeconomic and cultural impacts on our people.	

794	Anticipate that border infrastructure and enforcement actions that fall under the non-specific umbrella categories provided in the DPEIS may have deleterious impacts on sensitive plants and animals and cultural resources because of: anticipated trampling of vegetation and other direct damage to aquatic wildlife, wildlife habitat; fragmentation of habitat/wildlife corridors from roads/barriers, introduction of invasive species; anticipated trampling of cultural resources, disturbance of sites sacred to Native Americans; impacts to endangered species recovery efforts; wildlife mortality/displacement; modification of wildlife behavior; Concerned about the potential for significant impacts to the wilderness character across the National Wilderness Preservation System	
863	It is unclear how areas of high significance for cultural resources will be considered and analyzed in site specific actions proposed.	
82	Potential mitigation, "Cree Crossing."	CBP will assess and, when appropriate, consult on all construction, maintenance and repair activities that could impact tribes.
367	Any development in all listed alternatives of this draft requires a complete site survey and full documentation for cultural resources.	As part of the NEPA process, CBP will comply with the National Historic Preservation Act. CBP retains qualified Archeologists and Historical Architects to identify historical properties and cultural resources. CBP consults with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and affected tribes.
369	The potential for great damage to occur to cultural and paleontological resources through each of the alternatives listed in the draft Northern Border PEIS is very disturbing.	No further response required within the PEIS. CBP thanks you for your comment.
399	From our quick review of your analysis of the various impacts your alternatives would have on cultural resources, including historic resources, we disagree with your decision to classify most of these as minor to moderate. From our perspective, most of the activities your report describes have the potential to cause real and irreversible harm to cultural resources.	CBP disagrees with this comment. Because this analysis is broad and aimed at strategic understanding, each specific project would have to be evaluated on its own merits and potential impacts consulted upon at the time it is proposed.

401	To say that impacts of individual projects will be reviewed under the NHPA at a future date does not provide our resources with adequate protection, because acceptance of your PEIS in its current form already prejudices future reviews.	CBP will continue to analyze impacts under NEPA, NHPA, and a host of other applicable laws and regulations including those directing government to government consultation with Federally-recognized tribes.
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
98	We see no reason to obviate ANY environmental regulations in pursuit of Homeland Security on these very significant public lands. Most of our very important rivers have their headwaters within the 100-mile zone, thereby increasing the likelihood of damage to much of the rest of the State of Maine should CBP succeed in avoiding CWA regulations, for instance.	This PEIS is not tied to any legislation currently under consideration in congress. No projects would be proposed or initiated without additional NEPA documentation, public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with Federal, State, and local resource management agencies.

<p>115</p>	<p>Without details, it is impossible to know if the plan at Niagara Falls/Buffalo NY will benefit or compromise the historic areas, aggravate the health and env., kill thriving communities, resolve or exacerbate existing bi-national transportation problems</p>	<p>The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. Upon completion of this PEIS, CBP would still have to complete NEPA analysis for any proposed projects that would require environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. Any CBP proposals for projects or activities at specific locations would be made in the future and would comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory environmental requirements. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed. At such time, CBP would also conduct other appropriate required environmental reviews and consult with potentially affected tribes and land-owners as well as Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific NEPA analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public.</p>
<p>328</p>	<p>Concerned with the power this will give to border control to circumvent the rules of N Cascades NP. Does not want agencies to have the right to build roads, buildings, trails, and other structures in pristine back country. Where is the evidence for need</p>	
<p>794</p>	<p>Anticipate that border infrastructure and enforcement actions that fall under the non-specific umbrella categories provided in the DPEIS may have deleterious impacts on sensitive plants and animals and cultural resources because of: anticipated trampling of vegetation and other direct damage to aquatic wildlife, wildlife habitat; fragmentation of habitat/wildlife corridors from roads/barriers, introduction of</p>	

	invasive species; anticipated trampling of cultural resources, disturbance of sites sacred to Native Americans; impacts to endangered species recovery efforts; wildlife mortality/displacement; modification of wildlife behavior; Concerned about the potential for significant impacts to the wilderness character across the National Wilderness Preservation System	
809	A revised draft PEIS and the final PEIS should include assessments of these and all other wildlife species/populations potentially affected by this project, and to analyze the potential impacts to wildlife from a full spectrum of potential actions	
818	PEIS does not adequately assess impacts to a number of wide-ranging species that cross the international border including wolverine, grey wolf, Canadian lynx, fisher, and grizzly bear	
819	Wolverines, esp in WA, are highly sensitive to human disturbance. Any barriers, new roads or further intrusion (ATVs) into their habitat in the North Cascades would retard and perhaps halt their recovery in WA	
821	The Final PEIS must do a more thorough job of analyzing impacts of CBP developments and ongoing activities to drive more of the wide-ranging carnivores to extinction. It must provide for full mitigation of habitat impacts	
822	Strengthen language "In WOR Region, for example woodland caribou...intact habitat where these species occur should be avoided to the greatest extent practicable" DEIS pp. 8.3-22 and -23. Ensure long-term recovery of T&E, full mitigation of impacts	
841	We are keenly interested in the trans-boundary management of the Skagit ecosystem and any policies and actions that may influence that management	
144	Increased vehicular access and human activity along the border would impede efforts to recover listed populations of grizzly bear, lynx, and mountain caribou, or other species. It would be more beneficial to construct helistops for border	CBP is aware of this issue and will continue to coordinate its efforts with other agencies to evaluate its actions in this regard.

	patrols than to build new roads. Although this would impact wildlife the impacts would be less.	
155	Increased motorized vehicular access within wildlife habitats along the border would also hinder efforts to recover caribou, grizzly bear, lynx, and other wildlife.	
156	Caribou will flee if motorized vehicles make their way into winter habitats causing them to spend crucial energy reserves.	
159	Activities or projects that reduce the quality or quantity of snowshoe hare habitat (especially multi-storied lodgepole pine and spruce/fir forests) would negatively impact the recovery of lynx. Lynx require high elevation habitats that are capable of supporting populations of snowshoe hare (prey) - multi-storied lodgepole pine and spruce/fir forests are important.	
173	Any new roads, motorized routes, or increased motorized vehicular access proposed could hinder efforts to recover these species: caribou, [g]rizzly bear, lynx, and other wildlife.	
311	Do not plan projects with potential impacts on biological resources in protected areas such as North Cascades National Park, Glacier National Park, and the adjacent larger protected landscapes surrounding both that could otherwise have cumulative impacts on grizzly bears and other wildlife habitat and behavior. Also concerned about minor projects that might have these impacts. We hope important biological resources will be avoided when planning any projects in all areas along the border, not just National Parks.	
460	Particularly concerned about any disturbance or permanent human presence on the Selkirk crest in north Idaho and Purcells in NW MT or anywhere in the mt. caribou recovery zone. Any human disturbance to mt. caribou may result in increased vulnerability to predation and avalanche events and reduced repro success and calf survival	
462	Urge CBP to exercise restraint in any border related projects/activities that have the potential to undermine/compromise the ecological integrity of our near	

	border/shared US/Canadian border	
537	Any physical changes CBP might consider need to include Buffalo waterfront, the Niagara River from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario critical habitats. Any physical changes CBP might consider in the Niagara River Greenway should be carefully betted through the Niagara River Greenway Commission and the local public	
556	If pursued along the MN border, many of the potential activities described in the PEIS could result in adverse impacts to biological and ecological features given the high incidence of rare species; areas free of terrestrial and aquatic non-native invasive species; rare native plant communities, unfragmented or minimally fragmented habitat; public lands designated or managed for protection/conservation of recreational values.	
181	No mention of the Canada Lynx or Wolverine in the Draft PEIS.	Selected examples of wildlife across the study area are provided in Chapters 4 – 8, Appendix L, and Appendix M. Specific references to the Canada lynx and wolverine were provided in Chapters 7 and 8 and Appendix L and M. Specific ref include: Wolverine: 8.3.1.2/32/35. Lynx: 7.3.2.3/10 /23. 8.3.1.2 /32 of 35. 8.18.3 Line 15 of page 276. Appx L line 40 page 422. Appendix M.Selected examples of wildlife across the study area are provided in Chap 4 – 8, Appx L, and Appx M. Specific references to the Canada lynx and wolverine were provided in Chapters 7 and 8 and Appendix L and M. Specific references include: Wolverine: 8.3.1.2 Line 32 of page 35. Lynx: 7.3.2.3 Line 10 of page 23. 8.3.1.2 Line 32 of page 35. 8.18.3 Line 15 of page 276. Appendix L line 40 page 422. Appendix M.
350	Oppose any cutting of trees or ground cover near the border that is not recommended by a VT state or County forester for the health of the forest - Vermont	Specific CBP actions will be addressed in specific EA/EISs
352	The PEIS must take an extremely cautious approach to manipulation of standing forest communities and the creation of obstacles to species migration given the climatic shifts and stresses already on them	
375	This PEIS disregards impacts to wildlife, fish, birds, amphibians, and reptiles. It disregards impacts from invasive	These issues are addressed in the body of the PEIS.

	species take over cleared out areas	
701	Fence in the area [St. Lawrence river] will choke it to death.	Fencing, used as a force multiplier, may be installed in selected discrete areas where intrusion control is necessary. Prior to installation of any tactical security infrastructure items, a CBP NEPA planning document would be prepared on the environmental impacts of that specific fence project. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed.
805	Some major impacts to wildlife from construction of physical border barriers and roads include: altered wildlife behavior/range from infrastructure construction/operational noise/night lighting/low altitude overflights/increased road mortality/isolation of veg strands/habitat patches/loss of cover/connectivity/rem veg/inter of genetic exchange	CBP has discussed all of those impacts in the PEIS, in appropriate sections, such as air quality and aesthetics.
806	From construction of barriers and roads: Flora and fauna are vulnerable to significant loss/deterioration of their habitus, and/or increase in risk of human-caused mortality in borderlands	
826	8.18.3 page 8-18.2 Biological Resources - does not describe or explain any projected effects of CBP activities, or what those activities might be; merely states that impacts will be less than major but does not justify this statement and gives no examples to support statement	No further response required in the PEIS.
831	The PEIS must take an extremely cautious approach to manipulation of standing forest communities and the creation of obstacles to species migration given the climatic shifts and stresses already on them	CBP seeks to improve partnerships across and along the Northern Border. No "border fence" is contemplated as a part of this PEIS.
TRANSBOUNDARY IMPACTS		
96	While between Maine and Canada there may be some wildlife that does cross the border due to climate change as well as habitat that is shared across border, that wildlife is not a serious threat to homeland security.	CBP is aware of this issue and will continue to coordinate its efforts with other agencies to evaluate its actions in this regard.
673	The effect of such a border on migratory patterns of wildlife will be devastated	
674	Already the impacts of climate change is altering the habitat	

	of all forms of life from the smallest fungi to the largest trees, from the smallest mammals to the megafauna that inhabit this part of the U.S.	
675	Such a border will devastate the patterns of migration and the ability of such life to move northward during the future major shift in our climate which is already occurring	
129	Where fencing is constructed along the border to ensure that border crossing can legally regulated at points of entry, the impacts to wildlife or other environmental resources could vary. There primary concern would be the barriers posed to wildlife migration across the border.	Fencing for traffic management and deterrence at specific crossing points would be extremely limited relative to the amount of infrastructure north of the border. However, CBP would not initiate projects without appropriate consideration of impacts to wildlife, consultation with wildlife management agencies, and additional NEPA documentation.
139	Fencing within wildlife habitats would impeded wildlife mitigation and detract from efforts to sustain or recover populations of wildlife. Environmental impacts would be greater in remote locations that are presently inaccessible to motorized vehicles where the greatest wildlife habitats exist. Transboundary wildlife populations rely on the connectivity of habitat north and south of the border fencing could impact this.	
151	The recovery area for the mountain caribou is the only established recovery area for an endangered species that extends north of the Canadian border. Caribou are regularly documented in the northwest corner of the state, in the basin north of Snowy Top Mountain, and south along the crest of the Selkirk Mountains. The ability of wildlife managers to recover the "international Herd" to a viable pop depends on the connectivity of habitat. If fences were to be constructed along the Northern Border it would pose a migrational issue to mountain caribou.	The fact that eco-regions extend beyond the border with Canada is recognized and this infers that those species that prefer such habitat may have ranges that include such habitat on both sides of the border.
154	Grizzly bears recovery depends on free movement across border. The genetic exchange between bears in the greater ecosystem on both sides of the border is critical to ensuring a viable population. Grizzly bears also need secure habitats from the time they 59 emerge from hibernation until they retreat to their dens. The density of open motorized routes must be below minimum	CBP is aware of the importance of wildlife corridors and the transborder migration of wildlife. That concern will be part of specific reviews. CBP is aware of these issues and will continue to evaluate its actions in this regard. Specific CBP actions will be addressed in specific EA/EISs

	levels established in the motorized access plan for the Selkirk and Cabinet Yak recovery zone for areas outside of "core" grizzly bear habitat.	
456	Seriously concerned about any new infrastructure projects that will increase impacts to trans-boundary wildlife species, especially endangered, threatened, or sensitive (species of concern)	
760	Wildlife analysis insufficient to support site level activity. Activities to secure the border that preclude or reduce the ability animals to safely travel across boundary that are transboundary in distribution and rely on safe/unobstructive travel/connectivity will threatened the survival of these US populations	
SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES		
110	Plans in the DPEIS might compromise or risk the multi-billion dollars of trades at Niagara Falls/Buffalo.	The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. Upon completion of this PEIS, CBP would still have to complete NEPA analysis for any proposed projects that would require environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. Any CBP proposals for projects or activities at specific locations would be made in the future and would comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory environmental requirements. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed. At such time, CBP would also conduct other appropriate required environmental reviews and consult with potentially affected tribes and land-owners as well as Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific NEPA analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public.
115	Without details, it is impossible to know if the plan at Niagara Falls/Buffalo NY will benefit or compromise the historic areas, aggravate the health and env., kill thriving communities, resolve or exacerbate existing bi-national transportation problems	
633	Border should not divide towns because it causes issues with	The issue raised is beyond the scope of analyzing the environmental

	crossing the border.	and related socioeconomic impacts of current and potential/foreseeable future CBP activities along the Northern Border. The PEIS makes no judgment upon the validity of your concerns, but is not the appropriate mechanism for addressing them. CBP seeks to improve partnerships across and along the Northern Border. No "border fence" is contemplated as a part of this PEIS.
682	The BP make at least 80,000 a year while they live areas where the average family income is below poverty	
676	The impact on life in general and major ethnic communities will be equally devastating	
678	This PEIS will have vast effects on the psyches of the individuals who inhabit the PEIS area	
ALTERNATIVES		
24	CBP does not actually evaluate any of its alternatives.	The alternatives used in the PEIS were developed to provide CBP decisionmakers with a basis for understanding the relative environmental impacts associated with implementing different sets of tools/activities used to facilitate border security along the Northern Border. These alternatives provide a reasonable range of approaches to choose from to meet yet unidentified future threats. The relative environmental impacts that would likely occur from implementing each the alternatives are presented in the PEIS in narrative and tabular form throughout the document. They evidence the different environmental considerations inherent to any strategic approach.
282	NPCA is concerned that the range of alternatives is not sufficient to fully evaluate the different actions and prescriptions the CBP may implement under the final PEIS.	
283	The importance of flexibility seems to point to only one alternative meeting the purpose and need - Flexible Direction Alternative. Since only one of the current alternatives seems to full meet the P&N, there is a lack of a full range of alternatives.	
284	NCPA believes several versions of the Flexible Direction Alternative with different levels of implementation should have been "rigorously explored."	
285	Overall, the PEIS does not provide a framework to determine where specific components of the Flexible Direction Alternative are appropriate. We request that the Flexible Direction Alternative be supplemented to provide programmatic guidance, as per the document's intent, regarding the most effective and environmentally appropriate tactics within the context of existing land management and environmental policies. Supplemental guidance is required to actually meet the stated purpose of the PEIS, which calls for "A well-integrated, reasonable framework" for sustaining and enhancing security."	
288	Consider implementing the Flexible Direction Alternative at different levels. Ex: while the current alternative calls for 640	

	small constructive projects, and alternative that looks at the impact of 300 may be beneficial.	
324	The final PEIS could be improved by extending the range of alternatives by providing variations of the Flexible Direction Alternative.	
342	PEIS does not evaluate a full range of alternatives (Muckleshoot Indian Tribe v. USFS). Looking at two similar alternatives in Muckleshoot was not reasonable.	
453	Concerned about the failure of the PEIS to identify specific proposed action(s). The document states on p. 2-2 that "it does not analyze specific DHS...." This is unsupportable. How can an EIS that does not analyze a proposed strategy provide the necessary analysis for its implementation?	
590	We are concerned that the range of alternatives as currently stated is insufficient to full evaluate the different actions and prescriptions described under the PEIS. Currently, only the Flexible Direction Alternative meets the purpose and need of the PEIS. This does not meet the intent of NEPA to provide a full range of alternatives for consideration.	
844	The DPEIS and the range of alternatives presented are too vague and inadequate in detail, discussion, and analysis.	
845	The DEIS really only presents one action alternative for analysis, rather than a range from heavy to lighter impacts on the land	
25	CBP chose the Flexible Alternative because the PEIS weak evaluation showed no significant impact.	No alternative was selected at the time of publication of the Draft PEIS.
289	NCPA would have also appreciated disclosure of the CBP's preferred alternative. In CEQ FAQ's "Section 1502.14(e) requires the section of the EIS on alternatives to identify the agency's preferred alternative if one or more exists."	
290	NCPA also would have appreciated disclosure of the environmental preferred alternative. The CEQ 40 FAQs "Section 1505.2(b) requires that, in cases where an EIS has been prepared, the ROD must identify all alternatives that were considered, specifying the the alternatives which were	

	considered environmentally preferable"	
424	The Flexible Alternative is the preferred alternative. Work on a revised PEIS that actually looks into a real range of alternatives and their impact on the different Northern Border lands, wildlife, and communities	
455	The PEIS does not evaluate any other proposed actions outside of the preferred alternative which is an amalgamation of the other four alternatives	
46	Is in favor of alternative 1 "No Action".	CBP thanks you for your comment. It will be considered as we finalize determination of impacts from the alternatives.
367	Any development in all listed alternatives of this draft requires a complete site survey and full documentation for cultural resources.	As part of the NEPA process, CBP will comply with the National Historic Preservation Act. CBP retains qualified Archeologists and Historical Architects to identify historical properties and cultural resources. CBP consults with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and affected tribes. With regard to the PEIS, CBP has consulted with tribes.
370	The Koochiching County Historical Society encourages that all alternatives in this draft PEIS be significantly scaled back and that any future development initiated by the US CBP is undertaken with great caution.	All future site specific proposed actions will require a NEPA document and appropriate SHPO / Tribal consultation.
379	This PEIS requires a "No Action" alternative	It should be understood that Customs and Border Protection is not proposing or planning to request any change in legal responsibilities or to further increase its physical presence along the Northern Border. The PEIS is providing a prudent broad look and potential impacts if activity levels needed to change in the future due to a change in the threat environment along the border.
423	The document is vague regarding the proposed alternatives and the impact each would have along the Northern Border.	The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed. Upon

		completion of this PEIS, CBP would still have to complete NEPA analysis for any proposed projects that currently would require environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. Any CBP proposals for projects or activities at specific locations would be made in the future and would comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory environmental requirements. At such time, CBP would also conduct other appropriate required environmental reviews and consult with potentially affected tribes and land-owners as well as Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific NEPA analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public.
436	The no action makes the most sense because the northern USA citizens are good at catching sneaks trying to cross the border illegally	The issue raised is beyond the scope of analyzing the environmental and related socioeconomic impacts of current and potential/foreseeable future CBP activities along the Northern Border. The PEIS makes no judgment upon the validity of your concerns, but is not the appropriate mechanism for addressing them.
488	Page 4.10-4 Lines 11 and 12 shows WA State population centers since the 2000 census, "Idaho has..."is this referring to the entire state of Idaho, with the rapid growth in the Boise area or is it restricted to the WOR section?	Information is just on the portion of the state within the WOR region.
489	Page 4.10-4 Table 4.10-2 Population Centers Chart it should be noted, that while the 87.8% of WA population is in the population centers, only 8.6% of that is within the Spokane sector?	Information is on the Spokane population area, not the sector.
490	Pg 4.10-6, 12 thru 15 and 18 -19: these statements as well as the charts 4.10-7 tables 4.10-5 and 4.10-6 are erroneous for the Spokane sector. A separate study should have been made for the Blaine and Spokane sector to truly reflect pop/income/poverty/unempl/property	The analysis is not divided upon sector lines because resources are not divided by CBP's operational boundaries.
492	Statistics are given on these pages and charts for the visitor and economic information for the WOR and WA state. This should be sector specific as the majority of trade and visitors cross in the Blaine Sector	NEPA encourages the use of existing available information appropriate to inform decisions about the agencies proposal. CBP does not have a regional economic growth mission. It facilitates trade and travel which may aid or deter regional economics, but it is a non-

491	Chart 4.10.2.4 pg 4.10-10 to 13 sections 4.10.2.5 to 4.10.2.6 a separate study should have been done to assess regional economics	negotiable mission and not a result of CBP's discretionary actions.
582	Use the principles of the Beyond the Border Work Group to study actions and alternatives. Therefore PNWER opposes the Tactical Security Infrastructure Deployment Alternative and any subsequent program to build barriers, fences, or similar infrastructure on the northern border	Fencing, used as a force multiplier, may be installed in selected discrete areas where intrusion control is necessary. Prior to installation of any tactical security infrastructure items, a CBP NEPA planning document would be prepared on the environmental impacts of that specific fence project. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed.
ANALYSIS/CONTENT/TIERING ANALYSIS		
23	Difficult to comment since the information is vague, or CBP does not appear to actually use the PEIS content to actually weigh alternatives.	The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed. Upon completion of this PEIS, CBP would still have to complete NEPA analysis for any proposed projects that currently would require environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. Any CBP proposals for projects or activities at specific locations would be made in the future and would comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory environmental requirements. At such time, CBP would also conduct other appropriate required environmental reviews and consult with potentially affected tribes and land-owners as well as Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific NEPA analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public.
51	Nonnative invasive species should be included in the Wetland and Waterways (3.3.1.6); and Aquatic Resources sections. Potential impacts to alien invasive species are for more severe than just to list species of concern (3.3.3).	
114	There is an apparent lack of details and information contained in the document	

323	Given that there needs to be ground preparation to receive FOBs, any given FOB could have multiple impacts in access, construction, and operations. It isn't clear to NCPA that the estimates of impacts reflect this potential multiplier effect. Further discussion of this issue would be helpful.	
336	Withdraw and rewrite so specific actions in specific places are proposed for comment not open-ended laundry list.	
372	makes no sense to consider the northern border as one unit	
423	The document is vague regarding the proposed alternatives and the impact each would have along the Northern Border.	
448	Concerned about the scope, vagueness, broad latitude and lack of specificity in the PEIS regarding proposed plans to enhance security on our northern border with Canada esp in wilderness, parks, and national forest lands and critical habitats	
480	CBP activities likely to have sig neg impacts on the public's use and enjoyment of these public critical areas include mechanized & off-road transport/construction/mgt, power provisions/water/sanitation/commun./over-flights, motorized/night lights/etc	
518	In order to appropriately comment, residents need more detailed information on CBP's plans specifically for the Peace Bridge crossing in Buffalo NY, which operates on national protected land and is adjacent to the Prospect Hill-Columbus Park historic dist	
520	Without knowing how CBP plans will impact, alter, or affect our historic community, residents cannot adequately participate in the public comment process.	

543	Substance of PEIS is too broad to allow informed comments or be of value in any future project analysis. Its over breadth renders it insufficient under any law requiring env. review. Descriptions of conditions, alternative are too vague.	
544	Document jumps to sweeping, incorrect conclusions without any basis. Ex: System upgrades having only minor/minimum impacts to air quality, visual, cultural.... Another incorrect analysis is the Peace Bridge Crossing facilitating trade by preclearance or bigger customs plaza would increase truck traffic; increase already unacceptable pollution at that site; encroach on historic neighborhood, threaten neighborhoods viability due to increased commercialization of the area; impair current viewsheds towards the waterfront, historic, neighborhood, Olmsted park; negatively impact use of the homestead park for recreation; overburden the surrounding highways to an unsafe level; unfairly impose on a large poor, minority pop that already has high rate of asthma, burden of increased pollution, noise, and decrease in home values. Large number of children would be impacted	
553	MNDNR submitted comments on the scope of the PEIS. From reviewing the PEIS, it appears that some of MNDNR scoping comments were not explicitly addressed in the DPEIS.	
560	It is unclear how CPB will determine which future projects warrant additional environmental review of site specific and cumulative impacts. A description of the "triggers" should be more fully described.	
588	There is uncertainty about the true and full impact Forward Operating Bases may have on the environment. Their possible reuse and the ground preparation needs have a potential multiplier effect not analyzed in the PEIS	
616	Does not agree with the project bc the activities being evaluated have already taken place where he lives.	

620	Request for clarification on purpose and need. It is unclear what that there is any kind of verification that the current protection actions are failing. Asks what improvements are needed base on current activities.	
626	As the CBP continues to expand its facilities and services, we believe there is great potential for socioeconomic and cultural impacts on our people.	
833	Following are lands in VT that would be negatively impacted by any intrusive border structure or activity and should be protected: Missisquoi NWR, Highgate State Park Natural Area, Missisquoi River crossings at East Richford/Lake Memphremagog, Canada View property, Proposed Eagle Point SP, State Wildlife Mgt areas, Nulhegan Basin Division NWR, and Public lands in VT	
852	The North Cascades, in WA and BC, are of high value both biologically and socially. The habitat provides a travel-way and home for a wide range of species while the landscape provides unparalleled recreational opportunities. It is unclear that the DPEIS considered the real potential environmental impacts that could occur to these habitats through CBP activities	
855	The balance between access and habitat quality is of high concern for SEEC, and is not clearly laid out in any of the alternatives within the DPEIS nor how any changes to the access system will be analyzed before implementing.	
863	It is unclear how CBP activities will consider and analyze site scale impacts to sensitive habitats and species that are discuss only broadly in this DPEIS	
221	Page 3-11, line 3: sentence about 'major cities' is irrelevant and confusing in this location	This merely provides a context for understanding where there may be actual elevated levels of ozone and carbon monoxide near the Northern Border and why.

52	Look at standardized contract language for ensuring clean equipment and vehicles, and for clean fill and erosion mitigating materials for construction projects as prevention measures to avoid spreading species. Policies for field personnel are available for ensuring clean equipment and vehicle usage and weed free forage for hose back deployment. Also look at decontamination protocols when crossing continental divide.	Specific contract language for specific actions is not part of a PEIS CBP Best Management Practices would address such specific language when required.
55	It would be helpful to identify the specific avoidance contractual language, policies and protocols for preventing alien invasive species in Section 9.3 instead of just saying vague statements. Should also acknowledge and deal with Washington and Idaho alien invasive species prevention and control laws.	
53	Under operations section, enforcement for I-68 Canada Program for recreational boaters listed; Idaho has mandatory boat inspection programs that need to be supported. Based on traffic surveys there is a need for a boat inspection station at the Bonners Ferry crossing. This should be supported and included as a future construction and operation project.	This comment is directed at a site-specific and state mandated program and is outside the scope of consideration for this programmatic review of CBP Northern Border security activities.
56	In Section 9.5 Water Resources BMPs should include: reseeded and reestablishment of vegetation should be with native or non-invasive vegetation; mulching, straw berms, and temporary cover crops should be certified weed-free mulch or straw; appropriate erosion and sediment control planting needs to be with native or non-invasive vegetation; areas around buildings and parking lots would vegetated to minimize soil erosion should be with native or non-invasive vegetation; design elements such as grass swales and landscape features should be with native or non-invasive vegetation; vehicles that regularly use low-water crossings should be washed frequently and made free of fluid and should also be cleared of weed fragments, seeds, and invasive aquatic organisms; provide training to watercraft operators in the safe operation of boats should also include "clean, drain, dry" procedures for alien invasive plant and animal species; a	Specific seeding used for any specific application would be handled on a case-by-case basis.

	mandatory two-week ATV rider safety course should also include the cleaning of equipment and vehicle protocol.	
104	The current PEIS as written does not meet either the spirit or the letter of the NEPA. The current PEIS does not study or examine the environmental impacts of the alternatives to the proposed action because all of the alternatives are the proposed action. The current PEIS is nonsensical and arbitrary and capricious in that it does not do the analysis required by law, it creates a carte blanche approval for all actions.	CBP disagrees with the comment. In particular, it does not create a carte blanche approval for all actions as it clearly states any specific project proposals would be subject to additional NEPA analysis.
120	Given the nature of PEIS can only give general comments on how the Department should proceed with planning and approving future, site specific activities and general conservation issues the Dep. Should be aware of along Idaho's shared border with British Columbia.	CBP thanks you for this comment.
122	Encourage the Department to give serious consideration to any future site-specific activities and how these projects might affect our communities and our environment.	
123	The PEIS is written in a general sense both in terms of the action alternatives as well as the analysis of the alternatives. Site specific NEPA is critical to ensuring that decisions that may affect these values are appropriately informed by responsible, science based decision making./Again, site-specific projects and activities should be carefully considered as required by the National Environmental Policy Act.	
128	Do not see any specific environmental concerns associated with the construction or improvement of existing Ports of Entry or other buildings.	
163	The cumulative analysis falls short. Central to the analysis of cumulative effects is the disclosure of historical, present, and projected future resource conditions when taken with the action alternatives. The final PEIS should provide a more thorough discussion of the cumulative effects of the action alternatives, when taken with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future federal actions.	
192	Need clarification on page 1-10, Lines 39-41; Page 1-12,	CBP does not see how these statements can be clarified further.

	Lines 15-17	
195	Page 1-16, Lines 19-26: in order to effectively evaluate env impacts, esp biological, some idea of the max length, depth and height of fences in each segment is required	Fencing for traffic management and deterrence at specific crossing points would be extremely limited relative to the amount of infrastructure north of the border. However, CBP would not initiate projects without appropriate consideration of impacts to wildlife, consultation with wildlife management agencies, and additional NEPA documentation.
198	Page 1-19, lines 15-16: kindly provide an idea of what would trigger the env analysis of a specific project. Would an 'in-kind' replacement trigger an env review. Review for capital cost be a trigger?	All activities depicted within the PEIS would require some additional environmental review. Any item meeting the definition of a major Federal action that is not currently categorically excluded, or otherwise disclosed as not requiring additional environmental review would require at least initiation of an environmental assessment.
199	Page 1-19, lines 31-33. this being the case, kindly describe the types of situations that would regularly extend beyond the 100-mile zone, their frequency of occurrence, and which would require/trigger additional env review	The issue raised is beyond the scope of analyzing the environmental and related socioeconomic impacts of current and potential/foreseeable future CBP activities along the Northern Border.
201	Page 1-20, lines 12-15 comment for example, the use of scanning technologies by OFO or USBP at POEs or varies	CBP stands by this statement as the technologies have been repeatedly assessed and their use does not vary significantly in type of location or effect.
202	Page 1-11 , 21 radiation exposure is determined by duration of, distance from source, amount of shielding. EPA specifically calls out gamma radiation for all three of these factors (http://www.epa.gov/radiation/uunderstand/protection_bsics.htm) can't summarily write off as having little impact on human health and safety	This merely provides a context for understanding where there may be actual elevated levels of ozone and carbon monoxide near the Northern Border and why.
221	Page 3-11, line 3: sentence about 'major cities' is irrelevant and confusing in this location	
225	Page 3-12, lines 15-17: you have introduced permitting 225of 'major sources' and tell us it is not subject to GCR...but are there any expected 'major sources' in this This section does not presuppose whether CBP has major sources. It was important to lay out ther regulatory relationships for air quality.peis? If not why raise the issue w/out stating so	This section does not presuppose whether CBP has major sources. It was important to lay out their regulatory relationships for air quality.
226	Page 3-13, lines 11-14 & 18: presumably fossil-fuel boilers will be of interest in this PEIS...otherwise why call this	The point was to explain the energy/heat component to regulating fossil-fuel boilers.

	source out specifically. Suggest you add a statement to that effect	
230	Page 3-14, line 36 & Page 3-15 line3: stay consistent: is it rates or thresholds	Terminology is used consistently.
240	Page 3-29, lines 9-10: Generates noise in a national park that exceeds significant effects thresholds as outlined by the NPS...what of State Parks?	State Parks do not have a general noise threshold level to refer to at a programmatic level.
241	Page 3-30, line 5-6: should review noise levels created by operation of backup generators at larger facilities	CBP did consider the operation of standby generators in its list of considered noise sources.
242	Page 3-33, lines 16 to 17: first time anything has been mentioned within Canada. Is the Canadian area also being evaluated for the other resource impacts. Why isn't it in the Exec Summary. Do the sectors in the U.S. control the activities 2 miles directly north of them, or is there a special Canadian-BP? Is the Canadian government aware that the US is building on Canadian soil? by your discussion on page 3-34 lines 6-10, it would seem that the impact of all CBP activities should be evaluated on those 2 miles of Canadian soil. It is mentioned in Land Use, a decision should be made to either consistently evaluate the impact on Can.	CBP's projects and operations would occur in the United States. Some resource areas included Canada when useful for comparison purposes or it helped form the operational picture for the alternatives and impacts in the United States.
247	Page 3-33, lines 23-24: activates included within CBP's proposals...should also consider increase in total square footage that will be blacktopped rather than rural field or wilderness	This is covered in the expansion of facilities and associated infrastructure.
253	Page 3-35, lines 29-31:if you are trying to evaluate impacts conservatively, as you have stated, you would want to over-estimate the rec-type land since this type of land is considered more pristine rural/urban LU and would have greater impact than these	Over-estimating areas used for recreation would arbitrarily exaggerate the range of recreation impacts without changing the impact intensity determination.
256	Page 6.1-2, lines 16-17: concern- oversight of this very similar area split between two different offices resulting in potentially inconsistent analyses and inefficient decisions. Having the entire river w/in one office will ensure effect analyzes.	CBP's offices/sectors are structured for border security and trade and travel facilitation, not environmental resource management. CBP is not the owner or manager of river resources, but is a steward of its own actions.
277	The document also equally looks at possible mitigation strategies to address and/or avoid these impacts to the highest	CBP made earnest attempts to incorporate concerns expressed during Scoping that were relevant to the proposal and analysis of impacts

	extent practicable by using BMPs	into the Draft PEIS.
477	many of our scoping comments remain unaddressed.	
281	We are also disappointed that the Draft PEIS continues to place the entire state of Minnesota in the EOR region. We agree with the NPS that a better approach is to split the estate, placing eastern MN in the GL and the western portion in the EOR.	CBP made earnest attempts to divide the four regions logically, however, different resources have different boundaries for consideration. From a CBP decision-making perspective, it was better to use boundaries familiar to CBP operational components.
339	Current draft should be withdrawn and rewritten, should look at state by state, potential specific actions in specific places. Using "negligible, minor, moderate, or major" is not helpful. We should not be expected to evaluate vague open-ended laundry list.	Extending the comment period would not further public awareness of CBP activities that could affect their local environment. Despite the size of the document, the 45-day period is sufficient for interested parties to comment on concerns about potential future impacts within a given regional environment. The PEIS provides broad-based analysis of impacts from proposed alternative approaches to respond potential threat changes within the next five to seven years. CBP is not proposing an action or management plan in the PEIS. It would not and could not take any specific action based upon the analysis in the PEIS or decisions in the ROD. CBP would provide sufficient notice and review times to the public to comment upon future NEPA documents when it does propose actual projects with the potential for significant impacts to the environment.
510	Steep slopes, erosive thin soils, a short construction season, rain on snow events, and an abundance of streams both perennial and intermittent, create a difficult physical env for development of roads and other infrastructure. Specialized BMP's are sometimes required to protect water resources and achieve stable sites during and after construction. Our office can help you by reviewing stormwater pollution prevention plans and providing other information you might find useful.	See 8.5.6.2.
514	Construction projects in this state that are one or more acres in sized require an EPA NPDES construction general permit to reduce water pollution from eroding construction sites on privately owned land. We encourage you to adhere to this	CBP has clarified text to the document committing to adhere to EPA NPDES construction permit requirements for each state.

402	Clearly there needs to be a more inclusive review of the impacts/effects of potential actions before this PEIS is finalized - one that balances the public's right to have its built and natural environment protected with your agency's desire to build or enlarge your facilities.	It should be understood that Customs and Border Protection is not proposing or planning to request any change in legal responsibilities or to further increase its physical presence along the Northern Border. The PEIS is providing a prudent broad look and potential impacts if activity levels needed to change in the future due to a change in the threat environment along the border.
570	Ch. 8 Environmental Consequences Line 40-41 - This section should acknowledge that European earthworm propagates can also be introduced with placement of fill soils.	CBP is aware of the potential for harm through the intro of invasive species and will continue to monitor this issue
801	Due to border infrastructure and enforcement actions, impacts on air include: impacts from potential construction and changes to traffic patterns and impacts to viewsheds	CBP has discussed all of those impacts in the PEIS, in appropriate sections, such as air quality and aesthetics.
810	The proposed action is fundamentally unsatisfactory, it is a list of the types of activities that CBP undertakes in the context of border security	The alternatives used in the PEIS were developed to provide CBP decisionmakers with a basis for understanding the relative environmental impacts associated with implementing different sets of tools/activities used to facilitate border security along the Northern Border. These alternatives provide a reasonable range of approaches to choose from to meet yet unidentified future threats. The relative environmental impacts that would likely occur from implementing each the alternatives are presented in the PEIS in narrative and tabular form throughout the document. They evidence the different environmental considerations inherent to any strategic approach.
835	Bring PEIS up to the standards set forth by the NEPA and act upon Sierra Club et al.'s comments	
836	Given breadth and depth of proposed action we recommend that CBP issue a revised draft PEIS and engage the public in a more constructive dialogue about the nature and impacts of the proposed action and, as required, reasonable alternatives to it	
812	Lack of sufficient info regarding the ecosystems that fall within the project area makes the current form of this document inadequate to allow decision makers or the public to evaluate the actual impacts of the actions it covers (examples of issues include ecosystems in Washington and Vermont)	No further response required within the PEIS.
884	The analysis and decisions by CBP reported in the final PEIS must minimize environmental impacts to such irreplaceable ecosystems as those found within the Skagit watershed.	The Final PEIS includes BMPs and other mitigations that may be called upon at the site-specific level to minimize impacts to critical, sensitive, and threatened resources.
885	CBP activities that are likely to have significant negative impacts on the public's use and enjoyment of these public and private landscapes include off-road transport, construction,	The potential for significant impacts is based upon frequency and intensity of action and the sensitivity and capacity of the resource. CBP does not occur with the blanket assessment that impacts are

	provision, water, sanitation, over-flights, watercraft, nighttime light	likely to be significant from these activities at the programmatic level.
PROCEDURAL		
N/A	<i>A number of comments were received requesting copies of the document, changes to address, and mailing list additions/removals.</i>	Made attempts to mail out to everyone who made a request and all change request made.
30	Should have a public meeting in western Montana.	CBP made efforts to cover as much representative Northern Border territory as it could, given the extent of the area covered in the analysis. CBP could not accommodate meetings in every area that wanted one.
31	People in western MT would appreciate a field hearing. It is a long way to Bellingham or Havre. This is important. You have plenty of funding, why not include people?	
37	To listen to Native American issues as well as other people of the area to realize that this area is different than other parts of the (4000 miles of) Northern Border. (Public meeting should have had a public comment period, so people could hear what others had to say.)	
482	For such a far-reaching document this was poorly advertised. Only 11 meetings on the draft across over 4,000 miles of border is insufficient for the number of citizens it will impact.	
483	No advertisement was placed in the Republic News Miner - the county paper in Ferry County WA. The meeting in Idaho was at a remote location and was hard to find. Advertising was inadequate and not noticeable regarding the scoping and draft processes	
522	The senator asked CBP to hold more public meetings in Buffalo. I am deeply concerned that CBP chose to hold public meetings in Rochester, NY and Erie PA while no meetings were scheduled for the Buffalo-Niagara region which hosts 4 major crossings	
840	I participated in scoping but was not notified of the availability of the DEIS so I missed the Michigan meeting in October	

40	Two weeks ago library did not have a copy of the PEIS. Don't need more agents, as the ones we have do not have enough work to keep them busy.	Made attempts to mail out to everyone who made a request and all libraries identified within the study area. CBP's agents and officers are very engaged in border security, trade and travel processing, and emergency relief assistance when needed.
109	No public meetings held in Niagara falls or buffalo, NY even though there are four car or car/truck bridges and two train bridges at the border along the Niagara river	This PEIS is not tied to any legislation currently under consideration in congress. No projects would be proposed or initiated without additional NEPA documentation, public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with Federal, State, and local resource management agencies.
125	To clearly outline in the Final PEIS how site specific projects and activities will be planned, approved, and more importantly how the Department will solicit and respond to public concerns, comments, and input.	
126	The Department should consult with the USFWS and the National Marine Fisheries Service both on the PEIS and any future site specific projects. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game should also be consulted.	The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed. Upon completion of this PEIS, CBP would still have to complete NEPA analysis for any proposed projects that currently would require environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. Any CBP proposals for projects or activities at specific locations would be made in the future and would comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory environmental requirements. At such time, CBP would also conduct other appropriate required environmental reviews and consult with potentially affected tribes and land-owners as well as Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific NEPA analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public.
542	CBP should have provided information in Spanish, including advertising the PEIS in a Hispanic newspaper or radio station in the Buffalo area. Pop surrounding the peace bridge is largely Hispanic, but they have been denied an equal op. to take part	
432	Because illegal immigrants can impact the entire nation, you should take comment from all over the nation, not just along the northern border.	The issue raised is beyond the scope of analyzing the environmental and related socioeconomic impacts of current and potential/foreseeable future CBP activities along the Northern Border. The PEIS makes no judgment upon the validity of your concerns, but

		is not the appropriate mechanism for addressing them.
523	According to the PEIS website, the CBP process has been ongoing since July 2010 including activity involving Section 106 of the NHPA. The Prospect-Hill Columbus Park historic district had no knowledge that yet another EIS process that could ultimately impact the crossing	It should be understood that Customs and Border Protection is not proposing or planning to request any change in legal responsibilities or to further increase its physical presence along the Northern Border. The PEIS is providing a prudent broad look and potential impacts if activity levels needed to change in the future due to a change in the threat environment along the border.
842	We do not believe that a single environmental analysis document can cover the full northern border of the United State while providing adequate attention to the diverse natural resources impacts associated with varying ecosystems across that range.	
525	We respectfully request inclusion as consulting parties in CBP's section 106 process and be notified of the scheduled meetings and who we should contact as soon as possible.	At the time that CBP makes any specific proposals for changes to border crossings in and around Buffalo, stakeholders can make requests to participate in the section 106 process.
551	Objects to PEIS' cursory review of historic resources, particularly as it relates to the Buffalo-Niagara crossings. Requests to be listed as a Section 106 consulting party, and be informed of all meetings, and provided necessary materials	
540	Communicating with state DOTs early and often regarding infrastructure or operational changes on, or near, state highways is critical. All our goals and objectives can be accomplished effectively and safely, but they require coordination up front.	Extending the comment period would not further public awareness of CBP activities that could affect their local environment. Despite the size of the document, the 45-day period is sufficient for interested parties to comment on concerns about potential future impacts within a given regional environment. The PEIS provides broad-based analysis of impacts from proposed alternative approaches to respond potential threat changes within the next five to seven years. CBP is not proposing an action or management plan in the PEIS. It would not and could not take any specific action based upon the analysis in the PEIS or decisions in the ROD. CBP would provide sufficient notice and review times to the public to comment upon future NEPA documents when it does propose actual projects with the potential for significant impacts to the environment.
COMMENT PERIOD		
37	To listen to Native American issues as well as other people of the area to realize that this area is different than other parts of the (4000 miles of) Northern Border. (Public meeting should have had a public comment period, so people could hear what	CBP made efforts to cover as much representative Northern Border territory as it could, given the extent of the area covered in the analysis. CBP could not accommodate meetings in every area that wanted one.

	others had to say.)	
43	Why don't you want the public to know what you are planning? Why such a short comment period?	<p>The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed. Upon completion of this PEIS, CBP would still have to complete NEPA analysis for any proposed projects that currently would require environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. Any CBP proposals for projects or activities at specific locations would be made in the future and would comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory environmental requirements. At such time, CBP would also conduct other appropriate required environmental reviews and consult with potentially affected tribes and land-owners as well as Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific NEPA analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public.</p>
86	Extend the comment period; because of the short notice and short meetings I was hoping that there would be another opportunity for comments in Maine	
91	Given that the DHS and CBP issued the PEIS in September with opportunities for public comment restricted to early in October, Sierra Club ME would like to request that DHS and CBP extend the comment period at least 45 days... Allowing such short notice is neither conducive to public awareness nor commentary and appears to be in fact an effort to avoid public input	
108	Requesting an extension of the deadline for public comments	
330	I request that the time for public comment be extended to December 31, 2011	
335	45-60 day extension on comment period.	
388	Our primary objections involve the timeframe for review and	<p>Extending the comment period would not further public awareness of CBP activities that could affect their local environment. Despite the size of the document, the 45-day period is sufficient for interested parties to comment on concerns about potential future impacts within a given regional environment. The PEIS provides broad-based analysis of impacts from proposed alternative approaches to respond potential threat changes within the next five to seven years. CBP is not proposing an action or management plan in the PEIS. It would not and could not take any specific action based upon the analysis in the PEIS or decisions in the ROD. CBP would provide sufficient notice and review times to the public to comment upon future NEPA documents when it does propose actual projects with the potential for significant impacts to the environment.</p>

	comment, the venue of public hearings, and level of effect 4 of 5 alternatives would have on cultural resources.	
391	We strongly urge you to extend the period for public comment and hold a hearing in Buffalo/Niagara. The choice of Rochester for the only Western New York public meeting on a plan that will have far greater impact on the Buffalo/Niagara region was a poor one indeed. ..actions contemplated under Alternatives two through 5 would have a much more significant effect on this region than they would in Rochester, and public participation and feedback at a public meeting in Rochester would not be representative. We request that you provide the residents and property owners in the Buffalo/Niagara region with an opportunity to hear your presentation, question you, and provide comment on your proposed PEIS by holding an additional public meeting in our region.	
393	While the comment period of 45 days complies with the federal requirements, this period was wholly inadequate for the public in the Buffalo/Niagara region to review, discuss, comprehend, and provide comments to your agency. We request adequate time to respond to the PEIS.	
394	While we were holding a conference to protect our built environment...another branch of the federal government appeared to be undermine our efforts by quietly pursuing a plan that could produce disastrous results for our historic neighborhoods, structures, buildings, and cultural landscapes.	
422	Extended the comment period to December 2011.	
450	Given the geographic scope and implications of the proposed actions we believe that the comment period is inadequate and that a 60 day extension is warranted to allow stakeholders enough time to analyze the details and implications of the document. A project of this magnitude and over such extensive geography requires much more thorough public outreach. It affects everyone in US and cities like Seattle should not be ignored. Notices of meetings must be more widely posted. Many groups and individuals who are	

	interested in these issues did not even know about this initiative and process, including leading public interest law firms.	
495	I believe this document should be sent out for another public comment period	
497	Public meetings did not serve Eastern Washington. I think you should have a meeting either in Colleville or Republic or somewhere near northeastern Washington	
517	The Columbus Park Association supports U.S. Senator Charles Schumer (NY) along with other organizations across the nation calling upon CBP to extend the PEIS public comment period because the current information is too vague.	
846	In addition, public outreach in this EIS process does not reflect the magnitude of the analysis zone and potential impact. We suggest extending the public comment period on the DPEIS and conducting thorough outreach to affected communities along the border.	
671	The comment period for the DPEIS must be extended	
683	Please allow more time for public comment	
846	In addition, public outreach in this EIS process does not reflect the magnitude of the analysis zone and potential impact. We suggest extending the public comment period on the DPEIS and conducting thorough outreach to affected communities along the border	
360	Document was put together without adequate public input and effort was made to get this through bypassing many important state and local agencies.	CBP respectfully disagrees. CBP conducted a round of 11 scoping meetings and 13 draft PEIS public meetings across the Northern Border. CBP conducted two sets of mass mailings to over 1600 libraries and 900 other addressees and placed notifications in local newspapers. Since there are no specific proposed projects at specific sites, CBP sought not to bias its meeting locations based on existing activities. Any comments based on existing knowledge of environmental concerns with CBP activities have been well received in this process.
665	The general public is not aware that the document is over 1000 pages has been open for public scrutiny and comment for 45 days and that the public comment period ends on October 31, 2011.	
672	Sufficient work was not done to notify the public of the 45 day comment period nor for the planned meetings. Notices were not put in public papers nor were other media resources in regional localities employed	
434	Comment period needs to be extended so that comments can	The issue raised is beyond the scope of analyzing the environmental

	be taken from all over the nation.	and related socioeconomic impacts of current and potential/foreseeable future CBP activities along the Northern Border. The PEIS makes no judgment upon the validity of your concerns, but is not the appropriate mechanism for addressing them.
484	This draft should go out for another public comment period with greater effort to truly notify the public and accumulate a more varied base of comments to assess for the final plan	CBP made efforts to cover as much representative Northern Border territory as it could, given the extent of the area covered in the analysis. CBP could not accommodate meetings in every area that wanted one.
INTER-BORDER RELATIONS		
88	The best defense is to make friends, educate the public, be alert. When you fence in, you only drive the uniformed deeper into what you have not thought of or where you are not looking.	CBP seeks to improve partnerships across and along the Northern Border. No "border fence" is contemplated as a part of this PEIS.
111	US and Canada have not yet announced their agreement on border security and this could impact the Draft PEIS	This PEIS is meant to provide a strategic perspective to respond to any border security threats or priority changes. Though not directly tied to agreements on border security and trade and travel between the United States and Canada it will be cited as one among several sources that inform possible directions in the next five to seven years.
577	In Obama and PM Harper's Feb 4 meeting and subsequent announcement of Work Group, certain themes were highlighted: Develop an integrated treaty that would meet the threats and hazards that both our countries face; work on trade facilitation and economic growth and jobs to pursue creative and effective solutions to manage flow of traffic b/w Canada and US; integrate cross-border law enforcement to build existing bilateral law enforcement program; cultural infrastructure and cyber security to implement comprehensive cross-border approach.	
383	We don't need any more walls, fences, barriers, or divisions between us and our Canadian neighbors. More in common with t than federal authorities that want to divide us like Berlin used to be. Since 9/11 the country has been paralyzed with fear.	It should be understood that Customs and Border Protection is not proposing or planning to request any change in legal responsibilities or to further increase its physical presence along the Northern Border. The PEIS is providing a prudent broad look and potential impacts if activity levels needed to change in the future due to a change in the threat environment along the border.
469	Question the foundations of the proposed actions in light of our long, close, multi-tiered relationships with our Canadian neighbors who share our security concerns, respect our law, maintain stable institutions	
494	Canada is not a hostile neighbor which should be considered	CBP seeks to improve partnerships across and along the Northern

		Border. No "border fence" is contemplated as a part of this PEIS.
472	more productive/prudent in the long term for the DHS and CBP to put more emphasis on enhancing national security through North American context in close collaboration with our Canadian friends	The PEIS states that CBP would heavily rely on partnerships, including transboundary partnerships, regardless of any alternative approach it takes. However, CBP has the mandate to protect the borders regardless of the level of cooperation.
481	Trust that CBP will make an effort to clearly communicate/outreach to the American people/agencies of the US federal and state and Canadian govs about specific plans and their rationales before moving forward with these activities	The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed. Upon completion of this PEIS, CBP would still have to complete NEPA analysis for any proposed projects that currently would require environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. Any CBP proposals for projects or activities at specific locations would be made in the future and would comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory environmental requirements. At such time, CBP would also conduct other appropriate required environmental reviews and consult with potentially affected tribes and land-owners as well as Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific NEPA analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public.
704	Should work with Canada toward more partnership in developing and implementing joint endeavors in securing our borders.	CBP thanks you for your comment and agrees that it should continue to expand its partnership with agencies in Canada.
RELATIONSHIP TO PROPOSED LEGISLATION AND CONCERNS ABOUT WAIVERS OF ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS		
94	The PEIS is the result of proposed legislation (HR 1505, 1922, and S 803) which proposed to exclude all border areas within a 100-mile exclusion zone along the entire US borders areas with Canada and Mexico. What possible relationship	This PEIS is not tied to any legislation currently under consideration in congress. No projects would be proposed or initiated without additional NEPA documentation, public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with

	exists between endangered species and border crossing of illegal aliens?	Federal, State, and local resource management agencies.
98	We see no reason to obviate ANY environmental regulations in pursuit of Homeland Security on these very significant public lands. Most of our very important rivers have their headwaters within the 100-mile zone, thereby increasing the likelihood of damage to much of the rest of the State of Maine should CBP succeed in avoiding CWA regulations, for instance.	
100	We do not believe that DHS has the expertise to manage actions in a way that minimizes adverse impacts endangering communities, public land, and wildlife. Eliminating mandatory consultations with expert agencies will likely exacerbate problems already documented as the result of border construction activities undertaken without the benefit of normally applicable law.	
106	It is possible for DHS to seek waivers of certain laws and regulations on federal lands on a case-by-case basis. Absent a compelling and specific basis, a blanket exemption threatens our common heritage and the very things that we value as Americans. Sierra Club Maine supports the Sierra Club request that DHS adopt the no action alternative specified in the PEIS.	
178	The bill that waves compliance with 36 environmental laws and extends the agencies jurisdiction to within a 100-mile buffer along the borders and coastline is wrong.	
574	This project and the legislation need to go together (as in be considered together)	
661	Opposed to allowing the BP unprecedented authority to ignore 36 env laws on federal land in a 100-mile zone. If this legislation is approved, the BP would not have to comply with the ESA, CAA, Safe Drinking Water Act, the Solid Waste Disposal Act and 32 other federal laws in such places as the Olympic National Park and other federal lands. The	

	legislation would give the BP unrestricted freedom to build roads, offices, put up fences, set up surveillance equipment and sensors, and use aircraft and/or vehicles to patrol in all national parks, forests and federal lands within the 100 mile zone. Public is not aware of environmental, social, ecological, and health/safety effects of inacting such legislation.	
664	Washington's Democratic Gov, Christine Gregoire questions why such a law is needed since the DHS, which oversees BP has not requested the change in legislation.	
666	Passage of legislation would restrict access to federal lands, create a militarized zone in the wilderness, and unnecessarily waste tax dollars to employ the BP to provide wilderness surveillance when BP are paid outrageous overtime as it is. Most citizens would oppose such legislation if they only knew the inevitable effects.	
111	U.S. and Canada have not yet announced their agreement on border security and this could impact the Draft PEIS	This PEIS is meant to provide a strategic perspective to respond to any border security threats or priority changes. Though not directly tied to agreements on border security and trade and travel between the United States and Canada it will be cited as one among several sources that inform possible directions in the next five to seven years.
577	In Obama and PM Harper's Feb 4 meeting and subsequent announcement of Work Group, certain themes were highlighted: Develop an integrated treaty that would meet the threats and hazards that both our countries face; work on trade facilitation and economic growth and jobs to pursue creative and effective solutions to manage flow of traffic b/w Canada and US; integrate cross-border law enforcement to build existing bilateral law enforcement program; cultural infrastructure and cyber security to implement comprehensive cross-border approach.	
MISCELLANEOUS/OPINIONS		
14	Our Canadian residents would be impacted much more than their American counterparts due to geographical divisions.	The purpose of this PEIS is to provide broad based analysis of CBP activities that could become required within the next five to seven years in response to yet unknown changes in threat conditions. This PEIS does not contemplate specific locations for infrastructure, facility, or technology additions or modifications. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation
26	CBP's suggestion that it can and should impose whatever action it deems appropriate regardless of existing legal constraint should be the subject of the PEIS.	
137	Site-specific projects and activities should be carefully	

	considered as required NEPA.	(when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies if any actual projects are proposed. Upon completion of this PEIS, CBP would still have to complete NEPA analysis for any proposed projects that currently would require environmental assessments and environmental impact statements. Any CBP proposals for projects or activities at specific locations would be made in the future and would comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory environmental requirements. At such time, CBP would also conduct other appropriate required environmental reviews and consult with potentially affected tribes and land-owners as well as Federal, State and local agencies with jurisdiction over resources. The PEIS would permit CBP to tier off repetitive background information so project specific NEPA analysis could focus upon environmental impacts of most concern for planners and the general public.
146	Any proposals for increased motorized access along the border should include consultation with the USFWS, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the public.	
294	NCPA supports efforts to adhere to all existing law and specific regulations in protected areas such as national parks when operating ATV's due to the impacts caused by ATVs. Soil impacts such as compaction, rutting, and erosion can occur from high volume use of ATVs.	
320	The most important aspect of any and all future activities on the Northern Border is the need for site specific NEPA analysis	
328	Concerned with the power this will give to border control to circumvent the rules of N Cascades NP. Does not want agencies to have the right to build roads, buildings, trails, and other structures in pristine back country. Where is the evidence for need	
373	This PEIS makes a sham of environmental review. Preferred alternative gives the CBP authority to do basically anything it wants to do, without public knowledge or consent	
374	This PEIS will overturn a century of environmental law establishing wilderness and protected areas	
376	This PEIS is actually a terrorist act. Instead of strategic tactics to protect us, it would open up border areas and create passage ways for entry into this country	
387	We have concluded that the process you have undertaken and the conclusions you have reached in your PEIS are deeply flawed, and we object to the acceptance of this document by those agencies for whom it was prepared.	
443	Public Bridge Authority operates the Peace Bridge has announced its intention to expand its plaza and initiate a system of preclearance of commercial vehicles on the Canadian side of the border, both of which would be included under this PEIS umbrella	
458	We support alternatives to infrastructure projects and activities that will undermine the well-being of species, their	

	<p>movement corridors and seasonal habitats and compromise their ability to reproduce/adapt to climate related habitat changes. This includes activities that undermine travel corridors/seasonal habitats of grizzlies, wolverines, Canada lynx, grey wolves, and mt. caribou, etc. including linear disturbances/motorized use/fencing/</p>
481	<p>Trust that CBP will make an effort to clearly communicate/outreach to the American people/agencies of the US federal and state and Canadian govts about specific plans and their rationales before moving forward with these activities</p>
532	<p>The lack of space also makes future build-out unsuitable for expanding the footprint of the Peace Bridge plaza, increasing the inspection capacity, facilitating a higher volume of commercial traffic or building a super-sized Duty Free store off of the plaza.</p>
572	<p>Please continue to solicit our input on future site and project specific NEPA documentation</p>
593	<p>There is a great need for site-specific analysis at the start of each future project or activity that tiers from the PEIS... the specifics of each project will require an additional analysis in either an EA or EIS</p>
594	<p>Furthermore, tiering off from this PEIS for projects impacting beyond the 100 mile range should not be done.</p>
621	<p>There was no PI process for the upgrades being done at the Massena POE to evaluate socioeconomic impacts to the community and cost to community. No one requested public input or comments on the types of improvements and there has not been transparent, public documentation on costs of improvements or environmental impacts, or potential mitigation, including socioeconomic impacts to the community.</p>
813	<p>The analysis and decisions by CBP in the PEIS must min env impacts to pristine landscapes in the Pacific NW - Olympic NP/NF, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie NF, Okanogan-Wenatchee NF, North Cascades NP, Colville NF, Kaniksu NF, State</p>

	lands for wildlife-lynx/grizzly, focusing on impacts from mechanized and off-road transport, construction of facilities, resupply of remote facilities, provision of power/water/sanitation, communications, overflights, watercraft, nighttime light, noise on public's use/enjoyment of lands	
870	There is significant research and new science being produced on both carbon storage and adaptation values of habitats in the northwest that should be referenced and considered in the final PEIS. Old growth forests store carbon and help wildlife as they adapt to changing habitats and climates.	
28	The actions of the CBP and DHS have the greatest risk to our laws and constitution.	The issue raised is beyond the scope of analyzing the environmental and related socioeconomic impacts of current and potential/foreseeable future CBP activities along the Northern Border. The PEIS makes no judgment upon the validity of your concerns, but is not the appropriate mechanism for addressing them.
45	Concerned with where the money is coming from for this Border control extension.	
433	Wants the border secure to make sure no immigrants get through our border illegally.	
435	Environmental quality regs for PEIS. The project is waste of tax dollars the real threat is Mexico not Canada.	
436	The no action makes the most sense because the northern USA citizens are good at catching sneaks trying to cross the border illegally	
605	Locally there is a treaty saying the border extends eight feet about our heads.	
606	Votes for a redirection in activities	
607	Brought a letter addressed to Secretary Janet Napolitano about jurisdiction, land and this area	
608	Brought a letter addressing jurisdiction and land. Stated that we are here illegally and that our own law has been violated.	
610	Not our nation to guard.	
618	Millions of dollars are being spent on border protection but little is gained.	
680	It is unconstitutional and un-American. Being subjected to check points on any basis, especially on a daily basis is	

	completely against the right to privacy and pursuit of happiness enjoyed by the Americans who live in these regions.	
707	Develop an integrated treaty that would met the threats an hazards that both our countries face- address the threats early	
708	Trade facilitation economic growth and jobs to pursue creative and effective solutions to manage the flow of traffic between Canada and the United States.	
33	No to the draft. I am more confused after attending the meeting.	The Draft PEIS itself is the source for understanding the proposal and impacts.
39	Proposed project is outside of their aboriginal territory and does not need to be a part of the PEIS.	Thank you for informing us that you are not concerned about actions within the study area.
84	Is interested in the Northern Border of Vermont and Maine.	CBP thanks you for your comment.
143	While roadways and trails impede efficient and effective patrols, the lack of vehicular access can also be said to decrease opportunities for illegal border crossings and violations.	
334	Supplied document on environmental study conducted in Vermont	
345	"Islands" of wild natural areas gradually lose species of animals over time; two such islands in VT	
346	Museum in Vermont presented several exhibits illustrating the probable effects of global warming; could force VT wildlife to migrate north	
365	With a document of this magnitude, it is imperative that the entities writing it have an exact understanding of the lands, resources, and assets covered by this draft PEIS.	
366	Approximately 95% of the lands along the south side of the border between the US and Canada have not been inventoried for cultural or paleontological resources.	
368	The effects of a single proposed development may be minor, but the cumulative effects of many of the planned and proposed developments become major	
369	The potential for great damage to occur to cultural and paleontological resources through each of the alternatives listed in the draft Northern Border PEIS is very disturbing.	

583	Look forward to working with CBP on this issue	
584	We are pleased with the thorough evaluation of impacts on the natural and social environment associated with each of the alternatives.	
585	The PEIS includes a realistic characterization of the activities that could occur under each alternative, the effects of the impacts, and potential mitigation strategies	
625	We recognize the mission of the CBP to keep terrorists and their weapons out the United States. We share that objective and are committed to ensuring that our lands are not used for nefarious purposes. At the same time we also recognize CBP has a responsibility to facilitate legitimate trade and travel	
695	In the Olympic Peninsula BP has expended without need and are overpaid with little to do here. Waste of taxes, please recall your guys to elsewhere and leave us alone	
871	There is a long history of indigenous peoples and activities in the Upper Skagit River system that we have made investments to better understand and recognize, we refer you to two videos that we produced on this topic on our website: skagiteec.org ...	
886	Friends of Acadia is not recommending any one of the alternatives presented. Just commenting generally.	
88	The best defense is to make friends, educate the public, be alert. When you fence in, you only drive the uniformed deeper into what you have not thought of or where you are not looking.	CBP seeks to improve partnerships across and along the Northern Border. No "border fence" is contemplated as a part of this PEIS.
257	Does not want to see fencing on the Northern Border.	
431	A fence is no fix for the threat from Canada [lists lots of reasons] list includes: comparisons of engineering, life expectancy, obesity, deficit, and bank ratings of US and Canada. Excessive security spending represents misallocation of resources	
615	It is important to emphasize partnerships with state and local governments when CBP builds out infrastructure	
656	No Fence!!! We have enough officers and defense where it shouldn't be needed, or to ruin the env and to make such an	

	awful site	
677	Why is the government agents only consider the most harmful ways to cope with problems rather than looking at more reliable and less damaging projects	
687	Yes please build a fence at the border along NY and the Reservation. Not Canada, just the reservation	
703	Contraction of any physical barrier such as fence, no matter how short sends a negative message to our neighbors and friends to the north and the rest of the world. Building a fence is not the answer to both our countries security interests, but should instead pursue our mutual interest.	
93	CBP has pursued this PEIS even though the Department has not requested waivers on protected land in order to perform its duties.	This statement is true. No projects will be initiated without additional NEPA documentation being prepared. There will be additional opportunities for public involvement if any actual projects are proposed.
112	All plans should respect the 'open border' created by NAFTA	This PEIS is meant to provide a strategic perspective to respond to any border security threats or priority changes. Though not directly tied to agreements on border security and trade and travel between the United States and Canada it will be cited as one among several sources that inform possible directions in the next five to seven years.
138	The TSIDA poses more potential environmental impacts than FDAIA and DISCETA.	CBP thanks you for your comment. It will be considered as we finalize determination of impacts from the alternatives.
147	The FDA presents the greatest threat to human health and the environment. All environmental concerns outlined in our comments to other alternatives relate to this one. We encourage CBP to select alternative with more clarity than FDA. With the other alt, the public can have at least some level of expectations about the types of projects and the activities that will take place along the border.	The Flexible Direction Alternative would have the greatest level of impacts among the alternatives if carried through. However, there is no current program of projects planned beyond the levels indicated in the No Action Alternative. Any new specific proposed projects would be subject to additional NEPA analysis and there would be additional opportunities for public involvement, tribal consultation (when appropriate), and coordination/consultation with resource management agencies.
177	Additional powers of Homeland Security are unnecessary there are no problems with providing sufficient law enforcement services (with current BP and Park Rangers).	CBP, including USBP, is required to protect all of our borders and adhere to the Constitution of the United States of America in conduct of its border security mandate. CBP does not propose any extension of homeland security powers in this PEIS and would conduct additional NEPA analysis for any projects with potential to impact the
573	There is too much Border Patrol now	

601	Fear along the border of being harassed by the Border Patrol	environment proposed in the future.
603	Doesn't see an option for a reduction in security. Doesn't think all the security is necessary or that it even works.	
606	Votes for a redirection in activities	
609	Concern about expanding the border. Read an article about it in the newspaper (something about allowing Canada to do something at/around port)	
684	Please do not accept any of these proposals except the No action alternative	
685	In hard times like we Americans are facing, I feel like you could use money to help folks, not waist the money on frivolous projects like this. Problem is Southern Border.	
691	We like camping, hiking, and walking in a natural env not overrun by BP	
692	It was very disconcerting to see surveillance cameras everywhere on tall polls, ugly wall, aerostat etc in the south. The BP hassle ppl everywhere. I would hate to see that happen here.	
693	The BP has been pushing up checkpoints on this Olympic Peninsula (not wanted by ppl), hassling Hispanics everywhere they go, prowling neighborhoods and bushes, arresting and imprisoning legal residents...BP are a menacing presence	
700	Further restrictions of movements and other obstacles to the area will ensure that the only people left will be the police force in charge of protecting it. Law enforcement presence outnumbers local population.	
183	The border patrol does not need to be here. It's unneeded and invasive. I wish they would go away.	
179	Is interested in becoming a Border Patrol agent.	Information on the application process to become a Border Patrol agent is outside the scope of this PEIS. Here is the site for further information: http://www.cbp.gov/xp/cgov/careers/customs_careers/border_careers/application_process/bpa_hire_proces.xml

258	Believes that environmental impacts from the proposed construction will be minor and can be controlled by proper construction methods.	CBP will continue to use proper construction methods and best management practices for minimizing/ controlling construction emissions, runoff, and waste.
259	With respect to construction: All necessary measures must be taken to minimize fugitive dust emissions created during construction activities.	
260	With respect to construction: Care during construction activities near any state water to min adverse effects on a water body. This includes minimal disturb of stream beds and banks to prevent excess siltation, and the replacements and reveg of an area. Prevent spills of oil/grease that may reach water	
261	With respect to construction: Projects disturbing one or more acres are required to have a permit to discharge stormwater runoff until the site is stabilized by the reestablishment of vegetation. Additional regulations by cities possible	
262	With respect to construction: Noise from construction activates may have adverse effects on persons who live near the construction area. Use muffler and timing to minimize issues.	
263	Believe the proposed activities are consistent with the State Implementation Plan for the Control of Air Pollution for the State of North Dakota.	
264	Minimum requirements of ND Dep. Of Health to ensure minimal environmental degradation occurs as result of construction or related work with potential to affect waters of ND: Prevent the erosion of exposed soil surfaces and trapping sediments being transported. Fragile and sensitive areas such as wetlands, riparian zones, delicate flora, or land resources will be protected against compaction, vegetation loss, and unnecessary damage	

265	Minimum requirements of ND Dep. Of Health to ensure minimal environmental degradation occurs as result of construction or related work with potential to affect waters of ND: All construction which directly or indirectly impacts aquatic systems will be managed to minimize impacts.	
266	Minimum requirements of ND Dep. Of Health to ensure minimal environmental degradation occurs as result of construction or related work with potential to affect waters of ND: Any fill material placed below the high water mark must be free of top soils, decomposable materials, and persistent synthetic organic compounds. Including asphalt, tires, treated lumber, and construction debris. May require testing of fill materials. Debris and 267solid wastes will be removed from the site and the impacted areas restored as nearly as possible to the original condition	
297	Any new road construction needs to be kept to an absolute minimum and only go forward with the cooperation and consent of the appropriate land management agency.	CBP would execute or request road construction, maintenance, or closures for the purpose of border security measures. Responsibility for management of forests, parks, wilderness, roadless areas, etc., falls with Department of Interior agencies, US Forest Service, and state, local and private land managers.
301	While NPCA feels CBP should avoid fencing altogether, we appreciate the PEIS generally seeking to avoid fencing in designated recreation areas. Especially concerned about impact on wildlife movement and wilderness values.	The U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection, Office of Border Patrol has no intention of installing 4,000 miles or, any significant fraction thereof, of fencing along the United States and Canadian International Border. It is not feasible, necessary, nor a part of Northern Border strategy. Fencing, used as a force multiplier, may be installed in selected discrete areas where intrusion control is necessary. Prior to installation of any tactical security infrastructure items, a CBP NEPA planning document would be prepared on the environmental impacts of that specific fence project.
303	Frankly, fencing is not effective in securing the border over the long term, while being very costly to the taxpayer.	
306	Minimizing the amount of development , traffic, and disruption in previously undisturbed areas are key for minimizing wildlife disruption and recreation impacts.	CBP is aware of this issue and will continue to coordinate its efforts with other agencies to evaluate its actions in this regard
473	Urge CBP to become a partner in the interests of wildlife and wild lands in a climate changing world as the challenges to maintain the env national security will become all the more	

	serious in the coming decades	
475	Urge CBP to tour potentially affected areas with gov and independent wildlife biologists and species experts to better understand the breadth of habitat and conservation challenges	
339	Current draft should be withdrawn and rewritten, should look at state by state, potential specific actions in specific places. Using "negligible, minor, moderate, or major" is not helpful. We should not be expected to evaluate vague open-ended laundry list.	Extending the comment period would not further public awareness of CBP activities that could affect their local environment. Despite the size of the document, the 45-day period is sufficient for interested parties to comment on concerns about potential future impacts within a given regional environment. The PEIS provides broad-based analysis of impacts from proposed alternative approaches to respond potential threat changes within the next five to seven years. CBP is not proposing an action or management plan in the PEIS. It would not and could not take any specific action based upon the analysis in the PEIS or decisions in the ROD. CBP would provide sufficient notice and review times to the public to comment upon future NEPA documents when it does propose actual projects with the potential for significant impacts to the environment.
688	I am appalled by the possibility of your BP expanding it's presence all over our public lands here on the Olympic peninsula of WA state	
343	If you are not building a fence, CBP should retract the PEIS and issue a revision so readers can evaluate potential impacts of measures that are actually being measured	CBP stands by the clarity in the document about what is and what is not proposed. CBP cannot be responsible for inaccurate media stories depicting what is said in the PEIS nor can it be responsible for other individuals or organizations that inaccurately read or depict what is said in the PEIS.
348	Connect the "islands" by natural migration corridors between them - solves migration and climate change issues	CBP is aware of the importance of wildlife corridors and the transborder migration of wildlife. That concern will be specifically addressed as part of specific reviews of specific actions.
361	It is obvious that the individuals who assembled this document lacked the understanding and expertise for such a task.	No further response required within the PEIS. This is a non-substantive comment.
362	The City of Ranier rejects the Northern Border PEIS and recommends that it be abolished or sent back to the consultation stage and begun anew.	CBP has incorporated comment responses from all or most comments received from the public in the final PEIS and the PEIS meets CBP's planning needs.
371	Makes no sense to turn the MN/ border into semi-militarized zone. Little chance of terrorist plot will come my canoe and dog sled across the wilderness to attack--who or what?	It should be understood that Customs and Border Protection is not proposing or planning to request any change in legal responsibilities or to further increase its physical presence along the Northern Border.
377	This PEIS would allow the govt to set up military drone bases in a secretive manner on public lands that are isolated.	The PEIS is providing a prudent broad look and potential impacts if activity levels needed to change in the future due to a change in the

	Anyone within the 100 mile zone becomes part of a police state	threat environment along the border.
378	Strategies described will be extremely costly to US taxpayer. We don't need costly and unnecessary patrolling of our border	
384	Everyone focuses on the Southern Border regions and forgets about our Northern Border regions, thanks for staying on top of the situation.	
402	Clearly there needs to be a more inclusive review of the impacts/effects of potential actions before this PEIS is finalized - one that balances the public's right to have its built and natural environment protected with your agency's desire to build or enlarge your facilities.	
611	Border patrol is spending a lot of money on this when there are other issues to address.	
612	Can't use terrorism as an excuse to take away civil liberties.	
613	This is just being done as an exercise but you don't really change.	
658	a waste of money and something I don't want to see	
667	The expenditure of tax payers' dollars after the const. of an 8 million dollar detention center in Port Angeles is another instance of waste and abuse. Many citizens are outraged at the massive build up of the BP acting as a massive militarized zone in NW	
669	Your web site makes it difficult to state that one is against the proposal. Sees no reason to take away rights of people within 100 miles of border.	
679	because it is required that humans are to be considered in the EIS, this plan should not be adopted under these policies and constitutional rights expect as the No Action Alternative. Any other choice would create an unacceptable disruption in the area	
681	More surveillance, presences, and technologies are not needed. Already there are more BP than needed.	

686	not to worry, big brother will look after you, Russia is getting their freedom, here in northern NY the great police state of NY, we are losing ours	
689	Flush with out tax dollars, I hope your dreams of building walls and whatever obstacles to our freedom of views and movement will not materialize	
690	The people of the Northern border, contrary to south border, will not tolerate the militarization of their region. We like camping, hiking, and walking in a natural env not overrun by BP	
702	Stop wasting time and money when you already have a system in place.	
380	Thinks the EIS is total nonsense. Need to protect our borders but we have to jump thru hoops like this to get the job done.	CBP complies with its Constitutional responsibilities including upholding or complying with all laws of the United States. NEPA is a prudent and valuable planning tool that helps CBP do its part to be a steward of a healthy productive environment as it carries out its mission.
385	Needs a call back to determine who to address the comment letter to	No further response required within the PEIS. CBP provided.
500	Includes the northern border of Idaho between Washington and Montana state lines. Administers state programs that include air quality, surface and ground water quality, wastewater, waste and remediation, and drinking water.	CBP will consider these comments in its final determinations regarding mitigations in the PEIS and the ROD.
501	The tactical security and infrastructure and flexible direction alternative have the greatest potential to affect water quality.	
504	There is effort both private and public being focused on the recovery of impaired waters throughout the Coeur d' Alene Region on a variety of water quality projects ranging from road closures to remediation of abandon mine sites. Some of this work has been accomplished in the vicinity of the border such as the Boundary Creek watershed which is impaired due to excess temp which results from lack of canopy cover along streams.	
506	Idaho water become impaired because of cumulative effects of various human activities within a watershed. For example,	

	the clearing of riparian vegetation for fencing, motorized patrol, plugged culverts, loose sand or gravel, use of pesticides, and low water crossing are all minor impacts but if poorly planned can be cumulative impact.	
709	Integrated cross-border law enforcement to build on existing bilateral law enforcement programs	
710	Critical infrastructure and cyber security to implement a comprehensive cross-border approach	
502	A tool to learn about the streams, rivers, and lakes near or crossing the U.S. border is an interactive map www.global.deq.idaho.gov/Website/wq2010/viewer.htm . DEQ also has list of sub basin assessments, TMDLs, and TMDL implementation plans on their website.	CBP has placed this in a list of available resources.
509	We welcome projects that restore Idaho's impaired waters like the Boundary creek, which calls for an increase of shade	See 8.5.6.2 of the final for details on water BMPs and mitigation measures..
515	Idaho is unique in that many individuals use surface water ad their source of drinking water as do several public systems. Care is necessary when planning projects near streams, rivers, and lakes so these are not impacted.	
514	Idaho is unique in that many individuals use surface water ad their source of drinking water as do several public systems. Care is necessary when planning projects near streams, rivers, and lakes so these are not impacted.	CBP has clarified text to the document committing to adhere to EPA NPDES construction permit requirements for each state.
552	More technology needs to be in place for areas where the entire border is located in water	CBP agrees that water border areas present a unique challenge for surveillance, deterrence, or interdiction of illegitimate cross border activity.
617	Worries if X-ray machines are causing cancer in this area due to high levels of exposure and if a study has been done. Death rise after x-ray machines came in. Concerned that different studies aren't being done that maybe should be done	Studies were conducted on exposure when scanning devices were acquired and NEPA documents included analysis of potential radiation exposures for operators and travelers. No adverse effect was found from the levels of exposure encountered at and around the ports.
887	We request that CBP always do site-specific analysis in coordination with the National Park Service before taking action at Acadia and in the surrounding communities	CBP will necessarily coordinate with NPS, generally. regarding ongoing operations and, specifically, regarding any new projects or major changes in operations.
889	We feel there is too much unique to Acadia and too much potential for harm by lumping the park in with the general	CBP thanks you for your comment. The are a variety of unique resource areas along the northern border. CBP is committed to

	landscape of Northern New England through this programmatic EIS.	coordinating at the most immediate level to best manage activities in parks, forests, and other areas with sensitive resources or missions supporting public enjoyment of natural/cultural spaces.
--	--	--

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
4	Darren Bonaparte	Akwasasne	Tribal Data Concern & Tech Edits	<p>The territory of Akwasasne - St. Regis Mohawk Reserv. is not mentioned in the list of Native American Lands listed on page 12. This oversight is glaring in that the Massena station is located about 3,000 feet from the western boundary of the reservation. Half of the Akwasasne territory lies in Canada, Visitors from Canada to the Massena station must pass through the Canadian reserve via the international bridge system from Canada which passes through Cornwall island, kawehnoke, a high pop area of reserv. Millions of dollars of contraband pass through the area, according to reports published on a regular basis by Canadian/American law enforcements. It is inexplicable that the PEIS fails to mention even the existence of the Akwasasne territory. Johnson Road, St. Regis Road, River Road, Phillips Road, and McDonald Road all pass across the US/Canada border at various points along the territory but do not have any kind of POE. In most cases, there is no signage or even a border marker</p>	<p>The final PEIS corrected the place in 6.8.2.3 where it just referred to the St. Regis Indian Reservation to refer to the St. Regis Mowhawk Tribe Indian Reservation. In the final as it was in the draft, The St. Regis Mowhawk Tribe reservation is listed in "Table 6.11.-5. Native American Tribes that Have a Reservation, Judicially Established Interest, or Established Traditional Ties to Land within the 100-mile PEIS Corridor," "Figure 6.11-1. Native American Lands Within the 100-mile PEIS Corridor Crossing Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York," "6.8.2.3 Land Ownership in the Great Lakes Region in the United States," and incorporated into "Table 6.8-7. Land Ownership in the Great Lakes Region."</p>

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
21	Darren Bonaparte	Akwasasne	Tribal Data Concern & Tech Edits	Error in App H: Historical... pg H-25, 41-44: Iroquois were allies of the British during the French and Indian War, some were allied with the French in beg., but switched sides before summer 1760. Entered into Silver Covenant Chain of Peace & Friendship with Great Brittan and enjoyed free and open trade.	Correction made as follows: "During this same time, the Tuscarora, an Iroquoian-speaking group that migrated from North Carolina, joined the Five Nations. After the French and Indian war (1754-1762), the Iroquois, who had sided with the British, benefited from the subsequent Royal Proclamation of 1763, by which the British Crown prohibited settlement west of the Appalachian Mountains. However, this reprieve was brief, since after the American Revolution, Iroquois lands were increasingly encroached on by American settlers and the Iroquois were forced to relocate to ever-dwindling reservations."
24	David Hadden		Action/Alternati ve/Activities	CBP does not actually evaluate any of its alternatives.	The alternatives used in the PEIS were developed to provide CBP decisionmakers with a basis for understanding the relative environmental impacts associated with implementing different sets of tools/activities used to facilitate border security along the Northern Border. These alternatives provide a reasonable range of approaches to choose from to meet yet unidentified future threats. The relative environmental impacts that would likely occur from implementing each the alternatives are presented in the PEIS in narrative and tabular form throughout the document. They evidence the different environmental considerations inherent to any strategic approach. Chapter 1 of the final further clarifies this approach.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
29	David Hadden		Action/Alternative/Activities	Infrastructure upgrades and improvements should include upgrades to roadways and trails or the construction of new roadways .	Under the Tactical Security Infrastructure Deployment Alternative road and trail upgrades and new road construction were already included but the following statement was added to make it more apparent: "This alternative would also include upgrades to roadways and trails proximate to the border or construction of new roadways to access CBP facilities and infrastructure."
34	Darlene Pearson		Action/Alternative/Activities	PEIS does not state why we need 100 miles south of the border as opposed to 25. miles.	Under 1.2 CBP NORTHERN BORDER ACTIVITIES, the following was added starting at line 29: [Section 387(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides for CBP agents and officers "to board and search for aliens any vessel within the territorial waters of the United States and any railway car, aircraft, conveyance, or vehicle" within a "reasonable distance from an external boundary of the United States." Part 287 of Chapter 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations clarifies that 100-miles is a reasonable distance from an external boundary. Within the first 25 miles, CBP personnel have the right to access to private lands but not dwellings) to patrol the border to prevent the illegal entry of undocumented CBVs into the United States.]

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
41	Margo Locke		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Expanding the jurisdiction 100 miles south is total unnecessary.	Under 1.2 CBP NORTHERN BORDER ACTIVITIES, the following was added starting at line 29: [Section 387(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides for CBP agents and officers "to board and search for aliens any vessel within the territorial waters of the United States and any railway car, aircraft, conveyance, or vehicle" within a "reasonable distance from an external boundary of the United States." Part 287 of Chapter 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations clarifies that 100-miles is a reasonable distance from an external boundary. Within the first 25 miles, CBP personnel have the right to access to private lands but not dwellings) to patrol the border to prevent the illegal entry of undocumented CBVs into the United States.]
42	Margo Locke		Action/Alternative/Activities	What are check points for.	This was clarified in 1.2.3.2 USBP Mission and Operations as follows: "Traffic checkpoints, conducted on major roads leading away from the border, are aimed at detecting persons and narcotics entering the country illegally."
49	Sharon L. Sorby	Pend Oreille County Weed Board	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Concerns with the lack of redress to alien invasive species, especially noxious weeds.	The final says at 8.3.6 .1: "Depending on project needs and requirements, CBP would implement other protective measures to prevent or limit the spread of invasive plants or animals into native habitats." Within best management practices for reducing impacts to biological resources listed in chapters 8 and 9, CBP included routinely washing and inspecting vehicles used for construction as well as for patrols to remove vegetation, seeds, and insects and animals to reduce the risk of transporting non-native/invasive species into off-road environments.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
54	Sharon L. Sorby	Pend Oreille County Weed Board	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	In Chapter 4: West of the Rockies there is no discussion of alien invasive species in the Affected Environment.	In the last paragraph of section 4.3.2.5 Vegetative Habitate Typically Found in the Region, the draft did mention scotch broom as an example of invasives species posing a serious threat to native species in the region. The final clarifies that scotch broom (<i>Cytisus scoparius</i>) is (alien) native to Europe and North Africa..
80	Alvin Windy Boy Sr.		Tribal Data Concern & Tech Edits	Cultural sensitivity training to immigration/CBP.	The final added more explanation about its Environmental and Cultural Stewardship Training for agents: "1.2.2.3 Environmental Awareness line 37 on: Environmental and Cultural Stewardship Training, prepared jointly by CBP, the Department of Interior, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture-Forest Service, is mandatory for all USBP agents and available to all CBP personnel. This training provides practical guidelines to practice awareness of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural and cultural resources in the operational environment; • Lands and places set aside for preservation, conservation, or appreciation of unique natural or cultural values; and • People and departments that use or manage that land, including sensitivity to Government-to-Government relations with Tribes. All CBP components otherwise provide environmental and cultural resources training appropriate to their personnel's daily responsibilities."

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
118	Boundary County Commissioners	Boundary County, ID	Admin Process	Please consider us as equal to any other Government Agency you deal with and we wish to be considered by you in future actions as a co-coordinating agency.	The final PEIS says, in Chap 2 (pg 2-3, that): "When individual projects or program elements with the potential to significantly impact the environment are ripe for proposal and assessment, CBP will continue to conduct appropriate project-specific National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis. CBP will make determination of the appropriate level of review in accordance with 40 CFR 1501.2 thru 1501.4, as well as DHS Directive 032-01 sections V.H, VI, and Appendix A."
132	Brad Smith	Idaho Conservation League	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	There are more potential impacts to wildlife and other environmental resources under the DISCTEA when compared to the FDAIA. Increased vehicular access along the Northern Border could negatively affect efforts to recover listed and viable populations of wildlife. Infrastructure such as towers will need access roads or trails for maintenance reducing the quality and availability of wildlife habitats. The Department should carefully evaluate the effects of any such activities to wildlife before proceeding with construction.	The final says at 8.3.6.1 (first sentence): "Site-specific NEPA review would be required if impact to wildlife is a concern at a particular construction site. Planning activities will take the species into consideration within site-specific NEPA review. "
144	Brad Smith	Idaho Conservation League	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Increased vehicular access and human activity along the border would impede efforts to recover listed populations of grizzly bear, lynx, and mountain caribou, or other species. It would be more beneficial to construct helistops for border patrols than to build new roads. Although this would impact wildlife the impacts would be less.	The final commits CBP to develop and use more of an ecological site model approach to coordinate with Federal land and natural resource management agencies to evaluate potential impacts of future activities on critical biological resources.
149	Brad Smith	Idaho Conservation League	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Primary concern with the PEIS and future activities relates to potential impacts to wildlife. There are a number of T&E species in Idaho whose survival relies on the ability to move across the border.	The final says at 8.3.6.1 (first sentence): "Site-specific NEPA review would be required if impact to wildlife is a concern at a particular construction site. Planning activities will take the species into consideration within site-specific NEPA review. "

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
151	Brad Smith	Idaho Conservation League	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The recovery area for the mountain caribou is the only established recovery area for an endangered species that extends north of the Canadian border. Caribou are regularly documented in the northwest corner of the state, in the basin north of Snowy Top Mountain, and south along the crest of the Selkirk Mountains. The ability of wildlife managers to recover the "international Herd" to a viable pop depends on the connectivity of habitat. If fences were to be constructed along the Northern Border it would pose a migrational issue to mountain caribou.	The final says at 8.3.6.1 (first sentence): "Site-specific NEPA review would be required if impact to wildlife is a concern at a particular construction site. Planning activities will take the species into consideration within site-specific NEPA review. "
155	Brad Smith	Idaho Conservation League	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Increased motorized vehicular access within wildlife habitats along the border would also hinder efforts to recover caribou, grizzly bear, lynx, and other wildlife. [NOTED LATER: mountain caribou require secure habitat, uninterrupted by human disturbance. Grizzly bears also need secure habitats from the time they emerge from hibernation until they retreat to their dens the following winter.]	The final commits CBP to use more ecological site models to coordinate with Federal land and natural resource management agencies to evaluate potential impacts of future activities on critical biological resources.
156	Brad Smith	Idaho Conservation League	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Caribou will flee if motorized vehicles make their way into winter habitats causing them to spend crucial energy reserves.	The final commits CBP to use more ecological site models to coordinate with Federal land and natural resource management agencies to evaluate potential impacts of future activities on critical biological resources.
159	Brad Smith	Idaho Conservation League	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Activities or projects that reduce the quality or quantity of snowshoe hare habitat (especially multi-storied lodegpole pine and spruce/fir forests) would negatively impact the recovery of lynx. Lynx require high elevation habitats that are capable of supporting populations of snowshoe hare (prey) - multi-storied ladgepole pine and spruce/fir forests are important.	The final says at 8.3.6.1 (first sentence): "Site-specific NEPA review would be required if impact to wildlife is a concern at a particular construction site. Planning activities will take the species into consideration within site-specific NEPA review. "

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
160	Brad Smith	Idaho Conservation League	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The analysis of cumulative effects in the PEIS falls short. Central to that analysis is disclosure of historical, present, and projected future resource conditions.	CBP's approach to cumulative analysis is reasonable given CBP's small footprint for the area covered. However, the final provides additional information on recent historical growth in its activities along the Northern Border to provide meaningful perspective on resource impact trends.
163	Brad Smith	Idaho Conservation League	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The cumulative analysis falls short. Central to the analysis of cumulative effects is the disclosure of historical, present, and projected future resource conditions when taken with the action alternatives. The final PEIS should provide a more thorough discussion of the cumulative effects of the action alternatives, when taken with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future federal actions.	CBP's approach to cumulative analysis is reasonable given CBP's small footprint for the area covered. However, the final provides additional information on recent historical growth in its activities along the Northern Border to provide meaningful perspective on resource impact trends.
185	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Exec Summary: Page ES-1 lines 34-28 duplicated sentence	CBP made appropriate corrections in the final PEIS.
186	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Check grammar, punctuation and capitalization on Page ES-2 Line 33; Page ES-3 Line 9; ES-3 line 26; Page ES-3, Line 40; Page ES-4, lines 13-15; Table ES-1 15; Page ES-4; Page ES-5, Table ES-1	CBP made appropriate corrections in the final PEIS.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
187	Daniele Turcotte		Action/Alternative/Activities & Tech Edits	Introduction I. Page 1-3, Line 26 Comment: These statements give the impression that the area is a barren wilderness mostly owned by the government and a few Native Americans. However, the PEIS addresses the contiguous land encompassing NB and 100 m south	The terrain south of the border —which ranges from densely forested lands on the west and east coasts, to open plains in the central portion of the country, to the maritime environment of the Great Lakes. — largely comprisesThere are several sparsely populated Federal, state, and tribal lands along the immediate border area and sparsely distributed towns and smaller cities lands along the immediate border area. Around the Great Lakes and in the Pacific Northwest there are . More densely populated urban areas. occur mostly around the Great Lakes.. This operating environment differs appreciably from the other borders and requires its own to CBP employ a particular mixture of facilities, operations, infrastructure, and technology for itsas an appropriate law enforcement approach. In
188	Daniele Turcotte		Action/Alternative/Activities & Tech Edits	What are the actual percentages of public, privately-owned, and tribal lands within the entire area of analysis, ie 40,000 square miles	CBP corrected information on the Federal and tribal lands within the NB study area. Percentage breakdown of private lands is not pertinent to the analysis.
189	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 1-5, Lines 8-13 (inserts/deletes); Page 1-6, Lines 14-17 & Page 1-7 line 6 (clarification needed); Page 1-7, Lines 20-21: Who is the "interested organization"? It has not been previously referred to.	Replaced "interested organization" with "documented shipper (or recipient)." Clarified definition of "situational awareness" and denial of CBV awareness of law enforcement routines.
190	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Grammar Page 1-7 Lines, 21-22;	Changed from "They also use canine teams for detecting a variety of substances (such as narcotics and explosives)," to "CBP Officers also use canine teams for detecting a variety of substances (such as narcotics and explosives)."
191	Daniele Turcotte		Action/Alternative/Activities	VII Page 1-8, Lines 14-16: untrue, I was stopped at a BP checkpoint on the US 37/12 intersection in northern NY. The checkpt had elevated lights, a USBP van and signage. Neither of these roads meet the border	Changed from "Traffic checkpoints are conducted on roads that meet the border;" to "Traffic checkpoints, conducted on major roads leading away from the border, are aimed at detecting persons and narcotics entering the country illegally."

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
193	Daniele Turcotte		Impact Data/Analysis Determination & Action/Alternati ve/Activities	Page 1-12, lines 18-19: in some sections, CBP operates a Predator-B unmanned aircraft system (UAS) carrying live missiles would result in a different env impact than a crash of an un-armed predator-B	As is stated in the Draft PEIS, CBP's UASs do not carry explosive devices or any other types of munitions or armaments. We clarified the language in the PEIS to make clear that CBP's UASs are never armed and are used strictly for reconnaissance, surveillance, targeting, and acquisition for ground, air and maritime operating environments.
194	Daniele Turcotte		Impact Data/Analysis Determination & Action/Alternati ve/Activities	Page 1-12, Lines 23-24: are lasers the type used as armaments? Concern is again a crash of an aircraft and subsequent accidental deployment of the laser	As is stated in the Draft PEIS, CBP's UASs do not carry explosive devices or any other types of munitions or armaments. We clarified the language in the PEIS to make clear that CBP's UASs are never armed and are used strictly for reconnaissance, surveillance, targeting, and acquisition for ground, air and maritime operating environments.
196	Daniele Turcotte		Action/Alternati ve/Activities	Page 1-18, Lines 18-20 clarification maintain and continually seeking to enhance, security on a long and varied border, that faces facing multiple evolving threats, while using a changing set of resources and techniques, is therefore a highly dynamic enterprise.	Removed the "dynamic enterprises" sentence in the final and refocused paragraph on budgetary and technological considerations for border security maintenance.
197	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 1-18, lines 31-31: clarification. Which effort - the PEIS or the newly signed agreement with Canada	Clarified the relationship between the PEIS and the Canada agreement and DHS's NB strategy.
200	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Check grammar on page 1-21 (need to remove both has and the after activity)	Made corrections to discussion of procedural and substantive requirements.
204	Daniele Turcotte		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Page 2-2, Lines 25-28 kindly specify trigger level for conducting and environmental analysis on a specific project	Included the following statement: "When individual projects or program elements with the potential to significantly impact the environment are ripe for proposal and assessment, CBP will continue to conduct appropriate project-specific National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis. CBP will make determination of the appropriate level of review in accordance with 40 CFR 1501.2 thru 1501.4, as well as DHS Directive 032-01 sections V.H, VI, and Appendix A."

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
205	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 2-3, lines 34-35 is confusing	Rephrased as 2-2, line 38 as: "NEPA requires that Federal agencies rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives for a proposed action with the potential to significantly impact the human environment. NEPA analysis must also address other alternatives for meeting the agencies purpose for action that were eliminated from detailed study and briefly explain why they were not further analyzed. (Section 1502.14.)" 2-3, line 36-40: " Increases or fluctuations in the number of personnel securing the Northern Border would likely occur over the next five to seven years as a function of normal CBP-wide growth. Also, if the pace of operations were to increase due to changes in legal or illegitimate movement across the border for extended periods, additional personnel might be required in specific areas or facilities along the border. "
206	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 2-3, lines 39-40 grammar	CBP corrected the grammar in the final PEIS by breaking up the sentence into smaller complete thoughts.
207	Daniele Turcotte		Action/Alternative/Activities & Tech Edits	Page 2-4, lines 28-30 needs clarification...USBP agents in some locations are currently operating out of leased space...	Clarified as "In some cases, USBP agents are currently operating out of space not optimized for their operational responsibilities. This includes space leased in buildings primarily occupied by other Federal, State, or local governments/law enforcement agencies that may not meet space, location, or accommodation requirements for USBP Stations and the area of operations."
208	Daniele Turcotte		Action/Alternative/Activities & Tech Edits	Page 2-4, lines 42-44 needs clarification...It would also divert traffic from or increase the capacity of the more heavily used POEs, which would decrease waiting times...Waiting times for the cross-border violator of the previous sentence?	Clarified by adding "for vehicles engaged in legal trade and travel" to the end of the sentence.

Appendix A-2

Table A-2.2

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
209	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-8, lines 13-15: those definitions which are essentially the same for both natural env. And societal env. Should be stated in the same manner to avoid confusion to reader	Consolidated the definitions of impact level determinations so it is easier to read.
210	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	page 3-8, lines 18-19: grammar: The viability of the affected resource is not threatened although some impacts may prove irreversible	Corrected the grammar.
211	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-8, lines 33-34: definitions which are essentially the same for both natural env and societal env should be stated in the same manner to avoid confusing the reader (see comment as 209)	Consolidated the definitions of impact level determinations so it is easier to read.
212	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-9, lines 3-5: definitions which are essentially the same for both natural env and societal env should be stated in the same manner to avoid confusing the reader (see comment as 209)	Consolidated the definitions of impact level determinations so it is easier to read.
213	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-9, line 8: delete, this item may be true, however it is not a deciding factor as to whether an impact is minor or moderate (proper mitigation)	Concur. Deleted statement on proper mitigation.
214	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-9, lines 9-10 grammar	Description changed and grammar corrected.
215	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-9, lines 11-13 definitions which are essentially the same for both natural env and societal env should be stated in the same manner to avoid confusing the reader (see comment as 209)	See response to comment 139.
216	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-9, line 16 delete, this item may be true, however it is not a deciding factor as to whether an impact is minor or moderate (proper mitigation) (see comment 213)	Concur. Deleted statement on proper mitigation.
217	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-9, lines 19-21 definitions which are essentially the same for both natural env and societal env should be stated in the same manner to avoid confusing the reader (see comment 209)	Consolidated the definitions of impact level determinations so it is easier to read.
218	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-9, line 18: grammar	Description changed and grammar corrected.

Appendix A-2

Table A-2.2

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
219	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-9, line 36: grammar	Added "of the" between "descriptions" and "regionally affected."
222	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	page 3-11, line 23 & page 3-12 line 4: grammar	Removed comma from between "required" and "interim emission reduction."
223	Daniele Turcotte		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Page 3-11, lines 29-33: comment 93/153(b). These preset threshold levels, or de minimis rates, vary depending on the severity of the nonattainment, the and geographic location and De minimis emissions are total direct and indirect emissions...	Changed to read as: "Total direct and indirect emissions of a criteria pollutant caused by a Federal action in a nonattainment or maintenance area are de minimis if they are at rates less than the specified applicability thresholds. These de minimis rates vary depending on the type of pollutant and the geographic location for the level of nonattainment (Table 3.2-2)."
224	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-12, line 7: paragraph is confusing. Does 'these' refer to the permitting scenarios or the equipment, timing, etc	Added the word " scenarios" between "These" and "may" to clarify the reference.
227	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-13, line 26: grammar	Clarified that combination of fossil fuel boilers emitting 100-tpy of regulated pollutants would need to seek PSD permits.
229	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-13, line 22: grammar	Changed wording to "and to make minor modifications...."
230	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-14, line 36 & Page 3-15 line3: stay consistent: is it rates or thresholds	Threshold is used consistently for the limit.
231	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-15, Line 24: Sentence makes no sense	Changed to read as: "Several activities do not generate any direct or indirect emissions that would require CBP to maintain an ongoing program to control them. "
232	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-15, line 28: grammar	Changed to read as: "The PEIS does not carry these activities forward into the analysis of potential impacts to air quality."
233	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-22, line 2: grammar	Changed to read as: "Soils with low permeability have more potential for erosion by both wind and water due to the ability of water or air to move through its strata."
234	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-25, lines 19-20: use same terminology for impacts as in earlier section...ie. Negligible	Changed "insignificant" to "negligible."

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
235	Daniele Turcotte		Action/Alternative/Activities	Page 3-25, line 21: I don't believe you have considered enough scenarios for this item. It is not just during construction that there are potential affects to surface/groundwater. Also includes: construction and operating new dikes/culverts can redirect surface water which would affect waters; Runoff from operating new parking lots/airport runways can contain petroleum products and high sediment loads which affect surface/groundwater; leaks of aboveground fuel storage tanks could affect waters. Airplane accidents, predator accidents, marine vessel accidents....	Now reads as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fuel spills and leaks from vehicles, equipment, and storage tanks that runoff impervious surfaces or otherwise transport to make a groundwater aquifer unsuitable for withdrawing drinking water or impair surface waters; • High sediment loads in runoff from construction sites or that harm impair surface waters and aquatic organisms; • Construction projects that redirect surface waters during or after completion of the facilities and infrastructure; and • Substantial withdrawals from an aquifer that change the local water table and cause some existing wells to dry up.
239	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-29, lines 4: use same terminology as in earlier section: impacts not affects	The final PEIS uses impacts as the dominant terminology except where it would be repetitive or where "affect" is quoted from a reference.
240	Daniele Turcotte		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Page 3-29, lines 9-10: Generates noise in a national park that exceeds significant effects thresholds as outlined by the NPS...what of State Parks?	State parks noise issues are covered by the previous bullet on noise regulations and land management (compatibility with land use planning). In this case, we are referring to uniform guidance in a Federal law that applies to units of the NPS exclusively.
241	Daniele Turcotte		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Page 3-30, line 5-6: should review noise levels created by operation of backup generators at larger facilities	At 8.6.2 standby generators are considered see "Standby generators at modified POEs would be completely enclosed by buildings or other enclosures. Standby generators would operate for limited periods for maintenance and testing and during power outages. Due to their limited use, effects to the noise environment from standby generators would be minor."
248	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-34, line 6: some categories of land use...grammar	Corrected to read as: "Some impacts to land use discussed in chapter 8...."

Appendix A-2

Table A-2.2

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
249	Daniele Turcotte		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Page 3-34, lines 24-26: to identify the lands most likely...unclear...combining the list of land uses into a general 'recreation' land use? Or only combining the land uses that have the gov. as a landowner Also, why not also add campgrounds as you have for the Canadian side? Inconsistency of evaluating Canada	Revised to read as: "CBP's law enforcement jurisdiction frequently places its operational activities within areas designated or otherwise used for recreation and conservation purposes. This PEIS's analysis of areas most likely used for recreation in the United States includes lands within the designations listed beneath."
251	Daniele Turcotte		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Page 3-35, lines 23-25: the category of recreational land includes more land than that referenced in section 3.17 (recreation). Which focuses specifically on major Federal Recreation Sites. Shouldn't section 3.17 include discussion of all land now considered 'recreation' in the PEIS, or change the title of 3.17 to "Federal Recreational Areas"	Based on input from National Park Service, the section was rewritten to simplify the land use categorization. Canadian resources are included when they offer a useful comparison or the connectedness between the resources is relevant to border security and resource protection in the United States.
253	Daniele Turcotte		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Page 3-35, lines 29-31:if you are trying to evaluate impacts conservatively, as you have stated, you would want to over-estimate the rec-type land since this type of land is considered more pristine rural/urban LU and would have greater impact than these	Over-estimating areas used for recreation would arbitrarily exaggerate the range of recreation impacts without changing the impact intensity determination
254	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 3-39, line 31: grammar	Corrected to read as: "There is the potential for a land use impact to occur when an activity...."
278	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Tech Edits	Appendix I fails to mention the existence of Akimina-Kishenina Provincial Park and the British Columbia Flathead Watershed Protection Area. The entirety of this area is low impact use and can be categorically recognized as remote and pristine.	Appendix I now mentions the Akimina-Kishenina Provincial Park. The British Columbia Flathead Watershed Protection Area has not yet reached status, therefore it is not included in the final.
279	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Tech Edits	Appendix I in the Glacier National Park portion fails to mention the North Fork of the Flathead River's designation as a Wild and Scenic River. NPCA believes the entirety - not most - of the area is low impact use.	The entirety of the Flathead River's designation is mentioned in the Flathead National Forest portion below. The final removes the word most implying that the whole area low impact use.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
280	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Tech Edits	In Appendix I the Flathead National Forest part incorrectly states that the northern most extent of the Flathead National Forest is 50 miles south of the border. Instead, it is contiguous.	Changed to read as: Flathead NF starts just south of the northern border extending over 100 miles into Montana.
291	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination & Action/Alternati ve/Activities	One of the most important activities the CBP should pursue is cooperation with the NPS and other state and federal land management agencies that currently supervise thousands of acres within the 100 mile wide border corridor in which CBP actions will take place. Taking advantage of these resources and identifyign other opportunities to emply existing assets in increasing border security should be a prime objective of this proposed action.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
292	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination & Action/Alternati ve/Activities	NCPA supports efforts to coordinate with relevant federal land managers (including NPS) when needing access to lookout sites, in order to ensure consistency with the land manager's mission and specific land management requirements.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
299	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	NCPA supports efforts to redesign lighting on communications and radar towers to limit avian and bat mortality from collisions, which frequently occur on nights with bad weather. Use strobe or white lights and remove non-flashing and steady-burning red lights to substantially reduce mortality.	The final incorporates consideration of avian and bat hazard friendly technologies into mitigations for tower designs.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
300	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	NCPA supports efforts to eliminate the potential for significant major adverse visual impacts, by situating proposed towers and associated facilities at least 1.5 miles from Ares designated for their visual sensitivity (such as national monuments and park ...). NCPA believes 1.5 mile buffer zone is not appropriate in all situations, should take into consideration site-specific viewshet.	CBP concurs that site-specific considerations dictate tower placement and design. However, this may mean that towers need to be much closer than 1.5-miles which is proposed as a mitigation strategy and not a design and placment requirement.
304	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination & Action/Alternati ve/Activities	NCPA supports efforts to continue strengthening partnerships, communication, and discussion with knowledgeable personnel in recreation areas, such as NPS personnel, and ensure that the placement of new infrastructure, patrol routes, and other actions would have a low impact.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
305	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination & Action/Alternati ve/Activities	We strongly urge that this partnership cooperation be extended to include personnel knowledgeable about the movement and habitat needs of wildlife.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
306	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Minimizing the amount of development , traffic, and disruption in previously undisturbed areas are key for minimizing wildlife disruption and recreation impacts.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
308	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Action/Alternati ve/Activities & Impact Data/Analysis Determination	NCPA supports efforts to work with national park and forest service personnel to alert visitors to new traffic checkpoints if they are located in areas that could affect recreational users.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
311	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Do not plan projects with potential impacts on biological resources in protected areas such as North Cascades National Park, Glacier National Park, and the adjacent larger protected landscapes surrounding both that could otherwise have cumulative impacts on grizzly bears and other wildlife habitat and behavior. Also concerned about minor projects that might have these impacts. We hope important biological resources will be avoided when planning any projects in all areas along the border, not just National Parks.	The final commits CBP to develop and use more of an ecological site model approach to coordinate with Federal land and natural resource management agencies to evaluate potential impacts of future activities on critical biological resources.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
314	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	NCPA supports efforts to substantially involve other Federal agencies that manage border area in mitigation when the CBP periodically determines if adaptations would be feasible to further enhance beneficial effects of lessen adverse effects identified through the impact monitoring program and adaptive management effort.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
315	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Through this project, CBP will periodically measure the conditions of various environmental resources being affected by CBP's activities. NCPA recommends that these periodic measurements be published and easily available to the public.	CBP's commitment to responding to public inquiries regarding monitoring mitigations is found at DHS Directive 023-01, Appendix A, 1.C(5). CBP will report summary monitoring information as appropriate and meaningful given the projects and environmental concerns and any additional reporting requirements from DHS.
316	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Regarding the periodic measurements of environmental resources, CBP should ask for assistance from park service and forest service scientists who may have knowledge of landscape conditions over the long-term ND can more easily identify changes or impacts.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
317	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The draft PEIS does not mention that the U.S. government has subst. treaty obligations (World Heritage Convention) to protect the natural values of Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park. NCPA requests that this issue be specifically addressed in PEIS	CBP added a list of all World Heritage sites within the study area and clarified their unique value and protections.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
318	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	In the past, regardless of MOU's between CBP and NPS, CBP has occasionally pursued border related activities within national parks that should have resulted in prior consultation, but did not. NCPA hopes that the guidance and actions described in the PEIS that relate to coordination and consultation with the NPS will be followed and that future cooperation between these agencies will result in a safer border and healthier environment along that border.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
320	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The most important aspect of any and all future activities on the Northern Border is the need for site specific NEPA analysis	Added to the end of 1.1 Purpose of the PEIS: "CBP would not implement any alternative or any element of any alternative in this PEIS based solely on the analysis presented in this document. Material proposed changes to CBP activities meeting the definition of "major Federal action" (40 CFR 1508.18) would be subjected to further NEPA review at the appropriate level of analysis and documentation. This FPEIS would provide background information for incorporation into those more project-specific plans. However, site-specific NEPA will continue to be completed for all projects that would have required it prior to the PEIS. Subsequent environmental analysis documents for specific projects within the area studied in this PEIS will "tier off" or draw upon the general information in this area-wide programmatic analysis document. "

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
321	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	NCPA is concerned that the impacts of projects may extend beyond the analysis area, as stated in the draft PEIS: "The region of impacts varies, however, depending on the activity and the resource being assessed. For that reason, the region of impact can extend beyond the current lines. NCPA believes tiering off of PEIS for projects that extend beyond the project area is incorrect and inappropriate.	Added to the end of 1.1 Purpose of the PEIS: "CBP would not implement any alternative or any element of any alternative in this PEIS based solely on the analysis presented in this document. Material proposed changes to CBP activities meeting the definition of "major Federal action" (40 CFR 1508.18) would be subjected to further NEPA review at the appropriate level of analysis and documentation. This FPEIS would provide background information for incorporation into those more project-specific plans. However, site-specific NEPA will continue to be completed for all projects that would have required it prior to the PEIS. Subsequent environmental analysis documents for specific projects within the area studied in this PEIS will "tier off" or draw upon the general information in this area-wide programmatic analysis document. "
322	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	NCPA believes it is important to have a separate environmental resource category about RF/EM radiation because it is not just a HHS issue and can harm animals, and there is ample precedent for RF radiation exposure associated with radar systems to be included in the PEIS.	CBP does not believe that it should further segment resource areas in the PEIS because it dilutes presentation of synergistic/combined impacts to the affected environment by cutting it into ever smaller resources areas regardless of actual relative level of impacts. Instead CBP added more reference to potential for FR/EM radiation exposure to other natural resources in the biological resources consideration area. For example, "The presence and operation of communication towers can cause long-term impacts to avian habitat, mortality, and behavior from tower collisions and/or tower avoidance. Lights on towers and other infrastructure may, under intermittent circumstances, attract avian species near electromagnetic or radio frequency emitting sources."

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
324	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Action/Alternati ve/Activities	The final PEIS could be improved by extending the range of alternatives by providing variations of the Flexible Direction Alternative.	The alternatives used in the PEIS were developed to provide CBP decisionmakers with a basis for understanding the relative environmental impacts associated with implementing different sets of tools/activities used to facilitate border security along the Northern Border. These alternatives provide a reasonable range of approaches to choose from to meet yet unidentified future threats. The relative environmental impacts that would likely occur from implementing each the alternatives are presented in the PEIS in narrative and tabular form throughout the document. They evidence the different environmental considerations inherent to any strategic approach. Chapter 1 of the final further clarifies this approach.
325	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Importantly, continued and improved consultation and coordination with federal land managers, especially the NPS will help this project meet its goals while avoiding unnecessary impacts to the natural environment.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
326	David Graves	National Parks Conservation Association	Admin Process	Finally, the CBP needs to make a dedicated effort to engage in a thorough analysis of site-specific impacts for future projects tiered off of the PEIS and not rely solely on the analysis from the PEIS	Added to the end of 1.1 Purpose of the PEIS: "CBP would not implement any alternative or any element of any alternative in this PEIS based solely on the analysis presented in this document. Material proposed changes to CBP activities meeting the definition of "major Federal action" (40 CFR 1508.18) would be subjected to further NEPA review at the appropriate level of analysis and documentation. This FPEIS would provide background information for incorporation into those more project-specific plans. However, site-specific NEPA will continue to be completed for all projects that would have required it prior to the PEIS. Subsequent environmental analysis documents for specific projects within the area studied in this PEIS will "tier off" or draw upon the general information in this area-wide programmatic analysis document. "
331	Dee Miller		No Comment/Beyond Scope	Where can we read the public comments that have been submitted?	See Appendix A-2: Public Comments on the Draft PEIS.
340	Don Dickson	Vermont Sierra Club	Impact Data/Analysis Determination & Action/Alternative/ Activities	In chapter 7 regarding the NE region (7.17.2.1) it does not mention VT or the Green Mountains; contains voluminous factual info but no mention of impacts of proposed actions	CBP included reference to Vermont and the Green Mountains. Impacts analysis information is contained within chapter 8.
341	Don Dickson	Vermont Sierra Club	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	8.18.3 page 8-18.2 Biological Resources - does not describe or explain any projected effects of CBP activities, or what those activities might be; merely states that impacts will be less than major but does not justify this statement and gives no examples to support statement	The purpose of this PEIS is to generalize potential impacts and provide info for decision-making. Specific actions would require specific review for potential env impacts through the NEPA required EA/EIS process

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
351	Don Dickson	Vermont Sierra Club	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Assess Carbon Dioxide emissions and other CC impacts in project analysis...it is a requirement. Climate Change has already, and will increasingly, involve substantial climatic disturbances such as rising temps, extreme weather events, seasonal changes affecting flora and fauna, increased invasive species, species migration, ground level ozone, and AQ	Added a reference in the text of the final to identify that "Data on CO2 emissions from construction of various tactical security infrastructure projects can be found at Appendix J1-9 and J1-10."
356	Don Dickson	Vermont Sierra Club	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Following will be negatively impacted by any intrusive border structure or activity and should be protected: Missisquoi NWR, Highgate State Park Natural Area, Missisquoi River crossings at East Richford/Lake Memphremagog, Canada View property, Proposed Eagle Point SP, State Wildlife Mgt areas, Nulhegan Basin Division NWR, and Public lands in VT	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
359	Edgar Oerichbauer	City of Ranier	Action/Alternati ve/Activities	The Northern Border PEIS lacked any conclusive evidence that this undertaking was needed.	The PEIS clarifies in Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION that CBP prepared this PEIS for Northern Border Activities is to inform decision-makers about potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts that could occur if CBP were were required to implement major program enhancements to the improve security along the United States Northern Border with Canada.
363	Edgar Oerichbauer	Koochiching County Historical Society	Tech Edits & Impact Data/Analysis Determination	After an initial reading of the draft Northern Border PEIS, it is apparent that there is much confusion on the different types of land management and about the missions and responsibilities of different agencies.	Thank you for your comment. CBP has made the appropriate corrections
364	Edgar Oerichbauer	Koochiching County Historical Society	Tech Edits	Stating that the USFS manages national parks (page 5.8-11) is confusing	Thank you for your comment. CBP has made the appropriate corrections

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
404	George Eskridge	House of Representatives State of Idaho	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Addressing threats and hazards early including natural disasters and man-made threats, including terrorism	The purpose and need for the proposed action now clarifies that CBP needs to take a risk-based approach to identify and resolve threats efficiently.
405	George Eskridge	House of Representatives State of Idaho	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Trade facilitation economic growth and jobs to pursue creative and effective solutions to manage the flow of traffic between Canada and the United States.	Thank you for your comment. CBP must execute its mission with regard to the considerations of the Beyond the Border Action Plan which address trade and travel promotion and economic growth.
406	George Eskridge	House of Representatives State of Idaho	Action/Alternati ve/Activities	Integrated cross-border law enforcement to build an existing bilateral law enforcement program	The PEIS addresses the variety of domestic and cross-border partnerships which facilitate a risk-based approach to border security.
407	George Eskridge	House of Representatives State of Idaho	Action/Alternati ve/Activities	Critical infrastructure and cyber security to implement a comprehensive cross-border approach	The PEIS addresses the physical infrastructure with the potential to impact the physical environment.
413	Johnna Exner		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	document should address private property rights and construction related to property rights. ACTUAL COMMENT ...So this should address private property rights and constitution, and my comments are that land use and road construction and whatever decisions they decided to make, how it affects our private property.	See response to comment 34. Thank you for your comment. Programmatic documents are intended to address issues in a broad sense. As such, it cannot address private property rights. This document cannot address constitutional issues in that it deals with impacts to proposed actions.
414	Johnna Exner		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	What are the impacts to the people who live in these areas that are within the scope or within the stuff that's going to be done.	Thank you for your comment. The PEIS talks to the issue in a different manner than what you have requested. The document discusses impacts to such items as traffic, land use, air quality, etc. All of these are related to people but in a broader manner than this specific comment.
427	James Devine	USDOJ, USGS	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The DEIS describes in general terms a number of sensitive habitat types; however, it does discuss whether any of these sensitive habitats would be affected the proposed action. We suggest that the Final EIS identify and discuss the potential impacts.	The final says at 8.3.6.1 (first sentence): "Site-specific NEPA review would be required if impact to wildlife is a concern at a particular construction site. Planning activities will take the species into consideration within site-specific NEPA review. "

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
428	James Devine	USDOJ, USGS	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The DEIS does not include a list of birds found in the border area. Final EIS should include a list of birds in the border area and address possible impacts.	Various information on species of all types are incorporated through the references used to prepare this PEIS. Since no specific areas are identified for future activities, it would be impossible to assess impacts to all birds or any other species types in detail.
444	Joe McKay	Native Americans	Tech Edits & Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The EIS lists Indian lands in the same category as public lands. They are not public lands, they are owned by the government in trust from Indian tribes.	Corrected to read as: "Public and other non-private land ownership (by Federal agency, Canadian National Parks and Indian Reservations, and state); and"
463	Joe Scott	International Programs Director Conservation Northwest	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Urge CBP to consult closely with USFWS, USFS, NPS, NMFS, USGS, and state wildlife agencies/entities such as the Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee/subcommittees/tech teams and International Mt. Caribou Tech team to protect ecological integrity of land	CBP added reference to mechanisms for consulting and coordinating with DOI agencies and Forest Service on sensitive species, habitats, and wildlife movement. Coordination with Canadian agencies on transboundary species concerns would necessarily be done through our Federal natural resource management partners and the Department of State.
464	Joe Scott	International Programs Director Conservation Northwest	No Comment/Beyond Scopes & Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Also request that CBP consult with Canadian federal and provincial wildlife ministries about potential impacts to at-risk and sensitive transboundary species	CBP added reference to mechanisms for consulting and coordinating with DOI agencies and Forest Service on sensitive species, habitats, and wildlife movement. Coordination with Canadian agencies on transboundary species concerns would necessarily be done through our Federal natural resource management partners and the Department of State.
465	Joe Scott	International Programs Director Conservation Northwest	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Concerned about projects/activities/infrastructure that have practical effects of increasing human interactions with grizzlies, wolverines, wolves, and lynx and other species that have "peninsular" ranges and very vulnerable populations on WA, ID, MT, BC	The final says at 8.3.6.1 (first sentence): "Site-specific NEPA review would be required if impact to wildlife is a concern at a particular construction site. Planning activities will take the species into consideration within site-specific NEPA review. "
466	Joe Scott	International Programs Director Conservation Northwest	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Movement across the border for wildlife (grizzlies and mt. caribou) is very important and barriers like roads, backcountry motorized use and major energy developed projects already exist	The final says at 8.3.6.1 (first sentence): "Site-specific NEPA review would be required if impact to wildlife is a concern at a particular construction site. Planning activities will take the species into consideration within site-specific NEPA review. "

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
467	Joe Scott	Internation Programs Director Conservation Northwest	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Paramount that CBP projects are consistent with wildlife mgt habitat standards and recovery planning and objectives of wildlife agencies. Wildlife agencies have worked for decades to secure/recover sensitive species in shared US/Canadian ecosystems and they seek to adapt to what will certainly be profound climate related habitat changes and uncertainties.	CBP added reference to mechanisms for consulting and coordinating with DOI agencies and Forest Service on sensitive species, habitats, and wildlife movement. Coordination with Canadian agencies on transboundary species concerns would necessarily be done through our Federal natural resource management partners and the Department of State.
476	Joe Scott	Internation Programs Director Conservation Northwest	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Consult with biologists and GIS experts who are working to identify core and linkage zone habitats for species in order to avoid further impacts and maintain habitat effectiveness	CBP added reference to mechanisms for consulting and coordinating with DOI agencies and Forest Service on sensitive species, habitats, and wildlife movement. Coordination with Canadian agencies on transboundary species concerns would necessarily be done through our Federal natural resource management partners and the Department of State.
485	Johnna Exner		Tech Edits & Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Page 4.8-12 Map of land ownership in WOR, this map is woefully lacking on any designation of private land ownership. In Ferry County, 1999 there were 233,845 acres of private land yet this is not represented	The final does a better job clarifying that the private land discussed in the document is private land held in trust or otherwise for conservation purposes.
486	Johnna Exner		Impact Data/Analysis Determination & Tech Edits	4.9-3 lines 13 and 14 "Certain recreational users..." please identify who is referred to here in order to ascertain why these "certain" people have a clearer view of CBP infrastructure and activities	CBP clarified that recreational users who accessed areas where CBP infrastructure was present would have a clearer view of structures.
487	Johnna Exner		Tech Edits & Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Page 4.10-1 Lines 22, 23, and 24 this is an overall definition and should be regionally specific. The West side or "Blain Sector" of WA State is entirely different than the "Spokane Sector" both economically and culturally	CBP stands by this definition as sufficient for the PEIS.
493	Johnna Exner		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	I submit that the change and delays at the POEs in the Spokane sector have been detrimental to the small communities trade, recreation, and economy along both sides of the border. This should be an economic concern in this economic period	CBP stands by its discussion of impacts from wait times at POEs in various parts of the document.

Appendix A-2

Table A-2.2

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
509	June Bergquist	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	We welcome projects that restore Idaho's impaired waters like the Boundary creek, which calls for an increase of shade	CBP has added text to the document committing to better coordination with state and local agencies with expertise in BMPs and planning to avoid water impacts.
510	June Bergquist	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Steep slopes, erosive thin soils, a short construction season, rain on snow events, and an abundance of streams both perennial and intermittent, create a difficult physical env for development of roads and other infrastructure. Specialized BMP's are sometimes required to protect water resources and achieve stable sites during and after construction. Our office can help you by reviewing stormwater pollution prevention plans and providing other information you might find useful.	The final PEIS states at 8.5 that it is common practice in the civil construction industry (and is often specified in the issuance of construction permits) to implement best management practices (BMPs) such as silt fences, silt dams, and mulching for sediment and erosion control. These BMPs substantially reduce the amount of sediment leaving construction sites and entering receiving waters."
514	June Bergquist	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Construction projects in this state that are one or more acres in sized require an EPA NPDES construction general permit to reduce water pollution from eroding construction sites on privately owned land. We encourage you to adhere to this	In the final 8.4.2 does say "A soil erosion plan would help to control the impact of impermeable surfaces; NPDES permitting may apply." Could expand if desired.
515	June Bergquist	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Idaho is unique in that many individuals use surface water ad their source of drinking water as do several public systems. Care is necessary when planning projects near streams, rivers, and lakes so these are not impacted.	CBP has added text to the document committing to better coordination with state and local agencies with expertise in BMPs and planning to avoid water impacts.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
527	Kathleen Mecca	Niagara Gateway Columbus Park Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Over the past town years medical research has determined that commercial traffic at the peace bridge contributes to high rates of asthma on Buffalo's West Side which are 4 times above the national average.. The CDC, American Cancer Association, American Heart Association, and the American Lung Association report cancer, heart attack, stroke, DVT, diabetes, and birth defects might also be linked to carcinogens found in diesel exhaust and diesel soot. the Clean Air coalition of Western New York recently reported the same cancer causing agents found at the Tonawanda Coke Plant in Tonawanda NY are found in diesel emission. Residents who live along the Peace Bridge corridor can no longer be expected to endure this threat [air quality] to their health any longer. A stronger, healthier community requires a cross border infrastructure that undoes the serious damages which have been inflicted upon the communit and its health.	CBP thanks you for your comment. We incorporated some consideration of health aspects from vehicle emissions at border crossings into the PEIS. We have done this at the programmtic level while trying to indicate where more traffic occurs. The purpose of this PEIS is to generalize potential impacts and provide info for decision-making. Specific actions would require specific review for potential env impacts through the NEPA required EA/EIS process.
532	Kathleen Mecca	Niagara Gateway Columbus Park Association	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	the lack of space also makes future build-out unsuitable for expanding the footprint of the Peace Bridge plaza, increasing the inspection capacity, facilitating a higher volume of commercial traffic or building a super-sized Duty Free store off of the plaza	CBP thanks you for your comment. This PEIS attempted to indicate where more cross-border traffic occurs. The purpose of this PEIS is to generalize potential impacts and provide info for decision-making. Specific actions would require specific review for potential env impacts through the NEPA required EA/EIS process.
537	Laurance Beahan	Sierra Club	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Any physical changes CBP might consider need to include Buffalo waterfront, the Niagara River from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario critical habitats. Any physical changes CBP might consider in the Niagara River Greenway should be carefully vetted through the Niagara River Greenway Commission and the local public	The purpose of a PEIS is to generalize potential impacts and provide info for decision-making. Specific actions would require specific review for potential env impacts through the NEPA required EA/EIS process.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
562	Lori Dowling	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	In the framework for analysis -Recreation and Conservation resource areas the lists (p 3-34 - 3-37) provided do not include National Forest lands without a special designation or tribal lands. These lands meet the definition of "most likely used for recreation in the US"	Tribal lands have their own sovereignty and their use will be primarily defined by the associated tribes. National Forest lands likewise have multiple recreation and conservation uses as well as other responsibilities.
564	Lori Dowling	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	In chapter 5, page 5.5-3 this section should include mention of candidate Wild and Scenic rivers.	The number of river segments eligible for study in the Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) is considerable. CBP will consult with Federal land managers on any NRI listed segments within their jurisdiction.
566	Lori Dowling	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	On pages 5.5-4 to 5.5-5 there is no mention that the Pigeon River forms a portion of the Border at the east end of this segment and empties into Lake Superior - the Lake Superior Basin Watershed; also Rainy River Basin is incorrectly mapped	In the final, the description of the Rainy River Basin is correct and the Pigeon River's relationship to the border is mentioned in the Floodplains subsection of section 5.5.
567	Lori Dowling	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	On page 5.6-5 there is no mention of legal protection of natural soundscapes in the Wilderness Areas via the Wilderness Act	Natural landscapes protection in Wilderness Areas derives from Federal land management agency policies beyond the Wilderness Act. CBP will consult with Federal land management agencies regarding all land use policies for specially designated areas.
568	Lori Dowling	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Page 5.8-6 Tables 5.8-4, 5.8-5, 5.8-6: the province of Ontario is adjacent to a significant portion of this Border segment which includes Provincial Parks is not included in these tables	Additional information on provincial parks is included in the appendix referenced in the subsection on Canadian land ownership.
569	Lori Dowling	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Page 5.9-5 statement: "The states within the study area with the greatest share of federal land ownership are ID, WA, and MT..." The size of the public land base is not necessarily an accurate metric of recreation use since use levels vary.	The statement is not a metric, but a statement that there is a great potential for recreational use in these large states with large areas for recreational use.
570	Lori Dowling	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Ch. 8 Environmental Consequences Line 40-41 - This section should acknowledge that European earthworm propagates can also be introduced with placement of fill soils.	CBP is aware of the potential for harm through the intro of invasive species and will continue to monitor this issue

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
582	Matt Morrison	Pacific Northwest Economic Region	Action/Alternati ve/Activities	Use the principles of the Beyond the Border Work Group to study actions and alternatives. Therefore PNWER opposes the Tactical Security Infrastructure Deployment Alternative and any subsequent program to build barriers, fences, or similar infrastructure on the northern border	This PEIS was initiated before the Beyond the Border Work Group produced its action plan. The final acknowledges its influence on CBP planning. As is further clarified in the final, CBP would only use barriers at specific points of concern where other methods of border monitoring could not be maintained easily. No "border fence" is contemplated within this PEIS.
592	Matt Rudolf	National Parks Conservation Association	Action/Alternati ve/Activities	While the document contains a positive intent and some approaches for collaboration with federal land management agencies regarding CBP activities, more consultation is needed and planned for collaboration actually has to occur un the future	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
596	Merlan Paaverud	North Dakota State Historical Society Officer	Tech Edits	Page 5.11-8: Ambrose Border Inspection Station and two residences are recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The eligibility recommendations are in "Evaluation of Buildings and Structures at the Land Ports of Entry in North Dakota prepared by Michael Baker.	CBP thanks you for your comments and has ensured that these eligibility recommendations are incorporated into the PEIS (by reference).
597	Merlan Paaverud	North Dakota State Historical Society Officer	Tech Edits	Page 5.11-9: St. John Border Inspection Station, two residences (since removed), and two fuel storage sheds are recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The eligibility recommendations are in "Evaluation of Buildings and Structures at the Land Ports of Entry in North Dakota prepared by Michael Baker.	CBP thanks you for your comments and has ensured that these eligibility recommendations are incorporated into the PEIS (by reference).

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
598	Merlan Paaverud	North Dakota State Historical Society Officer	Tech Edits	Page 5.11-9: Portal Border Inspection Station and Commercial Inspection Station are recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The eligibility recommendations are in "Evaluation of Buildings and Structures at the Land Ports of Entry in North Dakota prepared by Michael Baker.	CBP thanks you for your comments and has ensured that these eligibility recommendations are incorporated into the PEIS (by reference).
600	Anenhaienton		Impact Data/Analysis Determination & No Comment/Beyo nd Scope	Air units fly very low with lights off several times a day and almost hit my house	CBP aircraft fly at higher altitudes during the daytime due to greater visibility and always have lights on during nighttime patrol. We believe that these are not CBP's aircraft, but are reviewing our flight operations.
603	Anenhaienton		Action/Alternati ve/Activities	Doesn't see an option for a reduction in security. Doesn't think all the security is necessary or that it even works.	Reduction in security does not mee the purpose and need.
623	Ms. Jock		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	It is not clear what the cumulative impact assessments are.	The cumulative impact assessments provide a perspective on other impact causing activities within the region of study that CBP's activities' impacts could interact with to increase the overall impact determination.
624	Michael Mitchell	Mohawk Council of Akwasasne	Tribal Concern & Action/Alternati ve/Activities	the Mohawk Council of Akwasasne represents the Northern territory of Akwasasne with Mohawk lands that lie along the St. Lawrence River. We are located in the Great Lakes region, and we noted that Mohawk lands are not listed amongst the Native American lands.	The final (as did the draft) has Mohawk lands included in 6.8.2.3 Land Ownership..., Table 6.8-7 Land Ownership in the Great Lakes Region, and Figure 6.11-1 Native American Lands within the 100-mile PEIS Corridor.... CBP clarified the points where it said St. Regis Indian Reservation to say St. Regis Mowhawk Tribe Indian Reservation.
626	Michael Mitchell	Mohawk Council of Akwasasne	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	As the CBP continues to expand its facilities and services, we believe there is great potential for socioeconomic and cultural impacts on our people.	CBP is committed to addressing specific socioeconomic and cultural imapcts in site-specific document for any proposals in the future if/when they ofccur. The final PEIS makes it more clear that CBP is not planning a great expansion of activities based on the PEIS determinations.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
629	Michael Mitchell	Mohawk Council of Akwesasne	Tribal Data Concern & Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Relationship building, cultural awareness training, and effective communication are keys to minimizing socioeconomic and cultural impacts on our people. It will take our collective effort if the CBP is to be the most effective at fulfilling its mission.	<p>The final added more explanation about its Environmental and Cultural Stewardship Training for agents: "1.2.2.3 Environmental Awareness line 37 on: Environmental and Cultural Stewardship Training, prepared jointly by CBP, the Department of Interior, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture-Forest Service, is mandatory for all USBP agents and available to all CBP personnel. This training provides practical guidelines to practice awareness of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural and cultural resources in the operational environment; • Lands and places set aside for preservation, conservation, or appreciation of unique natural or cultural values; and • People and departments that use or manage that land, including sensitivity to Government-to-Government relations with Tribes. <p>All CBP components otherwise provide environmental and cultural resources training appropriate to their personnel's daily responsibilities."</p>
630	Mel Heinrich		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Concerned that about the cost and time it takes to do numerous inspections of ships is slowing down the commerce	Ship inspection is beyond the scope of the NB PEIS. Inspections are conducted as a result of each nation's responsibilities to protect its citizens from agricultural pests, to collect custom's duties, search for cross border stowaways, and other issues. It should be noted that the Free Trade Act does allow for better trade between the US and Canada.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
631	Mel Heinrich		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Speed up border crossing process by only showing Drivers License for ID	After the terrorist attack on September 11, 2011 programs were put into effect to better identify visitors entering the United States. U.S. and Canadian residents can apply to make their exit and re-entry easier under the Trusted Traveler programs. The Fast Drive program, Nexus Program, SENTRI Program and or the Global Entry program are all WHTI compliant programs that may speed up travel. Keep in mind that depending upon which port of entry or airport that is located in your specific area, one or all of these programs may or may not be available at time of the completion of this PEIS.
632	Mel Heinrich		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Speed up border crossing by using HAZMAT background check instead of running another background check (to get certain other licenses).	After the terrorist attack on September 11, 2011 programs were put into effect to better identify visitors entering the United States. U.S. and Canadian residents can apply to make their exit and re-entry easier under the Trusted Traveler programs. The Fast Drive program, Nexus Program, SENTRI Program and or the Global Entry program are all WHTI compliant programs that may speed up travel. Keep in mind that depending upon which port of entry or airport that is located in your specific area, one or all of these programs may or may not be available at time of the completion of this PEIS.
635	Mohammad Arif	Selfridge ANG Base	Tech Edits	Page ES-1: Lines 31-38 contain repeated sentences	Thank you for your comment. CBP corrected the sentence.
636	Mohammad Arif	Selfridge ANG Base	Tech Edits	Page ES-1: Line 39, change evolution to evaluation	Factual correction. Thank you for your comment. Although the word "evolution" was intended there, CBP has further clarified the idea of doing an evaluation to account for changes (or evolutions) in environmental conditions surrounding our activities.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
657	No Name 1		Action/Alternative/Activities	Concentrate the effort at the actual border, status quo is preferred. Too many agencies there stumbling over each other.	The majority of effort is concentrated at the border, however, 4,000 miles is a very large area and looking both beyond the border northward with Canadian partners and southward with other Federal, State, local, and tribal partners provides efficiencies in detecting CBVs.
659	No Name 12		Tech Edits	pg. 7.11-7 map does not include any lands owned by the Aroostook Band of Micmacs	The description associated with the map does mention the lands of the Aroostook Band of Micmacs.
660	No Name 12		Tribal Data Concern	pg. 7.11-16 table 7.11-4 Native American Tribes that have Reservation, Judicially established interest, or established traditional ties or land within the 100-mile PEIS Corridor who makes up the Wabanaki Nation?	CBP included all Federally-recognized tribes with land within the area of study in the PEIS.
673	No Name 5		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The effect of such a border on migratory patterns of wildlife will be devastated	The PEIS clarifies in Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION that CBP prepared this PEIS for Northern Border Activities is to inform decision-makers about potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts that could occur if CBP were required to implement major program enhancements to improve security along the United States Northern Border with Canada.
674	No Name 5		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Already the impacts of climate change is altering the habitat of all forms of life from the smallest fungi to the largest trees, from the smallest mammals to the megafauna that inhabit this part of the U.S.	The PEIS clarifies in Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION that CBP prepared this PEIS for Northern Border Activities is to inform decision-makers about potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts that could occur if CBP were required to implement major program enhancements to improve security along the United States Northern Border with Canada.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
675	No Name 5		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Such a border will devastate the patterns of migration and the ability of such life to move northward during the future major shift in our climate which is already occurring	The PEIS clarifies in Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION that CBP prepared this PEIS for Northern Border Activities is to inform decision-makers about potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts that could occur if CBP were were required to implement major program enhancements to the improve security along the United States Northern Border with Canada.
676	No Name 5		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	the impact on life in general and major ethnic communities will be equally devastating	The PEIS clarifies in Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION that CBP prepared this PEIS for Northern Border Activities is to inform decision-makers about potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts that could occur if CBP were were required to implement major program enhancements to the improve security along the United States Northern Border with Canada.
677	No Name 5		Action/Alternati ve/Activities	Why is the government agents only consider the most harmful ways to cope with problems rather than looking at more reliable and less damaging projects	The PEIS clarifies in Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION that CBP prepared this PEIS for Northern Border Activities is to inform decision-makers about assessing potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts that could occur if CBP were were required to implement major program enhancements to the improve security along the United States Northern Bborder with Canada.
678	No Name 6		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	This PEIS will have vast effects on the psyches of the individuals who inhabit the PEIS area	The PEIS clarifies in Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION that CBP prepared this PEIS for Northern Border Activities is to inform decision-makers about potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts that could occur if CBP were were required to implement major program enhancements to the improve security along the United States Northern Border with Canada.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
688	Pat Carneal		Action/Alternative/Activities	I am appalled by the possibility of your BP expanding it's presence all over our public lands here on the Olympic peninsula of WA state	The PEIS clarifies in Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION that CBP prepared this PEIS for Northern Border Activities is to inform decision-makers about potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts that could occur if CBP were required to implement major program enhancements to the improve security along the United States Northern Border with Canada.
696	Paul Danicic	Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness	Beyond Scope	Webster-Ashburton treaty of 1842 is still in effect, Article II states [portages near Lake Superior] shall be free and open to both countries	We thank you for this comment. It is beyond the scope of this PEIS.
697	Paul Danicic	Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness	Action/Alternative/Activities	"Trans Boundary Protected Area" are generally "managed in parallel" and includes Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and other lands in this area. This area should be treated differently than the better defined border areas. Should be treated as "leave well enough alone" "unless and until there is any indication that these might present any special border enforcement issues".	CBP identified Transboundary Protected Areas in the appropriate regional environment sections in the final and discussed their treatment in Land Use environmental consequences.
699	Paul Danicic	Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness	Action/Alternative/Activities	If enforcement is needed in Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness , all measures should be taken to first work with the governing land agencies like UFS and NPS to minimize ecological, visual, and auditory impacts.	CBP is committed to working with all Federal and state land managers to determine ways to mitigate adverse impacts while maintaining CBP's security mission.
712	Mark Mitskovski		Admin Process	Requests a meeting in Buffalo	CBP had a limited budget and we were informed by our counterparts that Rochester was a good location by which to split the travel distance between major areas. During our first set of public meetings, CBP did not receive strong requests to hold the public meeting in Buffalo so CBP returned to Rochester.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
713	Mark Mitskovski		Admin Process	Why we chose to have a meeting in Rochester and not Buffalo.	CBP had a limited budget and we were informed by our counterparts that Rochester was a good location by which to split the travel distance between major areas. During our first set of public meetings, CBP did not receive strong requests to hold the public meeting in Buffalo so CBP returned to Rochester.
715	Mark Mitskovski		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	25,000 document cases of asthma in children around the Peace Bridge due to commercial truck driving.	CBP thanks you for your comment. We incorporated some consideration of health aspects from vehicle emissions at border crossings into the PEIS. We have done this at the programmatic level while trying to indicate where more traffic occurs. The purpose of this PEIS is to generalize potential impacts and provide info for decision-making. Specific actions would require specific review for potential env impacts through the NEPA required EA/EIS process.
716	Mark Mitskovski		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Consideration of environmental issues that surround the Peace Bridge and direct impact the bridge and traffic have on the community.	Thank you for your comment. These impacts are addressed generally within the PEIS. Site specific analysis would cover issues related to the Peace Bridge itself.
718	Mark Mitskovski		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Not considering the impact to the community from activities on the Peace Bridge (lost wages, children being out of school) and enabling the bridge operator to do these activities .	Thank you for your comment. These impacts are addressed generally within the PEIS. Site specific analysis would cover issues related to the Peace Bridge itself.
720	Mark Mitskovski		Action/Alternative/Activities	Expand scope of EIS.	Thank you for your comment. These impacts are addressed generally within the PEIS. Site specific analysis would cover issues related to the Peace Bridge itself.
722	Mark Mitskovski		Impact Data/Analysis Determination	PEIS is too short on the environmental impacts. Spend too much time talking about flora and fauna and less about people.	Thank you for your comment. These impacts are addressed generally within the PEIS. Site specific analysis would cover issues related to the Peace Bridge itself.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
737	Scott Nicol	Sierra Club	Action/Alternative/Activities	There are no actual alternatives to the preferred action in the draft PEIS. A revised draft PEIS should be developed that actually looks at a range of alternatives. Issues with the Flexible Direction Alternative being the preferred alternative so no other alternatives being considered.	The alternatives used in the PEIS were developed to provide CBP decisionmakers with a basis for understanding the relative environmental impacts associated with implementing different sets of tools/activities used to facilitate border security along the Northern Border. These alternatives provide a reasonable range of approaches to choose from to meet yet unidentified future threats. The relative environmental impacts that would likely occur from implementing each the alternatives are presented in the PEIS in narrative and tabular form throughout the document. They evidence the different environmental considerations inherent to any strategic approach.
738	Scott Nicol	Sierra Club	Action/Alternative/Activities	If no fence is being considered as part of this project, a revised draft PEIS should be issued with references to fencing excised so the stakeholders can focus their comments on the potential impacts under consideration. Fencing is listed under Tactical Security Alternative but in Canadian press comment said a border fence along the northern border is not being considered. Or clarification on apparent conflict is necessary.	The alternatives used in the PEIS were developed to provide CBP decisionmakers with a basis for understanding the relative environmental impacts associated with implementing different sets of tools/activities used to facilitate border security along the Northern Border. These alternatives provide a reasonable range of approaches to choose from to meet yet unidentified future threats. The relative environmental impacts that would likely occur from implementing each the alternatives are presented in the PEIS in narrative and tabular form throughout the document. They evidence the different environmental considerations inherent to any strategic approach.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
747	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternati ve/Activities	Most fundamental flaw: failure to identify a true proposed action. An EIS that does not analyze a proposed strategy does not provide the analysis necessary for implementation of a strategy	The alternatives used in the PEIS were developed to provide CBP decisionmakers with a basis for understanding the relative environmental impacts associated with implementing different sets of tools/activities used to facilitate border security along the Northern Border. These alternatives provide a reasonable range of approaches to choose from to meet yet unidentified future threats. The relative environmental impacts that would likely occur from implementing each the alternatives are presented in the PEIS in narrative and tabular form throughout the document. They evidence the different environmental considerations inherent to any strategic approach.
748	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternati ve/Activities	PEISs typically have well-defined proposed actions - for example, a management plan, guidelines, or a strategy - and alternatives to the proposed action	The alternatives used in the PEIS were developed to provide CBP decisionmakers with a basis for understanding the relative environmental impacts associated with implementing different sets of tools/activities used to facilitate border security along the Northern Border. These alternatives provide a reasonable range of approaches to choose from to meet yet unidentified future threats. The relative environmental impacts that would likely occur from implementing each the alternatives are presented in the PEIS in narrative and tabular form throughout the document. They evidence the different environmental considerations inherent to any strategic approach.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
749	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternative/Activities	Contrary to the NEPA regulations promulgated by the CEQ and binding all federal agencies, the draft PEIS fails to identify any alternatives other than the proposed action. The Flexible Direction Alternative (aka all alternatives), is the preferred alternative, there is nothing outside of the preferred alternative that was studied in the DPEIS	The alternatives used in the PEIS were developed to provide CBP decisionmakers with a basis for understanding the relative environmental impacts associated with implementing different sets of tools/activities used to facilitate border security along the Northern Border. These alternatives provide a reasonable range of approaches to choose from to meet yet unidentified future threats. The relative environmental impacts that would likely occur from implementing each the alternatives are presented in the PEIS in narrative and tabular form throughout the document. They evidence the different environmental considerations inherent to any strategic approach.
751	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternative/Activities	NEPA requires an agency to consider a full range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action (<i>Bob Marshall Alliance v. Hodel</i>). Only looking at two very similar alternatives violates the mandate to review a full range of reasonable alternatives (<i>Muckleshoot</i>). The alternatives, are only a single proposed action that has been artificially, and likely temporarily, separated, are insufficient to satisfy NEPA	See response to comment 24. CBP's need is to have the ability to respond to any threat or priority wherever and however it might emerge along the border. Scenario based alternatives would be limited to the scenario they were composed to counter. The alternatives in the PEIS are tools based and responsive to a wider range of threats at any points along the border.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
753	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternative/Activities	A revised draft PEIS should be developed that actually looks at a range of alternatives, rather than disingenuously breaking the preferred alternative into pieces that are easily reassembled. Alternatives might include a choice of strategy, such as placing an emphasis on increased security at the POEs as opposed to areas between the Ports	The alternatives used in the PEIS were developed to provide CBP decisionmakers with a basis for understanding the relative environmental impacts associated with implementing different sets of tools/activities used to facilitate border security along the Northern Border. These alternatives provide a reasonable range of approaches to choose from to meet yet unidentified future threats. The relative environmental impacts that would likely occur from implementing each the alternatives are presented in the PEIS in narrative and tabular form throughout the document. They evidence the different environmental considerations inherent to any strategic approach.
756	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternative/Activities	It would be wise to consider the desirable balance and policy direction at the strategic level for the northern border now, realizing that it might need to be adjusted to meet changing conditions in the future	This is CBP's point in proposing alternatives that are not rooted in a specific response scenario or specific points along the border.
757	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternative/Activities	An articulated strategy for the border security along the northern border could address implementation of a policy and protocol regarding CBP activities on public lands, recognizing the wide variety of both terrain and statutory uses of those lands.	CBP is not the land manager for the areas it patrols and protects. It is CBP's responsibility to adhere to the 1996 MOU and any site-specific agreements. We adhere to protocols set by the individual public land manager for patrols. However, pursuit policies necessarily protect agent safety first.
758	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternative/Activities	While the PEIS has much factual info about the history of native Americans and treaties and applicable laws, regulations and EO dealing with tribes, it appears devoid of any discussion regarding CBP's proposed actions to tribes and security/effects	There is no proposal to increase activities on native American lands. However, if any projects or activity increases were proposed in the future, CBP would consult with the specifically affected tribes/nations in accordance with Section 106 NHPA, any other applicable laws, and any specific programmatic agreements that applied.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
760	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Wildlife analysis insufficient to support site level activity. Activities to secure the border that preclude or reduce the ability animals to safely travel across boundary that are transboundary in distribution and rely on safe/unobstructive travel/connectivity will threatened the survival of these US populations	Concur that the PEIS is not sufficient to support any new site-level activity or specific new projects. CBP is aware of the importance of wildlife corridors and the transborder migration of wildlife. That concern will be specifically addressed as part of specific reviews of specific actions
773	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	PEIS provides general examples of types of impacts that result from certain activities and generally rates those impacts as "minor" to "moderate" but fails to estimate the level of development that could occur under this program over the next 5-7 years. Broad conclusions that have no basis in the info provided in the PEIS. The discussion of impacts resulting from the construction and maintenance of linear facilities makes it clear that severe consequences are likely from this action alternative. The description of the severity of impacts and the conclusion that impacts would be "minor" do not add up for linear construction (ch 8.3 p16-18). The only explanation given is mitigation will bring the level down but the PEIS admits potential depends on location and footprint (hence concern of not adding up).	CBP has considered the concerns regarding impacts from linear facilities and has clarified the conditions under which impacts would be greater than "minor." However, since mitigating BMPs, including siting decisions and the anticipated minimal footprint for infrastructure, are a part of all construction activities CBP maintains that the overall impact determination should be "minor."
778	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The Best Mgt, Minimization, and Mitigation section begins to flesh out the types of mitigation that should be used in site level development but fails to provide a comprehensive mitigation program and future CBP mitigation activities should not be limited to the content of this chapter. Some specific mitigation direction is given, but other recommendations are vague, and doesn't address what BMP's are and which are sufficient.	CBP has clarified that mitigations will necessarily be selected based on site-specific considerations and state and local requirements.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
780	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	BMPS that state "CBP will strive.." leaves much to be desired by members of the public seeking assurances that these irreplaceable resources will not be damaged by CBP activities (sensitive biological resources)	NEPA does not require assurances that there will be no disturbance at all to sensitive resources. Members of the public also want assurances that CBP will not compromise effective border protection while it complies with all applicable laws and regulations. CBP has clarified its commitment to enhance coordination and consultation with natural resource managers to limit impacts and assure compliance with mandated protections when it proposes specific projects.
781	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Activities affecting water resources lacks adequate measure for sedimentation from roads by restricting it to only "high" loads at construction sites...there is no quantitative definition for substantial. Identified construction activities affecting water resources do not include construction of new roads and trails, improving or modifying existing transportation networks; however, these appear to be included in the construction categories from chapter 2	New roads are dealt with in 8.5.4 of the PEIS. Due to the variability of soil properties and proximity/sensitivity of water bodies, CBP agrees that it should not restrict consideration of controls to "high" loads of sedimentation from construction sites.
787	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Land Use analysis in the PEIS fails to consider implications of future CBP activities on public land	CBP maintains that public land impacts were addressed adequately for a programmatic document of this nature.
788	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	PEIS fails to discuss what impact to the ownership type (lands) has on CBP activities. Leases/zoning laws/Memorandum of Understanding with public land managers must be considered.	Any specific impacts to CBP activities on specific parcels would be addressed in specific convenents and agreement documents.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
789	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	CBP should take advantage of land mgt agencies that already laid out pathway for minimizing and mitigating impacts to natural resources. FPEIS should acknowledge that public lands were established by Congress for the use and enjoyment of all Americans and that the responsibility to protect natural resources increases whenever public lands are used for CBP activities. Coordinate with the land mgt agencies and observance of their laws, regs, and plans as a primary avenue for meeting the obligation to the public and to future generations to preserve our public lands.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
800	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Due to border infrastructure and enforcement actions, impacts on aquatic environment include: effects on hydrological flows, toxic discharges and disturbance of aquatic habitat.	CBP concurs that these were addressed adequately for a programmatic document of this nature.
801	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Due to border infrastructure and enforcement actions, impacts on air include: impacts from potential construction and changes to traffic patterns and impacts to viewsheds	In the final this is generally covered in 8.2.1. "These effects would be primarily due to emissions from planned construction projects, and motorized ground, aircraft, and vessel patrols." Viewshed impacts are addressed in aesthetics.
805	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Some major impacts to wildlife from construction of physical border barriers and roads include: altered wildlife behavior/range from infrastructure construction/operational noise/night lighting/low altitude overflights/increased road mortality/isolation of veg strands/habitat patches/loss of cover/connectivity/rem veg/inter of genetic exchange	8.3.6.1 first sentence "Site-specific NEPA review would be required if impact to wildlife is a concern at a particular construction site. Planning activities will take the species into consideration within site-specific NEPA review. "

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
806	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	From construction of barriers and roads: Flora and fauna are vulnerable to significant loss/deterioration of their habitus, and/or increase in risk of human-caused mortality in borderlands	8.3.6.1 first sentence "Site-specific NEPA review would be required if impact to wildlife is a concern at a particular construction site. Planning activities will take the species into consideration within site-specific NEPA review. "
808	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	More intensive actions (then barriers and roads) such as fencing, light, noise devices, surveillance equipment, are likely to have more detrimental effects on species sensitive to human activity and developments	The final attempts to make it more clear that the impacts will vary based on the sensitivity of the resource and the location of the activity.
811	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternative/Activities	Nothing in Draft PEIS adequately informs the public as to what decisions will be made as a result of this process	CBP has stated the decisions it will make more explicitly in the Final PEIS. The decision will inform the public of what strategic approach CBP has determined meets its border security and trade and travel facilitation needs for the foreseeable future. It will not however, direct any specific future increase in activity.
815	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The Final PEIS and final decisions must ensure that activities of CBP are in concert with MOU (to minimize new road/trail construction) between fed agencies for recovery of grizzly bear...include MOU in PEIS. Grizzly bear analysis simplistic (8-3.9) and needs to be strengthened. Many ways to patrol without harming Grizzlies. Also need free access across border to protect population of grizzlies.	CBP is not the land manager for the areas it patrols and protects. It is CBP's responsibility to adhere to the 1996 MOU and any site-specific agreements. We adhere to protocols set by the individual public land manager for patrols. However, pursuit policies necessarily protect agent safety first.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
816	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternative/Activities & Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Some low-impact types of border patrol operations, such as using horses or pack strings, could be made compatible with wilderness and "backcountry" designations. Using ATVs and four wheel-drive vehicles would not be compatible.	CBP would cooperate/coordinate with the applicable Federal land managers and adhere to their management plans for proposed, recommended, and designated wilderness areas. If construction was identified as an absolute security need in a specific case, CBP would go through the proper environmental reviews and administrative procedures with the jurisdictional agencies and Congress for clearance to construct.
817	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternative/Activities	Oppose construction of facilities, including towers, fences, barriers, and buildings within Roadless areas, FS proposed wilderness areas, and existing designated wilderness areas prior to Congressional final decision. Any construction should take place within already developed areas.	CBP will cooperate/coordinate with the applicable Federal land managers and adhere to their management plans for proposed, recommended, and designated wilderness areas. If construction was identified as an absolute security need in a specific case, CBP would go through the proper environmental reviews and administrative procedures with the jurisdictional agencies and Congress for clearance to construct.
823	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Action/Alternative/Activities	The final PEIS should include provisions that all existing inventoried Roadless areas, as well as uninventoried areas are still unroaded, remain free of new roads built for CBP purposes	CBP would cooperate/coordinate with the applicable Federal land managers and adhere to their management plans for uninventoried unroaded and inventoried roadless areas. CBP cannot commit to never seeking to alter the road structure in roadless areas. However, CBP would go through proper administrative procedures through the Forest Service, and in cooperation with the Department of Interior as appropriate, if a change affecting road addition was required to fulfill a border security mandate.
824	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Ch. 7 about New England (7.17.2.1) does not mention Vermont or the Green Mountain National Forest. Whole PEIS contains voluminous factual info about the NE region but no mention of any env impacts of proposed CBP actions.	The final PEIS discusses the Green Mountain Forest in 7.17.2.1. Environmental impacts are addressed in Chapter 8.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
826	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	8.18.3 page 8-18.2 Biological Resources - does not describe or explain any projected effects of CBP activities, or what those activities might be; merely states that impacts will be less than major but does not justify this statement and gives no examples to support statement	The purpose of a PEIS is to generalize potential impacts and provide info for decision-making. Specific actions would require specific review for potential env impacts through the NEPA required EA/EIS process
830	Scott Nicol, Sierra Club, Wilderness Watch Wildlands CPR, Wildlands Network, Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative	11 organizations	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Assess Carbon Dioxide emissions and other CC impacts in project analysis...it is a requirement. Climate Change has already, and will increasingly, involve substantial climatic disturbances such as rising temps, extreme weather events, seasonal changes affecting flora and fauna, increased invasive species, species migration, ground level ozone, and AQ	Added a reference in the text of the final to identify that "Data on CO2 emissions from construction of various tactical security infrastructure projects can be found at Appendix J1-9 and J1-10."
848	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Tech Edits & Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The DPEIS incorrectly summarizes the primary purpose of the High Ross Treaty, which resolved a longstanding international environmental dispute by stating that, at least until 2065, the Ross damn would not be raised	Additional text was added regarding the 1984 Treaty and the international ecological, recreational, and cultural protection goals it outlined including that the High Ross Treaty also created the Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission (SEEC) to manage an endowment fund to preserve the area, pristine wilderness and fish and wildlife habitat in the Upper Skagit Watershed until 2065.
849	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Tech Edits & Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The DPEIS summary of the High Ross Treaty leaves out a critical part outlining the need for protecting the international ecological, recreational, and cultural significance of the Skagit Valley	Additional text was added regarding the 1984 Treaty and the international ecological, recreational, and cultural protection goals it outlined including that the High Ross Treaty also created the Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission (SEEC) to manage an endowment fund to preserve the area, pristine wilderness and fish and wildlife habitat in the Upper Skagit Watershed until 2065.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
862	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The Skagit within the North Cascades is home to both federally and state listed species, many of which depend on free movement across the border with secure habitat on either side.	Concerns regarding movement of wildlife across the border and potential impacts to that movement by CBP are generally addressed throughout the final.
863	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	It is unclear how CBP activities will consider and analyze site scale impacts to sensitive habitats and species that are discussed only broadly in this DPEIS	8.3.6.1 first sentence "Site-specific NEPA review would be required if impact to wildlife is a concern at a particular construction site. Planning activities will take the species into consideration within site-specific NEPA review. "
864	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Tech Edits	The description of the Okanogan and Wenatchee National forests and Pasayten Wilderness should be correctly identified in Washington State rather than Idaho. Portions of the Okanogan/Pasayten are in our interest area.	CBP added to and corrected and the discussion of the area.
865	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Tech Edits	The description of the North Cascades Complex should include: 3 units that are collectively managed by the NPS as a single administrative entity	CBP added to and corrected and the discussion of the area.
866	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Tech Edits	The description of the North Cascades Complex should include: information about the Stephen Mather Wilderness	CBP added to and corrected and the discussion of the area.
867	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Tech Edits	The description of the North Cascades Complex should include: Wilderness is a fundamental resource and value for the greater North Cascades ecosystem, in general, and for the North Cascades Complex in particular	CBP added to and corrected and the discussion of the area.
868	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Tech Edits	The description of the North Cascades Complex should include: The national park portion of the complex is almost entirely within wilderness...	CBP added to and corrected and the discussion of the area.
869	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	We believe this scope of discussion on climate change is too narrow. Should also include impact to state, regional, and national climate mitigation and adaptation strategies.	CBP is committed to working within state plans for air quality and sustainable land management to the extent feasible or otherwise required by law.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
874	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	The Land Use analysis in the DPEIS fails to consider implications for future CBP activities on public lands. Land use section also fails to discuss what impact ownership type has on CBP activities.	Under 1.2 CBP NORTHERN BORDER ACTIVITIES, the following was added starting at line 29: [Section 387(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides for CBP agents and officers "to board and search for aliens any vessel within the territorial waters of the United States and any railway car, aircraft, conveyance, or vehicle" within a "reasonable distance from an external boundary of the United States." Part 287 of Chapter 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations clarifies that 100-miles is a reasonable distance from an external boundary. Within the first 25 miles, CBP personnel have the right to access to private lands but not dwellings) to patrol the border to prevent the illegal entry of undocumented CBVs into the United States.]
876	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Impact Data/Analysis Determination & Action/Alternati ve/Activities	The DPEIS refers to MOE's that exist with public agencies, but the final decision must clearly outline the unique requirements of analysis and public engagement prior to any actions on public lands. How unique requirements are addressed are not addressed in PEIS.	Added to the end of 1.1 Purpose of the PEIS: "CBP would not implement any alternative or any element of any alternative in this PEIS based solely on the analysis presented in this document. Material proposed changes to CBP activities meeting the definition of "major Federal action" (40 CFR 1508.18) would be subjected to further NEPA review at the appropriate level of analysis and documentation. This FPEIS would provide background information for incorporation into those more project-specific plans. However, site-specific NEPA will continue to be completed for all projects that would have required it prior to the PEIS. Subsequent environmental analysis documents for specific projects within the area studied in this PEIS will "tier off" or draw upon the general information in this area-wide programmatic analysis document. "

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
878	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Specific to the trans-boundary Skagit ecosystem, land management plans would all need to be consulted to guide decision making about whether a CBP development is an appropriate use for certain areas of our public lands	Consulting with other governmental and private partners and land managers to resolve issues of potential conflicts with current land use planning;
879	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Admin Process	USFWS and Washington department of Fish and Wildlife would need to be consulted regarding impacts to any fish and wildlife species	8.3.6.3 states "Once a species list is obtained or verified as accurate, Federal agencies must determine whether their actions may affect any listed species or their critical habitat. If no species or their critical habitats are affected, no further consultation is required. If species may be affected, the agency must consult with the FWS (USDOL, 2010d)."
880	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	the final PEIS should acknowledge that public lands are unique and that the responsibility to protect natural resources increases whenever public lands are used for CBP activities	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."
881	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Action/Alternative/Activities	the final PEIS should identify coordination with the land management agencies and observance of their laws, regulations, and plans as a primary avenue for meeting the obligation to the public and to future generations to preserve our public lands	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
882	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Tech Edits	Correction: On page 3-34 you omit "wilderness" from the list of land use designations that support recreational activities on the U.S. side of the border	Although the Wilderness Act specifically states that wilderness areas are set aside for recreation as well as other uses. The list on the following page includes wilderness areas among places used for recreation that are also specifically recognized for conservation purposes .
883	Scott Powell	Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission	Tech Edits	Correction: On page 3-43, national parks are excluded from the list of areas having "High visual sensitivity"	Added "units of the National Park System and removed the following: " Threatened and endangered species designated critical habitat; Wildlife movement corridors; Areas for which an agency or organization is committed to take certain actions with respect to sensitive species habitat.
890	Stephanie Clement	Friends of Acadia	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	We would encourage the CBP to broaden the scope of environmental effects in the programmatic EIS to include the night sky as a resource. We encourage CBP to address the impacts on night skies on an equal basis with air quality, noise, etc.	CBP has added discussion of night sky as a resource area characteristic based on NPS comments.
894	Stephanie Clement	Friends of Acadia	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	In the mitigation of glare, we encourage the CBP to use full cut-off light fixtures for all facilities, even on the approach to border crossings.	CBP has added more discussion of full cut-off lamps to potential mitigations for light pollution in 8.9.7 as discussion of the "night sky" as a resource area and "light pollution" as an impact are increased in corresponding chapters and sections.
895	Stephanie Clement	Friends of Acadia	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Acadia is a significant economic generator for Maine, such economic contribution based on a wealth of natural beautiful deserves special consideration. We hope that CBP will delve deeply at Acadia in a cooperative planning process.	Added at 2-3, 36-41: "CBP is continuing to pursue and expand its cooperation with Federal and State land management agencies through several mechanisms including the Borderland Management Task Force and the Public Lands Liaison Agent program. CBP would expand its cooperation to cover more planning for specific construction, repair, and maintenance projects and generally for law enforcement activity operations."

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
906	Thomas Herrera-Mishler	Buffalo Olmsted Parks	Admin Process	Group requests: 1) Request a list of meeting attendees as well as all minutes and resolutions from previous meeting relating to the PEIS 2) A copy of the PEIS in its current draft form 3) A clear timeline on the study process highlighting benchmarks and opportunities for consulting party and public comments in the future	CBP added an appendix (A-2) on public meetings and comments on the Draft PEIS to the final PEIS. Additional information on study process was added to the website.
1001	Carol Groom	Vermont Chapter of the Sierra Club	Action/Alternative/Activities	Questioned if they would build a road parallel to the entire border.	Typically, CBP law enforcement officers use existing roads. New roads were constructed along the southern border as patrol roads and to construct and repair the fence.
1013	Mike		Action/Alternative/Activities	Concerned that regulating immigration is not a core purpose of USBP ...up on the screen here they are only concerned about terrorists. There's no mention of their core purpose in life of regulating immigration any more.	The comment is partially correct in that CBP deals with cross border violator-terrorist threats more than with immigration. Immigration is now part of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and Customs and Immigration Services (CIS). USBP mission is to protect the borders of the United States, including stopping cross border violations of all types.
1145	Mark H. Garrow	St. Regis Mohawk Tribal council	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	With respect to the summary of environmental impacts that were considered in the conclusion section of the PEIS for each alternative, this list does not fully interpret the true impacts as they would relate to a border community such as ours	CBP has improved the summary comparison of alternatives at the programmatic level. Specific impacts would be visited in site and project specific documentation.
1146	Mark H. Garrow	St. Regis Mohawk Tribal council	Action/Alternative/Activities	Heightened security and new facilities have made conditions and delays worse (in respect to their specific area of concern). To further affect our community by considering any alternatives besides No Action would be a grave carriage of injustice.	CBP appreciates your concern and has sought to improve discussion of the impacts of current delays and potential delays should an alternative be selected.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
1150	Mark H. Garrow	St. Regis Mohawk Tribal council	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	When viewing the Mohawk Territory, Federal, State and Provincial governments often parcel the land within the confines of each respective agency. This fragmentation needs to be fully considered under NEPA with respect to EJ.	CBP appreciates your concern and has sought to improve discussion of how analysis of communities should not be fragmented in site specific documentation.
1153	Lou Hagener		Action/Alternati ve/Activities	Hope that any aspect of this project involves a lot of cooperation with local law enforcement agents. It has been disappointing so far - hard to work between the Federal agencies. And that is part of your alternative, I think, and that is soemthing I really wan to see.	See resopnse to comment 1153. Thank you for your comment. As previosly indicated, the Office of Border Patrol and U.S. Border Patrol has created Public Lands Liasons and tribal liaisons within their sectors to reach out to various governmental agencies and affected tribes which may be affected by their actions. CBP and its law enforcment components are attempting to be more responsive to the concerns of local communities in which they interact.
1159	Duncan Standing Rock	Ojibwa Tribe	Tribal Data Concern	Ojibwa people have the 1777 treaty which gives them the right to pass and repass the border. (International Treaty). Law enforcement on both sides needs a better understanding of this.	Thanks you for your comment. Congress established under the commerce act, immigration act, and other acts to regulate entrance and exit from the United States. Review of congressional acts and international treaties are beyond the scope of this PEIS.
1168	Alvin Windy Boy Sr.		Admin Process & Tribal Data Concern	You have 556 federally recognized tribes that all do things differently. You need to have some type of cultural sensitivity	See resopnse to comment 1153. Thank you for your comment. As previosly indicated, the Office of Border Patrol and U.S. Border Patrol has created Public Lands Liasons and tribal liaisons within their sectors to reach out to various governmental agencies and affected tribes which may be affected by their actions. CBP and its law enforcment components are attempting to be more responsive to the concerns of local communities in which they interact.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
1176	Alvin Windy Boy Sr.		Admin Process	It concerns me the way consultation with tribal governments have been handled. We are concerned with what's happening with a lot of these projects, and I hope someone takes that serious.	Thank you for your comment. CBP is working to improve tribal consultation for undertakings. Typically for new construction projects, CBP will first send out consultation letters to affected tribes and the the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) indicating the nature and scope of the project and request if there is any information either group wishes to provide CBP for evaluation or inclusion. CBP will then typically have an Archeological and Historic Property Survey conducted. The results of the survey and CBP's determination is then submitted to the SHPO and any tribe that requests a copy of the survey. CBP strives to be in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. It should be noted that our correspondence is sent to either the Tribal executive officer (e.g., Chief, Chairperson, President) or to the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) or to any other person so directed by tribal leadership.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
1181	Alvin Windy Boy Sr.		Tribal Ddata Concern & Impact Data/Analysis Determination	[Comment has to do with use of trails and acquiring Caribou.] Is CBP going to assure my tribe, the Ojibwa tribe that ability to carry those out at the border crossing	The U.S. Government and Canadian Government have established legal port of entries between the two countries. Canandian citizens, American citizens and other international visitors to both countries are required to use the legal ports of entry. The John Jay Treaty does not prohibit governments from establishing legal access points between countries. Food products from Canada, including pet food and fresh (frozen or chilled), cooked, canned or otherwise processed products containing beef, veal, bison, and cervid (e.g. deer, elk, moose, caribou etc.) are now permitted from Canada in passenger baggage. Products containing sheep, lamb, or goat will not be allowed entry. The passenger must provide proof of the origin of beef, pork, poultry, cervid meat, and pet food in order to bring them into the United States. Examples of proof of origin include the grocery store receipt where the product was purchased or the label on the product indicating the province in which it was packaged. Hunter harvested game birds (pheasant, quail, goose, etc.) or cervid carcasses (e.g. deer, moose
1184	Candi Schaedle	USEPA, NEPA Compliance Division	Tech Edits	Table 3.2-1 Chapter 3 incorrectly lists the states Indiana and Illinois, and it should be corrected to include WI and MI	Changes made as requested.
1185	Candi Schaedle	USEPA, NEPA Compliance Division	Tech Edits	Corrections and additions to add to table 3.2-1 1. Replace MdDNR with Minnesota Pollution Control Agency 2. Michigan - Department of Env Quality (DEQ) and 3. WI - Dept of Natural Resources (DNR)	Changes made as requested.
1186	Candi Schaedle	USEPA, NEPA Compliance Division	Tech Edits	Regional 5 offic noted that the population data for Lake County, Minnesota may be inccorof and the accuracy of these numbers used for the noise supporting document may need to be revised	Changes made as requested.

Comments with Responses Incorporated into the PEIS or Otherwise of Special Interest for Response

ID	Name	Agency/ Organization [If Identified]	Type of Comment	Comment	Incorporation/Response
1187	Candi Schaedle	USEPA, NEPA Compliance Division	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Provides adequate discussion of the potential env impacts and we have not ID any potential env impacts requiring substantive changes.	1503.4(a)(5). No further change required within the PEIS.
1188	Candi Schaedle	USEPA, NEPA Compliance Division	Impact Data/Analysis Determination	Recommend that during the construction phase of future project-specific actions along the NB that CBP consider adopting additional measures, such as diesel retrofits, the use of clean fuels, and anti-idling provisions to reduce vehicle emissions	Added this consideration under contract actions BMP for the Climate Change and Suatinability environmental resource area.
202-1202	Daniele Turcotte		Tech Edits	Page 1-22 Lines 19-28 tense	Corrected for the Final PEIS.