

<b>Question#:</b>	19
<b>Topic:</b>	Sibling Separated
<b>Hearing:</b>	The Secure and Protect Act: a Legislative Fix to the Crisis at the Southwest Border
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Amy Klobuchar
<b>Committee:</b>	JUDICIARY (SENATE)

**Question:** When I traveled to the Texas border last summer, I spoke with a brother and sister from Honduras who were separated not only from their mother, but from each other.

What efforts are Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officials making to keep unaccompanied minor siblings together, and what procedures are in place to track familial relationships?

**Response:** The CBP TEDS policy provides that CBP maintains family unity to the greatest extent operationally feasible, absent a legal requirement or an articulable safety concern. TEDS additionally states, regarding unaccompanied alien children siblings, that whenever operationally feasible, UAC siblings should not be separated, unless deemed necessary for safety purposes. In circumstances where siblings must be separated due to different immigration dispositions, such a separation must be documented in the appropriate electronic system(s) of record.

CBP notifies HHS whenever underage siblings are determined to be UAC and requests placement in a shelter together. HHS is responsible for the ultimate placement decision.

**Question:** Does CBP have data on the number of siblings that have been separated since the President ended the Administration's family separation policy on June 20, 2018?

**Response:** CBP does not track siblings who may or may not have been separated.

<b>Question#:</b>	20
<b>Topic:</b>	Lancaster and Roseau MN
<b>Hearing:</b>	The Secure and Protect Act: a Legislative Fix to the Crisis at the Southwest Border
<b>Primary:</b>	The Honorable Amy Klobuchar
<b>Committee:</b>	JUDICIARY (SENATE)

**Question:** In January 2018, CBP reduced hours at the Lancaster and Roseau Ports of Entry in Minnesota and reallocated staffing resources. CBP later defended this change and stated that its field offices had not received any complaints regarding the reduction of hours.

I have heard from local business owners who have expressed concerns that the reduction will have a significant impact on their businesses. Will you commit to reviewing CBP's decision to determine whether CBP should return these ports to the previous operating hours?

**Response:** DHS is fully committed to conducting another review to assess the impact of service reductions at the Ports of Roseau and Lancaster. We will perform the review in January 2020 because we will then have 2 years of reduced-hour data, enough to identify and validate any trends.

This review will complement two previous evaluations conducted in January and April 2019. The January assessment found that car traffic at Roseau increased in FY 2018, although FY 2017 contained 21 percent more operational hours. Lancaster continued its 5-year annual decline in volume, but at a much lower rate than the previous year. In FY 2018, the decline in volume was 4.1 percent, compared to 7.7 percent the previous year. Uncommonly high snowfall across Minnesota's Northern Border this past winter prevented DHS from accurately identifying trends or making any comparisons between the two crossings and the other ports located in the state.

Service reductions at the two ports have benefited Minnesota overall because DHS has been able to better align workloads with personnel. Reduced hours in FY 2018 enabled DHS to increase staffing at International Falls, which enabled the port to accommodate a 15.7 percent increase in trade. This port now accounts for 47 percent of land border staffing and 95.2 percent of trade in the state.

Roseau and Lancaster now have staffing appropriate for their workload. In FY 2017, Roseau and Lancaster received 16.7 percent of Minnesota's land border staffing while processing 7.9 percent of the vehicles and 3.5 percent of trade entering the state. The two ports now receive 10.3 percent of the personnel, while processing 7.5 percent of the vehicles and 3.3 percent of trade entering at Minnesota's land border crossings.