The meeting of the Borders Committee was called to order by Chair Patricia McCoy (South County) at 12:31 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Borders Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2006, MEETING MINUTES

   Action: Upon a motion by Supervisor Greg Cox (County of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember Ben Hueso (City of San Diego), the Borders Committee approved the minutes from the September 8, 2006, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

   Pedro Orso-Delgado (Caltrans) requested to update the Committee on the Border Infrastructure Program funding received from SAFETEA-LU. Senator Ducheny assisted in getting $91 million allocated for border infrastructure. Caltrans is in the process of requesting the funding from the CTC. It is intended that $81 million be used to augment SR 905 funding and the remainder of the funds will go toward the Brawley Bypass and other planning and operational efforts.

   Bob Leiter also informed the group that on Thursday, October 25, 2006, SANDAG participated in the annual meeting of the National Association of Mexican Municipal Planning Agencies in Ensenada, B.C. Mexico. SANDAG made two presentations, one on the work being done with Tijuana IMPLAN and the other on the Regional Comprehensive Plan. SANDAG found the meeting very informative and useful, as they were able to meet with agencies from several different metropolitan areas in Mexico, learn of the initiatives proposed for the border region, and share ideas with those from the municipal planning agencies in Mexico.

   Chair McCoy congratulated them on the foundation that has been laid.

CONSENT ITEMS (Items 3 - 6)

3. COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO): MEMBERSHIP AND LEADERSHIP (REVIEW/COMMENT)

   Ed Gallo (North County Inland) commented that recommendation number one was a good idea to hold people accountable. He then asked if it had been an issue in the past.
Hector Vanegas responded that attendance had been an issue in two meetings out of twelve last year and some of the members desired to establish the rule.

Supervisor Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) questioned the portion stating the reinstatement of the County.

Hector Vanegas explained that in 2002, the County of San Diego representative asked not to be a member due to a lack of funding.

Bob Leiter clarified that there is now a volunteer representative, Megan Jones, which attends the meetings.

Supervisor Slater-Price said that Supervisor Greg Cox would be the point person regarding County representation and should be contacted if any issues arise.

4. OTAY MESA – MESA DE OTAY BINATIONAL CORRIDOR: FOLLOW UP ON TRANSPORTATION EARLY ACTIONS (INFORMATION)

Chair McCoy proposed the approval of the consent items with Mr. Gallo moving to approve and a second by Councilmember Hueso. It passed unanimously.

Ed Gallo then asked that the record show that he is the voting delegate for North County Inland.

REPORTS (Items 5 - 7)

5. 2007 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) WHITE PAPER: CROSSBORDER TRANSPORTATION (DISCUSSION)

Elisa Arias, Principal Planner (SANDAG), spoke of the objectives of the White Paper, which were to assess the current cross border travel conditions, identify multi-modal transportation needs to facilitate cross border travel, and evaluate potential funding sources to implement port of entry and transportation infrastructure at the current and proposed ports of entry at San Ysidro, Otay Mesa, Tecate, East Otay Mesa, and Jacumba.

Information was presented regarding passenger vehicle, bus, pedestrian, and truck crossings in the region. Mexico is the second largest trading partner with the United States and for California is the number one export market. The Otay Mesa port of entry is the busiest commercial border crossing on the California/Mexico border, and in 2005, it handled more than $24 billion in goods. There have been few improvements to the border crossing infrastructure in the past 20 years. Delays have increased and are more unpredictable even though programs have been implemented to expedite border crossing. These delays impact not only the economy but air quality and the proposals made in the White Paper are intended to improve cross border travel and security.
Challenges for timely implementation of border transportation projects include: a shortage in traditional funding for port of entry infrastructure and operations and connecting roads; lack of clear understanding among the different governmental agencies of how priorities are established; the long lead time to implement projects conflicts with development pressure and rapid growth in border communities. Due to the many challenges, it is important that San Diego actively participate in legislation to implement public/private partnerships or toll facilities.

The White Paper recommends that the RTP consider projected growth in northern Baja California and the San Diego region in conjunction with the cross border projects described in the paper to evaluate future cross border travel demand. It recommends that financial feasibility assessments be conducted to investigate the viability of using tolls or fees to establish a revenue stream that could cover project costs. It recommends that an evaluation of the implications of proposed seaport and rail projects on future cross border freight movements be conducted and that SANDAG monitor developments related to the proposed cross border airport terminal in the context of airport planning activities in the region. It also recommends the Department of Homeland Security explore and implement state-of-the-art technologies and processes at all ports of entry including implementing Smart Border Technologies.

The White Paper has been presented to the Regional Planning Stakeholders Working Group, the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities, and will be presented on December 8, 2006, to the Transportation Committee after receiving comments and input from the Borders Committee.

Chair McCoy asked for comments from the Committee.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) commented that the amount of trucks crossing the border hasn’t increased as much as the value of the cargo. He asked from where the data was obtained.

Ms. Arias concurred with his comment and stated that the data was obtained from the Bureau of Customs on Border Protection (CBP) and the Bureau of Transportation Statistics. She explained that Customs receives trade information on invoices, and then reports the information to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics.

Councilmember Hueso asked how the White Paper related to the issues presented in other previous reports and if this was a duplication of the information presented in the Otay Mesa Plan. He also asked if it was more of a Border Plan.

Ms. Arias explained that the Otay Mesa – Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan is subregional in nature and that the issues presented in the White Paper are issues being dealt with in the RTP, which covers the entire San Diego region. Although some of the crossborder issues may be duplicated in the RTP, they are dealt with more in depth in the Otay Mesa Plan. She explained that the RTP is the San Diego region blueprint for transportation, and cross border transportation is one of the elements to be evaluated for the RTP.
Executive Director Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) added that the Otay Mesa binational plan covers more than transportation; it also includes land use, housing, and environmental issues.

Councilmember Monroe stated that this was a tremendous opportunity for the region and asked if there was an economic projection proving the benefits of addressing these challenges to the San Diego economy. He believes the action needs to move forward more rapidly.

Ms. Arias said that a study on the economic impacts from border delays estimated more than a $4 billion loss to the regional San Diego/Baja California economies and that border waits also have an impact on jobs. The analysis suggests that if nothing is done to improve the situation at the border, the impacts will double over the next ten years.

Ed Gallo asked if there is a potential to fast track the actions on the legislation regarding public/private partnerships and public toll facilities.

Mr. Gallegos answered that it is not a question of lack of planning or consensus on what is needed to be done, rather a lack of resources. In the past, San Diego relied on either the state or federal governments to help with the infrastructure investment along the border, and neither is keeping pace. The idea now is to fee these items and have the revenue to build them today and pay for them over a period of time. There is an upcoming bond issue before the voters that will give authority to fee the items. Also, a study in conjunction with Caltrans is being performed that will confirm the feasibility so that the San Diego region will be able to compete for one of the pilot projects being offered by the California legislature.

Councilmember Hueso added that this is very important regarding the planning efforts the City of San Diego and it has enormous potential impacts to the metropolitan community in both countries. He concurred that time is of the essence and asked if this process would provide an unfunded inventory of improvements that are necessary to get to the next level to start work on them. He also asked for a timeline in terms of finalizing the report.

Mr. Gallegos stated that the very short answer is yes. He explained that the RTP prices out not only what is thought the project is going to cost, but also overlays the revenues thought to be available. As far as a timeline, Mr. Gallegos stated that it is necessary that the RTP be adopted by the end of next calendar year.

Mr. Orso-Delgado requested that some of the short term improvements also be presented when considering the RTP.

Councilmember Dave Allan (East County) asked about the federal government’s position on the issue.
Mr. Gallegos stated that the federal government is very supportive as rarely an opportunity is presented in which multiple goals making legitimate trade and travel more efficient and cost effective, improving security for the country, and building a new facility with up-to-date technology can be accomplished. Mr. Gallegos further discussed the progress with SR 905.

Supervisor Slater-Price noted how helpful the U.S. Senators were with SR 905, given the fact that neither is from Southern California.

6. PORT OF ENSENADA’S MASTER PLAN (INFORMATION)

Chair McCoy introduced and thanked Juan Carlos Ochoa, Director of Promotions of the Port of Ensenada for his presence at the meeting.

Mr. Ochoa began his presentation explaining that the Port of Ensenada now has a new vision of managing three ports: Ensenada, El Sauzal, and Punta Colonet. El Sauzal lies approximately six miles north of Ensenada and Punta Colonet is between 80 and 90 miles south of Ensenada. The plan is to have Ensenada become a totally nautical and cruise activity oriented port. El Sauzal will become the industrial/commercial fishing activity port, and Punta Colonet will serve as the most important container hub in the Mexican Pacific.

In order to create intermodal corridors to capture more business, they are in the process of making the planning and infrastructure investments now. The Mexican government has authorized routes for the flow of trucks and the plan is to have the flow of goods to the ports both to and from the United States, thus handling the overflow from ports such as Long Beach and Los Angeles.

The 2006/2011 Master Plan for the Port of Ensenada shows a conversion of area directed toward nautical tourism (marinas and ship repair) and will maintain some cargo business. El Sauzal will begin renovations to create a port more or less the same size of Ensenada with a rail connection to Tecate. Punta Colonet will be developed also and will have a rail line connection to Mexicali. An international bidding contest will be held for the master development plan that includes areas for port and rail support activities, industrial and adjacent development, as well as housing and public services.

Mr. Ochoa stated that due to increased domestic and international cargo passing through both countries, infrastructure must be upgraded, especially highways and rail line development. Customs regulations will also play a key factor to assure cargo a smooth flow as well as security.

Supervisor Slater-Price noted the huge impacts currently experienced by the existing rail line that runs parallel to the I-5 corridor that goes through Downtown and asked if there was an update on the rail line extensions.

Mr. Ochoa said that the update had not been done yet.
Mr. Gallegos stated that one of the items discussed when updating the RTP was an inland freight line; however it is a long term project.

Supervisor Slater-Price then asked about the existing inland rail line.

Mr. Gallegos said that the Carrizo Gorge line is currently in operation and continues to be used for freight; however, it needs rehabilitation as the tunnels are too low for stacked containers. He also mentioned that currently SANDAG is in the process of developing a Business Plan and working with Congressman Filner’s office in order to obtain funding for the necessary studies.

Mike Hix, Principal Planner (SANDAG) informed the Committee that the kick-off meeting took place and discussions were conducted regarding the RFP for the long range study concerning improvements to the rail line in eastern San Diego County.

Supervisor Slater-Price requested that there be an update item given to both the Borders Committee and the Transportation Committee.

Mr. Gallo asked about the difference in cost between the rail line in North County and the figures for the rail line in Mexico.

Mr. Gallegos stated that the two were different, in that the project in the North County is already owned by the City and the other project is a green field project, where they will have to buy right-of-way, build tunnels and bridges, etc.

Mr. Allan asked who owned the NAFTA line.

Mr. Ochoa clarified that NAFTA was the name of the rail project related to the free trade program and not the operator.

Chair McCoy was interested to know if there had been studies conducted regarding water availability, climate change, and sea level rise as these effects will have an impact on what is being planned. She suggested that the studies be incorporated into the planning process.

Mr. Ochoa answered that they are in the process of performing a water study.

Councilmember Crawford spoke about ensuring that both countries are communicating about the same rail alignments due to the enormous amounts of cargo flow so that investments are made in the right places to ensure the efficiency of the system on both sides of the border.

Mr. Ochoa offered that a workshop be conducted regarding urban planning from both sides.

Councilmember Hueso noted that the Carrizo Gorge line actually passes into Mexico and asked if Mexico had plans to link up that rail line.
Mr. Ochoa replied that not at this time. For the short term, only the desert line from Tecate to Plaster City is being looked at. There are discussions presently involving Carrizo Gorge between both countries regarding intermodal operation and an agreement with Union Pacific regarding upgrades.

Chair McCoy thanked Mr. Ochoa for his presentation.

7. STATUS REPORT ON THE FOOTHILL-SOUTH CORRIDOR/STATE ROUTE (SR) 241 TOLL ROAD (INFORMATION)

Heather Werdick, Senior Planner (SANDAG), reported that at the August 4, 2006, Board of Directors meeting, Board members raised questions regarding the inclusion of the Foothill-South SR 241 toll road project in SANDAG’s 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Board members asked staff to work with the Borders Committee to provide information on the toll road and to document SANDAG’s involvement with the project.

Ms. Werdick explained that the Transportation Corridor Agency (TCA) is proposing to construct the Foothill-South as a limited access toll road from I-5 in San Diego, to the existing SR 241 in Orange County. As the project passes through two regions, it must be included in both SANDAG and SCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan and RTIP.

Borders Committee members had raised concerns about the environmental impacts of this project, particularly to the San Mateo Campground, San Mateo Creek, and the Trestles surf area.

Councilman Peter Herzog (City of Lake Forest) from TCA presented an overview of the project, including the alternatives analyzed as part of the environmental process, and discussed the project impacts. He explained that the TCA is a governmental agency, a joint powers authority that is entered into by twelve cities in Orange County along with Supervisors. TCA has worked with the Federal Highway Administration, the EPA, the Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Caltrans, and Camp Pendleton to develop the chosen alignment.

The toll road system is 51 miles presently and is expected to grow to 67 miles. The entire system is funded through municipal bonds. Mr. Herzog explained the toll road will not affect San Onofre State Beach, nor will it affect the campsites at San Mateo. The alignment will impact .2 percent of the San Mateo Creek watershed and the bridge will not impact the sediment flow into the beach. Retention basins located in the watershed will improve water quality before it reaches San Mateo Creek. The toll road will connect with I-5 to improve goods movement and transportation and the alignment is the least environmentally damaging and most practical to expand the I-5.

Mr. Allan commented that the toll road would bring jobs to San Diego County and was beneficial to public safety as it provides another route out of the area and acts as a natural firebreak. He asked if funds would be given to the state parks.
Mr. Herzog responded that the San Diego labor unions are aware of the jobs coming to the area and that public safety is a key issue, in that the extra entrance/exit to and from San Diego is of benefit. State parks are always a priority and the TCA continues to work with them in order to work out an equitable arrangement.

Mr. Allan asked Mr. Gallegos what position SANDAG was taking in regard to the issue.

Mr. Gallegos answered that the Board asked that it be brought back for an educational piece to the Borders Committee.

Chair McCoy then asked for speakers from the public to address the Committee.

Dan Silver, Endangered Habitats League, stated that the toll road would harm San Onofre State Beach and the campground. He asked for more alternatives and improving the existing infrastructure. He reported that Smart Mobility had reviewed the environmental documentation and concluded that using TCA’s own data, a balanced set of arterial improvements and I-5 lane improvements, called the AIP Alternative, will likely provide traffic benefits superior to the toll road alignment. He said TCA rejected the AIP Alternative because of claimed displacement of hundreds of homes and businesses. Another interchange study was conducted by the City of San Clemente which rejected the clover leaf style of interchange designs that TCA has proposed as they caused too much displacement and they substituted more modern urban types of interchange designs. He felt that TCA is a single purpose agency that is fixated on building just one particular route and they have deceived the public as to the alternatives.

Stefanie Sekich, Vice Chair of the San Diego Chapter of the Surfrider Foundations, spoke regarding her doubts that certain environmental laws and policies such as those in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the Endangered Species Act aren’t being circumvented. She said there is too much uncertainty that surrounds the project and too many California voters that oppose the project. Ms. Sekich asked that all San Diegans reject the toll road and try to stop it from happening, as it is one of the last open spaces on the coastline.

Larry Rannals, representing Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, explained that the Marine Corps and the Department of the Navy would have some authority and say on any part of the project as it passes through the base. When the final EIS is completed, the Marine Corps, Department of the Navy, and possibly the Secretary of the Navy will have an opportunity to review and comment on the EIS and the Record of Decision.

Mr. Rannals reported that the Marine Corps has concurred that this particular alignment is acceptable and could be supported, but that decision will not be made until they review the complete final EIS and Record of Decision. He stated that the Marine Corps is neither a proponent nor an opponent. They are neither advocating nor objecting to the project – they are neutral.

Supervisor Cox commented that he understood that the Marine Corps in essence is going to have a final veto authority at the end of the process contingent upon making sure it is consistent with the Corps’ mission and obligations.
Mr. Rannals responded that their veto process only applies to the last 4 ½ miles that pass through Camp Pendleton.

Supervisor Cox asked if San Onofre State Beach is owned by Camp Pendleton.

Mr. Rannals answered that yes, the property is owned by the Department of the Navy, which has leased the land for the San Mateo Campground to the California State Parks and the lease expires in 2021.

Supervisor Cox asked if it will be renegotiated.

Mr. Rannals replied that most likely yes; however, he was uncertain at this time.

Bill Hickman, Chapter Coordinator for the San Diego County Surfrider Foundation, spoke regarding the importance of reviewing the area involved and taking into account the far reaching environmental and recreational impacts.

Councilmember Crawford expressed concern about the alignment and the considerable impacts it will have on San Diego County resources. Ms. Crawford stated that the City of Del Mar wrote a letter agreeing with the State Park’s resolution expressing concerns about the project. She said there have been a number of issues raised with regard to some of the alternative alignments, in particular the I-5 alignment. Ms Crawford asked that the I-5 alignment be carefully studied due to the impacts to resources, as there have been enough issues raised that it merits additional reviews.

Supervisor Slater-Price added that she also has great concerns about the project especially since it has two lawsuits initiated by the State of California.

Mr. Herzog stated that they are proceeding ahead with the planning, as it is normal to have lawsuits when involved in any major transportation project.

Supervisor Slater-Price cited that the State of California was opposing the project on the grounds that it will have a very negative impact on the State Parks system. She then asked if the land was set aside as open space when it was originally dedicated.

Mr. Herzog replied that no, the property is owned by Camp Pendleton. The State has leased it and is aware of the right-of-way.

Chair McCoy stated that as it has an effect on San Diego State parks, she would like this item to be sent to the Transportation Committee as an informational item and then back to the main Board, should the Committee agree with her.

Supervisor Slater-Price agreed, and Mr. Hueso seconded. It was then unanimously agreed upon.

Mr. Allan asked how much of the toll road would be in San Diego.

Mr. Herzog replied that the only part in San Diego was to be located on Camp Pendleton.
Councilmember Monroe said he was impressed to see that the TCA had been working with the environmental groups and that it was his understanding that this alignment has the concurrence of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. He again requested the Marine Corps’ point of view because he felt they were encouraging the project.

Mr. Rannals reiterated that the Marine Corps is not encouraging it. They will not take a position for or against the toll road at this point, however, this particular alignment has been evaluated by the Marine Corps and has been determined to have no effect on our mission, our training flexibility and it is the only alignment that we could accept should this project come through Camp Pendleton.

Mr. Orso-Delgado asked what the timeline is in the environmental process in order to finalize the document and have a Record of Decision.

James Brown, Chief Engineer for TCA said they are in the final process of finalizing the EIS. There are several internal reviews that still have to take place prior to its public circulation. The Marine Corps will have a separate review process. They will have to review the document and approve it prior to its public circulation. They are almost done with the final reviews with the FHWA and will then pass that document on to Camp Pendleton. Public circulation of the final EIS could be sometime in the spring of next year, with a Record of Decision to follow.

Chair McCoy thanked Mr. Brown and noted that she was remiss in acknowledging Bob Ham, Executive Director of IVAG.

8. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for November 17, 2006.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair McCoy adjourned the meeting at 2:21 P.M.
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