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MISSION STATEMENT
The Borders Committee provides oversight for planning activities that impact the borders of the San Diego region (Orange, Riverside and Imperial Counties, and the Republic of Mexico) as well as government-to-government relations with tribal nations in San Diego County. The preparation and implementation of SANDAG’s Binational, Interregional, and Tribal Liaison Planning programs are included under this purview. It advises the SANDAG Board of Directors on major interregional planning policy-level matters. Recommendations of the Committee are forwarded to the Board of Directors for action.
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Borders Committee on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to Committee staff. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Borders Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under meetings on SANDAG’s Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than noon, two working days prior to the Borders Committee meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
ITEM #: APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 13, 2008, MEETING MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Borders Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CHAIR’S REPORT (#3)

3. UPCOMING INTERSTATE 15 (I-15) INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (IRP) JOINT POLICY MEETING

INFORMATION

The I-15 IRP Joint Policy Committee will be meeting at the Escondido Chamber of Commerce on September 17, 2008, to kick off Phase III of the partnership. The primary goal of the I-15 IRP is to foster collaborative strategies in transportation, housing, and economic development that will improve the quality of life for residents in both counties. This meeting will kick off the third phase of this partnership with funding from Caltrans, District 8, to focus on developing a strategic implementation plan for the I-15 corridor at the county line, engaging cluster industries in a strategic action plan for economic development, and collaborating on transit-oriented development in southern Riverside and northern San Diego.

REPORT ITEMS (#3 through #7)

4. SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY MAJOR INVESTMENT STUDY UPDATE (Heather Werdick, SANDAG; and Charlie Larwood, Orange County Transportation Authority)

DISCUSSION

The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) is currently conducting a South Orange County Major Investment Study (SOCMIS). SANDAG participates in this study on the Policy and Technical Advisory Committees. OCTA staff will provide an update on the study progress to date including the recommended locally preferred strategy.
+5. REPORT ON INTERSTATE 8 (I-8) INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (IRP) WITH IMPERIAL COUNTY (Rosa Lopez, Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG); and Warren Whiteaker, PMC)

IVAG, in partnership with Caltrans, District 11, and SANDAG, has initiated the development of the I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan. A progress report on advances made on this study will be provided.

+6. UPDATE ON THE SAN YSIDRO PORT OF ENTRY (POE) RECONFIGURATION AND EXPANSION PROJECT (Keith Lew, U.S. General Services Administration)

The U. S. General Services Administration (GSA) presented the conceptual master plan for the San Ysidro POE Reconfiguration and Expansion project to the Borders Committee at its September 2007 meeting, and in January 2008 the Committee reviewed SANDAG comments on the project. This report will provide updates on this project.

+7. TRANSPORTATION BORDER CONGESTION RELIEF PROGRAM (Pedro Orso-Delgado, Caltrans; and Christina Casgar, SANDAG)

On May 30, 2008, the U.S. Department of Transportation requested applications to participate in the Transportation Border Congestion Relief (TBCR) Program. Caltrans, District 11, submitted applications for four border projects in San Diego and Imperial Counties. The attached report describes the TBCR Program and the proposed projects.

+8. UPDATE ON THE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) TRIBAL TRANSIT GRANT (Boxie Phoenix, Chair, Tribal Transportation Working Group; and Jane Clough-Riquelme, SANDAG)

The Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA) recently received a $425,000 grant from FTA’s Tribal Transit Program (5311c) for year one of a four-year program to improve transit connections between the tribal reservations and the urban transit system through enhancements to existing routes, as well as the addition of tribally-operated connector routes. The grant program was intended to cover 100 percent of program costs; however, the FTA awarded slightly less than 50 percent of the requested funding. Work is now underway to re-scope the year one activities to coordinate with the transit agencies. Boxie Phoenix, Chair of the Tribal Transportation Working Group, will brief the Borders Committee on the re-scoping process and share the recommendations made by the Working Group and the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association. The RTA has prepared the attached status report for the Committee’s information.
9. UPCOMING MEETINGS

   The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, September 26, 2008, at 12:30 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

   + next to an item indicates an attachment
DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

The joint meeting of the Borders Committee, Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO), and the City of Tijuana was called to order by Chair Patricia McCoy (South County) at 1:01 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Borders Committee member attendance.

Chair McCoy welcomed members from the Borders Committee, COBRO, and the City of Tijuana.

Mayor Jorge Ramos (City of Tijuana) expressed his commitment to regional development and stated the City of Tijuana welcomed the opportunity and looked forward to participating in the discussions.

Chair McCoy announced the release of a new book entitled A Barrier to Our Shared Environment, and said copies of the book can be obtained from Committee Coordinator Hector Vanegas.

Chair McCoy announced that the order of the agenda would be revised as follows: Item No. 8 would go first followed by Item No. 5, Item No. 6, Item No. 7, and then Item No. 4.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember John Minto (East County) and a second by Vice Chair Greg Cox (County of San Diego), the Borders Committee unanimously approved the revised agenda order.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Cox and a second by Deputy Mayor Crystal Crawford (North County Coastal), the Borders Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the May 23, 2008, meeting.

Chair McCoy announced Item No. 3 as Consent, only for information.
Action: Upon a motion by Vice Chair Cox and a second by Deputy Mayor Crawford the Borders Committee unanimously approved Agenda Item No. 3 on Consent.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Consul General Remedios Gómez-Arnau welcomed Mayor Jorge Ramos and invited everyone to join them at the Mexican Independence Day celebration the Consulate is planning for September 9. She requested that SANDAG supports and participates at this event. She also informed Mexico will be celebrating its bicentennial in 2010 and also was interested in SANDAG participating at that time.

Chair McCoy commented she was sure everyone would save the date on their calendars.

CONSENT ITEM (#3)

3. STATUS REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL BORDER SEWAGE ISSUES (INFORMATION)

Action: This item was presented for information only.

REPORT ITEMS (#4 through #10)

8. CITY OF TIJUANA MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN: URBAN AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT (INFORMATION)

Mayor Ramos briefly commented on some of the characteristics of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), the three-year plan which contains a vision for Tijuana. The MDP allows for unprecedented coordination between federal, state, and local governments and already has $500 million dedicated toward infrastructure and public facilities projects. Mayor Ramos also highlighted the public participation process which involved over 9,500 citizens, including educational and academic institutions, and others which led to the creation and unanimous approval of the MDP.

Alonso Hernandez, Deputy Director, Tijuana’s Municipal Planning Institute (IMPlan) reported the City of Tijuana continues to meet with representatives from Tecate, Rosarito, and Ensenada to obtain their input regarding the various challenges, goals, opportunities, and dynamics associated with the region. He also provided more detailed information regarding Tijuana’s planned urban and regional development; including infrastructure, urban mobility, land preservation, and binational planning.

Mayor Ramos presented information regarding Valle de Las Palmas, Tijuana’s future planned community for 376,000 citizens which involves two of Mexico’s most important private housing development firms. He stated street construction has already begun and soon approximately 80,000 houses will be built.
Mr. Hernandez added the MDP contains tools which facilitate the identification of conservation areas and aided in planning for Tijuana’s Downtown, Los Laureles, and Mesa de Otay sites; as well as in the binational planning process, by minimizing any potential impacts to either side of the border.

Chair McCoy requested questions be held until the end due to the tight agenda. She announced Item No. 5 would be presented.

**Action:** This item was presented for information only.

5. **BACKGROUND ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OTAY MESA – MESA DE OTAY BINATIONAL CORRIDOR STRATEGIC PLAN (INFORMATION)**

Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning (SANDAG), presented an overview of the events leading up to the adoption of the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan by the Tijuana City Council and the SANDAG Board of Directors. He stated the Strategic Plan has led to excellent collaboration at the staff, community, and policy levels and has expedited the implementation of the Otay Mesa East Border Crossing and related connecting highways.

Mr. Hernandez stated soon, the federally funded study of Arroyo La Rinconada will begin. The study is designed to determine the feasibility of developing the area as an access point for the new Otay Mesa East Port of Entry. He also stated they are working jointly with the State to develop a final project definition of the Arroyo Alamar, including a water filtration ecological project.

**Action:** This item was presented for information only.

6. **FIRST ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES INCLUDED IN THE OTAY MESA – MESA DE OTAY BINATIONAL CORRIDOR STRATEGIC PLAN (DISCUSSION)**

Elisa Arias, Principal Planner (SANDAG), stated the Strategic Plan has received an “Honorable Mention” from the Transportation Planning Excellence Program, co-sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the American Planning Association (APA); and the award for Smart Growth from the San Diego/Tijuana Chapter of the Urban Land Institute (ULI).

Ron Saenz, Associate Planner (SANDAG), gave an update on transportation, economic development, housing and environment initiatives identified in the Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan.

Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) indicated in regards to land uses in Otay Mesa that the San Diego Regional Economic Prosperity Strategy (REPS) recommends conducting an employment lands inventory. In the past, inventories of industrial and commercial lands were performed. Now, however, the new study recommends preserving “employment lands,” which is a shift from the industrial/commercial concept.
Mr. Saenz also reported on the California Biodiversity Council (CBC) Las Californias Group’s efforts to secure lands on both sides of the border to create binational conservation corridors; actions to retrofit trucks with diesel oxidation catalyst filters and diesel particulate filters; and, the truck stop electrification study.

Deputy Mayor Crawford commented on the recent Smart Growth and Sustainability on the Border: Opportunities for Collaboration with Strategic Partners seminar held at Caltrans on June 3, 2008, which involved dignitaries and representatives from both sides of the border. She said discussions yielded a desire for the creation of a better mechanism in which to communicate regional border planning needs to state and federal government officials, and the creation of better financing mechanisms for infrastructure.

Chair McCoy stated she had received many positive reports and thanked Ms. Crawford for moderating the event.

Mr. Saenz said staff will continue to work with stakeholders on the implementation of actions and hold periodic meetings to inform members from COBRO, the City of Tijuana, and the Borders Committee.

Mark Baza, Senior Transportation Planner (Caltrans) reported on recent progress concerning the Otay Mesa East Port of Entry and State Route 11 and reviewed the project’s schedule. He highlighted various milestones such as the completion of the GSA’s Feasibility Study, the introduction of the Otay Mesa East Toll Facility Act, or SB 1486, and the Phase I Programmatic Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (PEIR/PEIS). He also reviewed the next steps Caltrans plans to take in relation to the project.

Pedro Orso-Delgado, District 11 Director (Caltrans), stated the Phase I Environmental Document was presently being reviewed by the Department of State, Council on Environmental Quality, Federal Highway Administration, and others in Washington D.C., and he was hopeful that a Conditional Presidential Permit would be issued soon.

Chair McCoy invited comments from the Consul General.

Consul General Gomez-Arnau stated four technical commissions were created to handle the border crossings between California and Baja California. The Otay Mesa Technical Commission has met twice this year, with a third meeting scheduled for July 8 in Tijuana. Recently Mexico’s Secretariat of Communications and Transportation (Secretaria de Comunicaciones y Transportes or SCT) concluded studies on the Conceptual Master Plan, cost benefit, and financing feasibility related to the Otay II Port of Entry. The Mexican government is considering allowing private contractors to handle construction and tolling of the new Otay II facility; charging $19 pesos per passenger vehicle and $86 pesos per truck. In April, a diplomatic letter of support for the Presidential Permit process was sent by the Mexican Embassy in the United States to the U.S. Department of State. Also, work on the new Otay II Port of Entry is expected to begin in 2009.
Mr. Hernandez, IMPlan, commented studies are in progress for the areas of Arroyo La Rinconada and the Alamar river. By the end of the year, it is anticipated the Arroyo Alamar Specific Plan, along with a plan for the access to the new Otay II POE will be completed.

**Action:** This item was presented for discussion only.

7. **OTAY MESA – MESA DE OTAY BINATIONAL CORRIDOR STRATEGIC PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACTIONS (DISCUSSION)**

Jennifer Williamson, Senior Planner (SANDAG), stated work toward accessing property for a coordinated transit center at the existing Otay Mesa Port of Entry is presently under way. The South Bay Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system would utilize buses to emulate rail without that expense. Regarding the future Otay Mesa East Port of Entry, it has been determined that it is premature at this time to make any decisions regarding BRT. A number of meetings have been held with IMPlan regarding their existing and proposed transit network for the existing Otay Mesa Port of Entry. As Tijuana’s existing transit is comprised of many dispersed travel patterns, recommendations have been shared in an effort to provide better access for transit, private vehicles, and pedestrians to the POE. The South Bay BRT is entering the environmental phase, with implementation scheduled for 2012.

**Action:** This item was presented for discussion only.

4. **REPORT ON THE UNITED STATES – MEXICO BORDER EFFICIENCY CONFERENCE (INFORMATION)**

James Clark, Mexico Business Center of the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, reported recommendations regarding border wait times derived from the first Mexico Border Efficiency Conference were forwarded to President Bush, the U.S. Secretary of Commerce, Department of Homeland Security and Mexico’s President Calderón, the Secretariat of Economy and Secretariat of Governance. He stated a second conference will be conducted to examine the progress that has been made at the border crossings and the results will be presented at the Border Governors Conference to be held in August.

Chair McCoy commented on the new San Diego-Baja California Border Region View From Space map which was distributed to all.

Chairman Chris Devers, Southern California Tribal Chairman’s Association (Pauma), welcomed representatives from Mexico to the ancestral land of the Kumeyaay nation. He stated additional tribal nation involvement from both sides of the border is imperative to the border region’s activities especially in the area of ancestral lands’ cultural and burial sites. He acknowledged Chairman H. Paul Cuero, Jr. from the Campo Band of the Kumeyaay nation.

Chair McCoy commented he was correct and an effort will be made to ensure tribes are included in the future. She also thanked Chairman Cuero for his attendance.
Chairman Devers added Chairman Cuero of the Kumeyaay Repatriation Committee or Louis Guassac of the Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians as resources that may be contacted regarding binational projects.

Mr. Orso-Delgado commented that he had received information from the Mexican federal government that the Otay Mesa II border crossing project would not progress until the land was secured either by the City of Tijuana or the State of Baja California.

**Action:** This item was presented for information only.

9. **FUTURE JOINT MEETINGS (DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION)**

Chair McCoy solicited comments regarding a future meeting.

Councilmember Ed Gallo (North County Inland) complimented and congratulated Mayor Ramos on his efforts and stated he was in favor of an annual meeting.

Chair McCoy apologized for the meeting’s time constraints and said the next meeting will allow enough time for discussion to take place.

Deputy Mayor Crawford noted the California Biodiversity Council has been working across the border with counterparts to preserve land, corridors, and habitat and suggested tribal representation and involvement on the California Biodiversity Council Binational Working Group. She also invited the local tribes to participate in this working group as tribal ancestral lands cross south of the border.

Chair McCoy asked if there were any objections to having another meeting. There were none. She announced the possibility that the upcoming Borders Committee meeting scheduled for July 25 might be changed to August 1, 2008.

**Action:** This item was presented for discussion only.

10. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next regular meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, July 25, 2008, at 12:30 p.m.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair McCoy adjourned the meeting at 2:31 p.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
## CONFIRMED ATTENDANCE
### JOINT MEETING OF THE BORDERS COMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO), AND THE CITY OF TIJUANA
**JUNE 13, 2008 - 1:00 to 2:30 p.m.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Patricia McCoy (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>County of Imperial</td>
<td>Victor Carrillo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of Del Mar</td>
<td>Crystal Crawford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of San Marcos</td>
<td>Jim Desmond</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Ed Gallo</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>John Minto</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>David Allan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Ben Hueso</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Greg Cox (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
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<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
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<td>David Ouzan</td>
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<td>Tony Young</td>
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<tr>
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<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Coronado</td>
<td>Phil Monroe</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jack Feller</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Tony Young</td>
<td>2nd Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Calexico</td>
<td>David Ouzan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County of Riverside</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Patricia McCoy (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY MAJOR INVESTMENT STUDY UPDATE  

Introduction

The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) is currently conducting an assessment of various strategic alternatives for improving travel between the San Diego County border and State Route 55 (SR 55) in south Orange County. This conceptual planning process, which began in early 2006, is called the South Orange County Major Investment Study (SOCMIS). A study team consisting of consultants and OCTA staff is conducting the study. SANDAG staff participates in the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and City of Del Mar Mayor David Druker represents SANDAG on the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). The committees meet regularly to provide feedback and direction to the SOCMIS study team. Additionally, as part of the Borders Planning and Coordination work program, SANDAG meets regularly with staff from OCTA to discuss other items of joint interest.

Discussion

Background

The SOCMIS is assessing various alternatives for improving north-south travel from the Orange/San Diego County border to SR 55 and east-west travel from the foothills to the coast. A map of the study area is shown in Attachment 1. The ability to efficiently move people and goods is critical for the sustained economic growth and quality of life in Orange County. Due to rapid growth in both residential development and employment, south Orange County residents are finding it increasingly difficult to avoid traffic congestion. The main transportation corridor in the south Orange County area is Interstate 5 (I-5), an eight-lane freeway with traffic volumes as high as 350,000 vehicle trips per day. Without a long-term strategic vision, the I-5 corridor and surrounding transportation infrastructure will experience increasing levels of congestion.

The study objectives for the SOCMIS were developed based on feedback from elected officials, agency staff, and stakeholders in the study area. As listed below, these objectives are critical to assure that the SOCMIS provides solutions for transportation issues in south Orange County.

- Reduce freeway congestion in the study area
- Minimize freeway travel times
- Provide continuity of facilities along south Orange County freeways
- Improve freeway access at the interchanges
- Evaluate public transit options
Study Oversight

Three committees provide feedback and oversight to the SOCMIS.

Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)

The PAC was formed to keep elected officials within the project area informed about the progress of the study and seek their input on policy direction to help guide the study process. The 21-member PAC consists of 18 voting members representing each city and supervisory district in the study area and a public member from the OCTA Board of Directors, and three nonvoting members, representing SANDAG, Caltrans, and Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA).

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Each city within the study area, as well as the County of Orange, Caltrans, TCA, Federal Highway Administration, and SANDAG, has a designated staff member to serve on the TAC. The TAC provides the study team with detailed technical analysis and feedback on every element of the study.

Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)

The SWG provides feedback throughout the study process. Each SWG member represents a constituency and is charged with helping to build consensus for regional transportation solutions. SWG members represent a broad range of interest groups, including: business, environmental, public safety, developers, homeowner associations, transportation, and the community.

SOCMIS Process

The SOCMIS is part of OCTA strategic efforts to keep Orange County moving over the next 25 years and beyond. The study includes a comprehensive public participation process and is divided into the following components:

- Identify I-5 corridor deficiencies
- Develop the purpose and need for the corridor improvements
- Develop initial transportation alternatives
- Evaluate initial transportation alternatives
- Select a reduced set of transportation alternatives
- Evaluate a reduced set of transportation alternatives
- Recommend a locally preferred transportation strategy

The study began in early 2006 and is expected to be completed in fall 2008. The study team developed 14 initial multimodal transportation alternatives. The evaluation results for the 14 alternatives were presented to the TAC, SWG, and PAC in July/August 2007 for feedback. The PAC recommended that the 14 initial alternatives be reduced to six alternatives for further study. The six alternatives include a mixture of roadway, arterial, and transit/rail improvements at various investment levels. This reduced set of alternatives was approved for further study by the OCTA Board of Directors in October 2007. The reduced set of alternatives was evaluated with the findings on benefits, impacts, and costs presented to the TAC, PAC, and SWG this spring.
Based on this evaluation, the TAC developed a draft locally preferred strategy that included the best performing arterial, freeway/toll road, and transit system elements from the remaining six alternatives. The PAC reviewed the key technical findings and accepted a recommendation from the TAC on a draft multi-modal locally preferred strategy in May 2008. On July 16, 2008, the PAC selected a final multi-modal locally preferred strategy to recommend to the OCTA Board of Directors.

The final locally preferred strategy includes a combination of arterial, freeway/toll road, and transit improvements. Freeway/toll road improvements include adding general purpose lanes to sections of I-5 and I-405, extending the high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lane to the San Diego county line, and reduced tolls and improvements to the toll roads. Proposed transit features include increased local, express, and bus rapid transit services and double-tracking the LOSSAN Rail Corridor with increased passenger service between Orange and San Diego Counties.

**Next Steps**

The OCTA Board of Directors will be asked to approve the locally preferred strategy in September 2008.

OCTA staff is currently making presentations to City Councils and other agencies. SANDAG staff has conveyed some initial comments to OCTA staff concerning the draft locally preferred strategy. These comments include pursuing high occupancy toll lane improvements throughout the corridor versus general purpose lane improvements and supporting improvements to the LOSSAN corridor and other transit investments. Comments from SANDAG will be presented to the OCTA Regional Highway Committee and Board of Directors.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. South Orange County Major Investment Study - Area Map

Key Staff Contact: Heather Werdick, (619) 699-6967; hwe@sandag.org
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REPORT ON INTERSTATE 8 (I-8) INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (IRP) WITH IMPERIAL COUNTY

Introduction

At its May 23, 2008, meeting, the Borders Committee approved the San Diego - Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan Joint Policy Advisory Group Charter. This group will participate in efforts to develop the I-8 IRP with Imperial County by providing policy direction of the upcoming I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan. This report summarizes the developments since that meeting.

At the same time, the Borders Committee appointed three members and one alternate to serve on this Joint Policy Advisory Group. Councilmember Dave Allan, City of La Mesa; Councilmember John Minto, City of Santee; and Mayor Pro Tem Patricia McCoy, City of Imperial Beach were appointed as members, and in his absence, Board of Supervisors Chairman Greg Cox, County of San Diego, was designated to serve as alternate. Unfortunately, Supervisor Cox will be unable to participate as an alternate member to this Policy Advisory Group. This Committee is asked to appoint a different Alternate member to the I-8 IRP Joint Policy Advisory Group.

Discussion

The I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan will evaluate interregional traffic between San Diego and Imperial Counties and identify strategies that address the transportation, economic, environmental, and quality of life needs of both regions. As the study develops, key findings and decision points will be assessed by the I-8 Corridor Technical Advisory Working Group before they are forwarded to the Borders Committee and the Joint Policy Advisory Group.

On June 27, 2008, the Technical Advisory Working Group held its first meeting and discussed: 1) study goals and objectives, 2) the interregional public survey, and 3) existing conditions. The draft goals and objectives (Attachment 1) for the study will be used to guide the development of near- and long-term strategies for consideration in this and subsequent studies. The goals center around addressing the transportation needs of two growing regions by addressing traffic, land use, economic, environmental, and overall quality of life objectives.
To ensure the Strategic Plan is responsive to the needs of current I-8 travelers and the San Diego and Imperial County communities at large, a public survey will be conducted this summer. The survey will be composed of two parts, an I-8 traveler-based survey and an Imperial Valley resident telephone survey. The survey is designed to profile residents and commuters to better understand the factors and decisions that may contribute to traffic congestion and increased interregional commuting along the I-8. The results of the interregional public survey would be presented at the October 2008 Borders Committee.

A draft report of existing traffic, land use, demographic, environmental, and economic conditions will be presented by the project consultant at the July 25, 2008, Borders Committee meeting.

Next Steps

The Borders Committee and the I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan Joint Policy Advisory Group is expected to meet three times during the development of the Strategic Plan. SANDAG staff will seek policy guidance from the Borders Committee and Joint Policy Advisory Group at key project milestones. Meanwhile, the I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan Technical Advisory Working Group will meet monthly through the project’s completion in February 2009 to provide input in the preparation of the Strategic Plan and help resolve technical issues.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan: Draft Goals and Objectives

Key Staff Contact: Ron Saenz, (619) 699-1922; rsa@sandag.org
## SAN DIEGO-IMPERIAL COUNTY I-8 CORRIDOR STRATEGIC PLAN

### Draft Goals and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Improve interregional collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Establishment of partnerships or a structural framework for addressing interregional concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Establishment of a collaborative process between Caltrans, SANDAG, and IVAG, and other local officials, to address issues of common concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Establishment of a collaborative process between I-8 stakeholders, including Caltrans, SANDAG, IVAG, Tribal Nations, Imperial and San Diego County and other local officials, to address issues of common concern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Maintain and improve mobility for people and goods.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Adequate levels of service on the I-8 over the next 20 years and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Improved travel times along the I-8 corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Reduced dependency on single occupant vehicle trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Implementation of strategies that reduce the growth in congestion, while improving air quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Implementation of strategies that incorporate the management and operations of the transportation system with the overall planning process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Enhance the quality of life in the Imperial Valley and San Diego County.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Improved jobs and housing balance in the Imperial Valley and San Diego County (by developing more efficient land use patterns that accommodate a sufficient housing supply to match population increases and workforce needs for the full spectrum of the population).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Implementation of neighborhood and project designs that promote more walking and biking for healthier communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Implementation of smart growth principles such as transit-oriented development around major transit hubs and minimizing of growth in areas that are disconnected from adequate local or regional transportation options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Implementation of strategies that improve transportation safety and security through improved integration of these issues into the transportation planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Implementation of strategies that preserve the unique and rural character and viability of communities along the I-8 corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the economic vitality of Imperial Valley and San Diego County.</td>
<td>Increase in the number and diversification of employment opportunities in the Imperial Valley and San Diego County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Increased supply of workforce housing for a diversified job market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Increased collaborative economic strategies that build on the assets of the two regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize negative impacts of growth and transportation improvements on the environment</td>
<td>Improved strategies that protect habitat and environmentally sensitive lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Implementation of climate action strategies that reduce the carbon footprint of growth and traffic from the Imperial Valley and greater San Diego region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Improved mitigation of environmentally sensitive lands along the I-8 corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Implementation of strategies that preserve the scenic value of the I-8 corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPDATE ON THE SAN YSIDRO PORT OF ENTRY (POE) RECONFIGURATION AND EXPANSION PROJECT

Introduction

The San Ysidro POE is the busiest international land port of entry in the world and is used by one person of every ten entering the United States through any air, sea, and land port of entry. The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) will brief the Committee on progress toward this expansion project.

Discussion

GSA estimates the cost of the Reconfiguration and Expansion Project for the San Ysidro POE at $577 million. The project will be implemented in three phases: Phase 1 will include northbound capacity improvements and the acquisition of all required property; Phase 2 will include construction of northbound buildings; and Phase 3 will include construction of southbound roadways and facilities as well as renovations to the old POE.

Of the $577 million budgeted for the project, $34 million has already been allocated to the GSA’s Federal Building Fund. Another $38 million was submitted in the 2007 prospectus and an additional $161 million was allocated by the Congress in December of 2007. A pre-phase period was added to the program in order to initiate construction during GSA’s Fiscal Year 2008. The pre-phase period will include construction of employee parking on the vacant lot (formerly the location of a commercial operation facility) on Virginia Avenue, the retrofit of five vehicle lanes including the addition of double-stacking inspection booths, and the conversion of one vehicle lane into a feeder lane which will serve four additional inspection booths. It is expected that these preliminary steps will allow the POE to continue its operations while the initial phases of the project progress.

GSA presented a conceptual Master Plan to the Committee in November of 2007. In response to this plan, in January of 2008, the Borders Committee reviewed SANDAG’s letter of comments to the GSA. These comments included the following:

- Support expansion of the eastern pedestrian border crossing to include both north and southbound pedestrian crossings.
- The proposed pedestrian bridge is, in reality, unfriendly to pedestrians.
- Encourage the GSA to increase sidewalk widths, add extensive signage, and design a more friendly pedestrian bridge located closer to the border. The bridge design should be more user-friendly to people with strollers, with carts, disabled people, etc.
- Consider alternatives to replace Camiones Way as well as options for pick-up and drop-off areas for pedestrians and transit users.
- Mitigate impacts to the surrounding community following the Federal Uniform Right-of-Way Act.
- Encourage the GSA to improve efforts to coordinate with Mexico.
- Urge the GSA to continue to pursue a financial plan that ensures the completion of all phases of the project.

Additional comments were provided by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), and community organizations.

In response, GSA made some changes to the master plan (Attachment 1) and worked with the community to prepare a new offsite associated project (Attachment 2), which tries to address many of the comments listed above. The City of San Diego, County of San Diego, MTS, Caltrans, and SANDAG sent a joint letter to Congressman Bob Filner that identifies remaining issues with the project’s current design, primarily with pedestrian access and transit connectivity. This letter also urges Congressman Filner to support the community and the San Diego region’s efforts to improve the design for the San Ysidro POE reconfiguration project and to pursue additional funding to address those offsite associated projects (Attachment 3).

**Next Steps**

The City of San Diego, along with Caltrans, MTS, and SANDAG, will continue to work with GSA to resolve issues related to pedestrian access, transit connectivity, and community projects. Caltrans included a San Ysidro Investment Strategy proposal as one of the four projects submitted to the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) Transportation Border Congestion Relief Program, which is described on Item No. 8 of this agenda packet.

**BOB LEITER**

Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments:  
1. San Ysidro Border Station: Current Design Considerations, April 22, 2008  
2. San Ysidro Border Station: Project Definition Diagram, Offsite Associated Project (by others), April 22, 2008.  

Key Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas, (619) 699-1972; hva@sandag.org
CURRENT DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

**H, I** study alternative locations for central plant, smaller central plant, multiple central plants.

**C, D** study alternative east/west pedestrian bridge location to minimize walking distances and improve pedestrian experience.

**K** possible bridge plaza on Camino de la Plaza.

**J** potential relocation of duty free store.

**A** investigate alternative SB I-5 configurations to maximize commercial land retention.

**B** study potential intermodal plaza or access road.

**D** study alternative north/south pedestrian bridge locations to:
1. Potentially retain existing duty free store in phase 1.

**E** create space for additional booths & lanes on west side.

**H, I** study acquisition & use of East Side parcels.

**I, L** study relocation of old port.

**I, L** program POE for both NB and SB pedestrian flow on the East Side.

**H, I** incorporate community mobility needs & pedestrian enhancements.
June 18, 2008

The Honorable Robert Filner
Member of Congress, 51st District
2428 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Filner:

SUBJECT: San Ysidro Port of Entry Reconfiguration and Expansion Project

Thank you for your participation in the San Ysidro Smart Border Coalition meeting on May 30, 2008. We appreciate your interest in this monumental project that provides the opportunity for improvement of transportation infrastructure at the busiest land border crossing in North America.

Caltrans, the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, Metropolitan Transit System, and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) have reviewed the proposed plans and several agencies have submitted comment letters to the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA). We are supportive of GSA’s effort to expand capacity for autos and their effort to pursue expansion for both north and southbound pedestrian crossings on the east side of the port. We also appreciate the level of planning that GSA has done to date to address the community’s concerns, but we have identified issues with the effect of the project’s currently proposed design and its impact or opportunity to improve pedestrian access and transit connectivity.

The following are key issues that need to be addressed in order to create a successful project that meets both the needs of GSA and its clients, including the U.S. Customs and Border Protection, as well as the neighboring community. We encourage support of GSA’s effort to coordinate with Mexico to expand the eastern pedestrian crossing to provide both north and southbound access for pedestrians. This proposal, if successful, may affect the currently proposed pedestrian bridge (estimated cost: $13 million) that will increase the already long walking distance for those crossing the border on foot. This will serve as a deterrent to those who would like to gain access from the border crossing to existing and planned public transit service. Additionally, intermodal transportation issues both east and west of the freeway need to be addressed to provide for a coordinated, pedestrian-friendly system that includes local and long-haul buses, jitneys, Trolley, taxi, and pick-up and drop-off opportunities for transit riders and pedestrians. The GSA improvements should complement local efforts to encourage non single-occupant vehicle border crossings to reduce border wait times, traffic congestion, and improve local air quality.
In closing, we urge your support of the community and the San Diego region's effort to pursue additional funding to address the above-mentioned mitigation opportunities, including the potential expansion of the Interstate 5/Camino de la Plaza Bridge/Overcrossing (estimated cost: $25 million). Additionally, we request your support as we work with GSA and the community to improve the design for the San Ysidro Port of Entry reconfiguration project to address national security, as well as community concerns related to pedestrian safety and accessibility, community cohesion, together with regional transportation needs.

Sincerely,

Jerry Sanders  
Mayor, City of San Diego

Pedro Orso-Delgado  
Director, Caltrans District 11

Paul Jablonski  
CEO, Metropolitan Transit System

Greg Cox  
Chairman, San Diego County Board of Supervisors

Gary L. Gallegos  
Executive Director, SANDAG
TRANSPORTATION BORDER CONGESTION RELIEF PROGRAM

Introduction

On May 30, 2008, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) requested applications to participate in the Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TBCR). Caltrans, District 11, submitted applications for four border projects in San Diego and Imperial Counties. This report describes the TBCR Program objectives and the four proposed projects.

Discussion

Transportation Border Congestion Relief (TBCR) Program Overview

The goal of the TBCR Program is to identify and assist international border states with the implementation of innovative solutions to help address land border travel delay and facilitate trade and travel without compromising the security of America’s borders.

The primary objectives of the TBCR Program are to:

A. Reduce border travel time delays by promoting non-traditional project delivery and operation approaches at or near international land border crossings.

B. Illustrate the benefits of alternative financial models.

C. Promote and support more efficient coordination among Federal and local agencies with an interest in international land borders.

D. Improve system connectivity to facilitate trade and the safe, legitimate, movement of people and goods across the U.S. border by decreasing border travel times without compromising the vital mission of securing America’s borders.

E. Demonstrate the viability of developing land border crossing projects using an investment model based on sound economics and market principles.

F. Build on the institutional expertise of the U.S.-Mexico Joint Working Committee for Border Planning and other interagency groups.
The U.S. DOT intends to select two or more surface transportation projects for the TBCR Program, at least one on the U.S.-Mexico border and one on the U.S.-Canada border, which can help improve border travel times through use of nontraditional transportation project finance, delivery, and operation mechanisms. If a project is selected for participation in the TBCR Program, U.S. DOT will work with the project sponsor to expedite the delivery of the project.

**Caltrans, District 11, TBCR Program Application Summary**

Caltrans, District 11, submitted applications for four border projects in San Diego and Imperial Counties, which are described in this section. The priority given to the proposed projects in the application package is as follows:

1. Otay Mesa East Port of Entry (POE) & State Route 11
2. San Ysidro POE
3. Calexico East POE
4. State Route 905/125 Interchange at Otay Mesa POE

Project stakeholders recognize that an integrated approach is needed to address the many challenges associated with border congestion. The four projects outlined in the application would improve crossborder travel capacity and enhance security. A brief description of each of the four projects is provided below.

**Otay Mesa East POE & State Route 11:**

The Otay Mesa East POE and State Route 11 (SR 11) project seeks to relieve traffic congestion at the San Ysidro and Otay Mesa regional border crossings, reduce wait times at border inspection stations, and improve efficient cross-border movement of people and goods. This project would construct a new land POE at no cost to the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) or U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) complete with state-of-the-art technology for security and enforcement, and furnishings primarily through tolls or user fees. The project is estimated to have a positive economic impact exceeding $31.6 billion over the first 10 years of operation from 2015-2024 and it is fully supported by its local, regional, federal, and international stakeholders.

**San Ysidro POE:**

The San Ysidro-Puerta Mexico POE is known as the busiest international land border crossing in the world. One of every ten people entering the U.S. via sea, air, or land port, enters through the San Ysidro POE. This project seeks to address community and regional transportation improvements that will complement the San Ysidro POE expansion project underway by U.S. GSA. The proposed study would create a plan for transportation improvements and identify self-help/innovative financing tools for the public and private sectors to partner in creating an international trade gateway. Caltrans is advancing this study, in cooperation with the City of San Diego, SANDAG, and other stakeholders.
Calexico East POE:

This project seeks to expand the Calexico East POE on land owned by Caltrans and the U.S. GSA. The project purpose is to increase capacity at the U.S.-Mexico border crossing and decrease wait times at both the Calexico East and the Calexico West border crossings. The proposed improvements can be accomplished quickly to add capacity to the existing POE and benefit the region by allowing commercial and passenger vehicles to enter and exit the port more efficiently, reducing wait times, air pollution, and enhancing international trade. The proposed Project is a minimum cost-maximum benefit situation, where additional capacity could be attained quickly to help ease current congestion at both POEs in Calexico.

State Route 905/125 Interchange at Otay Mesa POE:

This project is the result of extensive collaboration among SANDAG, Caltrans, and city and county governments to improve the efficiency of border crossings as well as goods movement from the border to the regional freeway system serving the southwest region of the United States and beyond. Phase 3 of the SR 905 project is needed to facilitate the freeway-to-freeway connection at SR 125. This interchange is vital to improve travel times to and from the existing Otay Mesa POE and the proposed Otay Mesa East POE, increasing efficiency in the movement of goods and people.

Next Steps

The U.S. DOT is expected to announce the projects selected for participation in the TBCR Program in August 2008.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Key Staff Contact: Christina Casgar, (619) 699-1982; cca@sandag.org
UPDATE ON THE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) TRIBAL TRANSIT GRANT

The Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA) recently received a $425,000 grant from FTA’s Tribal Transit Program (5311c) for year one of a four-year program to improve transit connections between the tribal reservations and the urban transit system through enhancements to existing routes, as well as the addition of tribally-operated connector routes. The grant program was intended to cover 100 percent of program costs; however, the FTA awarded slightly less than 50 percent of the requested funding. Work is now underway to re-scope the year one activities to coordinate with the transit agencies. The RTA has prepared the attached status report for the Committee's information.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Cover letter from the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA)
               2. Working Group Report on the Tribal Transit Grant

Key Staff Contact: Jane Clough-Riquelme, (619) 699-1909; jcl@sandag.org
Dear Borders Committee;

In FY 2007, the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues served as the Project Advisory Group for the development of a Tribal Transit Feasibility Study sponsored by Caltrans through a cooperative planning grant awarded to SANDAG to analyze potential transit corridors to connect reservations in the San Diego region to the urban transit system. As a result of this project, the Working Group recommended that the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA) act as its fiscal agent and apply to secure funding for the recommended strategies through the new FTA Tribal Transit Program (5311c) available only and directly to Tribes and consortia of Tribes through the current transportation bill known as SAFETEA-LU. The RTA submitted an application on August 2, 2007. The FTA announced the FY 2007 awards in March of 2008, including a $425,000 grant to the RTA. This grant was the largest awarded nationwide, however, it was less than 50 percent of the amount requested. RTA has analyzed the options for re-scoping the project and requests input from the Working Group as they begin to process the grant.

At its quarterly meeting on June 18, 2008 the tribal members of the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues (Working Group) recommended that the attached report be shared with the SCTCA Board and that the tribal leaders provide direction and guidance on the re-scoping of the Tribal Transit Grant. RTA presented the possible options for revising the scope to the SCTCA at their July 1 Board meeting. The SCTCA provided the following recommendation:

- Focus funding on pilot 388 express bus to the Escondido Transit Center, assess the feasibility of a connector route between the southeastern tribes and the tribal transit node at Viejas, and refine the service operation plan.
- Apply for second year funding due August 19, 2008

Attached is the full report, with details about the project, the proposed options for the project and appendices submitted to the Working Group and the SCTCA for consideration. The RTA has held several meetings with staff from NCTD and MTS to reassess viable alternatives, given the current budget situation. The RTA will update the Borders Committee and Working Group as the Year One scope of work is finalized and programmed.

Respectfully,

Kim Yearyean
General Manager

“We are the product of what we let ourselves be.”
UPDATE: RESERVATION TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (RTA) APPLICATION TO FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) TRIBAL TRANSIT FUND 5311(c)

Introduction

In FY 2007, the Working Group served as the Project Advisory Group for the development of a Tribal Transit Feasibility Study sponsored by Caltrans through a cooperative planning grant awarded to SANDAG to analyze potential transit corridors to connect reservations in the San Diego region to the urban transit system. As a result of this project, the Working Group recommended that the RTA apply for funding to finance all, or a portion of, the recommended strategies through the new FTA Tribal Transit Program (5311c) available directly to Tribes and consortia of Tribes through current transportation bill, Safe Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The RTA submitted an application on August 2, 2007. The FTA announced the FY 2007 awards in March of 2008, including a $425,000 grant to the RTA. This grant was the largest awarded nationwide, however, it was less than 50 percent of the amount requested. RTA has analyzed the options for rescoping the project and requests input from the Working Group as they begin to process the grant.

Recommendation

The Working Group is asked to make a recommendation to the RTA on the direction and emphasis to take for rescoping the year one program for the Tribal Transit program.

Discussion

Tribal Transit Feasibility Study

The federal 2005 transportation legislation, SAFETEA-LU, reinforces the importance of intergovernmental cooperation in improving transportation services and facilities. SANDAG was awarded a transit planning grant from Caltrans to determine the feasibility of implementing transit service in one or two key transportation corridors between selected Tribal reservations and cities and/or urbanized community planning areas in the unincorporated area of San Diego County. This study examined traditional public transit services, as well as the potential for nontraditional services that could be funded by private sources and/or public-private partnerships.
The study was a collaborative effort between SANDAG, the RTA, and the region’s transit agencies - the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD). SANDAG contracted with IBI Group to conduct the technical analysis for the study. The Working Group served as the Project Advisory Group, providing guidance throughout the study. Numerous meetings of the project team and the Working Group were held as part of the study at different reservations to provide direction and comment.

The study divided the eastern portion of the county into north and south corridors. The north corridor was focused on Tribes generally along State Routes 76 and 78. The south corridor was generally focused along Interstate 8 and State Route 67. The two corridors overlapped in the vicinity of Ramona. The report recommended that new route deviation bus service be provided in both north and south corridors, a new express route be introduced to the north corridor via Interstate 15, and bus stop improvements be constructed at significant stops. The services would enhance local connections among the Tribes and on reservations, as well as providing improved linkages to urban centers. The proposed services are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2 (Attachment 1).

Draft recommendations were reviewed and the proposals were adjusted in response to comments. The final report was completed in June 2007, with direction to pursue FTA Section 5311(c) funds in this year’s grant cycle for the improvements.¹

FTA Tribal Transit Program (5311c)

Under the 2005 transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU, the federal government announced a new competitive program open only to Tribal governments and Tribal consortia to fund transit service in rural areas. Eligible recipients may use TTP funds for any purpose authorized under the Section 5311 program. This means that grants can be awarded to recipients located in rural and small urban areas with populations fewer than 50,000 not identified as an urbanized area by the Bureau of the Census for public transportation capital projects, operating costs of equipment and facilities for use in public transportation, planning, and the acquisition of public transportation services, including service agreements with private providers of public transportation services. Service funded under this program must be designed to be accessible to members of the general public who have disabilities. Coordinated human service transportation that primarily serves elderly persons and persons with disabilities, but that is not restricted from carrying other members of the public, is considered available to the general public if it is marketed as public transportation. No cost sharing is required for this program. However, FTA encourages Tribes to leverage the program funds and demonstrate commitment to the project through in-kind contributions and use of other funding sources that are available to support public transportation service.

The Working Group directed the RTA to apply for this grant program to support the recommendations from the Tribal Transit Feasibility Study. RTA contracted with IBI Group to assist them in preparing the application. The RTA submitted the application on August 2, 2007. Funds were sought for the startup of five new routes and substantial enhancement to one existing route that serves reservations. These improvements are intended to serve multiple purposes:

¹ The Final Report was distributed to the Working Group on several occasions. The full report may be downloaded at http://www.sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid_305_7616.pdf. Hard copies are available upon request. Please contact Jane Clough-Riquelme (jcl@sandag.org).
• Connect rural residents to local and nearby destinations
• Connect Tribes to regional transit system
• Connect Tribes to intercity transportation services
• Help bring employees from urbanized areas to new employment opportunities on Tribal lands

They will benefit many of the 148,000 rural residents in San Diego County including reservation residents and Tribal employment center employees. In March of 2008, the FTA announced the grant recipients (Attachment 2). RTA was awarded $425,000 of the $928,000 requested for year one of a four-year budget plan (Attachment 3).

**Revised Budget Rescoping Options**

Given the significantly reduced funding received from the FTA for this program, the Year One programming for this project must be modified -- unless funding can be identified and obtained for the remaining portion of the budget. Several technical meetings were held between the RTA and SANDAG to develop feasible alternatives for reprogramming the funding. These options were reviewed and discussed by the RTA Executive Council at their May 8, 2008, meeting.

Two principle alternatives developed are outlined in Attachment 4. Criteria used to develop these options were to: maximize effective, efficient use of funding to the benefit of Tribal governments, build a track record of success with the FTA to ensure future funding, ensure that all alternatives benefit both the northern and southern corridors.

**Option A**
Focuses on enhancing existing routes in both the north and the south. The majority of the funds would be dedicated to enhancements to NCTD Route 388, which also improves routes serving Tribes in the MTS area of influence.

**Option B**
Focuses on the addition of an Express Route portion of NCTD Route 388, leaving the rest of the route unmodified. Funding also would be dedicated to enhancements to MTS routes serving Tribes on the I-8 corridor. Additionally, a portion of the funds would be dedicated to refining the new Tribal transit operational plan, which would be submitted, to the FTA for the next funding cycle.

**Next Steps**

The overall budget for this project is based on a four-year plan. As this grant is based on yearly competitions and the San Diego Tribes were successful in obtaining funding, the RTA, on behalf of the Tribal governments, should consider applying for the next cycle. The deadline is **August 19, 2008**.

Once the Working Group has provided guidance on how to rescope the current one year grant, it is suggested that the Working Group form an ad hoc Tribal Transit Task Force to assist: a) in refining the scope of work for year one; and b) provide feedback for the development of the next grant application. The ad hoc Task Force should include the RTA and representatives from at least one Tribe in the northern corridor and one in the south, as well as transit planning staff from SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD.
Attachments: 1. Tribal Corridor Service Maps  
2. March 2008 Federal Registry TTP Grant Announcement  
3. Grant Award Letter to RTA  
4. Tribal Transit Options Matrix

Key Staff Contacts:  Kim Yearyean, RTA, kim@rezta.com, (951) 308-1442 or cell (951) 234-9127  
Jane Clough-Riquelme, SANDAG, jcl@sandag.org, (619) 699-1909
South Corridor Proposed Transit Services

Sources: SANDAG, SANGIS
North Corridor Proposed Transit Services

Sources: SANDAG, SANGIS
resulted in a lower level of safety than was maintained before it was granted; or (3) continuation of the exemption would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315.

Basis for Renewing Exemptions

Under 49 U.S.C. 31315(b)(1), an exemption may be granted for no longer than two years and renewed for additional two year periods. In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, each of the 34 applicants has satisfied the entry conditions for obtaining an exemption from the vision requirements (64 FR 27027; 64 FR 51568; 67 FR 10475; 69 FR 8260; 71 FR 16410; 64 FR 54948; 65 FR 159; 67 FR 17102; 69 FR 17267; 71 FR 6824; 64 FR 68195; 65 FR 20251; 65 FR 45817; 65 FR 77066; 68 FR 1654; 70 FR 7545; 66 FR 17743; 66 FR 33990; 68 FR 35772; 71 FR 644; 68 FR 74699; 69 FR 10503; 71 FR 6829; 71 FR 5105; 71 FR 19606; 68 FR 35772; 66 FR 17743; 68 FR 74699; 69 FR 10503). Each of these 34 applicants has requested renewal of the exemption and has submitted evidence showing that the vision in the better eye continues to meet the standard specified at 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10) and that the vision impairment is stable. In addition, a review of each record of safety while driving with the respective visual deficiencies over the past two years indicates each applicant continues to meet the vision exemption standards. These factors provide an adequate basis for predicting each driver’s ability to continue to drive safely in interstate commerce. Therefore, FMCSA concludes that extending the exemption for each renewal applicant for a period of two years is likely to achieve a level of safety equal to that existing without the exemption.

Request for Comments

FMCSA will review comments received at any time concerning a particular driver’s safety record and determine if the continuation of the exemption is consistent with the requirements at 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315. However, FMCSA requests that interested parties with specific data concerning the safety records of these drivers submit comments by April 4, 2008. FMCSA believes that the requirements for a renewal of an exemption under 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315 can be satisfied by initially granting the renewal and then requesting and evaluating, if needed, subsequent comments submitted by interested parties. As indicated above, the Agency previously published notices of final disposition announcing its decision to exempt these 34 individuals from the vision requirement in 49 CFR 391.41(b)(10). The final decision to grant an exemption to each of these individuals was based on the merits of each case and only after careful consideration of the comments received to its notices of applications. The notices of applications stated in detail the qualifications, experience, and medical condition of each applicant for an exemption from the vision requirements. That information is available by consulting the above cited Federal Register publications. Interested parties or organizations possessing information that would otherwise show that any, or all of these drivers, are not currently achieving the statutory level of safety should immediately notify FMCSA. The Agency will evaluate any adverse evidence submitted and, if safety is being compromised or if continuation of the exemption would not be consistent with the goals and objectives of 49 U.S.C. 31136(e) and 31315, FMCSA will take immediate steps to revoke the exemption of a driver.

Issued on: February 26, 2008.

Larry W. Minor,
Associate Administrator for Policy and Program Development.

BILLING CODE 4910–EX–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

Public Transportation on Indian Reservations Program; Tribal Transit Program

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Award.

SUMMARY: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) announces the selection of projects to be funded under Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 appropriations for the Tribal Transit Program (TTP), a program authorized by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact the appropriate FTA regional Tribal Liaison (Appendix A) for application-specific information and issues. For general program information, contact Lorna R. Wilson, Office of Transit Programs, at (202) 366–2053, e-mail: Lorna.Wilson@dot.gov. A TDD is available at 1–800–877–8339 (TDD/ FIRS).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Tribal Transit Program (TTP) established by Section 3013 SAFETEA–LU, Pub. L. 109–49 (August 15, 2005), under 49 U.S.C. 5311(c) makes funds available to federally recognized Indian tribes or Alaska Native villages, groups, or communities as identified by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) in the U.S. Department of the Interior for public transportation capital projects, operating costs and planning activities that are eligible costs under the Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (Section 5311). A total of $10 million was made available for the program in FY 2007. A total of 75 applicants requested $21 million for new transit services, enhancement or expansion of existing transit services and planning studies including operational planning. FTA made project selections through a competitive process based on each applicant’s responsiveness to the program evaluation criteria outlined in FTA’s April 4, 2007, Federal Register Notice: Notice of Funding Availability and Solicitation for FY 2007 TTP (71 FR 16397). FTA evaluated applications for planning grants on a pass/fail basis, whereas FTA evaluated applications for start up and existing transit services on a numeric score system. FTA also took into consideration the current status of the FY 2006 grants for those tribes requesting multi-year funding. Because of the high demand, many applicants selected for funding will receive less funding than they requested to enable FTA to support an increased number of meritorious applications.

This notice only addresses FY 2007 funding for projects. Tribes that sought funding for a multi-year project in response to the FY 2007 solicitation must submit a new application in response to the FY 2008 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) in order to be considered for FY 2008 funding. The FY 2008 notice will be published in the spring of 2008. The selected projects, providing $10 million to 65 tribes, break down as follows: $399,963 for transit planning studies and/or operational planning; $904,666 for startup projects for new transit service; and, $8,695,371 for enhancements or expansion of existing transit services. Each of the 65 awardees, as well as the applicants not selected for funding, will receive a letter explaining the funding decision. The successful applicants for FY 2007 are listed in Table 1. Following publication of this notice, FTA’s regional tribal liaison will contact each applicant selected for funding to discuss technical assistance/needs. In the event the contact information...
provided in the FY 2007 application has changed, please contact your tribal liaison with the current information in order to expedite the grant award process.

Issued in Washington, DC, this 29th day of February, 2008.

James S. Simpson, Administrator.

Appendix A—FTA Regional Offices and Tribal Transit Liaisons

Region I—Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Vermont and Maine—Richard H. Doyle, FTA Regional Administrator, Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, Kendall Square, 55 Broadway, Suite 920, Cambridge, MA 02142–1093, Phone: (617) 494–2055, Fax: (617) 494–2865, Regional Tribal Liaison: Judi Molloy.

Region II—New York, New Jersey—Brigid Hynes-Cherin, FTA Regional Administrator, One Bowling Green, Room 420, New York, NY 10004–1415, Phone: (212) 668–2170, Fax: (212) 668–2136, Regional Tribal Liaison: Rebecca Reeyes-Alicea.

Region III—Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Delaware, Washington, DC, Letitia Thompson, FTA Regional Administrator, 1760 Market Street, Suite 500, Philadelphia, PA 19103–4124, Phone: (215) 656–7100, Fax: (215) 656–7260.

Region IV—Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, Alabama, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands—Yvette G. Taylor, FTA Regional Administrator, 230 Peachtree St., N.W., Suite 800, Atlanta, GA 30303, Tel.: 404–865–5600, Fax: 404–865–5605, Regional Tribal Liaisons: Jamie Pfister and James Garland.


Region VI—Texas, New Mexico, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma—Robert Patrick, FTA Regional Administrator, 819 Taylor Street, Room 8A36, Ft. Worth, TX 76102, Phone: (817) 978–0550, Fax: (817) 978–0575, Regional Tribal Liaison: Lynn Hayes.

Region VII—Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri—Mokhtee Ahmad, FTA Regional Administrator, 901 Locust Street, Suite 404, Kansas City, MO 64106, Phone: (816) 329–3920, Fax: (816) 329–3921, Regional Tribal Liaisons: Joni Roeseler and Cathy Monroe.

Region VIII—Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Utah—Terry Rosapep, FTA Regional Administrator, 12300 West Dakota Avenue, Suite 310, Lakewood, CO 80228–2583, Phone: (720) 963–3300, Fax: (720) 963–3333, Regional Tribal Liaisons: Jennifer Stewart and David Beckhouse.

Region IX—California, Arizona, Nevada, Hawaii, American Samoa, Guam—Leslie Rogers, FTA Regional Administrator, 201 Mission Street, Suite 1650, San Francisco, CA 94105–1926, Phone: (415) 744–3133, Fax: (415) 744–2726, Regional Tribal Liaison: Lorraine Lerman.


BILLING CODE 4910–57–P
### Table 1 – FY 2007 Tribal Transit Grant Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>Start-up</th>
<th>Discretionary ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asa'Carsarmiut Tribal Council</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>165,366</td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catawba Indian Nation</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocopah Indian Tribe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>211,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d'Alene Tribe</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation's</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowlitz Indian Tribe</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Band of Cherokee Nations</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td>172,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Belknap Indian Community</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>218,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Portage Band of Chippewa Indians</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulkana Village Council</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havasupai Tribe of the Havasupai Reservation</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healy Lake Village</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,017</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Heath Services</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispel Tribe of Indians</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>208,296</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenaitze Indian Tribe</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiowa Tribe</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>262,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath Tribe</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac Courte Oreilles Tribe</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td></td>
<td>161,632</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Brule Sioux Tribe call</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lummi Tribe of the Lummi Reservation</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manley Village Council</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscogee (Creek) Nation</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenana Native Council</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northway Village</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oglala Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha Tribe of Nebraska</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orutsaramiut Native Council</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
<td>136,370</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponca Tribe Nebraska</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td>216,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 – FY 2007 Tribal Transit Grant Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>Start-up</th>
<th>Discretionary ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ponca Tribe of Oklahoma</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>207,119</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo of Santa Ana</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
<td>240,221</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservation Transportation Authority</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>425,104</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson Rancheria</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebud Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sac and Fox Nation</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,963</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos Apache Tribe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee Sioux Nation</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>195,800</td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole Nation</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie Tribe</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>250,130</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Rock Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>94,355</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanzville Indian Rancheria</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>206,082</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetlin Village Council</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bishop Paiute Tribe</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Blackfeet Tribe</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,820</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chickasaw Nation</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>315,234</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Citizen Potawatomi Nation</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>275,774</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>154,760</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sitka Tribe</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td></td>
<td>172,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Keetoowah Band</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>327,000</td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walatowa Pueblo of Jemez</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mountain Apache Tribe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yurok Tribe</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>122,347</td>
<td></td>
<td>D2007-TRTR-065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL $10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$399,963</td>
<td>$8,695,371</td>
<td>$904,666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[FR Doc. 08–967 Filed 3–4–08; 8:45 am]
Kim Yearyean
General Manager
Reservation Transportation Authority
28860 Old Town Front Street, Ste. C-1
Temecula, AZ 92590

Attn: Jane Clough-Riquelme, SANDAG

Dear Ms. Yearyean:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is pleased to inform you that your application to the Tribal Transit program has been selected for funding. FTA received seventy-five applications representing a variety of proposed rural transit projects, from which sixty-five applications were selected for Fiscal Year 2007 Tribal Transit Program awards. We look forward to the successful implementation of your project to the benefit of your tribe and surrounding communities.

The next step is for your tribal transit program manager to contact the FTA Region IX for assistance with completing preliminary grant requirements. In order to streamline the process you will be asked to submit a paper application that will be entered into our grants management system, TEAM. Please also note that if you applied for the TTP via Grants.gov, the SF424 form you completed with your application has been entered into FTA’s TEAM system.

We look forward to working with you and again congratulate you on being selected for funding. If you have further questions about the Tribal Transit Program please contact your tribal program liaison, Lorraine Lerman, Community Planner, at 415-744-2735 or email lorraine.berman@dot.gov.

Sincerely,

Leslie T. Rogers
Regional Administrator
FTA Tribal Transit Grant (5311c)
Grant for FY 2008:

Requested for Year 1: $928,000
Received for Year 1: $425,000

Options Matrix for Revised Budget

| Original Plan for Year 1 | • Restructuring existing NCTD Route 388 to increase frequency, extend service to two Tribal employment centers, and add a freeway express segment; and  
|                          | • Preparing for the startup of the new services in year two, including vehicle procurement, finalizing the operating plan, and selecting an operating contractor |

| Option A | • Restructuring existing NCTD Route 388 to increase frequency, extend service to two Tribal employment centers (75% of funds);  
|          | • Enhance service in the southern portion of the county w/MTS (25% of funds) |

| Option B | • Add a freeway express segment to the NCTD 388 which would service two Tribal employment centers (50% of funds);  
|          | • Enhance MTS routes in south to service Tribal employment centers (40% of funds); and  
|          | • Refine service plan for new Tribal operated routes (10% of funds) |
South Orange County Major Investment Study
SANDAG Borders Committee
July 25, 2008

Study Area
• South Orange County Major Investment Study
• Geographic Area: 40 Percent of Orange County
Public Involvement Program

Study Process Guided by Three Committees:

- Policy Advisory Committee
- Technical Advisory Committee
- Stakeholder Working Group

The “Transportation Problem”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway Congestion</th>
<th>Rail Corridor Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Roadway Congestion</td>
<td>Economic Growth &amp; Quality of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Congestion</td>
<td>Need to Maximize Use of Existing Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Transit Choices</td>
<td>System Gaps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Select the Best Combination of Transportation Investment Choices that includes the:

- Arterial System
- Freeway/Toll Road System
- Transit System

Future Transportation Baseline

- Committed and Funded Projects by 2030
- Examples:
  - Foothill South (SR-241 Completion)
  - Adding 1 Lane per Direction to the Toll Roads
  - 30 Minute Metrolink Service
  - Arterial Projects (Alton Parkway Extension, Completion of La Pata, Tustin Ranch Road Extension, Cow Camp Road)
**TSM / TDM Improvements**

- **Transportation Systems Management (TSM)**
  - Strategies that improve the roadway system’s performance
- **Transportation Demand Management (TDM)**
  - Strategies that result in more efficient use of transportation resources
  - Examples: rideshare programs, parking pricing, reduced bus fares, workplace flex time

**Arterial System**

Objective:
Complete buildout of the Master Plan of Arterial Highway (MPAH) system. Provide east-west roadway capacity needed to keep pace with growing travel demand, addressing rapidly developing areas of southeast Orange County.

Proposed Transportation Features:
- Construct a new four-lane arterial roadway between I-5 and Antonio Parkway. Provide direct ramp connections to SR-73 and I-5.
- Widens Oso Parkway by one lane in each direction. Total width of Oso Parkway becomes 8 lanes between I-5 and Antonio Parkway.
- Widens Orange Highway further by one lane in each direction. Total width of Orange Highway becomes 8 lanes between I-5 and Antonio Parkway.
- Includes MPAH improvements.

Note: Orange highway (SR-73), a planned to become two lanes in each direction between I-5 and Antonio Parkway. These environmental studies are currently underway.
**Freeway & Toll Road System**

**Objective:**
Add lanes to the freeway system in locations that experience the most severe levels of freeway congestion. Achieve a better balance between the freeway system and the toll road system by widening the toll roads in the study area and by reducing the price of the toll for toll road users.

**Proposed Transportation Features:**
- Add general purpose lanes to sections of I-5 and I-405.
- Extend the existing HOV lanes on I-5 to the County Line.
- Reduce the toll price for toll road users by employing a "shadow toll" or equivalent strategies.
- Widen existing toll roads (SR-73, SR-241, and SR-133) by one lane in each direction to maintain competitive levels of service.
- Conduct further study of new access to I-5 in the vicinity of Fullerton College.
- Provide Truck Climbing Lane, Direct HOV Ramps, and Selected Interchange Improvements.

*Note: A "shadow toll" is a per vehicle subsidy that is paid to a toll road operator by a third party and not to toll users. Shadow toll amounts are based on the type of vehicle and distance traveled.*

---

**Bus Transit System**

**Objective:**
Enhance existing bus service and introduce new types of bus transit services to address a variety of travel markets within the study area.

**Proposed Transportation Features:**
- Increase local and express bus services by improving frequency and geographic coverage.
- Provide a substantial investment in community-based shuttles.
- Introduce beach buses and special event shuttles.
- Provide Bus Rapid Transit Route from Tustin Station to downtown San Juan Capistrano, serving 30 rail stations and major activity centers along the route.
Rail Transit System

Objective:
Improve transit travel times and trip reliability in order to attract the discretionary rider. Address capacity constraints on the Los Angeles - San Diego (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor within the study area. Improve access to passenger rail stations.

Proposed Transportation Features:
- Double-track LOSSAN Rail Corridor in tunnel, addressing areas that are currently single-track
- Increase passenger rail service by adding more round-trip trains as well as more weekend trains between San Diego and Orange Counties
- Provide direct ramps from Jamboree Road to Tustin Station
- Add a new rail station in Lake Forest
- Increase the amount and quality of transit services connecting to and from rail stations (e.g., Go Local MetroLink Connectors, Fixed Guideway)

Recommended LPS

- May 2008 – Technical Advisory Committee recommended the draft LPS be sent to the Policy Advisory Committee
- July 2008 – the Policy Advisory Committee approved the LPS be sent to the OCTA Board for their consideration
- September 2008 – OCTA Board will be asked to consider the approval of the recommended LPS
Next Steps

September 2008

• OCTA Highways Committee
• OCTA Board of Directors
San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan

Borders Committee
July 25, 2008

Overview

• I-8 Corridor Study Area spans from 2nd Street in El Cajon to Arizona border
• Key Plan Elements:
  - Goals and Objectives
  - Existing Conditions
  - Interregional Public Survey
  - Early Actions and Interregional Strategies
Draft
Goals and Objectives

• Improve interregional collaboration
  - Establish partnerships and collaborate with Caltrans, SANDAG, IVAG, Tribal Nations, Imperial and San Diego counties and other stakeholders to address I-8 study area and other issues of common concern
Draft Goals and Objectives

• Maintain and improve mobility of goods and people
  - Provide adequate level of service
  - Improve travel times
  - Reduce dependency on single occupant vehicles
  - Reduce growth in congestion while improving air quality
  - Incorporate management and operations in planning process

Draft Goals and Objectives

• Enhance the quality of life in Imperial Valley and San Diego County
  - Improve jobs-housing balance
  - Provide more opportunities for more pedestrian/bicycle-friendly neighborhoods and smart growth development
  - Address transportation safety and security
  - Preserve unique and rural character and viability of communities along corridor
Draft Goals and Objectives

• Improve the economic vitality of Imperial and San Diego County
  - Increase number and diversity of jobs
  - Increase supply of workforce housing
  - Develop greater collaborative economic strategies between two regions

Draft Goals and Objectives

• Minimize negative impacts of growth and transportation improvements on the environment
  - Protect habitat and environmentally sensitive lands
  - Implement climate action strategies
  - Preserve scenic value of corridor
Draft Existing Conditions
I-8 Corridor

Existing (2007) Traffic Volumes
Existing (2006) Truck Volumes

Source: SANDAG

Existing Level of Service

Source: SANDAG
I-8 Travelers

- Commuters – represent 16 percent of daily traffic at county border
- Truckers – represent 10 percent of daily traffic at county border / up to a quarter of corridor-wide daily traffic
- Recreational-Based Trips
  - Tribal Casinos
  - Imperial Dunes Recreation Area
- Others
Population – San Diego County

- 332,000 added since 2000 (12% increase)

Source: California Department of Finance

Population – Imperial County

- 34,000 added since 2000 (24% increase)

Source: California Department of Finance
Housing – San Diego County

- 99,000 added since 2000 (9% increase)

[Graph showing the number of housing units from 2000 to 2008 for San Diego County.]

Source: California Department of Finance

Housing – Imperial County

- 12,000 added since 2000 (27% increase)

[Graph showing the number of housing units from 2000 to 2008 for Imperial County.]

Source: California Department of Finance
Employment – San Diego County

• 150,000 added since 2000 (11% increase)

Source: California Employment Development Department

Employment – Imperial County

• 4,000 added since 2000 (7% increase)

Source: California Employment Development Department
Future Level of Service

Source: SANDAG

Future* Level of Service

Source: IVAG

* Future level of service based on Imperial County General Plan build out
Projected Population Growth

• By 2050,
  - San Diego County is projected to be home to 4.5 million people, equivalent to adding another City of San Diego to the county
  - Imperial County is projected to be home to almost 400,000 people, more than doubling today’s population

Existing Conditions and Key Preliminary Findings

• Existing congestion along corridor is limited
• Commuters and trucks do not represent the majority of traffic at county-boundary
• Imperial Valley is not currently a bedroom community for San Diego County
• The two economies are independent but linked

Source: California Department of Finance
Next Steps

• Joint Policy Advisory Committee meeting August 1
• Feedback on Goals and Objectives
• Finalize Existing Conditions
• Interregional Public Survey
• Early Actions and Interregional Strategies
SAN YSIDRO BORDER STATION
Expansion and Reconfiguration Project
SITE MASTER PLAN
Status Report, JULY 2008

DRAFT MASTER PLAN: DECEMBER 2007
- SB lanes shifted to maximize commercial land retention;
- Central plant relocated to east side of Port;
- East side SB Pedestrian crossing accommodated, supported by east side Pedestrian plaza with amenities;
- Community connector/economic development area can be accommodated around Camino de la Plaza
- Walking Distance of E/W pedestrian bridge optimized
- NB expansion lanes potential created at west side of Port
- Community projects at edges of Port identified. (Implementation committee recommended).

REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN

A
SOUTHBOUND ROADWAY, PRIOR PLAN
A SOUTHBOUND ROADWAY, REVISED PLAN

C/D EAST-WEST PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE
CAMINO DE LA PLAZA ELEVATED PARKWAY
OPTION 3

CAMINO DE LA PLAZA WIDENING CONCEPTUAL
ELEVATED PARKWAY
I/L EAST SIDE SB PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

SCOPE OF WORK: FEDERAL PROJECT
SCOPE OF WORK: COMMUNITY PROJECTS

SAN YSIDRO BORDER STATION
MASTER PLAN 2008
TBCR Program Overview

- **Program Goal:** Help international border states implement innovative solutions to reduce border travel delays, facilitate trade & travel, and maintain security

- **Program Objectives:**
  - Promote non-traditional project finance, delivery, and operation mechanisms
  - Illustrate benefits of alternative financial models
  - Build on institutional expertise of U.S.-Mexico Joint Working Committee for Border Planning and other interagency groups
TBCR Program Overview

- U.S. DOT applications were due June 30, 2008
- U.S. DOT expected to select at least two surface transportation projects – one on U.S.-Mexican border and one on U.S.-Canadian border
- U.S. DOT will work with selected project sponsors to expedite delivery of projects

California TBCR Projects

- Otay Mesa East Port of Entry (POE) and State Route (SR) 11
- San Ysidro POE
- Calexico East POE
- SR 905/SR 125 Interchange at Otay Mesa POE
SR 905/SR 125 Interchange at Otay Mesa POE

Summary & Next Steps

- An integrated approach is needed to address border congestion challenges
- The four TBCR projects would improve crossborder capacity and enhance security
- U.S. DOT expected to announce selections in August 2008
Transportation Border Congestion Relief Program (TBCR)

Borders Committee
July 25, 2008