BORDERS COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, January 9, 2009
12:30 to 2:30 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP JOINT POLICY ADVISORY GROUP CHARTER AMENDMENT

• DRAFT SAN DIEGO – IMPERIAL COUNTY I-8 STRATEGIC PLAN

• UPDATES ON THE SAN YSIDRO – PUERTA MEXICO PORT OF ENTRY RECONFIGURATION AND EXPANSION PROJECTS

• STATUS REPORT ON THE PROPOSED OTAY MESA EAST-OTAY II PORT OF ENTRY AND CONNECTING ROADS

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

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.
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**ITEM 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 (Item #3)**

+3. I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP JOINT POLICY ADVISORY GROUP CHARTER AMENDMENT (Chair Patricia McCoy)

The Borders Committee will be asked to amend the I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP) Joint Policy Advisory Group Charter to include representatives from the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) on the Joint Policy Advisory Group.

**REPORT (Items #4 through #8)**

+4. DRAFT SAN DIEGO – IMPERIAL COUNTY I-8 STRATEGIC PLAN (Rosa Lopez, Imperial Valley Association of Governments; and Ron Saenz, SANDAG)

The Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG), in partnership with Caltrans, District 11, and SANDAG, has been working on developing the I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan. The Draft Strategic Plan will be presented to the Borders Committee in preparation for the January 23, 2009, Joint Policy Advisory Working Group meeting.
+5. SOUTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL’S COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (Cindy Gompper-Graves, South San Diego County Economic Development Council)

The South County Economic Development Council (SCEDC) recently received a $50,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Commerce’s Economic Development Administration (EDA) to create a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). Local agencies and economic development councils from Imperial Valley and San Diego County are participants in the preparation of this strategy, which could complement the strategies identified in the Draft San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan.

+6. UPDATES ON THE SAN YSIDRO – PUERTA MEXICO PORT OF ENTRY RECONFIGURATION AND EXPANSION PROJECTS

The United States and Mexico’s complementary plans to reconfigure and expand the San Ysidro – Puerta Mexico Port of Entry will be presented.

a.) San Ysidro/Virginia Avenue Port of Entry Reconfiguration and Expansion Project
   (Keith Lew, U.S. General Services Administration)

   The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) will brief the Committee on the status and progress on this project.

b.) Puerta Mexico/El Chaparral Port of Entry
   (Sean Cázares, Mexico’s Secretariat of Foreign Relations; and Fidel Castañeda, Mexico’s Institute of Administration and Estimates of National Real Estate)

   This report will present Mexico’s plans to reconfigure the Puerta Mexico Port of Entry, including the former commercial facility known as El Chaparral. The Institute of Administration and Estimates of National Real Estate (INDAABIN) is Mexico’s counterpart to the U.S. GSA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+7.</td>
<td>STATUS REPORT ON THE PROPOSED OTAY MESA EAST-OTAY II PORT OF ENTRY AND CONNECTING ROADS (Mark Baza, Caltrans; Martha Elvia Rosas, Consulate General of Mexico; Sean Cázares, Mexico’s Secretariat of Foreign Relations; and Elisa Arias, SANDAG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Borders Committee will be briefed on key milestones accomplished in 2008 towards the implementation of the proposed Otay Mesa East-Otay II Port of Entry project and connecting roads.

8. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, February 27, 2009, at 12:30 p.m.

9. ADJOURNMENT

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
BORDERS COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTION
MEETING OF NOVEMBER 21, 2008

The meeting of the Borders Committee was called to order by Chair Patricia McCoy (South County) at 12:32 p.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Borders Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

   Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Crystal Crawford (North County Coastal) and a second by Councilmember Ed Gallo (North County Inland), the Borders Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the October 24, 2008, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

   Bill Figge, Deputy District Director of Planning (Caltrans), announced the Presidential Permit for the Otay Mesa East Port of Entry was signed by the Department of State; however, this is not the final step, as a 15-day review period with five federal agencies still remains.

   Chair McCoy acknowledged and thanked District 11 Director Pedro Orso-Delgado (Caltrans) and Executive Director Gary Gallegos (SANDAG) for their persistence in the matter.

   Councilmember Gallo remarked he has enjoyed his time on the Borders Committee and took pride in bringing the tribes to the table along with the progress that has been made. He recognized Deputy Mayor Crawford and Chair McCoy for their leadership.

   Councilmember Phil Monroe (South County) recognized Borders staff and the progress which has been made over time. He thanked Deputy Mayor Crawford and Chair McCoy for their leadership and vision.

   Chair McCoy thanked both of them for their participation and cooperation while serving on the Committee.

   Consul Lydia Antonio (Republic of Mexico) expressed the Mexican government’s satisfaction due to the signing of the Presidential Permit and said they look forward to working with their American counterparts to simultaneously advance the project.
Chair McCoy announced Mayor Debbie Cook (Orange County) sent her regrets. She also informed on the tour of Imperial County which took place October 31st and was lead by Supervisor Victor Carrillo (Imperial County).

**CONSENT ITEMS (#3 through #4)**

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

4. COMPLETION OF THE SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY MAJOR INVESTMENT STUDY (INFORMATION)

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember John Minto (East County) and a second by Deputy Mayor Crawford, the Borders Committee unanimously approved Consent Items #3 and #4.

**CHAIR’S REPORT**

5. NATIONAL AMERICAN INDIAN HERITAGE MONTH (INFORMATION)

Chair McCoy informed that November has been designated “National American Indian Heritage Month.” The current administration has designated the day after Thanksgiving on a permanent basis as “Native American Indian Heritage Day;” and, there will be a Tribal Roundtable Speaker Series at Scripps Cottage at SDSU on November 24th, at 4:00 p.m.

Chair McCoy welcomed Denis Turner, Executive Director of the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association.

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

**REPORT ITEMS (#6through #9)**

6. REPORT ON NATURAL DISASTERS AND THE ENVIRONMENT ALONG THE U.S. - MEXICO BORDER (INFORMATION)

Dr. Paul Ganster, COBRO Committee Chair and Chair of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB), a federal advisory panel that reports on United States – Mexico border environmental issues to Congress and the President, briefed the Committee on the GNEB’s 11th Annual Report. The key message of the report was that on-the-ground border coordinated action remains very limited. A more formal type of participation and institutionalized ways of cooperating need to be developed for larger incidents and disasters to enable the borders to remain open during all periods of emergency response. The main problem is that both countries tend to look at their own areas and statutory requirements, often ignoring connections with other agencies.

Councilmember Gallo remarked that this is not just endemic to that area; the State of California and County of San Diego suffer the same problem.
Dr. Ganster said the one exception was SANDAG; the Borders Committee has looked beyond to Riverside, Imperial, and Orange counties and across the border.

The report also suggests that when federal policy is being formulated about natural disasters, international border-specific issues need to be factored into it. It is necessary to build capacity at all levels of government so that institutions and organizations have the resources and training to do their jobs. It is necessary to have better coordination of existing systems so they can function across jurisdictions; and, the existing United States-Mexico agreements also need to be expanded. There is also a need to balance efforts to conserve and protect nature and human populations by reviewing and coordinating preparedness and practicing response.

Dr. Ganster reported the GNEB plans to work on improving and implementing present agreements, improve post-impact associated disease response, ecosystems protection, and flooding and floodplain settlement. He stated it is necessary to go beyond agreements and have real, on-site transborder emergency response practices so that in the event a disaster would occur, all involved are better able to respond.

Chair McCoy recommended Dr. Ganster present this report to the Public Safety Committee.

Dr. Ganster said he would be delighted.

Deputy Mayor Crawford asked if the GNEB had specific recommendations on how SANDAG could assist in making progress on the report’s recommendations.

Dr. Ganster said as the recommendations are based on best case practices, and the GNEB has no funding, they only have the ability to raise the issues with Congress and the Administration. They have improved their interactions with the Council for Environmental Quality and U.S. EPA, and continue to educate those in Washington and elsewhere. They hope groups such as SANDAG can make the recommendations work.

County Chair Pro Tem Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) informed that Senators Boxer and Feinstein, along with Congressman Filner have been very helpful with border infrastructure projects.

Dr. Ganster said copies of the report have been distributed to delegations in Washington D.C. and staff has briefed relevant delegation staff members. They have also sent copies to northern delegations as well. The challenge is getting others to understand the importance of the border issues.

Consul Antonio asked if SEMARNAT, the Mexican environmental and natural resources secretariat, is aware of the results from the report.

Dr. Ganster stated in developing the report, they had some participation and interaction with the Mexican Embassy in Washington D.C.; however, they did not have a particularly good outreach effort in Mexico. There has been representation from the Mexican Council on Sustainable Development and participation from Mexican officials at various meetings.
Greg Thomsen, Bureau of Land Management, stated the San Diego Border Agency Fire Council has a very successful binational partnership which has sponsored mass casualty binational drills. He said presently they are experiencing a few challenges due to the new passport requirements; however, they continue to work on ensuring that rapid crossborder response continues.

Dr. Ganster remarked September 11th and the subsequent reaction in the U.S. and the concern about national security has turned the border from an open integrated area to a closed barrier and made life more difficult and more expensive. It is necessary to work harder and hopefully conditions will ease.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS ON TRIBAL POLICY ISSUES TO INCLUDE IN BORDERS COMMITTEE AGENDAS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009 (DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Denis Turner, Executive Director of the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA), explained that he was representing the SCTCA at today’s meeting as there was a death in the tribal community of the Pauma Band necessitating Chairman Chris Devers’ (Pauma) presence. He stated the importance of the non-tribal community respecting traditional leaders such as Boxie Phoenix and the important role they play in the tribal community. He acknowledged leadership of Chairman Devers and Boxie Phoenix (Barona) for their participation in SANDAG and the Tribal Transportation Working Group. He stated that the areas which the SCTCA is interested in pursuing are transportation, renewable energy, affordable housing, regional fire prevention, and developing protocols for sharing data and information. He acknowledged the specialized leadership roles that various SCTCA representatives play in bringing the tribal perspective to the table: Boxie Phoenix, as the Chair of the Reservation Transportation Authority and of the Tribal Transportation Working Group; Chris Devers, SCTCA Representative to the Borders Committee is also on the National Executive Committee of the Council for Energy Resource Tribes (CERT), and John Hernandez, who has a special interest in affordable housing. On behalf of the SCTCA Board they are especially interested in participating in further dialogue regarding issues affecting tribes. He said tribal leadership agrees it is time to hold another tribal summit and are pleased with the progress made so far, and that they look forward to developing even stronger relationships as they work with SANDAG on tangible government-to-government projects.

Councilmember Gallo commented that it is important for the groups to meet again as we are all part of the same county. He also expressed his desire to participate.

Chairman Turner stated that what is happening in San Diego in terms of the government to government dynamic, is being replicated among tribal leadership in other counties throughout the state.

Councilmember Minto agreed another summit was a good idea. He said while en route to the Imperial Valley, it was interesting to see how many casinos were along the I-8 corridor and the group became aware of how much more needs to be discussed.
Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Minto and a second by Vice Chair Greg Cox (County of San Diego), the Borders Committee unanimously recommended to include several tribal policy issues in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 meeting schedule, as well as to coordinate with the SCTCA and staff on several issues that can be followed up at a technical level.

8. DISCUSSION ON POSSIBLE SAN DIEGO REGIONAL TRIBAL SUMMIT IN FY 2010 (DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION)

Jane Clough-Riquelme, Tribal Liaison (SANDAG), reported the last Tribal Summit of March 2006 resulted in two major structural changes; an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the SCTCA and SANDAG putting the SCTCA on the Board and all Policy Advisory Committees, and the creation of the Tribal Transportation Working Group. As tribal leadership is interested in holding periodic summits, staff suggested holding the next summit during the first half of FY 2010. The summit would provide the opportunity to set goals and objectives for coming years, discuss major regional initiatives that impact tribes, and provide a forum for direct feedback at a policy level. It would also allow tribal nations to speak for their particular government, provide the opportunity to establish and build relationships among elected and traditional leaders, and develop protocols for government-to-government collaboration on the development of upcoming regional planning efforts. She said staff suggests establishing an ad hoc task force to assist with agenda development and meeting structure on a government-to-government basis should it be decided that another summit take place.

Chair McCoy suggested recommending the summit planning begin soon as it is an arduous planning process.

Vice Chair Cox asked if the summit would be conducted after the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Chair McCoy said it would take place in FY 2010.

Ms. Clough-Riquelme confirmed it would be considered for the next fiscal year.

Councilmember Gallo pointed out that one on the benefits of mutual government-to-government discussions is that very specific projects can emerge from understanding mutual concerns and needs. He explained that as a result of Tribal Transportation Working Group North County Transit is working with the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA) to set up a new service route which was proposed by the tribal working group - the 388 Express which will complete the 388 loop passing through the Valley Center/Pauma/Pala/Rincon tribal reservation areas.

Ms. Clough-Riquelme noted that the Chair of RTA would be speaking about this in the next item.

Deputy Mayor Crawford asked if FY 2010 started July 2009 and continued through June 2010. She also commented that one of the benefits from the relationships built over the years has been a much better understanding of how issues are addressed at the tribal
government level, as well as at SANDAG by all parties involved. The successful development of the new transit route is an example of parties coming together to understand tribal community transportation needs and then working through NCTD, MTS, and SANDAG to develop public transit routes that provide services essential to the well being of those communities. She congratulated all involved for their hard work.

Councilmember Minto offered to participate in the ad hoc task force for planning the next Tribal Summit.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Councilmember Minto, and a second by Councilmember Gallo, the Borders Committee unanimously recommended holding a Tribal Summit in FY 2010 and developing an ad hoc task force to assist with the development of the agenda and meeting structure on a government-to-government basis.

9. **UPDATE ON THE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION GRANT FOR THE TRIBAL TRANSIT PROGRAM (INFORMATION)**

Boxie Phoenix, Chair of the Reservation Transportation Authority Chairman, and the Tribal Transportation Working Group updated the Committee on the FTA Tribal Transit Grant. He noted that the RTA was able to rescope and amend the grant to include the following activities: the addition of the pilot 388 Express from Pala to the Escondido Transit Center and improvements to existing bus stops along the 388, including a bus loading point located at the Pala Reservation. He expressed satisfaction that the Working Group was able to bring the tribes, transit agencies, and SANDAG together; coordinate the work; and, produce an outcome which improves the region. He also informed the Committee that the RTA—on behalf of the tribes in San Diego—has applied for additional funding for the continuation of the route and he would return to present a progress report in the spring.

Chair McCoy congratulated them on the landmark decision for all.

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

10. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, January 9, 2009, at 12:30 p.m.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair McCoy adjourned the meeting at 1:38 p.m.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Position</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Buckley</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Mexico</td>
<td>Consul General of Mexico</td>
<td>Remedios Gomez-Arnau</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Consul General of</td>
<td>Martha Rosas</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consul</td>
<td>Lydia Antonio</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Pauma</td>
<td>Denis Turner (Rincon) for Chris Devers</td>
<td>Member</td>
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<td></td>
<td>Mesa Grande</td>
<td>Mark Romero</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
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<td>Caltrans</td>
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<td>Pedro Orso-Delgado</td>
<td>Member</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
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<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Member</td>
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<tr>
<td>County of Orange</td>
<td></td>
<td>Debbie Cook</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- • indicates that the name is a placeholder.
I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP JOINT POLICY ADVISORY GROUP

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Introduction

At its October 24, 2008, meeting, the Borders Committee approved an amendment to the San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan Joint Policy Advisory Group Charter. The Charter was amended to include an advisory member from the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA). At the November 21, 2008, Borders Committee meeting, the SCTCA requested that the same membership criteria be used for the I-15 Interregional Partnership (I-15 IRP) Joint Policy Committee. Attached is the recommended amended Charter for the Committee’s approval.

Recommendation

The Borders Committee is asked to authorize the I-15 Interregional Partnership Joint Policy Committee to include in its membership an advisory tribal representative appointed by the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA).

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. I-15 Interregional Partnership Joint Policy Committee Charter

Key Staff Contact: Jane Clough-Riquelme, (619) 699-1909; jcl@sandag.org
CHARTER
I-15 Interregional Partnership Joint Policy Committee

PURPOSE
The primary goal of the I-15 Interregional Partnership (IRP) Joint Policy Committee is to review and provide policy input on Phase III of the I-15 IRP Project. The Southwest Riverside County and San Diego County regions seek to collaborate on mutually beneficial housing, transportation, and economic planning to improve the quality of life for the region’s residents through the identification and implementation of short- and medium-range policy strategies.

LINE OF REPORTING
The I-15 IRP Joint Policy Committee will report its recommendations to both the SANDAG Borders Committee and the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) Executive Council on the three components of Phase III: economic development, housing, and transportation strategies.

RESPONSIBILITIES
The responsibilities of the Committee include reviewing and providing policy-level feedback on the analysis from the joint county economic development workshops; various transportation studies including the Origin and Destination survey of vanpools; interregional transit and priority options and the Smart Growth Concept Map for Southwest Riverside. The Committee will provide input to staff on how these studies could be used to develop collaborative interregional strategies for infrastructure planning and public policy.

MEMBERSHIP
The Committee is composed of no more than three elected officials from the San Diego region, and three from the Southwestern Riverside County region, designated from the Boards of Directors of the participating agencies in the I-15 Interregional Partnership: SANDAG; WRCOG; Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC); and the Riverside Transit Agency (RTA), and one tribal advisory member appointed from the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA).

MEETING TIME AND LOCATION
The Committee will meet a minimum of three times during the grant period to discuss the three components and receive full status reports on the developments of each strategy; to receive the draft reports on each component and provide feedback for the final draft; and to receive the final draft. The meetings will alternate between locations in southwestern Riverside County and northern San Diego County.

DURATION OF EXISTENCE
The Committee will continue to exist through the completion of Phase III of the I-15 IRP and the completion of the final report for this phase (January 2010).
Introduction

The Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG), in cooperation with SANDAG and Caltrans District 11, began work on the development of the San Diego Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan earlier this year. This study seeks to identify issues, establish goals and objectives, and develop interregional strategies in the areas of transportation, housing, and employment to ensure adequate levels of service on the I-8 corridor. Since last reported to the Borders Committee at its October 24, 2008, meeting, the Technical Advisory Group met two times and the Joint Policy Advisory Group met once.

Discussion

At the October 24, 2008, meeting, IVAG staff and its consultant gave a presentation on the preliminary results of the interregional public survey conducted during August and September 2008. This presentation generated discussion among the Committee members that resulted in input for the Borders Committee representatives of the Joint Policy Advisory Group, including collaboration on issues related to crossborder travel (people and goods movement), and exploring opportunities to expand ridesharing.

On October 31, 2008, the Joint Policy Advisory Group toured key locations in the Imperial Valley and met to review and discuss several proposed strategies. Some of the Advisory Group’s recommendations included monitoring related interregional issues such as SDG&E’s Powerlink and improving interregional and regional information sharing regarding on-going studies to maximize the benefits and minimize duplication of effort.

The outcome of input received from the Borders Committee, the Joint Policy Advisory Group, and the Joint Technical Advisory Group is reflected as proposed early actions and interregional strategies included in the Draft San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan: Section V. Key Findings and Recommendations (Attachment 1, page 95). The following highlights some of these key proposed joint SANDAG and IVAG strategies:

- Strategy 1a: Improve interregional and regional information sharing regarding on-going studies to maximize the benefits and minimize duplication of effort.
- Strategy 1b: Continue to integrate Tribal Nations into overall planning process for the I-8 corridor.
• Strategy 1c: Collaborate on crossborder people and goods movement issues, including recommendations and projects identified in the California-Baja California Border Master Plan.

• Strategy 2a: Maintain key capital investments identified in SANDAG’s 2030 Regional Transportation Plan and the Imperial County 2007 Transportation Plan Highway Element to improve mobility for people and goods on I-8, including widening from four to six lanes between El Cajon to Alpine (2nd Street to Los Coches Road) and widening within Imperial Valley between State Route 111 and Forrester Road as priorities.

• Strategy 2b: Explore opportunities to expand ridesharing.

• Strategy 4: Support economic development focusing on job creation, particularly on higher paying jobs.

Staff believes that collaboration on crossborder goods movement issues (Strategy 1c) is a key proposed strategy that could be accomplished in part through the upcoming San Diego and Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) Railway Gateway study. This study will assess the role and economic viability of the SD&AE Railway and San Ysidro Intermodal Facilities within the context of the San Diego-Imperial Valley region to serve as an international trade gateway. A consultant team has been retained and work is anticipated to start in February 2009.

Next Steps

The Joint Technical Advisory Group is scheduled to meet two more times through the project’s completion in February 2009. The next meeting of the Joint Policy Advisory Group is scheduled to be held at SANDAG on January 23, 2009, at 12:00 p.m. The final San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan would be presented at a joint Borders Committee and IVAG meeting, which is tentatively scheduled on February 27, 2009.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

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

Key Staff Contact: Ron Saenz, (619) 699-1922; rsa@sandag.org
SOUTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
COUNCIL'S COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Introduction

The South County Economic Development Council (SCEDC) recently received a $50,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Commerce’s Economic Development Administration (EDA) to create a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for Imperial County and portions of the County of San Diego. Local agencies and economic development councils from Imperial Valley and San Diego Counties are participants in the preparation of this strategy, which could complement proposed strategies identified in the Draft San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan. Due to the study’s accelerated schedule, SCEDC requested this report be brought to the Borders Committee in January for input. In addition to the CEDS study, the Mega-Region Initiative Phase I study, under development by the San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation (EDC) and the Imperial Valley EDC, also focuses on strategies that link San Diego and Imperial Counties. A presentation on the Mega-Region Initiative is scheduled for the February 27, 2009, Borders Committee meeting. SANDAG staff is actively monitoring these two studies to ensure consistency with strategies identified in the I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan.

Discussion

A CEDS is designed to bring together the public and private sectors in the creation of an economic roadmap to diversify and strengthen regional economies. The CEDS analyzes the regional economy and serves as a guide for establishing regional goals and objectives, developing and implementing a regional plan of action, and identifying investment priorities and funding sources. A CEDS integrates a region’s human and physical capital planning in the service of economic development.

It is anticipated that a CEDS would result in a continuing economic development planning process developed with broad-based and diverse public and private sector participation, and set forth the goals and objectives necessary to solve the economic development problems of the region. A CEDS will also provide a useful benchmark by which a regional economy can evaluate opportunities with other regions in the national economy.

SCEDC is the lead project proponent in the development of the CEDS in conjunction with the Imperial Valley Economic Development Council (IVEDC), the East County Economic Development Council (ECEDC), and the San Diego County and Imperial County governments. The CEDS study area boundaries include the Imperial County and the geographic jurisdictions covered by the ECEDC and
SCEDC, which with a few exceptions (i.e., City of Santee, and portions of the cities of El Cajon and La Mesa), mostly covers areas in the county located south of I-8 (Attachment 1).

The main focus of this CEDS is to identify issues and opportunities and create economic strategies around what the San Diego-Imperial County study areas have in common including but not limited to the international border, the I-8 corridor, joint housing/workforce and shared water source issues.

Another focus of this CEDS is that these two regions both share characteristics of being economically distressed. It is anticipated that pursuit of a CEDS for these two regions, concurrently with designating the target area as a Economic Development District (EDD) would qualify the district for financial assistance from the EDA. This assistance would help pay the cost of economic development planning and administrative expenses in support of job creation and economic development.

**Next Steps**

To qualify for financial assistance through the EDA’s funding programs an economically distressed region first must be designated as an EDD by a local jurisdiction. In this case, the San Diego and Imperial County governments would provide this designation. Steps are currently being taken by SCEDC and its partners to secure the EDD designation.

In addition a task force will be established to provide for oversight of the CEDS. SCEDC has released a Request for Proposal (RFP) to complete this study. The selected consultant is expected to conduct research, interviews, and other actions as appropriate between February and May 2009. The first draft CEDS is due in June 2009 and is anticipated to be presented to the task force at the June SCEDC Board meeting. The final draft CEDS is due in August 2009 while the final CEDS is due in September 2009.

Staff will continue to provide periodic updates to the Committee on progress made on this study and on how this progress relates to the San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Map of Proposed San Diego-Imperial County CEDS Study Area

Key Staff Contact: Ron Saenz, (619) 699-1922; rsa@sandag.org
CEDS Map
Imperial and San Diego Counties

Notes:
- Census Tracts with unemployment rates greater than one percent above the national average of 3.5 percent in 2004 and 3.1 percent in 2005.
- Census Tracts with per capita income less than the national average of $17,176 (1998).
- Imperial County index with unemployment and per capita income criteria.
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UPDATES ON THE SAN YSIDRO – PUERTA MEXICO PORT OF ENTRY RECONFIGURATION AND EXPANSION PROJECTS

Introduction

The San Ysidro – Puerta México Port of Entry (POE) is the busiest international land POE in the world and is used by one out of every ten people entering the United States through any air, sea, and land POE. The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) and Mexico’s Institute of Administration and Estimates of National Real Estate (Instituto de Administración y Avalúos de Bienes Nacionales or INDAABIN) will brief the Committee on progress toward this expansion project.

Discussion

San Ysidro POE

On July 25, 2008, GSA updated the Committee on the San Ysidro POE Reconfiguration and Expansion project. GSA estimates the cost of the Reconfiguration and Expansion Project 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.

A pre-phase period was added to the program in order to initiate construction during GSA’s Fiscal Year 2008. The pre-phase period included the construction of an employee parking area 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.

Also, GSA continues the preparation of the Traffic Study and the Environmental Report.
Based on discussion from the Borders Committee at the July 2008 meeting, SANDAG staff submitted a letter of comments to GSA on the conceptual Master Plan (Attachment 1), including the following:

- The proposed pedestrian bridge will worsen travel conditions for the current 29,000 daily users.
- The elimination of Camiones Way, on the western side of the project, will affect transit operations, passenger drop-offs, and pedestrians that utilize this facility.
- Inadequate pedestrian facilities will hinder efforts to improve crossborder transit connections and future transit services, as crossborder travel demand continues to grow.
- Several conceptual projects outside the federal footprint included in the Offsite Associated Projects Diagram should be incorporated in the San Ysidro Reconfiguration and Expansion project to mitigate impacts to the community. Cost estimates for off-site projects also are needed.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), the City of San Diego, and community organizations also have provided comments to GSA.

In October 2008, SANDAG staff also commented on GSA’s draft Traffic Impact Study under development for the environmental clearance document (Attachment 2). These comments were mainly focused on the need for additional analyses of pedestrian traffic and circulation, the Camiones Way closure, and impacts to transit services.

In response, in November 2008, GSA proposed changes to the master plan to accommodate a potential southbound pedestrian gate on the eastern side of the project and initiated the preparation of cost estimates of the offsite associated projects. On December 10, 2008, SANDAG staff sent comments on the proposed master plans options to GSA, in collaboration with Caltrans, MTS, and the City of San Diego (Attachment 3). Key comments are outlined below:

- The project has focused on the design of federal footprint and has incorporated some feedback from stakeholders, but we are concerned that as the design of the POE continues in order to maintain the project’s development schedule, project impacts and mitigations are not fully being considered and it may be difficult to make changes to the POE design in the future.
- The project needs to provide a balanced, multi-modal transportation system that serves pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists in order to address state legislation related to climate change.
- Impacts on parking, access to public transit and the safety of pedestrians are issues that still are not resolved in the project.
- A pedestrian study that includes current and future flow numbers, explanation of methodology for projections, change of modes of transit when exiting or entering the facility should be prepared.
- Funding sources to mitigate regional mobility impacts resulting from the San Ysidro POE reconfiguration and Expansion project should be identified.
Puerta México Port of Entry

The Mexican federal government, led by The Institute of Administration and Estimates of National Real Estate (INDAABIN), has prepared executive plans for improving and reopening the former commercial gate at El Chaparral (south of Virginia Avenue) to accommodate GSA’s plans for southbound passenger vehicles. This project complements the San Ysidro POE reconfiguration and expansion.

The City of Tijuana Municipal Planning Institute (Instituto Municipal de Planeación or IMPlan) and the State of Baja California Secretariat of Infrastructure and Urban Development (Secretaría de Infraestructura y Desarrollo Urbano del Estado or SIDUE) developed a traffic circulation proposal to accommodate vehicle traffic from El Chaparral.

In early December 2008, SIDUE unveiled a proposal to reconfigure the eastern area of the POE to include a new multimodal transportation facility, retail space, and an area for governmental offices. This project, named Puerta Bicentenario (Bicentennial Gate), which extends from the current northbound pedestrian facility east to the rail yard, is intended also to improve pedestrian and transit facilities to accommodate the proposed southbound pedestrians on the eastern side of the POE. The Bicentennial Gate project is anticipated to be in operation in 2010.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. SANDAG letter to GSA with comments on the San Ysidro Port of Entry Reconfiguration and Expansion Project
2. SANDAG letter to GSA with comments on the Draft San Ysidro Port of Entry Border Station Expansion Traffic Impact Study
3. SANDAG letter to GSA with comments on proposed master plans options

Key Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas, (619) 699-1972; hva@sandag.org
August 20, 2008

Mr. Daniel Voll
Deputy Assistant Regional Administrator
U.S. General Services Administration
450 Golden Gate Avenue, Third Floor East
San Francisco, CA 94102-3434

Dear Mr. Voll:

SUBJECT: Comments on the San Ysidro Port of Entry Reconfiguration and Expansion Project

We would like to thank the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) for providing SANDAG with the opportunity to comment on the San Ysidro Port of Entry Reconfiguration and Expansion Project.

During the most recent Borders Committee meeting held at SANDAG on July 25, 2008, we commended your agency's efforts to improve the infrastructure of the world's largest international land port of entry, and also reiterated the need to improve existing and future conditions for pedestrians and transit users.

The last major improvement to this international port was made in 1974. Since then, the number of border crossings and the interdependency between both sides of the border have grown tremendously. The reconfiguration and expansion project provides a great opportunity to not only accommodate current crossing demand, but to prepare for the future.

Current conditions for pedestrians and transit users can make crossing the border arduous for many and impossible for some. Long walking distances and wait times and exposure to the elements discourage pedestrian crossings and encourage greater vehicle crossings, which contribute to longer border wait times, traffic congestion, air pollution, and economic losses.

The proposed location and design for the new pedestrian bridge is of particular concern because it will worsen pedestrian travel conditions. The proposed bridge design will force the current 29,000 daily users to walk a longer distance and to cross through a very busy intersection, which includes an Interstate 5 freeway on- and off-ramp. Additionally, on the western side of the project, the existing Camiones Way will be eliminated. GSA's proposed master plan does not include an alternative to replace this roadway and accommodate the current transit routes, passenger drop-offs, and pedestrians that utilize this important facility. In addition, as crossborder travel demand
continues to grow, SANDAG is working on plans to provide additional transit service in the vicinity of the San Ysidro Port of Entry. We are also working with counterpart agencies in Mexico to improve crossborder transit connections and future transit services in Tijuana. However, inadequate pedestrian facilities at the San Ysidro Port of Entry will hinder these efforts.

GSA has worked to address many areas of community concern and has prepared a diagram with potential projects outside the federal footprint [Project Definition Diagram: Offsite Associated Project (by others)]. We acknowledge this effort, but we also believe that several of these conceptual projects should be incorporated in the San Ysidro Port of Entry Reconfiguration and Expansion Project to mitigate impacts to the community. A detailed cost estimate for these associated projects also is needed.

Lastly, we continue to urge GSA to develop a finance plan to ensure the completion of all phases of the project, including the rerouting of southbound traffic to Virginia Avenue.

SANDAG shares the GSA and the Department of Homeland Security's interest to improve the infrastructure and operating conditions at this essential facility and stresses the importance of addressing the aforementioned concerns. This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity that will impact millions of people for years to come, and every effort should be made to get it right.

We welcome any questions that you may have and look forward to a constructive dialogue that will result in a border crossing that will be a model for the nation and the world.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

GA Y. L. GALEGOS
Executive Director

GGA/HVA/cda
October 17, 2008

Mr. Greg Smith
U.S. General Services Administration
401 West A Street, Suite 2075
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Smith:

SUBJECT: San Ysidro Land Port of Entry Border Station Expansion Traffic Impact Study

We would like to thank the U.S. General Services Administration for the opportunity to comment on the San Ysidro Land Port of Entry (LPOE) Border Station Expansion Draft Traffic Impact Study, dated September 2008.

SANDAG staff has reviewed the Draft Traffic Impact Study (Study) and a matrix of our detailed comments is attached. While we appreciate the efforts to quantify the traffic impacts of this complex project, the report falls short in a number of analysis areas:

- **Pedestrian traffic and circulation:** The Study excludes analysis of pedestrian traffic and circulation. Thousands of pedestrians currently cross through the San Ysidro POE on a daily basis. The proposed project contains major modifications in the POE pedestrian crossing, which will increase the walking distance and affect pedestrian circulation through adjacent intersections. A comprehensive evaluation of pedestrian traffic and circulation patterns is needed.

- **Camiones Way closure:** The Study fails to discuss the impacts of the elimination of Camiones Way, which currently serves as a drop-off point for MTS bus routes 929 and 932, taxis, jitneys, and private vehicles. The Study does not discuss how and where these current users will be re-located and incorporated into the pedestrian flow at the reconfigured POE. Additionally, the study does not acknowledge the elimination of the direct and convenient southbound pedestrian crossing that will be lost though the closing of Camiones Way.

- **Transit:** Transit carries 29,000 passengers to the San Ysidro POE daily. SANDAG on-board ridership surveys indicated that 97 percent of those passengers traveling to and from San Ysidro Blue Line Trolley Station and the MTS routes 929 and 932 San Ysidro bus stop will cross the border. The Study does not identify locations for the MTS bus routes and bus stops or those for private operator buses, including Greyhound, which will be dislocated due to the POE project.
We look forward to your response to our comments and to continuing to work with you on this major planning effort. If you have any questions, please contact me at (619) 699-1936 or ear@sandag.org.

Sincerely,

ELISA ARIAS
Principal Planner

ear/ais

Attachment: SANDAG Comments on the San Ysidro Land Port of Entry (LPOE) Traffic Impact Study

cc: Bill Figge, Deputy District Director, Planning Division, Caltrans, District 11
    Mike Daney, Senior Transportation Planner, MTS
    Alejandra Gavaldon, Director of Binational Affairs, City of San Diego
    Lisa Dye, International Transportation Program Engineer, FHWA
    Keith Lew, Branch Chief, GSA
    Dan Voll, Deputy Assistant Regional Administrator, GSA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Traffic Study Text</th>
<th>SANDAG Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no analysis of pedestrian and transit traffic or acknowledgement of impacts that the GSA project may have upon pedestrians and transit users.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>No projections were done for future pedestrian traffic. Was a pedestrian factor applied in determining delay at intersections? Was this based on current pedestrian traffic at evaluated intersections? The intersection of San Ysidro Blvd. and the I-5 on/off-ramp may experience an increase in pedestrian crossings due to the relocation of the Southbound pedestrian bridge. Was this increase in pedestrian traffic taken into account in the intersection delay calculations for this intersection?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The executive summary refers only to 'vehicle' lanes without reference to pedestrian facilities. It mentions the loss of commercial property and a parking lot, but not the loss of Camiones Way, a transit station, and drop-off and pick-up areas. There is no consideration given to circulation impacts beyond Rail Ct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;Project Traffic: The proposed project will affect the existing vehicular traffic system in several...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The text does not mention the elimination of Camiones Way, transit station, or drop-off and pick-up areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;Transportation Overview: most transit operations are located at or in the vicinity of the Intermodal Transit Center on the east side of I-5...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The paragraph fails to mention some transit operations to the west of I-5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 to 19</td>
<td>The GSA diagram shows a potential northbound/southbound crossing on the east side of the POE. This has not been analyzed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 to 19</td>
<td>Page 9 through 19. Figures 1-3 through 1-12 show Camiones Way as if it will not be affected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Camino de la Plaza: the Ensenada bridge is used as pedestrian bridge during the time the pedestrian bridge at the SY POE is closed for maintenance or for security reasons. Camiones Way: description does not mention that it serves as drop-off for transit routes and as drop-off and pick-up for passengers. Pedestrian volumes at intersections are not mentioned in this section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Traffic Study Text</td>
<td>SANDAG Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Are the two bus lanes noted on page 32 two individual bus lanes or tandem? Figures do not reflect the lost of Camiones Way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Will the proposed bus lanes be sufficient to handle future bus traffic? Figures do not reflect the lost of Camiones Way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Have any lanes been designated for HOVs\Carpools?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>A number of the Freeway segments in 2030 have lower levels of service compared to 2030 without the project. Segments with LOS reduced to levels E or F would require mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>&quot;As shown in Table 5-2, all freeway segments analyzed will operate at LOS D or better.&quot;</td>
<td>This statement is inaccurate. Table 5-2 shows three freeway segments functioning at level E or F(0) in 2030 with the project. These three segments operate at LOS C without the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-I-5 from I-805 Interchange to East San Ysidro Blvd. -I-5 from San Ysidro Blvd. to International Border -I-805 from San Ysidro Blvd. to I-5 Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Table 5-3 shows that Camino de la Plaza/ Virginia Ave. will experience an increase in delay from 51.8 to without the project to a delay of 319.5 with the project. This is a very significant increase in delay which is not discussed in the text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>The intersection of Camino de la Plaza\Virginia Ave. has a LOS of F in 2030 both with and without the project. However, the difference in the delay is very significant (267.7). How will this delay be mitigated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;The Las Americas (formerly International gateway of the Americas) Shopping Center provides surface parking&quot;</td>
<td>This statement should be revised to clarify that this parking is for the shopping center customers and not the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;With the project, the trolley racks will be extended further south allowing 4 trolley cars to access the transit station.&quot;</td>
<td>Is this a project that GSA will be funding as part of the POE reconfiguration? This project is not in the current Regional Transportation Plan and SANDAG does not have any commitments to fund this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Traffic Study Text</td>
<td>SANDAG Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;the southbound 929 and 932 bus stops are located at the southern terminus of Camiones Way on the west side of Interstate 5.&quot;</td>
<td>This portion of Camiones Way will be closed as part of the POE reconfiguration. Where will the bus stops be relocated to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;The Greyhound bus routes are currently located on the east side of Interstate 8 at the SYITC.&quot;</td>
<td>This should state Interstate 5 not Interstate 8. Additionally the Greyhound facility will be impacted by the project. Where will this facility be relocated and how will it tie in with other transit services in the POE area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>&quot;Pedestrians traveling south into Mexico have two ways of getting to Mexico. If they are on the west side of I-5, they would cross the border at the existing crossing point.&quot;</td>
<td>The portion of Camiones Way that is adjacent to the southbound border crossing will be closed as part of the GSA project and southbound pedestrians will be required to use a bridge to access the southbound gate. What is the difference in walking distance between the current drop-off location on Camiones Way and the distance of the new access bridge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>&quot;City of San Diego Municipal Code indicates that 600 feet of walking distance is acceptable for a property to provide an off-site shared parking facility and reasonable for an individual to accomplish.&quot;</td>
<td>As stated in the report the new pedestrian bridge will have a walking distance of 2,257 feet, a length that is over three and half times the San Diego Municipal Code acceptable distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>As acknowledged in the potential improvements section there are several projects that are adjacent to the LPOE but are not being funded as part of the GSA project. Projects that are not being funded and built as part of the GSA should not be considered as mitigations for impacts of the GSA project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Traffic Study Text</td>
<td>SANDAG Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>&quot;By creating the plaza, an area for pedestrian pick-up or drop off will exist, as providing an area for buses, taxis, or jitneys to pick up passengers.&quot;</td>
<td>The plaza project is not being funded or constructed as part of the GSA project. The word &quot;will&quot; should be changed to &quot;could.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>&quot;Due to the shortening of Camiones Way with the realignment of southbound I-5, the current southbound terminus for the bus routes 929 and 932 would need to be relocated.&quot;</td>
<td>The plaza over I-5 is not a funded project. GSA needs to identify another location where bus routes 929 and 932 can be relocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>The improvements identified on page 63 deal only with vehicular traffic. Several improvements appear to be missing from this list include the bus turn around on the east side of the POE, and a safe pedestrian crossing for the new pedestrian bridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Chapter 8 does not identify who will be responsible for implementing the roadway improvements listed in table 8-1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Chapter 9 appears to state that GSA proposes to trade a portion of property in exchange for not addressing local traffic impacts. Is this correct? This Chapter mixes the term 'station' with 'lanes'. It does not mention the loss of Camiones Way, its impact on transit operations, and the lost of an important drop-off and pick-up area. Resulting congestion at intersections is not mentioned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 10, 2008

Mr. Keith Lew
U.S. General Services Administration
450 Golden Gate Avenue
3rd Floor West
San Francisco, CA 94102-3434

Dear Mr. Lew:

SUBJECT: San Ysidro Port of Entry Reconfiguration Project

Thank you for providing our agencies with the opportunity to review the draft San Ysidro Land Port of Entry (SY-POE) Expansion – Traffic Impact Study (Traffic Study), and for your recent meetings to discuss some suggestions for mitigating the project's impacts. This letter is to respond with comments to the traffic study and the exhibits you shared with us in November 2008 after your review of our comment letters on the traffic study. We recognize the importance of this project and appreciate the General Services Administration's (GSA) commitment to solving border congestion in San Diego.

The development of this POE project by GSA has included multi-agency meetings, ongoing community meetings, and multiple opportunities for input. As the project has progressed, you have focused on the design of the federal footprint and always made clear the need to maintain the project's implementation schedule. However, GSA also has been willing to look at community and transportation concerns outside the federal footprint. This approach has been useful in allowing the federal POE design to progress, while incorporating some feedback from stakeholders into the POE project. It also has begun to identify potential POE project impacts and mitigation in the surrounding area, but we are concerned these aspects of the overall POE area are being bifurcated from the POE design.

The proposed POE project has created a number of concerns for the City of San Diego, Caltrans, MTS, and SANDAG regarding the ability to provide a safe and improved POE and surrounding environment. The POE design is moving forward to a point where changes will be very difficult to make. In the meantime, we are still discussing basic issues of how to address pedestrian, transit user, local area traffic, and circulation, while accommodating border vehicular throughput. How we address these modes will be very important in light of our planning to address the growing concern of global warming and its impacts to the region.
California state and local governments have taken a leadership role in addressing mitigation and adaptation strategies for a changing climate. Specifically, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, Assembly Bill 32, declares that “global warming poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California” and requires that the State’s global warming emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. Assembly Bill 32 also directs the California Air Resources Board to develop regulations and establish a reporting and monitoring system to track global warming emissions levels. Additionally, Executive Order S-20-06, directs state agencies to implement AB 32.

In 2004, transportation was the largest source of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in California. As a result, the City of San Diego and SANDAG have incorporated plans and strategies to reduce GHG emissions in their respective General Plan and Regional Transportation Plan. The City of San Diego’s General Plan has a strong sustainability focus, which includes policies to target growth in compact, walkable neighborhoods, and to promote a balanced transportation system as well as a Climate Protection Action Plan that addresses both the GHG emissions from the community (residential, commercial, and industrial sectors) and the GHG emissions specifically from the operations provided by City government. The 2030 Regional Transportation Plan funds projects that promote carpooling, vanpooling, and increasing opportunities for riding public transit, which will reduce vehicle miles traveled, fuel consumption, and GHG emissions. Additionally, Caltrans is integrating GHG reduction measures into transportation investment decisions. With this strong state and local emphasis on addressing climate change, it is important that the SY POE provide a balanced, multi-modal transportation system that serves pedestrians, bicyclists, transit-users, and motorists.

Furthermore, our concern remains that the SY POE project will have a significant negative impact on parking, access to public transit, and the safety of pedestrians. The project will increase pedestrian walking distances to the border from pick-up and drop-off locations, as well as add additional congestion at several major intersections in and around the project’s boundaries. Most of these impacts have been created due to the design of the new GSA facility, which pushes existing transit and pedestrian facilities currently within or near the boundaries of the POE, further outside or away from the future POE project boundaries.

Our agencies agree with the GSA and believe that in order to properly evaluate the exhibits provided or other design alternatives, a pedestrian study is essential. Subsequently, we appreciate that you have agreed to conduct such a study and volunteered to circulate a scope of work to us to review. As we stated at the December 3, 2008, PDT meeting, the pedestrian study needs to be robust enough to identify pedestrian flows by purpose, if not origin and destination, sufficiently to assess how proposed transit and pedestrian relocated facilities function. We ask that the pedestrian study address the following:

- What are current and future pedestrian flows numbers? We would like to see your data and understand your methodology.
- Please explain your methodology for projections.
- We can safely assume that pedestrian flows have the San Ysidro Land Port of Entry as the point of origin (and/or ultimate destination within the USA). However, it would be useful to understand where pedestrians change modes of transit (i.e., from pedestrian to vehicle, bus, taxi, jitney, trolley, etc) when exiting and entering your facility.
- How do you group pedestrians by choice of transportation mode?
• Where will the funding come from to mitigate regional mobility impacts resulting from the San Ysidro POE reconfiguration project?

Moreover, the draft Traffic Study continues to raise concerns in a number of areas, which we believe must be addressed prior to finalization of the Traffic Study and this project. The remainder of this letter details responses to your suggestions for mitigation measures as discussed during the individual meetings between GSA and the agencies included in this letter. It also spells out several outstanding issues that have yet to be addressed by the GSA.

**Map 1 – Proposed Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Property / GSA Easement Swap**

• The existing Trolley Court at the San Ysidro Port of Entry (POE) accommodates a wide array of public transport services while at the same time providing a good pedestrian environment for northbound crossings. Trolley service, city bus service, jitney service, taxi service, and emergency medical vehicles share this facility, which is currently at capacity. The GSA’s suggestion to swap this facility for the existing GSA parking facility located south of and adjacent to Camino de la Plaza (identified in red on Map 1) would result in a multimillion dollar loss of public investment at the transit center, and eliminating this location for transit and the other transport services would create significant impacts in and around the border area. The GSA’s proposal does not adequately address the need to build and relocate facilities for all displaced services and the high costs associated with doing so.

**Map 2 – New Taxi/Jitney Queue and Drop-off Area and Trolley Station Relocation**

• The GSA identified a new Taxi/Jitney, Queue, and POV Drop-Off area located adjacent to Camino de la Plaza as a way to replace Trolley Court in part. Currently the property is owned by MTS, with an easement agreement with the GSA, and the GSA uses the property for staff parking. Before our agencies can consider this a viable alternative for capacity lost with the elimination of Trolley Court and Camiones Way, the following questions need to be addressed:

  ◆ Is it feasible to have a westbound left hand turn lane into the proposed facility off of Camino de la Plaza? Without this turning ability, no vehicles originating from San Ysidro Boulevard heading west on Camino de la Plaza will be able to use the facility efficiently and effectively. In addition, it is not clear whether vehicle access to the proposed new facility would be impacted if the proposed deck over Interstate 5 is built.

  ◆ Can full size transit vehicles negotiate the vertical difference between the street level of Camino de la Plaza and surface level of the proposed area? If not, what are the alternatives, how much will they cost, when will it be operational, and who will pay for it? The suggested new facility does not appear to provide a viable replacement for MTS bus access that would be eliminated at Camiones Way and Trolley Court. Therefore, this issue needs to be resolved prior to moving forward with the POE Expansion.

  ◆ Can the proposed new transit, taxi, jitney, and POV drop-off location adequately accommodate services that currently use Camiones Way? Is there adequate space to successfully turn vehicles around without conflicting with vehicles that are parked in the turn-around area? Preliminary analysis indicates that the size of the property is too small to adequately accommodate all of the uses as assumed by GSA.
What are the traffic impacts related to the proposed new transit, taxi, jitney, and POV drop-off area as recommended? Adding significant movements to this location will necessarily have traffic impacts that would need to be addressed as part of the GSA project. A jitney station may add more traffic at currently busy intersections. This could create further pedestrian and vehicle conflicts at the I-5 on/off-ramp and San Ysidro Boulevard intersection. The percentage of pedestrians that would be accessing the taxi/jitney drop-off needs to be estimated in order to assess the level of congestion relief provided by the secondary proposed walkway and whether the width of the easternmost section of the bridge should be reduced. Is there data to support reduction in bridge width on the east end of east/west pedestrian bridge?

- The GSA staff has suggested relocation of the trolley station north to the southeast corner of San Ysidro Boulevard and Camino de la Plaza. This suggestion would require property acquisition and improvements at a significant cost. GSA staff did not indicate a source of funding for this project; however, our agencies are not prepared to bear this cost. Furthermore, relocating transit facilities to this new stop location would increase walking distances between transit modes and lengthen walks to and from the border crossing points. Forcing pedestrians to walk further to access transit inherently makes transit service less attractive and likely would result in increased vehicular border crossings.

- A pedestrian study is required to determine appropriate alternatives for mobility. The study is also needed to determine if reducing the bridge width east of I-5 is appropriate. Without supporting data, reduction of the pedestrian bridge cannot be validated.

- The second landing from Camino de la Plaza for the E/W pedestrian bridge is a good idea. It will allow pedestrians direct access to the E/W bridge after being dropped off at the proposed "Taxi/Jitney Queue and POV Drop-off Area," assuming the existing drop-off would remain. Elevations of the connector and the grade up to the E/W Pedestrian Walkway will need to be evaluated. The connector appears to begin to the east of the Camino de la Plaza Overcrossing and traverses across the proposed “Taxi/Jitney Queue and POV Drop-off Area.”

- The easternmost terminus of the pedestrian bridge should be looked at as a very viable alternative at the southeast corner of the Camino de la Plaza and Via San Ysidro.

**Map 3 – Camino de la Plaza/Interstate 5 Connector**

- GSA staff suggests a new northbound on-ramp from Camino de la Plaza to Interstate 5 as mitigation for the POE Expansion Project. As with the other proposals, there is no indication as to how this project would be funded; however, our agencies are not prepared to assume the cost of a new on/off ramp at this time. More importantly, the viability of this ramp proposal will need to be determined. In addition to identification of funding, the following questions must be addressed:

  - Does this ramp meet Caltrans spacing requirements for freeway ramps?
  - Would a new ramp require widening of the structure?
  - Would a new signal be required to facilitate traffic going east to enter the N/B ramp?
  - Would the ramp allow traffic to proceed north on both I-5 and I-805?
  - Does the new ramp require modifying the exiting on-ramp from San Ysidro Boulevard?
A project of this magnitude would require a complete traffic impact study and detailed environmental report, neither of which could be completed in time for the GSA's proposed 2009 construction start.

- Any recommendations within Caltrans right-of-way will require a Project Initiation Document (PID) to identify a purpose and need and alternatives for addressing those needs. The document will need to be prepared using Caltrans guidelines but funded by interested parties.

- As part of the PID, a Traffic Study would need to be completed analyzing the intersection/signal spacing and operational effectiveness in addition to analyzing for future projections.

- With this proposed alternative, access to NB I-5 could be compromised due to the proximity of the I-5/I-805 split. The New NB on-ramp from Camino de la Plaza to I-5 should also include a ramp to I-805. Two direct ramps from Camino de la Plaza - one to I-5 and the other to I-805 - should be examined. The ramps could address the congestion issue at the on/off-ramp near the current border trolley stop, especially if this ramp is designated as "transit only."

- Proposal would require the purchase of additional right-of-way.

**Map 4 – Option 2 - Pedestrian Bridge Connection**

- While we support GSA's concept for providing an eastern crossing into Mexico, we recognize that any proposals for a pedestrian crossing need to be coordinated with Mexico. The Option 2 concept matches Mexico's last proposal, but the two nations are a long way from an agreement, and this option would require the construction of pedestrian bridges in Mexico. It is not clear whether GSA staff is suggesting that this crossing serve both northbound and southbound pedestrian traffic. As with the other proposals for mitigation, there is no clear delineation of funding responsibility for this project. This option would create a longer walking distance than Option 3 and is not preferred.

**Map 5 – Option 3 - Pedestrian Crossing Through Sidewalk Widening**

- The Option 3 concept could provide a shorter walking distance and improved access to transit, as well as allow for both a northbound and southbound pedestrian border crossing. This option would, however, require that Mexico expand the current northbound pedestrian walkway and identify an area to inspect southbound pedestrians heading into Mexico.

- We understand that the overall expansion project would include the removal of the historically designated Customs House. Alternatives for relocating and preserving this structure (or elements from it) should be explored through the environmental clearance process.

- Another alternative that could be explored with Mexican counterparts is the use of the Xicotencatl ramp in Tijuana for northbound pedestrians and the current path to accommodate southbound pedestrians.

- Has there been discussion with Mexico to consider NB pedestrians on the west side as well as the east side of the POE? This could also eliminate pedestrian/vehicles conflicts and shorten pedestrian access lengths.
Due to the nature of how this project is evolving, we would like to request that a new project development team (PDT, including, SANDAG, Caltrans, FHWA, MTS, the City of San Diego, and the GSA) be established to ensure that the questions brought forward to you within this letter and all future concerns related to this project and its impacts are recognized and addressed in a timely and effective manner. It would be ideal that these meetings take place at least once a month until all outstanding concerns are addressed.

Again, thank you for continuing to work with our agencies to find solutions for border congestion that will provide for safe and efficient travel for all people crossing through our nation’s busiest land POE. We look forward to any additional proposals you have for mitigation of the GSA’s SY-POE Expansion Project.

Sincerely,

Gary L. Gallegos
Executive Director

cc: Greg Smith, General Services Administration
    Hon. Bob Filner, Member of Congress, 51st District
STATUS REPORT ON THE PROPOSED OTAY MESA EAST-OTAY II PORT OF ENTRY AND CONNECTING ROADS

Introduction

Several key milestones towards the implementation of the Otay Mesa East-Otay II Port of Entry (POE) have been accomplished in 2008. The Borders Committee last received a progress report on planning activities in June 2008.

Coordination among U.S. federal, state, and local agencies responsible for POE planning and implementation continues through the Otay Mesa East POE Interagency Working Group. Collaboration between agencies in the U.S. and Mexico continues through the Otay Mesa East-Otay II POE Technical Commission, under the umbrella of the U.S.-Mexico Border Liaison Mechanism.

Discussion

This report highlights the outcomes of key planning and legislative activities completed in 2008, which culminated with the issuance of a Presidential permit for the Otay Mesa East POE and legislation that authorizes SANDAG to charge tolls and issue bonds to finance the Otay Mesa East POE and the connecting highway State Route (SR) 11.

United States

Presidential Permit

In the United States, the federal approval process for a new border crossing begins with the application for a Presidential permit. The law authorizes the President, or the Secretary of State acting on his behalf, to issue permits for the construction of international bridges and land border crossings, and to issue a Presidential permit for the same, if construction is deemed to be in the national interest.

Caltrans submitted the Presidential permit application on January 14, 2008. It included a description of the facility and its relationship to existing border crossings, traffic information and projected demand for the new POE, projected financing and construction plans, status of the counterpart project in Mexico, status on U.S. approvals necessary for construction, historic preservation information, and a description of how the POE would serve the national interest.
The U.S. Department of State approved the Presidential permit on December 8, 2008, which authorizes the U.S. General Services Administration (U.S. GSA) to build the Otay Mesa East POE as a vehicular and pedestrian border crossing.

**Toll Legislation**

Senate Bill (SB) 1486, the Otay Mesa East Toll Facility Authority Act, was introduced in February 2008, by Senator Denise Ducheny (D-San Diego) and signed by Governor Schwarzenegger on September 30, 2008. SB 1486 allows SANDAG to develop a public toll project to move people and goods along the SR 11 corridor and the Otay Mesa East POE.

The bill authorizes SANDAG to impose tolls and issue bonds secured by those toll revenues to finance the cost of acquiring and/or operating the SR 11-Otay Mesa East POE project.

**Proposition 1B: Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF) Program**

Proposition 1B (Prop. 1B), approved by the voters at the November 2006 general election, enacts the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, which authorizes the issuance of more than $19.9 billion of general obligation bonds for various transportation programs. One of the Prop. 1B programs is the Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF), which focuses infrastructure improvements along trade corridors that accommodate a high volume of freight movements.

In January 2008, SANDAG submitted a nomination to the CTC for the SR 11 and Otay Mesa East POE project. Funding to complete SR 905 as a six-lane facility between the existing Otay Mesa POE and Interstate 805 (I-805) also was requested. On April 10, 2008, the CTC adopted the TCIF program of projects, which includes $75 million for the SR 11-Otay Mesa East POE and $91.6 million for SR 905.

**U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) Border Congestion Relief Program**

On June 30, 2008, Caltrans District 11, submitted applications for four border projects in San Diego and Imperial Counties to participate in the U.S. DOT Transportation Border Congestion Relief Program. On September 18, 2008, the U.S. DOT identified the Otay Mesa East POE and SR 11 as one of the three projects selected nationwide for this Program.

The U.S. DOT is offering access to a senior-level Federal border congestion team to advance project planning and implementation. Projects would receive priority access to discretionary programs, including innovative financing.

**Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Phase 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for State Route 11 and the Otay Mesa East POE**

Caltrans District 11, in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), evaluated alternative locations to identify a corridor for the future SR 11 and a site for future development of the Otay Mesa East POE. These projects ultimately would be designed and built by different agencies. Caltrans/FHWA will be responsible for SR 11 while the U.S. GSA will be responsible for the POE.
The purpose of the Phase 1 document is to identify preferred facility locations and allow for several decisions and actions, which are outlined below:

- Route adoption by the California Transportation Commission (CTC);
- Consideration and approval of a Presidential permit for locating the POE by the U.S. Department of State (DOS);
- Facilitation of land use and circulation planning in the East Otay Mesa Specific Plan area by local agencies;
- Support of international cooperation efforts to pursue the development of the Otay Mesa East-Otay II POE; and
- Possible future designation of right-of-way for SR 11 and the Otay Mesa East POE in cooperation with local and regional jurisdictions to ensure that the rights-of-way are shown conceptually on planning documents.

The Draft Phase 1 PEIR/PEIS was released for public review and comment on January 18, 2008. On May 30, 2008, Caltrans published the Administrative Draft Final Phase 1 PEIR/PEIS, which included responses to comments received. On August 22, 2008, the Final Phase 1 PEIR/PEIS was released. This document identifies the Western Alternative shown in Attachment 1 as the preferred corridor for SR 11 and the POE. FHWA issued a Record of Decision on October 3, 2008.

GSA Feasibility/Functionality Study

In June 2008, GSA completed a feasibility study to evaluate alternatives that would satisfy the projected traffic demand and space requirements at the proposed Otay Mesa East POE as well as to reconfigure the existing Otay Mesa POE. The preferred alternative (Alternative H) calls for the Otay Mesa East POE to function as a commercial and noncommercial facility, includes modernization of the commercial and noncommercial installations at the existing Otay Mesa POE, and takes into account tolls or user fees for the SR 11-Otay Mesa East POE project.

Mexico

Economic, Financial Feasibility, and Functionality Study for the Mesa de Otay II POE

The Otay II POE is a priority project for the Mexican government. In March 2008, Mexico’s Secretariat of Communications and Transportation (SCT) released an economic, financial feasibility, and functionality study. The objectives of this study are to develop a conceptual master plan of the new POE, and to conduct socioeconomic and financial viability studies. Key tasks are outlined below.

- Estimate the Otay II POE potential market demand
- Define the POE conceptual layout
- Develop a Master Plan integrating the urban zone of Mesa de Otay
- Analyze the connectivity of the transportation corridor at the current Mesa de Otay POE
- Estimate the financial and economic feasibility of the project
According to the study, the preferred alternative calls for a POE that would handle both passenger and commercial vehicles with separate access roads connecting to the Mesa de Otay II-Otay Mesa East POE and SR 11. The study contemplates user fees of approximately $19.17 pesos (about $1.47 dollars) for passenger vehicles and up to $86 pesos (about $6.61 dollars) for 5-axle commercial vehicles (user fees would be based on the number of axles).¹

The study, prepared by the consultant team of Ochoa y Asociados, estimates the cost of the Otay II POE project at $391 million pesos (about $30 million dollars) (The study does not include the cost of the 39 hectares (about 96 acres) already reserved for the POE site by the City of Tijuana, nor the access roads.) The Otay II POE would be built through a 30-year concession, and is planned to be a toll facility.

On December 8, 2008, the Governor of Baja California Hon. José G. Osuna announced the investment of $1,600 million pesos (about $123 million dollars) for this project, $780 million pesos (about $60 million dollars) would be used to buy the property, $777 million pesos (about $59.7 million dollars) for access roads, and the rest of the funds will be used for planning and other required studies.

Additionally, the State of Baja California and the City of Tijuana are in the process of identifying possible locations for access roads in the vicinity of the Otay II POE. Funds have been allocated to conduct a risk analysis of nearby canyons to determine whether they should be declared as High Risk Zones for housing settlements and could be considered as right-of-way for access roads. Also, the City of Tijuana will start the bid process to initiate construction of the first phase for canalizing the Alamar River and of a new expressway, which also would provide access to the new Otay II POE once completed.

**Next Steps**

Major activities slated for 2009 are outlined below.

**Tier II EIR/EIS for State Route 11 and the Otay Mesa East POE**

Caltrans, in cooperation with GSA and FHWA, has initiated project-level environmental clearance studies for SR 11 and the Otay Mesa East POE. A Tier II EIR/EIS will evaluate design and operational alternatives for SR 11, the POE, and a potential Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facility (CVEF). A public scoping meeting was held on December 4, 2008. A Draft EIR/EIS will be completed in fall 2009 with completion of the final anticipated in summer 2010.

In addition, Caltrans will prepare a Project Report for SR 11 (preliminary engineering and design).

**GSA Project Development Study for the Otay Mesa East POE**

The next step in GSA’s planning process, following the completion of the feasibility study in June 2008, is the preparation of a Project Development Study (PDS). The PDS for the Otay Mesa East POE will further develop and analyze the proposed preferred alternative project leading to future design activities. This study is anticipated to begin in early 2009.

¹ The exchange rate used to convert pesos to dollars is $13 pesos per $1 dollar.
Future Project Financing

As described earlier, Senate Bill 1486 enacted the Otay Mesa East Toll Facility Act, which authorizes SANDAG to issue bonds for the acquisition, construction, and completion of transportation facilities and to impose tolls and user fees for the use of the SR 11 corridor. Toll revenues from the Otay Mesa toll facility project would be used to repay bonds, the cost to SANDAG for operating the project, and the cost for capital improvements, based on an expenditure plan.

SANDAG staff has initiated preliminary activities related to the financing of the SR 11 and Otay Mesa East POE project. Staff intends to perform a phased due diligence process to seek guidance from the U.S. DOT, as part of the project selection under the Transportation Border Congestion Relief program, and from private sector tolling experts.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. Proposed East Otay Mesa Port of Entry and State Route 11 Study Area (Map)

Key Staff Contact: Elisa Arias, (619) 699-1936; ear@sandag.org
Proposed East Otay Mesa Port of Entry and State Route 11 Study Area

LEGEND

- Proposed SR-11 (Western Alignment)
- Proposed SR-11 (Eastern Alignment)
- Proposed Truck Access Road
- Proposed SR-805 and SR-125 Alignment
- Proposed POE Access Road (Mexican Jurisdictional Boundaries)

 Existing/Future (2030) Roadway

- Proposed East Otay Mesa POE (100 acres/40.47 hectares)
- OTAY MESA COMMERCIAL VEHICLE ENFORCEMENT FACILITY
- Truck Access Road - Alternative 1
- Truck Access Road - Alternative 2
- Avenida Internacionales
- Boulevard Buena Vista

Proposed Mesa De Otay POE (86 acres/34.62 hectares)
San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan

Borders Committee
January 9, 2009

Strategic Plan Elements

• Goals and Objectives
• Existing Conditions
• Interregional Public Survey
• Early Actions and Interregional Strategies
Goals and Objectives

- Improve interregional collaboration
- Maintain and improve mobility of goods and people
- Enhance the quality of life in Imperial Valley and San Diego County
- Improve the economic vitality of Imperial Valley and San Diego County
- Minimize negative impacts of growth and transportation improvement impacts on the environment

Key Study Findings

- The Imperial Valley is currently not a bedroom community for San Diego County
- There is general satisfaction with the current state of the I-8 corridor commute
- As congestion increases on I-8 in the future, it would be worse in San Diego County
- Commuters willing to carpool/rideshare
Recommended Strategies

- Key Responsible Parties

- Time Frame:
  - Early Action
  - Mid-Term Strategy
  - Long-Term Strategy
Recommended Strategies

• *Goal 1: Improve Interregional Collaboration*
  • Strategy 1a: Improve interregional and regional information sharing regarding on-going studies to maximize the benefits and minimize duplication of effort
    • Key Responsible Parties: IVAG, SANDAG
    • Time Frame: Early Action

Recommended Strategies

• *Goal 1 (continued)*
  • Strategy 1b: Continue to integrate Tribal Nations into overall planning process for the I-8 corridor
    • Key Responsible Parties: IVAG, SANDAG, Tribal Nations, Caltrans
    • Time Frame: Early Action
Recommended Strategies

• Goal 1 (continued)
  • Strategy 1c: Collaborate on cross border people and goods movement issues, including recommendations and projects identified in the California-Baja California Border Master Plan
    • Key Responsible Parties: Caltrans, IVAG, SANDAG
    • Time Frame: Early Action

Recommended Strategies

• Goal 2: Maintain and Improve Mobility for People and Goods
  • Strategy 2a: Maintain [commitment to] key capital investments ...widening I-8 from four to six lanes between El Cajon to Alpine (2nd Street to Los Coches Road) and widening I-8 within Imperial Valley between SR-111 and Forrester Road
    • Key Responsible Parties: Caltrans, IVAG, SANDAG
    • Time Frame: Long-Term Strategy
Recommended Strategies

• Goal 2 (continued)
  • Strategy 2b: Explore opportunities to expand ridesharing
    • Key Responsible Parties: IVAG, SANDAG
    • Time Frame: Early Action

• Goal 2 (continued)
  • Strategy 2c: Explore the feasibility of promoting telecommuting programs at government agencies and other large employers
    • Key Responsible Party: IVAG
    • Time Frame: Mid-Term Strategy
Recommended Strategies

- **Goal 3: Enhance the Quality of Life in the Imperial Valley and San Diego County**
  - Strategy 3a: Support pro-active, comprehensive planning
    - Key Responsible Parties: Imperial County, local jurisdictions within Imperial County, San Diego County, and the city of El Cajon
    - Time Frame: Mid-Term Strategy

- **Goal 3 (continued)**
  - Strategy 3b: Explore means of preserving what people like about the Imperial Valley
    - Key Responsible Party: IVAG
    - Time Frame: Mid-Term Strategy
Recommended Strategies

• **Goal 3 (continued)**
  • Strategy 3c: Explore local access to medical and dental care, including specialized care and hospitalization
    • Key Responsible Party: IVAG
    • Time Frame: Mid-Term Strategy

Recommended Strategies

• **Goal 4: Improve the Economic Vitality of Imperial Valley and San Diego County**
  • Strategy 4: Support economic development focusing on job creation, particularly higher paying jobs
    • Key Responsible Parties: Imperial Valley EDC, East County EDC, IVAG, SANDAG
    • Time Frame: Mid-Term Strategy
Recommended Strategies

- **Goal 5**: Minimize Negative Impacts of Growth and Transportation Improvement Impacts on the Environment
  - Strategy 5a: Preserve I-8 transportation corridor right of way
    - Key Responsible Parties: Caltrans, IVAG, SANDAG, Imperial County and local jurisdictions within Imperial County, San Diego County, and the city of El Cajon
    - Time Frame: Long-Term Strategy

- **Goal 5 (continued)**
  - Strategy 5b: Monitor related interregional issues, such as SDG&E’s Sunrise Powerlink, and identify impacts to the corridor, if any
    - Key Responsible Parties: Caltrans, IVAG, SANDAG
    - Time Frame: Early Action
Upcoming Meetings and Next Steps

Scheduled Meetings

- January 12  East County EDC
- January 14  IVAG Management Committee
- January 15  Technical Advisory Working Group – am / Public Meeting – pm
- January 23  Joint Policy Advisory Group
- January 28  IVAG Regional Council
- February 25  IVAG Regional Council
- February 27  Borders Committee
San Diego-Imperial County I-8 Corridor Strategic Plan

Borders Committee
January 9, 2009
Economic Development District (EDD) Action Plan

South County Economic Development Council
1111 Bay Blvd. Suite E
Chula Vista, CA 91911

Requirements for EDD

- Sufficient Size and Population
- Unemployment Rates above the national average
- Low per capita income
- Cross Jurisdictional boundaries (counties)
Location

Borders Include
1. North: Interstate 8, following the city boundaries
2. South: Mexico/U.S. Border
3. East: Arizona/California Border
4. West: Pacific Ocean

Cities Include
1. Imperial Beach
2. National City
3. El Cajon
4. Coronado
5. Santee
6. El Centro
7. Bombay Beach
8. Calexico
9. Holtville
10. Imperial
11. Palo Verde
12. Salton City
13. Westmorland
14. Chula Vista
15. La Mesa
16. San Diego
17. Lemon Grove
18. Desert Shores
19. Calipatria
20. Brawley
21. Heber
22. Salton Sea Beach
23. Niland
24. Ocotillo
25. Seeley
26. Winter Haven

Process to Create EDD

- Establish District Organizations
  - Stakeholders
  - Board of Directors
  - Establish Committees
- Create CEDS
Establish District Organization
(one of the following)

- **Public Organization**: formed through an intergovernmental agreement providing for the joint exercise of local government powers (JPA) This will not occur.
- **Public Organization**: established under State-enabling legislation for the creation of multi-jurisdictional area-wide planning organizations. This will not occur.
- **Non-Profit Organization**: incorporated under the applicable non-profit statutes of the State in which it is incorporated

Establish EDD Board of Directors

**Structure:**
1. Representation of both counties
2. Geographical Representation
3. Representation of Principle Economic Interests
4. Private Sector Representative
5. One of More of the following:
   1. Executive Directors of Chambers of Commerce
   2. Representatives of institutions of post-secondary education, workforce development groups or labor groups
6. A simple Majority (50%+): elected officials of general purpose local governments or employees of such local governments who have been appointed
7. Private Citizens
Establish EDD Board of Directors cont.

- **Requirements:**
  1. Provide access for persons who are not members to make their views known
  2. Hold meetings open to the public at least once a year
  3. Adopt a system of Parliamentary Procedures, Provide public with information, decisions, and proposals in advance
  4. Make audited statements, annual budgets, and minutes available to the public
  5. Comply with all federal and state financial assistance requirements

- **Operations:**
  1. Coordinate and implement economic development activities in District
  2. Carry out economic development research, planning, implementation, and advisory functions as specified in the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies (CEDS)
  3. Coordinate the development and implementation of the CEDS with other local, state, federal and private organizations

Establish Committee Responsible for:

- **Conducting Meetings**
  1. Develop Process Allowing:
     - Local input on economic development projects
     - Proposal of Projects
     - Vote on Proposals

- **Documentation of:**
  1. Economic Development Problems
  2. Past, Present, and Projected economic development investments
  3. Economic Development Strategy
What is your EDD??

- Two Counties:
  - Imperial
  - San Diego (South and East County)

Responsibilities of EDD

- Prepare/ Revise/ Maintain:
  1. Overall Economic Development Program
  2. Other required or desired development strategies and plans
  3. Local Community and Economic Development strategies (CEDS) as requested by cities and counties
  4. Regional and Local Development Databases
**Tasks of EDD**

- Assist with the regional and local program/project process
  - Program/Project Identification, including benefits
  - Design and cost analysis
  - Financing Identification
  - Financing application preparation and following through
  - Implementation and Grant Administration
- Assist in obtaining and maintaining financing eligibility of the EDD
- Research
- Special Projects/Studies

**EDD v Mega Region**

- Both are projects under EDA the US Economic Development Administration.
- **EDD** – is a “district” with defined boundaries which enhances the ability for a “distressed” region to obtain EDA & other grant funding.
- **Mega Region** – is a technical study culminating in a report on how the region can better compete in a global environment, the outcome is expected to be better marketing and regional cooperation, but no significant entity creation.
The San Diego South County Economic Development Council (SCEDC) at the request of the EDA filed an application for the formation of an EDD between South San Diego County and Imperial County and was awarded the grant to form such an EDD on Aug. 27, 2008.

The proposed boundary of this district includes all of Imperial County and basically everything south of I-8 (with some exceptions) in San Diego County from the coast to the east border. It also includes a number of tribal nations along that route.
EDA background

- The EDA grant funded the program with a $50,000 award which has to be matched by the applicant with also $50,000.
- This is expected to be done by “in kind” contributions.

EDA formation process

- The district has to be formed by October of 2009.
- The first working meeting was held on Oct. 15, 2008 at SCEDC; second meeting on Nov. 13, 2008 in Imperial Valley.
- The major initial step is to complete a joint CEDS (Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy.) Imperial County is nearly done with its CEDS. This will then be combined with San Diego through the use of a consultant.
EDD formation process

- Once the combined Imperial County and San Diego CEDS are done, the next tasks will include developing the “Board” of directors for this EDD.

EDD “pro – con”

- The Pros’ are:
  - better/enhanced opportunity for funding by EDA.
  - Better recognition and opportunities for funding by other than EDA agencies or private institutions.
  - Opportunity for regional cooperation and projects otherwise not possible.
- The Cons’ are:
  - Fear of big vs. little county in receiving grants funds.
  - Politics.
  - EDD may not get formed.
The working group on preparing the EDD towards its goal of being adopted and formed are:

- South County Economic Development Council
  - Cindy Gompper Graves, CEO
- Imperial County through Planning & Development Services Dept.
  - Jurg Heuberger, AICP, Director
  - Esperanza Colio, ED Division Manager
- San Diego County
  - Chantal Saipe, Project Manager, Tribal Liaison
- Imperial Valley Economic Development Corporation
  - Tim Kelley, CEO
- East County Economic Development Council
  - Deanna Weeks, CEO & President
  - Jo Marie Diamond, Vice President
- Supported by US Economic Development Administration
  - Wilfred L. Marshall

EDD v Mega Region
are they the same thing?

- NO!
- The EDD will if approved be a “district” with a defined Board of Directors with specific authority and responsibility, and with a defined boundary. It will have the specific function of targeting grant or other funding from EDA as well as other philanthropic organizations.
- The EDD will have the responsibility to review all projects within the District for funding through EDA.
- The EDD has the potential to give a “distressed” area the ability to secure more funding then would otherwise be available under the current “independent” structure.”
EDD v Mega Region
are they the same thing?

- NO!
- The Mega Region project will culminate in a “REPORT” which will be a strategy or a plan on regional cooperation, regional information, regional goals, but it will not have an implementing organization.
- Implementation of such a plan will fall upon the involved agencies to continue cooperation in marketing the region, but with no defined structure, no rules or accountability.
San Ysidro Port of Entry (POE) Reconfiguration and Expansion Project
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SANDAG’s Presentation Outline

San Ysidro POE Reconfiguration Project
- GSA Project
- Regional and Community Impacts
U.S. GSA’s Proposed San Ysidro POE Reconfiguration Project

Regional & Community Impacts

- Pedestrian
- Transit
Pedestrian Impacts

1) Unsafe crossing at the San Ysidro Boulevard\NB I-5 onramp intersection for east\west trips

2) Loss of pick-up\drop-off location on San Ysidro Boulevard

3) Loss of accessibility to SB pedestrian gate

4) Loss of drop-off\pick-up on Camiones Way

Transit Impacts

1) MTS Trolley and bus services must utilize congested San Ysidro Boulevard\NB I-5 onramp intersection

2) Loss of MTS 929 and 932 routes and bus stop; and further impacts to future planned service
GSA’s Master Plan Options (November 2008)

San Ysidro Port of Entry (POE) Reconfiguration and Expansion Project

Borders Committee
January 9, 2009
STATE ROUTE 11/OTAY MESA EAST PORT OF ENTRY (POE)

Study Area

DRAFT For Preliminary Design Purposes Only
State Route 11/Otay Mesa East POE

Total project cost: $715 Million

Programmed Funding Available:

- State (STIP) Tier II Env./Eng. $13.0 M
- Federal (SAFETEA-LU) Tier II Env./Eng. $0.8 M
- State (Prop. 1B TCIF) Construction $75.0 M
  Total $88.8 M

Remaining Funds Needed (Toll Funds/Other): $626.2 M

State Route 11/Otay Mesa East Port of Entry

PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT - APPROVED 12/8/08

Project Schedule:

- Toll Finance Implementation/ Solicitation to financial firms 2009
- Tier II Env. Doc. 2010
- Design/Right of Way 2011
- Begin Construction 2012
- End Construction 2014
PROJECT STATUS:
MILESTONES COMPLETED

- Scoping Document: Project Study Report
- Exchange of Diplomatic Notes
- Financial Feasibility Studies: Mexico & U.S.
- Port of Entry Feasibility Studies - Mexico & U.S.
- Toll Legislation Approved - SB 1486 (Ducheny)
- Tier I Program EIS/EIR, Approved - October 2008

PROJECT STATUS:
MILESTONES COMPLETED

Transportation Border Congestion Relief Program (TBCRP)

- SR-11/Otay Mesa East project was selected by U.S. DOT/FHWA on September 18, 2008
- One of three binational projects selected
- Federal government will provide technical assistance and support to expedite project
PROJECT STATUS:
SENATE BILL 1486 - DUCHENY

• SB 1486 Otay Mesa East Toll Facility Act
  Signed and approved by Governor
  Schwarzenegger on September 30, 2008

• The bill authorizes SANDAG, within the SR 11
  corridor and at the Otay Mesa East POE, to:
  ➢ Issue bonds to acquire, construct, complete transportation
    facilities
  ➢ Impose tolls/user fees on SR 11
  ➢ Use toll revenue for capital, right of way, operating and bond
    repayment costs

• Must be public-public partnership

FINANCIAL STRATEGY: NEXT STEPS

• Preliminary Toll Analysis and Strategy is in
  Early Development Stage:
  ➢ Interview meetings with toll experts
  ➢ Advance financing needs - Transportation Infrastructure Act
    (TIFIA) with U.S.DOT
  ➢ Toll analyses: public toll financing implementation, binational
    toll strategy, and finance plan

• Request for Information/Request for
  Qualifications/Request for Proposals
  (RFI/RFQ/RFP) - Solicitation to financial firms,
  Target: Summer 2010
• Preserve Right-of-Way for Highway and POE Corridor

• Pursue advanced funding for design, ROW, and construction

• Tier II Studies for SR 11 and POE - Underway (Project Level Engineering and Environmental)

• Complete Draft Tier II EIS/EIR - Fall 2009
**Project Update**

- Stakeholder Coordination
- Master plan refinements
- Interior Program and Interior Space Planning
- Environmental in progress
  Pedestrian Traffic Studies

---

**San Ysidro POE: Pedestrian Access**

Existing

- Northbound
- Southbound
- Cross-town
- Transit Trolley
San Ysidro POE

Potential Site conveyance for parking and transit queue
Partial-taking of Camiones way for continued queuing
Easement relinquished for taxi and jitney queuing
Bridge aligned to minimize on-ramp conflict
Easement for MTS remains intact

Expanded transit boarding opportunities reduce pedestrian congestion

Potential SB Crossing at Virginia Avenue
Existing SB to remain w/minor adjustment
SB Pedestrian Access to Puerta Bicentenario

San Ysidro POE: Site Acquisition

Potential Site conveyance for parking and transit queue
Partial-taking of Camiones way for continued queuing
Easement relinquished for taxi and jitney queuing
Bridge aligned to minimize on-ramp conflict
Easement for MTS remains intact

Expanded transit boarding opportunities reduce pedestrian congestion

Potential SB Crossing at Virginia Avenue
Existing SB to remain w/minor adjustment
SB Pedestrian Access to Puerta Bicentenario
Next Steps

- Continue design
- Establish plan to move forward
- Site acquisitions
- Start qualifications processes for contractors
- Early off-site fabrication of various port components
- Affect throughput improvements in FY 2009
SANDAG Borders Comittee

Status on Tijuana – San Ysidro and Mesa de Otay II – East Otay Mesa POEs

January 2009
San Diego, California
Tijuana – San Ysidro "Puerta México"

- The Mexican Inter-agency Bridges and Border Crossings Group conducted follow-up meetings of this project all through out 2008.

- INDAABIN presented a project that placed the crosswalk entry into Mexico on the eastside of the current port, thus making use of land owned by the Government of Baja California.

- During the regional meeting of the International Bridges and Border Crossings Binational Group (Rosarito), INDAABIN presented an alternative to the pedestrian crossing into Mexico by which pedestrians would be received on an elevated level, which would provide them with greater security when crossing towards the public transportation area.
• The Government of Baja California recently introduced a new rehabilitation project for the San Ysidro border crossing on the Mexican side which they have called Bicentennial Gate. It includes a pedestrian southbound crossing on the eastern side of the actual crossing.

• The Mexican Interagency Bridges and Border Crossings Group is currently evaluating the existing conceptual designs and Baja’s new proposal in order to determine which is most viable, which will in turn become a formal proposal to the United States.
PUERTO FRONTERIZO EL CHAPARRAL, TIJUANA B.C.

PLANTA DE CONJUNTO.
Propuesta Conceptual Paso Peatonal
Mesa de Otay II – East Otay Mesa

- On October and November of 2008, bi-national meetings were held between the United States and Mexico in order to review the status of the Otay Mesa II - East Otay Mesa Project. This project was also discussed during the meeting of the Border Flows Facilitation Working Group that was held in Washington on October 21st, 2008.

- The Mexican Ministry of Communications and Transportation announced that Mexican construction could begin as soon as November 2010 and operations on November 2012. If accepted, the bidding process would be carried out in 2009.

- Considering that the Border Master Plan ranked this project as the main priority for the two Californias, the Mexican Government has requested the United States local, state and federal authorities to expedite the necessary administrative procedures in order to move forward the construction schedule of the East Otay Mesa POE.
• Throughout the meetings, U.S. authorities have informed that there are alternatives for accelerating the beginning of construction work, such as an early acquisition of lands.

• The U.S. authorities have mentioned the importance of the Mexican Government advancing in the acquisition of land and in the bidding process on the Mexican side, as this would signal certainty for U.S. investors.

• The Government of Mexico recognizes the efforts of all agencies involved in obtaining the Presidential Permit for this project, since it signifies a great step forward in realizing Otay II.

• It was agreed to hold bi-monthly follow-up meetings, the first of which will be held tentatively on January 28, 2009, in San Diego.