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MISSION STATEMENT

The Borders Committee provides oversight for planning activities that impact the borders of the San Diego region (Orange, Riverside and Imperial Counties, and the Republic of Mexico) as well as government-to-government relations with tribal nations in San Diego County. The preparation and implementation of SANDAG’s Binational, Interregional, and Tribal Liaison Planning programs are included under this purview. It advises the SANDAG Board of Directors on major interregional planning policy-level matters. Recommendations of the Committee are forwarded to the Board of Directors for action.

San Diego Association of Governments  ·  401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231  
(619) 699-1900  ·  Fax (619) 699-1905  ·  www.sandag.org
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.
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BORDERS COMMITTEE  
Friday, September 24, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>APPROVAL OF THE JULY 23, 2010, MEETING MINUTES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Borders Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Clerk of the Board if they have a handout for distribution to Borders Committee members. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Borders Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

REPORTS (3 through 6)

+3. REPORT FROM THE CONSUL GENERAL OF MEXICO  
(Hon. Remedios Gómez-Arnau, Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego)  
INFORMATION

The Consul General of Mexico in San Diego, Hon. Remedios Gómez-Arnau, contributes to the Borders Committee dialogue by providing periodic reports on binational activities within the purview of the Committee. This report highlights the United States - Mexico Declaration on 21st Century Border Management, including key goals to strengthen border security and management.

+4. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2010 BINATIONAL SEMINAR  
(Chair Paul Ganster, Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities)  
ACCEPT/RECOMMEND

This report will present highlights from the 2010 binational seminar and suggested next steps from the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO). COBRO will present the recommendations from the 2010 Binational Seminar to the Borders Committee for its acceptance and recommendation to the Board of Directors.

+5. THIRTEENTH REPORT OF THE GOOD NEIGHBOR ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD: REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: A BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION ON THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER  
(Chair Paul Ganster, Good Neighbor Environmental Board)  
INFORMATION

This report describes the principal chronic environmental issues that plague the border region today, and identifies immediate and medium-term actions that the federal government and other key partners in the region can take to address these problems. The Executive Summary of the report is attached.
6. **STATE ROUTE 11/OTAY MESA EAST PORT OF ENTRY (POE) PROJECT UPDATE** (Marney Cox and Christina Casgar, SANDAG; and Mario Orso, Caltrans)

SANDAG and Caltrans staff will provide an update on planning and financing the State Route 11/Otay Mesa East POE project. Recent milestones include hiring an investment banking firm, briefing Washington officials, engaging an architectural firm for preliminary design work, and advancing coordination efforts with federal and state agencies in Mexico.

7. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, October 22, 2010, at 12:30 p.m.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
1. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

   **Action:** Upon a motion by Supervisor Greg Cox (County of San Diego) and a second by Vice Mayor David Allan (East County), the Borders Committee unanimously approved the minutes from the June 25, 2010, meeting.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS**

   **Action:** There were no comments/communications.

**CONSENT (3)**

3. **JULY 4, 2010, ELECTIONS IN BAJA CALIFORNIA (INFORMATION)**

   On July 4, 2010, the State of Baja California held elections to elect Mayors and councilmembers for the five municipalities and Legislators (Diputados) of the 16 districts to the State legislature. The Mayors-elect of the five municipalities will be sworn in on December 1, 2010, for the 2010-2013 term of office. The State Legislators will start their terms on October 1, 2010.

   **Action:** Upon a motion by Council President Ben Hueso (City of San Diego) and a second by Councilmember John Minto (East County), the Borders Committee unanimously approved Consent Item No. 3.
REPORTS (4 through 9)

4. REPORT FROM THE CONSUL GENERAL OF MEXICO (INFORMATION)


Action: This item was presented for information only.

5. REPORT ON THE 2010 SAN DIEGO REGIONAL TRIBAL SUMMIT: PROCEEDINGS AND NEXT STEPS (DISCUSSION)

Chair Patricia McCoy stated more than 100 people participated in the 2010 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit, which included the Boards of Directors from SANDAG and the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA); and, other advisory agencies such as Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transit System, and the San Diego County Water Authority. A discussion was held regarding a set of transportation and regional planning strategies upon which to focus collaborative efforts in coming years and a matrix of proposed next steps was reviewed and discussed by the Borders Committee.

Chairman Chris Devers, Pauma Band of Mission Indians (SCTCA), reported on items discussed at the Summit which included accomplishments since the last Summit in 2006; goals and strategies; strengths and weaknesses; visions of mutual benefit; the value of the SCTCA’s role in collaboration with SANDAG and other advisory committees.

Action: This item was presented for discussion only.

6. TRIBAL VIDEO ON SOVEREIGNTY (INFORMATION)

Chairman Chris Devers, Pauma Band of Mission Indians (SCTCA), presented a short video regarding tribal sovereignty.

Committee members provided suggestions regarding distribution of the video and Chair McCoy asked staff to distribute copies of the video to Committee members when they become available.

Chairwoman Pam Slater-Price (County of San Diego) informed on the Pala Band of Mission Indians’ struggle against the proposed Gregory Canyon Landfill which involves Gregory Canyon and other areas considered sacred by the Luiseño people.

Action: This item was presented for information only.
7. UPDATE FROM TRIBAL LEADERSHIP (INFORMATION)

Chairman Chris Devers, Pauma Band of Mission Indians (SCTCA), briefed the Committee on current local and federal policy issues that are impacting tribes which include housing; public safety; water; energy; law enforcement and the justice system; internet gaming; health care; transportation; immigration; and, developing government-to-government relationships with tribes and written protocols for bringing leaders together.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

8. TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS AND TAXATION (INFORMATION)

Chairman Edwin "Thorpe" Romero, Barona Band of Mission Indians (SCTCA), introduced Angela Medrano, Staff Attorney, California Indian Legal Services (CILS), who briefed the Committee on the applicability of Federal, State, and local taxes to Indian Tribes and their members.

Action: This item was presented for information only.

9. UPDATE FROM THE RESERVATION TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY ON TRIBAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS UNDERWAY (INFORMATION)

Action: This item was tabled; and, will be presented at a future date.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, September 24, 2010, at 12:30 p.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Chair McCoy adjourned the meeting at 2:02 p.m.

Attachment: Attendance Sheet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL AREA</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MEMBER/ALTERNATE</th>
<th>ATTENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>City of Imperial Beach</td>
<td>Patricia McCoy (Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Rudy Ramirez</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Coastal</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Crystal Crawford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Oceanside</td>
<td>Jim Wood</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Inland</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Sam Abed</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Poway</td>
<td>Carl Kruse</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East County</td>
<td>City of Santee</td>
<td>John Minto</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of La Mesa</td>
<td>David Allan</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Ben Hueso</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sherri Lightner</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County of San Diego</td>
<td>Greg Cox (Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Slater-Price</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Paul Ganster</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cindy Gompper-Graves</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Angelika Villagrana</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Riverside</td>
<td>City of Lake Elsinore</td>
<td>Thomas Buckley</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of Mexico</td>
<td>Consul General of Mexico</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Consul General of Mexico</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consul</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consular Officer</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>选票</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Tribal</td>
<td>Pauma Chris Devers</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairmen’s Association</td>
<td>Mesa Grande Mark Romero</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCTCA Denis Turner</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Laurie Berman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Figge</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
<td>Elsa Saxod</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>Rich Macias</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathew Gleason</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Orange</td>
<td>City of San Clemente Jim Dahl</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Campbell</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT FROM THE CONSUL GENERAL OF MEXICO

Introduction

The Consul General of Mexico in San Diego, Honorable Remedios Gómez-Arnau, contributes to the Borders Committee dialogue by providing periodic reports on binational activities within the purview of the Committee. This report highlights the U.S.-Mexico Declaration on 21st Century Border Management (Attachment 1).

Discussion

The intention of the U.S.-Mexico Declaration on 21st Century Border Management, signed on May 19, 2010, is to “create a border that promotes economic competitiveness and enhances security through the secure, efficient, rapid, and lawful movement of goods and people.” The document describes areas for cooperation, as well as means for implementation and oversight.

The two countries recognize the need to collaborate on reducing congestion and delays, strengthening and enhancing trusted travelers and shippers programs (such as SENTRI, FAST, and C-TPAT), streamlining repatriation processes, and improving bilateral mechanisms to share information. One of the areas of collaboration of interest to the Borders Committee is the reference to “improved binational coordination in planning, permitting, designing, building, and operating ports of entry, as well as optimal staffing of ports of entry.”

To facilitate the implementation and oversight of the goals noted in the Declaration, the two countries have established a Twenty-First Century Border Bilateral Executive Steering Committee composed of representatives from the appropriate federal government departments and offices. For the United States, this includes representatives from the Departments of State, Homeland Security, Justice, Transportation, Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Defense, and the Office of the United State Trade Representative, and for Mexico it includes representatives from the Secretariats of Foreign Relations, Interior, Finance and Public Credit, Economy, Public Security, Communications and Transportation, Agriculture, and the Office of the Attorney General of Mexico.


Key Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas, (619) 699-1972, hva@sandag.org
19 May 2010

U.S., Mexico Declaration on 21st Century Border Management

Highlights key goals to strengthen U.S.-Mexico border security, management

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary
May 19, 2010

Declaration by The Government Of The United States Of America and
The Government Of The United Mexican States
Concerning Twenty-First Century Border Management

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States, hereinafter referred to collectively as the “Participants,”

Acknowledging their shared interest in creating a border that promotes their economic competitiveness and enhances their security through the secure, efficient, rapid, and lawful movement of goods and people;

Expressing a desire to fundamentally restructure the way in which the shared border between Mexico and the United States is managed to enhance public safety, welcome lawful visitors, encourage trade, strengthen cultural ties, and reduce the cost of doing business in North America;

Recognizing the importance of securing and facilitating the lawful flow of goods, services, and people between their countries;

Understanding that joint and collaborative administration of their common border is critical to transforming management of the border to enhance security and efficiency;

Recognizing the potential value, both in terms of enhancing security and reducing congestion, of shifting certain screening and inspection activities, traditionally performed at the immediate border, to geographic departure and transit zones away from the border and of considering other non-traditional border crossing concepts;

Appreciating that enhancing the flow of information needed for effective shared border management requires professionalism in law enforcement, strong institutional capacity, and effective interagency coordination in and between both countries;

Recognizing that transnational criminal organizations threaten the economies and security of both the United States and Mexico and that both countries share responsibility for the conditions that give rise
to these criminal organizations and that allow them to endure, as well as shared responsibility for remedying those conditions;

Understanding that law enforcement coordination between the Participants is essential to preventing crime and to disrupting and dismantling transnational criminal organizations;

Sharing an interest in ensuring a legal, orderly system for managing migration between their countries and developing coordinated procedures for managing repatriation and ensuring that it remains safe and humane;

Hereby express their commitment to strengthen cooperation in:

• Enhancing economic competitiveness by expediting lawful trade, while preventing the transit of illegal merchandise between their two countries,

• Facilitating lawful travel in a manner that also prevents the illegal movement of people between their two countries,

• Sharing information that enhances secure flows of goods and people, and

• Disrupting and dismantling transnational criminal organizations and punishing their members and supporters.

I. AREAS OF COLLABORATION

In light of these mutual understandings, the Participants expect to work in a collaborative and coordinated fashion across a wide-range of border-related activities, including:

• Programs focused on reducing congestion and delays in cross-border traffic entering both Mexico and the United States, building a foundation for efficient border and expanded economic growth, improving community safety and quality of life, and reducing unhealthy emissions from idling vehicles;

• The creation, expansion, or mutual recognition of “trusted shipper” programs such as FAST and C-TPAT and “trusted traveler” programs such as SENTRI and Global Entry, allowing enforcement authorities to concentrate their efforts where they are most needed to stop illicit border flows;

• Pre-screening, pre-clearance, and pre-inspection of people, goods, and products, particularly where such activities increase the Participants’ abilities to intercept dangerous individuals, hazardous goods, and contraband before they cause harm and to alleviate congestion at ports of entry;

• The enhancement of the repatriation processes through the exchange of information and close bilateral cooperation, with special attention to vulnerable people such as unaccompanied minors, pregnant women, and the sick and elderly.

• The improvement of bilateral mechanisms to share information related to aviation security and border security.
• The development of complementary risk management strategies aimed at separating high-risk and low-risk shipments, as well as high-risk and low-risk individuals, including specific procedures for repatriation of individuals with criminal records;

• The standardized collection and single entry of trade data, so that importers and exporters are asked for a given piece of information only once, reducing the administrative burden of compliance and therefore the cost of trade;

• Improved bi-national coordination in planning, financing, permitting, designing, building, and operating ports of entry, as well as optimal staffing of ports of entry;

• Promotion of a closer partnership with the private sector, the trade community, and international partners to secure supply chains;

• Development of shared priorities for public investments in ports of entry along the border, planned in coordination with the infrastructure feeding into them, as well as funding mechanisms for such projects, including private sector participation;

• Joint assessments of threats, development of a common understanding of the operating environment, and joint identification of geographic areas of focus for law enforcement operations;

• Augmentation of their collection, analysis, and sharing of information from interdictions, investigations, and prosecutions to disrupt “criminal flows” and enhance public safety; and

• Bringing together border communities and relevant stakeholders as partners in efforts to protect public safety by integrating law enforcement efforts with other government functions including social assistance, community outreach, and responsiveness to citizen concerns.

II. IMPLEMENTATION AND OVERSIGHT

To coordinate and facilitate work aimed at furthering the goals noted in this Declaration, the Participants intend to establish a Twenty-First Century Border Bilateral Executive Steering Committee (ESC) composed of representatives from the appropriate federal government departments and offices. For the United States, this includes representatives from the Departments of State, Homeland Security, Justice, Transportation, Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Defense, and the Office of the United State Trade Representative, and for Mexico includes representatives from the Secretariats of Foreign Relations, Interior, Finance and Public Credit, Economy, Public Security, Communications and Transportation, Agriculture, and the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic. Each Participant should integrate its own section of the ESC section into the relevant interagency processes to achieve better bilateral coordination.

It is expected that the inaugural meeting of the ESC, to be convened no later than August 19, 2010, will develop a mutually accepted action plan to realize the goals of this Declaration and identify working groups, drawing, where appropriate, upon existing bilateral, border-related groups, to implement the action plan.
III. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

This Declaration represents an understanding between the Participants and does not constitute a legally binding agreement. The Participants understand that activities in support of the goals mentioned in this Declaration are to be carried out in accordance with the laws and regulations of the Participants’ countries, and applicable international agreements to which the Participants’ countries are parties. The Participants are expected to bear their own costs in engaging in any such activities. All such activities are subject to the availability of funds and human resources.

(Distributed by the Bureau of International Information Programs, U.S. Department of State. Web site: http://www.america.gov)
Introduction

The 2010 Binational Seminar “Crossborder Climate Change Strategies: Raising Awareness on Adaptation” was held on June 1, 2010, at Caltrans, District 11. A preliminary report on this event was presented at the June 25, 2010, Borders Committee meeting.

As part of its responsibilities, the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) reviewed the summary of this seminar and discussed possible recommendations to the Borders Committee at its July 6 and September 7, 2010, meetings.

Discussion

To develop its recommendations, COBRO discussed the following considerations:

1) The topic of climate change is a development issue that affects urban development as a whole and includes: transportation, environmental, water and energy, among other issues.

2) Communication about crossborder climate change needs to be active and proactive in order to adequately reach stakeholders on both sides of the border.

3) Future crossborder efforts regarding climate change adaptation need to be compatible with existing programs and efforts, such as Border 2012. The goal should be to work in the same direction and not at cross-purposes.

4) Stakeholders should become more aware of the various federal and local governmental efforts, as well as the research conducted by the scientific community, in order to better develop adaptation strategies.

5) The San Diego-Tijuana BLM could be a local binational forum where climate change adaptation discussions could take place. An example of a border-wide forum that could be a model for these discussions is the U.S. EPA and SEMARNAT’s Border 2012 Program and its Work Groups and Task Forces. These groups focus on different environmental media such as air and water and have traditional/institutional meeting and reporting structures. The Environmental Work Table of the Border Governors Conference also provides a useful forum for discussion of climate change issues.
**Next Steps**

Following a recommendation from the Borders Committee, staff will schedule a report on the 2010 Binational Seminar for the October or November 2010 Board of Directors meeting.

CHARLES "MUGGS" STOLL  
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. 2010 Binational Seminar Recommendations

Key Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas, (619) 699-1972, hva@sandag.org
2010 Binational Seminar Recommendations

Following COBRO’s discussions, the Borders Committee may forward the following recommendations to the Board of Directors and recommend approval by the Board of Directors:

• Support the institutionalization of crossborder climate change adaptation discussions via existing mechanisms, such as the Border 2012 Program sponsored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico (SEMARNAT) and/or the San Diego-Tijuana Border Liaison Mechanism (BLM).

• Request that the two Consul Generals of the United States and Mexico explore a feasible sub-committee or technical commission within the San Diego – Tijuana BLM structure to address crossborder climate change adaptation strategies. The BLM would agree on topics to explore and recommend to SEMARNAT and EPA that these topics be incorporated into the activities of the current Border 2012 Program and also be made a part of the new border environmental program that will replace Border 2012 in the future.
THIRTEENTH REPORT OF THE GOOD NEIGHBOR ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD: REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: A BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION ON THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER

This report describes the principal chronic environmental issues that plague the border region today, and identifies specific immediate and medium-term actions that the federal government and other key partners in the region can take to address these problems.

CHARLES “MUGGS” STOLL
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. A Blueprint for Action on the U.S.-Mexico Border

Key Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas, (619) 699-1972, hva@sandag.org
A Blueprint for Action on the U.S.-Mexico Border

Thirteenth Report of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board to the President and Congress of the United States

June 2010
The 13th report of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB) describes the principal chronic environmental issues that plague the border region today. The report also identifies specific immediate and medium-term actions that the federal government and other key partners in the region can take to address these problems. Although there certainly is a need for more funding to address the environmental problems of this underserved region of the United States, there is much that federal agencies can do to better implement existing programs and better use current resources. They can provide the leadership required to eliminate domestic and international barriers to facilitate efforts of state and local government, border communities, and the private sector. Federal participation is key to working effectively across the border with Mexico, and absolutely necessary for developing and applying solutions to environmental problems that spill across the border and cause problems for U.S. and Mexican communities.

The 13th report highlights important environmental problems and solutions in the areas of climate change, air quality, water quantity and quality, energy, habitat and biodiversity conservation, solid and hazardous waste, emergency response, environmental health, security along the border, and institutional mechanisms for addressing border environmental problems. Most of the topics are treated as stand-alone chapters. Some topics are integrated in a number of places in different chapters, as is the case with security, and with environmental health, which is treated in the water, air, and waste chapters.
The 13th report does not prioritize the border environmental problems according to their severity nor according to proposed recommendations. Instead, the Board provides its perspective of what the important border environmental problems are, and actions that the federal government can take to address those problems. This report aims to reflect the concerns of border communities. Many nongovernmental, state and local governmental, and tribal Board members live and work in border communities; federal members of the GNEB also are experts on these border issues. The Board typically meets three times annually, twice in border communities, and hears firsthand from local residents about the challenges that they face in the management of border environmental issues.

Context
There are a number of defining features and characteristics of the border region that make it fundamentally different from other regions within the United States. The U.S. border region is defined by rapid economic and population growth, rapid urbanization, spillover effects from Mexico, asymmetries with Mexican communities across the border, international commerce and trade flows, high rates of poverty, and a distinct ethnic identity. These features all present challenges that regions located within the interior of the United States often do not have to overcome, especially when they occur simultaneously and in the same place.

Population and urbanization
Since the 1940s, the population of the U.S. and Mexican border states has grown more rapidly than the national averages and the populations of the counties and municipalities along the border have grown faster than the states in which they are located. Driven by migration, especially of young people, the populations of Mexican municipalities have grown at a faster rate than their U.S. counterparts. These trends make the border region the most demographically dynamic region of the United States and of Mexico. By 2000, some 12.4 million people lived in the border counties and municipalities, and by 2010 that figure had reached 14.4 million, concentrated largely in binational metropolitan sister cities. By 2020, the border population is projected to reach 19.5 million.

Urban growth often outpaces the ability of government to provide adequate infrastructure in these border cities, especially on the Mexican side of the boundary where much of the urbanization has been unplanned. In burgeoning cities such as Ciudad Juárez, Nuevo Laredo, Nogales, and Tijuana, lands were settled and houses were constructed, but water and sewerage infrastructure installation occurred years afterward. In areas of the U.S. border region, principally in Texas and New Mexico, but also in Arizona and California, colonias—residential communities in rural areas of counties lacking basic services such as water, sewage, electricity, and often paved roads—developed without standard infrastructure. Thus, on both sides of the border, large numbers of residents do not have safe potable water piped into their homes and lack proper sewage collection and treatment services. Hundreds of thousands of U.S. border residents do not have the same levels of water and sewage services as their fellow citizens elsewhere in the United States. By 2000, the deficit in environmental infrastructure in U.S. and Mexican border communities ranged from $5.8 to $10.4 billion, and by 2010 the deficit was more than $1 billion for water and wastewater projects in U.S. and Mexican border communities.

One of the major difficulties for making environmental progress on the U.S.-Mexico border is that although the border region of the United States is one of the poorest areas of that nation (see graph below), Mexico's border region is one of the wealthiest regions of Mexico, along with Mexico City, Guadalajara, and Monterrey. This fact has made it politically difficult for Mexican federal authorities to spend funds on border environmental infrastructure when there are more pressing needs elsewhere in the country.

Economic and trade expansion: North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)
When NAFTA was being negotiated and debated in Congress in the early 1990s, many border residents had hopes that the trade agreement would address environmental problems of
their communities and also bring economic development, including well-paying jobs. NAFTA produced a large increase in trade and investment across the border with Mexico, but did not create prosperity in U.S. border communities. Although NAFTA stimulated commerce and created many jobs along the border, those jobs tended to be low-skill and low-paying, while border communities lost higher paying assembly and manufacturing jobs that moved into Mexico and elsewhere offshore. At the same time, the increased vehicular crossings saturated the border infrastructure and overwhelmed communities along the major trade corridors with increases in air pollution, producing health as well as safety concerns. Although regions throughout the United States benefited from the growth of NAFTA-related trade and investment, border communities absorbed a disproportionate share of the environmental costs related to congestion.

**Poverty and ethnicity**

A 2006 report by the U.S./Mexico Border Counties Coalition, *At the Cross Roads: US/Mexico Border Counties in Transition*, provides useful analysis for understanding key features of the U.S. border region. The report points out that if the 24 U.S. counties along the border were aggregated as the 51st state, they would rank 40th in per capita income, 5th in unemployment, 2nd in tuberculosis, 7th in adult diabetes, 50th in insurance coverage for children and adults, and 50th in high school completion—all characteristic of regions of poverty.

Hispanics constitute the largest ethnic group in the border region, are the largest minority group in the United States, and are a majority of the population in 18 of the 24 counties along the international border with Mexico. By 2008, 88 percent of the population of the border counties, excluding San Diego and Pima counties, was Hispanic. The percentage of Hispanics in the U.S. border population is increasing due to continuing migration from Mexico and the high birth rate of border Hispanic populations (see adjacent table).

Adding to the cultural and economic complexity, there are 26 U.S. federally recognized Native American Tribes in the border region that range in size from 9 to 28,000 members. Some of these tribes share extensive family and cultural ties to indigenous peoples in the border region of Mexico.

The border region, then, is a region where poverty and ethnicity coincide. It also is a region where the population is harmed by the health effects of deteriorated environmental conditions.

### Estimated Population of U.S. Counties Adjacent to the Border, and Hispanic Percentage (July 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/County</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
<th>Percentage Represented by Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise</td>
<td>129,006</td>
<td>40,860</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>1,012,018</td>
<td>335,257</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>42,923</td>
<td>34,428</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>194,322</td>
<td>108,108</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>1,378,269</td>
<td>518,653</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>163,972</td>
<td>125,864</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>3,001,072</td>
<td>926,926</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>3,165,044</td>
<td>1,052,790</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Mexico</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doña Ana</td>
<td>201,603</td>
<td>131,014</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>4,910</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luna</td>
<td>27,227</td>
<td>16,252</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>233,740</td>
<td>150,131</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewster</td>
<td>9,331</td>
<td>3,994</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>392,736</td>
<td>338,953</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimmit</td>
<td>9,758</td>
<td>8,187</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>742,062</td>
<td>606,810</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidalgo</td>
<td>726,604</td>
<td>651,063</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudspeth</td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Davis</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinney</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maverick</td>
<td>52,279</td>
<td>49,449</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio</td>
<td>7,467</td>
<td>6,219</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starr</td>
<td>62,249</td>
<td>60,596</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrell</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Verde</td>
<td>48,053</td>
<td>37,613</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb</td>
<td>236,941</td>
<td>224,088</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapata</td>
<td>13,847</td>
<td>12,233</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>2,310,896</td>
<td>2,004,510</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,087,949</td>
<td>3,726,084</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total minus San Diego</strong></td>
<td>4,086,877</td>
<td>2,799,158</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total minus San Diego and Pima</strong></td>
<td>3,074,859</td>
<td>2,463,901</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape and climate

The natural environment and climate of the border region provide a number of challenges for environmental quality and sustainability of communities. The border is mostly arid, and major populations such as San Diego and El Paso depend on scarce groundwater and surface water that is insufficient to meet current demands for urban and agricultural uses and ecosystem services. To meet these needs for potable water, border communities are forced to transport water over long distances or implement desalination of saline groundwater, both costly solutions. Climate predictions point to higher average temperatures and declining snowpack in the Colorado and Rio Grande systems; as a result, water resources are projected to decrease in the future (see Chapters 1 and 7).

Border location

Its location along the international boundary adjacent to a newly industrialized country with low per capita income and striking income inequalities provides the border region with challenges that other regions within the United States do not share. With populations doubling every 10 to 15 years, Mexican border cities tend to prioritize water supply for the population over other needs such as sewage treatment, hazardous and solid waste disposal, water for conservation, road paving, and motor vehicle emissions control systems. Although environmental spillover effects are inevitable in the densely settled sister-city pairs along the border, the level of development in Mexico means that U.S. border cities need to spend more to address these issues on their side of the border.

The ports of entry also have significant economic as well as environmental impacts on U.S. border communities because of the enormous quantities of freight that move through the trade corridors with Mexico, and the long crossing wait times for commercial and non-commercial vehicles. In 2007, these wait times for personal and commercial crossing from Tijuana to San Diego alone cost the U.S. and Mexican economies an estimated $7.2 billion in foregone gross output and more than 62,000 jobs. If compiled, the figure for losses produced by long wait times along the entire border with Mexico would be very large,
in excess of $10 billion per year. These are costs absorbed by border communities that benefit communities throughout the United States.

The Board addressed key border security environmental issues in its 10th and 11th annual reports. Many of the subjects raised in the 10th report, *Environmental Protection and Border Security on the U.S.-Mexico Border*, as well as those discussed in detail in the 11th report, *Natural Disasters and the Environment Along the U.S.-Mexico Border*, are addressed in other sections of this report, notably in the emergency preparedness and hazardous waste sections.

The international boundary adds complexities and costs for U.S. border communities in their attempts to address regional environmental issues. Organizing a proper emergency response system is greatly complicated by the international boundary, as is dealing with regional air pollution issues when part of the airshed is located in Mexico. Conservation, water quality protection, aquifer management, watershed management, and solid and hazardous waste are other examples of environmental issues that ultimately only have binational or international solutions.

**Conclusions**

The governments of the United States and Mexico have responded to the challenge of border environmental issues with a number of measures that include the 1944 international water treaty, the 1983 La Paz Agreement, the border environmental program of Border 2012, and the creation of the binational institutions of the North American Development Bank (NADB) and the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC). Although these efforts to address border environmental problems have had positive results, they have been inadequate to meet the needs of dynamic border communities with growing environmental problems.

In 2009, the Board issued two separate letters of advice: the first on May 19, which addressed a wide variety of border issues, and a second letter on December 2, which addressed the environmental effects of the border fence. Both letters, and the reply to the Board from the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), are found in the Appendices. A response to the December 2 letter from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is available on the GNEB Web Site (http://www.epa.gov/ocem/gneb/pdf/2009_1224_gordon_letter_gneb_chair.pdf).

The GNEB in this 13th report recommends that all relevant federal agencies improve coordination and commitment to address the wide suite of environmental problems and opportunities present on the border, and facilitate cross-border efforts of the border communities whenever possible. At the same time, strategic funding increments are necessary, particularly to address the chronic environmental infrastructure deficit that still exists throughout the border and affects these communities.
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21st Century Borders for North America

- **Mexico and the US maintain a busy and intense relationship**, with the daily crossing of more than 2.3 million people and 300 thousand vehicles through 54 border crossings.

- Approximately 70% of the total trade between Mexico and the United States is **conducted by truck**, while 16.4% by sea and 8.4% by rail. The remaining is done by other means of transportation.

- **Trade between Mexico and the U.S. has grown exponentially, but our border facilities have not grown accordingly.** From 1993 to 2008, exports from the US to Mexico have grown 223% and exports from Mexico to the US, 396%. Border crossings between both countries has grown only 10%.
Mexico and the United States have acknowledged a shared interest in creating a border that promotes economic competitiveness for the whole of North America, enhancing regional security through safe, efficient, rapid, and lawful movement of goods and people.

President Obama and President Calderón have recognized the potential value of a collaborative administration of their common border through the Declaration by The Government Of The United States Of America and The Government Of Mexico Concerning Twenty-First Century Border Management on May, 2010.

Both Governments have expressed their commitment to strengthen cooperation:
- Enhancing economic competitiveness by expediting lawful trade, while preventing the transit of illegal merchandise
- Facilitating lawful travel and enhancing secure flows of goods and people, and
- Disrupting and dismantling transnational criminal organizations and punishing their members and supporters.
- Make the communities in border states partners in efforts to protect public safety by integrating law enforcement efforts with social assistance, community outreach, and responsiveness to citizen concerns.
Bi-national Border Management Initiatives

- Development of a single, shared set of priorities for public investments in ports of entry along the border, as well as innovative and long standing funding mechanisms for such projects.

- Improve and expand passenger preclearance and pre-scanning of cargo shipments and trusted traveler programs (SENTRI, FAST & and other programs) and move screening activities away from the border.

- Full staffing at Ports of Entry in both countries to guarantee their optimal functionality.

- Continue bi-national coordination in planning, financing, permitting, designing, building, and operating ports of entry within the existing mechanisms.

- Analyze innovative approaches on bi-national trade logistics to minimize unnecessary costs on importers and exporters.

- The development of complementary risk management strategies aimed at separating high-risk and low-risk goods and people.

- Collaboration in law enforcement and information sharing to prevent cross-border crime and to disrupt and dismantle transnational criminal organizations.
In recent years, Mexico and the United States have reached remarkable levels of understanding and coordination regarding the development of border infrastructure, towards strengthening the competitiveness of North America.

Our governments agree on the importance of the border as a region of opportunity and bi-national cooperation. We carry out efforts in order to strengthen security and encourage commercial trade.

The development of new infrastructure at the U.S.-Mexico border suffered a historical impasse. However, in early 2007 we achieved the simultaneous construction of three new ports of entry:

- San Luis Rio Colorado – San Luis II, (Sonora-Arizona)
- Rio Bravo-Donna (Tamaulipas–Texas).
Reynosa-McAllen “Anzaldúas”

Anzaldus International Bridge, first international bridge between Mexico and the US in 10 years. President Felipe Calderón and US Trade Representative, Ron Kirk during the opening ceremony.

San Luis Río Colorado II

To be inaugurated in October 2010.

Bridge that connects the Mexican POE to the US

Inspection Booths
Río Bravo - Donna

Under construction. To be inaugurated in 2010.

Construction of the inspection facilities in Mexico

International bridge

Final Remarks

- Achieving a comprehensive modernization of the border is the stepping-stone for the enhancement of North America’s regional competitiveness.

- Secure the flow of people and goods between our countries while expediting legitimate commerce and travel, and reducing the duration and variability of wait times.

- **Our geographical proximity is the only advantage that we share permanently;** hence the development of a world class infrastructure with a binational scope—highways, railways, land ports and seaports—is essential to enable timely and efficient supply to producers and consumers.

- The support and involvement of the United States Congress will be key for the success of these efforts. Coordinated work between the Legislative and Executive Branches of both countries is critical to achieve our goals.
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- The topic of climate change is a development issue.
- Crossborder communication about climate change needs to be active and proactive.
- Future crossborder efforts regarding climate change adaptation need to be compatible with existing programs and efforts.
Crossborder Climate Change Strategies  
Raising Awareness of Adaptation

• Stakeholders should become more aware of the various federal and local governmental efforts, as well as the research conducted by the scientific community, in order to better develop adaptation strategies.

• The San Diego-Tijuana BLM (Border Liaison Mechanism), the U.S.-Mexico Border 2012, and the Border Governors Conference could be possible forums for ongoing climate change discussions.

Crossborder Climate Change Strategies  
Raising Awareness of Adaptation

Recommendation

COBRO is presenting the recommendations from the 2010 Binational Seminar (Attachment 1 of Agenda Item #4) to the Borders Committee for its acceptance and recommendation to the Board of Directors.
Recommendation One:

Support the institutionalization of crossborder climate change adaptation discussions via existing mechanisms, such as the Border 2012 Program sponsored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources of Mexico (SEMARNAT) and/or the San Diego-Tijuana Border Liaison Mechanism (BLM).

Recommendation Two:

Request that the two Consul Generals of the United States and Mexico explore a feasible sub-committee or technical commission within the San Diego - Tijuana BLM structure to address crossborder climate change adaptation strategies. The BLM would agree on topics to explore and recommend to SEMARNAT and EPA that these topics be incorporated into the activities of the current Border 2012 Program and also be made a part of the new border environmental program that will replace Border 2012 in the future.
Crossborder Climate Change Strategies
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Estrategias Transfronterizas sobre Cambio Climático
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GNEB

- A federal panel that advises the President and Congress on border environmental issues
- Members include border community representatives, tribes, academia, local and state governments, NGOs, private sector, and federal agencies
- Issues an annual report and occasional comment letters
  - May 19, 2009, border environmental priorities
  - December 2, 2009, the border fence
GNEB 13th Report

• A comprehensive blueprint on border environmental issues
• The Board approached the issues and solutions with a clear understanding of the ongoing federal resource limitations
• The Board brings perspectives from all border stakeholders, especially the border communities

A Blueprint for Action

• 63 specific and actionable recommendations grouped in 8 thematic chapters
• There are also a number of cross-cutting observations and recommendations that appear throughout the report
A Blueprint for Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Climate Impacts, Adaptation, and Mitigation</th>
<th>9 recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>7 recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td>6 recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>6 recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Solid and Hazardous Waste</td>
<td>11 recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>9 recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Habitat and Biodiversity Conservation</td>
<td>9 recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Institutional Mechanisms</td>
<td>6 recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Climate Impacts, Adaptation, and Mitigation
  - Effects on border water and ecosystems
  - Coordinate U.S. & Mexico federal, state, local adaptation and mitigation planning, education, and implementation for the border region

- Air Quality
  - Binational airshed management
  - Reduce idling and wait times at ports of entry
  - Co-benefits of GHG and criteria pollutant reductions
A Blueprint for Action

• Renewable Energy
  – Coordination with Mexico of regulations and transborder effect assessment of renewable energy production and transmission
  – Federal regulations and incentives for residential and commercial renewable energy and energy efficiency

• Water
  – Water supply and drought
  – Transboundary Aquifer Assessment Program
  – Water and watershed management coordination with Mexico and tribes

A Blueprint for Action

• Solid and Hazardous Waste
  – U.S. and Mexico coordination to improve flow of hazmat through ports of entry; binational hazmat tracking system
  – U.S. and Mexico coordination of flow and management of used materials such as tires, appliances, vehicles
  – Binational recycling market development

• Emergency Preparedness
  – Address border port of entry bottlenecks for emergency responders
  – Improve and implement international and city-to-city agreements for effective regional emergency response system
A Blueprint for Action

• Habitat and Biodiversity Conservation
  – Better coordination among U.S. and Mexican officials for management of shared natural resources
  – Coordinated binational response to climate change
  – Mitigation of fence impacts and long-term monitoring
  – Department of Interior participation in Border 2012 is needed

A Blueprint for Action

• Institutional Mechanisms
  – Transboundary Environmental Impact Assessment is needed
  – Clarify roles of border institutions to address and prioritize unmet needs
  – Make Border 2012 more accessible to tribes and small communities
  – Other federal agencies should more actively participate in Border 2012 process—Energy, Agriculture, DHS, Defense, Interior, and others
A Blueprint for Action: Themes

• Due to location along the international boundary, border communities face greater challenges and have a lower environmental quality than comparable communities within the United States.

A Blueprint for Action: Themes

• There is a coincidence of poverty, ethnicity, and environmental problems in border communities.
  – 68.5% Hispanic
  – 88.0% Hispanic without San Diego & Pima
A Blueprint for Action: Themes

• Improved coordination across the border is needed to develop binational solutions for binational environmental problems

• Better coordination among all U.S. federal agencies with programs in the border region would significantly improve approaches and efficiencies to border environmental problem resolution

For More Information

http://www.epa.gov/ocem/gneb/

GNEB reports and advice letters are on this website.
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