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BORDERS COMMITTEE AGENDA
Friday, May 25, 2018
12:30 to 2:30 p.m.
SANDAG Board Room
401 B Street, 7th Floor
San Diego

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

• 2018 SAN DIEGO REGIONAL TRIBAL SUMMIT – DRAFT STRATEGIC ACTIONS

• SENATE BILL 1: TRADE CORRIDOR ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

• 18TH REPORT OF THE GOOD NEIGHBOR ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD – ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND BORDER SECURITY: A 10-YEAR RETROSPECTIVE

• UPDATE ON THE MERGER OF THE NORTH AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK AND THE BORDER ENVIRONMENT COOPERATION COMMISSION

PLEASE SILENCE ALL ELECTRONIC DEVICES DURING THE MEETING
YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE BORDERS COMMITTEE MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEBSITE AT 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 (Committee) on any item at the time the Committee is considering the item. Please complete a Request to Comment form, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the form to the Committee Clerk seated at the front table. Members of the public may address the Committee on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. The Committee may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

Both agenda and non-agenda comments should be sent to SANDAG via comment@sandag.org. Please include the committee name and meeting date, agenda item, your name, and your organization. Any comments, handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Committee meeting should be received by the Committee Clerk no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting. All public comments and materials received by the deadline become part of the official project record, will be provided to the members for their review at the meeting, and will be posted to the agenda file as a part of the handouts following each meeting.

In order to keep the public informed in an efficient manner and facilitate public participation, SANDAG also provides access to all agenda and meeting materials online at www.sandag.org/meetings. Additionally, interested persons can sign up for e-notifications via our e-distribution list either at the SANDAG website or by sending an email request to webmaster@sandag.org.

SANDAG operates its programs without regard to race, color, and national origin in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. SANDAG has developed procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints, and the procedures for filing a complaint are available to the public upon request. Questions concerning SANDAG nondiscrimination obligations or complaint procedures should be directed to the SANDAG General Counsel, John Kirk, at (619) 699-1997 or john.kirk@sandag.org. Any person who believes himself or herself or any specific class of persons to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI also may file a written complaint with the Federal Transit Administration.

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 or (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG agenda materials can be made available in alternative languages. To make a request, call (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

Los materiales de la agenda de SANDAG están disponibles en otros idiomas. Para hacer una solicitud, llame al (619) 699-1900 al menos 72 horas antes de la reunión.

如有需要，我们可以把SANDAG议程材料翻译成其他语言。

请在会议前至少 72 小时打电话 (619) 699-1900 提出请求。

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or visit 511sd.com for route information. Bicycle parking is available in the parking garage of the SANDAG offices.
ITEM NO. | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
+1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES | APPROVE

The Borders Committee is asked to review and approve the minutes from its February 23, 2018, meeting.

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 the Committee 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 Borders Committee coordinator prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify the Borders Committee coordinator if they have a handout for distribution to Committee members. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

CHAIR’S REPORT

+3. HON. LUIS VIDEVARAY, SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF MEXICO, VISIT TO SANDAG

INFORMATION

Chair Serge Dedina will provide an overview of the visit from the Hon. Luis Videgaray, Secretary of Foreign Relations of Mexico, to SANDAG on March 23, 2018.

REPORTS

+4. 2018 SAN DIEGO REGIONAL TRIBAL SUMMIT – DRAFT STRATEGIC ACTIONS (Chairman Edwin “Thorpe” Romero, Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association; Jane Clough)

DISCUSSION

The Borders Committee is asked to provide feedback on the draft strategic actions identified during the 2018 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit for inclusion in San Diego Forward: The 2019-2050 Regional Plan.

+5. SENATE BILL 1: TRADE CORRIDOR ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

INFORMATION (Robyn Wapner; and Mario Orso, Caltrans)

Mario Orso and staff will provide an overview of border-related projects approved for funding under the SB 1 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program.

   Dr. Paul Ganster will provide an overview of the 18th Report of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board, including recommendations to preserve and enhance environmental protection and security.

+7. **UPDATE ON THE MERGER OF THE NORTH AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK AND THE BORDER ENVIRONMENT COOPERATION COMMISSION (Denise Ducheny, BECC/NADB Board of Directors)**

   Denise Ducheny will provide an update on the merger of the North American Development Bank and the Border Environment Cooperation Commission.

8. **CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS**

   If the five-speaker limit for public comments was exceeded at the beginning of this agenda, other public comments will be taken at this time. Subjects of previous agenda items may not again be addressed under public comment.

9. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

    The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, June 22, 2018, at 12:30 p.m.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

    + next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
BORDERS COMMITTEE

MAY 25, 2018

AGENDA ITEM NO. 18-05-1

ACTION REQUESTED: APPROVE

BORDERS COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS

FEBRUARY 23, 2018

The meeting of the Borders Committee was called to order by Chair Serge Dedina, South County, at 12:30 p.m.

Chair Dedina welcomed and introduced new Borders Committee members and guests.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (APPROVE)

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Ronn Hall (East County) and a second by Supervisor Greg Cox (County of San Diego), the Borders Committee approved the minutes from its January 26, 2018, meeting. Yes: Chair Dedina, Vice Chair Gallo, Supervisor Cox, Councilmember Hall, and Councilmember Jack Feller (North County Coastal). No: None. Abstain: None. Absent: City of San Diego and Imperial County.

8. 13TH ANNUAL BINATIONAL DELEGATION TO MEXICO CITY (INFORMATION)

Kenia Zamarripa, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, provided an update on the annual Binational Delegation to Mexico City, scheduled to be held April 15–18, 2018.

Action: This item was presented for information.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

CONSENT

3. 2018 SANDAG ANNUAL BINATIONAL EVENT (INFORMATION)

This report provided an update on the SANDAG Annual Binational Event, scheduled to be held on June 5, 2018.

Action: Consent Item No. 3 was presented for information.
REPORTS

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

This item was pulled from the agenda.

5. REPORT FROM THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TRIBAL CHAIRMEN’S ASSOCIATION (INFORMATION)

Edwin "Thorpe" Romero, Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, provided an update on current Tribal policy issues, including updates on the organization of the 2018 Tribal Summit to be held on April 13, 2018.

Action: This item was presented for information.

6. SENATE BILL 1: TRADE CORRIDOR ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM (INFORMATION)

Staff provided an overview of border-related projects submitted from the region for funding consideration under the Trade Corridor Enhancement Program.

Action: This item was presented for information.

7. BORDER HEALTH PROGRAM (INFORMATION)

Justine Kozo, County of San Diego, Office of Border Health, provided an overview of the Border Health Program, which facilitates collaboration among local, state, and federal organizations working on health issues in the U.S.-Mexico border region.

Dr. Wilma Wooten, County Public Health Officer, commented on the Border Health Program.

Action: This item was presented for information.

9. CONTINUED PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no additional public comments.

10. UPCOMING MEETINGS (INFORMATION)

The next meeting of the Borders Committee is scheduled for Friday, March 23, 2018, at 12:30 p.m.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Dedina adjourned the meeting at 1:39 p.m.
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HON. LUIS VIDEÑARAY, SECRETARY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF MEXICO, VISIT TO SANDAG

Introduction

On March 23, 2018, the Honorable Luis Videgaray became the first Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Mexico to visit and address the SANDAG Board of Directors. Secretary Videgaray provided an update on relevant issues impacting the United States and Mexico, including crossborder infrastructure.

Description

Mexico became an advisory member of SANDAG in the 1970s, when the City of Tijuana joined the Board of Directors. Through the years, the Secretariat of Foreign Affairs of Mexico (SRE as its acronym in Spanish) via the Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego, consolidated the representation and participation of Mexican officials at SANDAG. In 2003, Senate Bill 1486 (Ducheny) ratified the participation of Mexico as an advisory member to the Board of Directors, and its advisory membership on the Borders Committee, which was formed previously in 2001. Also, since the creation of the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities Working Group in 1996, the Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego acts as its Co-Chair.

The visit from Secretary Videgaray to SANDAG was part of a two-day program in the San Diego region, which included a public event at the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies at UC San Diego, and meetings with the private sector, academia, and community-based organizations.

At SANDAG, Secretary Videgaray addressed the Board of Directors, which includes representatives from the 18 cities and the county in the San Diego region. His address to the Board covered many of the relevant regional as well as national issues facing the United States and Mexico.

- The California-Baja California region is one of the brightest examples of meaningful collaboration between two countries, which exists through friendship, dialogue and a proactive approach towards decision-making, which also embraces the complexity and challenges of an international border. The region has many opportunities to create policies that support growth, prosperity, and the well-being of those who live in the binational region.
• Mexico will continue to focus on supporting the partnerships in the region that are built on a common purpose and values. Despite the noted differences between the respective federal administrations, there continues to be an outstanding working relationship, which has led to joint efforts on initiatives and projects including new approaches to international customs policy and new infrastructure projects – specifically the future Otay Mesa East Port of Entry (POE).

• With regard to the North American Free Trade Agreement, Mexico is not opposed to the modernization and appreciates the potential impacts felt specifically by the border region. It is the duty of the three governments to protect the economy and find ways to negotiate trade agreements effectively. There is an optimistic perception that the current negotiation timeline is viable for reaching common ground.

• In reference to the Tijuana River, Mexico has allocated funds to immediately address the sewage pollution issue in Mexico. Secretary Videgaray deemed this problem to be an unacceptable situation and stressed the sense of urgency within the Mexican government to resolve the issue. Given the upcoming changes in the federal administration in Mexico this election year, the objective is to identify a clear path forward on this matter so that this issue continues to be a priority.

The Secretary’s full address may be accessed on the SANDAG website at sandag.org/Videgaray.

Following the Board of Directors meeting, Secretary Videgaray visited the State Route 11 and Otay Mesa East POE project. The project team provided an update on the status of the POE and discussed next steps for the project, which is currently the largest binational infrastructure project between the United States and Mexico.

VICTORIA STACKWICK
Principal Government Relations Analyst

Key Staff Contact: Héctor Vanegas, (619) 699-1972, hector.vanegas@sandag.org
2018 SAN DIEGO REGIONAL TRIBAL SUMMIT – DRAFT STRATEGIC ACTIONS

Introduction

The 2018 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit (Tribal Summit), held Friday April 13, 2018, brought together the boards of the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) and SANDAG to discuss issues of mutual interest, identify collaborative opportunities, and set forth strategies for inclusion in San Diego Forward: The 2019-2050 Regional Plan (2019 Regional Plan).

Discussion

As part of the Tribal Summit agenda, elected officials and other participants engaged in roundtable sessions on topics other than transportation to determine possible policy areas of future collaboration. The policy areas included cultural resources, habitat conservation, energy, public safety/emergency preparedness, and economic development.

Tribal Summit participants were assigned to roundtables by policy area. A worksheet describing the policy area and potential strategic actions was provided to each table. Attachment 1 includes a summary of comments and feedback on the strategic actions by roundtable participants. Attachment 2 shows the proposed revised strategic actions based upon feedback received.

Next Steps

The results of the roundtable discussions will be included in the 2018 Tribal Summit Proceedings, which will be presented to the SCTCA and SANDAG Boards. In addition, the proposed updates to the strategic actions will be provided to the SCTCA and SANDAG Boards for further direction and incorporation into the 2019 Regional Plan.

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

Attachments: 1. 2018 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit Roundtable Discussions, Comments, and Feedback on Strategic Actions by Policy Area


Key Staff Contact: Jane Clough, (619) 699-1909, jane.clough@sandag.org
2018 San Diego Regional Tribal Summit Roundtable Discussions, Comments, and Feedback on Strategic Actions by Policy Area

Policy Area: Cultural Resources

General Comments

Although the National Environmental Policy Act at the federal level and the California Environmental Quality Act at the state level have consultation requirements, tribal nations have reported that the consultation on specific projects often comes too late into the process, when decisions have already been made or development is underway.

Tribes reported that consultation does not necessarily result in the avoidance of impacts to culturally significant or sacred land because many culturally significant and sacred land is located outside reservation areas. Agencies carrying out projects have followed consultation procedures outlined in state law and have sometimes found tribes to be non-responsive.

SANDAG is the first Metropolitan Planning Organization to be subject to Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) (Gatto, 2014), which applies to tribal consultation for the Environmental Impact Report for the Regional Plan. This presents an opportunity for coordination between SANDAG and tribes.

Feedback on Strategic Actions

Participants concluded that the following strategic actions were still relevant:

- Collaborate on a way to provide information regarding the location of culturally significant resources without compromising the preservation of the resource.
- Explore ways to collaborate in communicating information regarding legal requirements of tribal consultation.

It was suggested that one of the strategic actions be modified as follows:

- Develop a methodological template Programmatic Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding for tribal consultation pursuant to AB 52 for San Diego Forward: The 2019-2050 Regional Plan, which will be applied to projects as they come through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

Policy Area: Habitat Conservation

General Comments

As efforts increase to preserve habitat throughout the region, pressure for tribal lands to be considered open space or endangered species habitat have risen. There are many important natural areas with cultural significance located outside the reservation in areas where tribes have limited influence or control. Tribes want to join the regional dialogue on environmental conservation and habitat planning.
It was suggested that existing forums at SANDAG be a way to engage tribal governments, local jurisdictions, and other environmental organizations to discuss areas of mutual interest.

An emphasis was placed on improving communication and engaging in a respectful and effective manner.

**Feedback on Strategic Actions**

Participants concluded that the following strategic actions were still relevant:

- Support the protection of habitat from a cultural perspective as well as environmental perspective.
- Explore opportunities to engage tribal nations in regional habitat conservation efforts.

It was suggested that one strategic action be modified as follows:

- Create a new working group to use SANDAG working groups as regional forum to bring tribes, local jurisdictions, resource agencies, and environmental stakeholders together for better collaboration and coordination.

The following new strategic action was suggested:

- Work with the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) to add a tribal representative to the Environmental Mitigation Working Group. This could be a member of an intertribal environmental organization to bring a tribal perspective to discussions.

**Policy Area: Energy**

**General Comments**

Southern California tribes continue to explore the potential for energy development on their lands. Tribes have been working at the state and federal levels to promote renewable energy opportunities for reservations. The federal Energy Self-Determination Act allows tribal nations to develop energy plans without waiting for the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, which is an opportunity for the region.

As several local jurisdictions are adopting Community Choice Energy programs and tribal nations are developing renewable energy sources on their land, there seems to be areas of mutual benefit to explore. There is an opportunity to work together to influence legislation that might benefit all jurisdictions.

There are obstacles to financing energy projects – even when the state provides grants, the structure of the grants is not conducive for tribes.
**Feedback on Strategic Actions**

Participants concluded that the following strategic action was still relevant:

- Explore opportunities to engage tribal nations in regional energy planning coordination.

The following new strategic action was suggested:

- Work with the SCTCA to add a tribal representative to the Regional Energy Working Group as a first step in communication and coordination.

**Policy Area: Public Safety/Emergency Preparedness**

**General Comments**

Disasters know no boundaries, and the regional risks of catastrophic wildfire, earthquakes, and severe weather are shared. Mutual aid agreements have been a part of the Reservation Fire Departments since their inception. The ability to cross political boundaries to attack a fire early has been key to preservation of life and property for many years.

Tribes and tribal emergency service personnel have been very active in coordinating efforts amongst each other and with local, state, federal, and private-sector partners.

There is an uneven level of cooperation and missed opportunities to jointly plan, mitigate, and prepare more effectively for a more unified regional response to emergency situations.

**Feedback on Strategic Actions**

Participants suggested the following modifications to the strategic actions:

- Provide educational opportunities for law enforcement local and state elected officials and emergency responders on Public Law 280.

- Explore Continue exploring opportunities for coordination and collaboration between the Inter Tribal Long Term Recovery Foundation and other established emergency management organizations, based upon mutually-agreed priorities.

Participants suggested the following new strategic actions:

- Identify ways to craft policy and agreements concerning mutual aid opportunities in accordance with tribal public safety laws

- Work with the SCTCA to have a tribal representative join the Unified Disaster Council

- Bring a report to the Public Safety Committee on Public Law 280

- Expand efforts to plan, evaluate, and test joint exercises for emergency preparedness
Policy Area: Economic Development

General Comments

Economic development for tribes beyond gaming is constrained by remote locations, lack of access to capital and infrastructure are compounded by the limited ability to fully utilize the tax base of reservation lands.

Property, sales, possessory interest, and income taxes from businesses on reservation lands are diverted from the reservation economy with little consideration for government services provided by the tribal nation.

Each local tribe has its own plan for economic development and diversification.

There are many markets being explored, such as renewable energy, ecotourism, waste management, recreational facilities, and more for essentially state-run enterprises.

Some tribes choose to run their own businesses, while others select contractors to operate their enterprises.

Some tribal business ventures have been off-reservation, such as purchases of small businesses, historic buildings, golf courses, and land.

In some cases, tribes can support local jurisdiction services through a contracting process, such as fire protection.

Feedback on Strategic Actions

Participants suggested revising the current strategic action as follows:

- Seek funding and partnerships to develop economic benefit impact analysis of tribal enterprises for the regional economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Area</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government-to-Government</strong></td>
<td>• Share legislative agendas and explore opportunities to collaborate on legislation of mutual interest that benefits the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>• Coordinate the incorporation of existing Tribal Long-Range Transportation Plans in San Diego Forward: The 2019-2050 Regional Plan (2019 Regional Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement the Intraregional Tribal Transportation Strategy through the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td>• Collaborate on a way to provide information regarding the location of culturally significant resources without compromising the preservation of the resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore ways to collaborate in communicating information regarding legal requirements of tribal consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Senate Bill 18/Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop methodological template Programmatic Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding for tribal consultation pursuant to AB 52 for the 2019 Regional Plan that will be applied to projects as they come through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Habitat Conservation</strong></td>
<td>• Support the protection of habitat from a cultural perspective as well as environmental perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore opportunities to engage tribal nations in regional habitat conservation efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create a Use SANDAG working groups as regional forum to bring tribes, local jurisdictions, resource agencies, and environmental stakeholders together for better collaboration and coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work with the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) to add a tribal representative to the Environmental Mitigation Working Group. This could be a member of an intertribal environmental organization to bring a tribal perspective to discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy</strong></td>
<td>• Explore opportunities to engage tribal nations in regional energy planning coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work with the SCTCA to add a tribal representative to the Regional Energy Working Group as a first step in communication and coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Safety/Emergency Preparedness</strong></td>
<td>• Provide educational opportunities for local and state elected officials and emergency responders law enforcement on Public Law 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore Continue exploring opportunities for coordination and collaboration between the Inter Tribal Long Term Recovery Foundation and other established emergency management organizations, based upon mutually-agreed priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify ways to craft policy and agreements concerning mutual aid opportunities in accordance with tribal public safety laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work with the SCTCA to have a tribal representative join the Unified Disaster Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bring a report to the Public Safety Committee on Public Law 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expand efforts to plan, evaluate, and test joint exercises for emergency preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development</strong></td>
<td>• Seek funding and partnerships to develop economic benefit impact analysis of tribal enterprises for the regional economy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


SENATE BILL 1: TRADE CORRIDOR ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Introduction

On April 28, 2017, Governor Jerry Brown signed Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) (Beall) into law. SB 1 is a transportation funding package with investments primarily targeted towards fix-it-first infrastructure projects. Among its provisions, SB 1 is anticipated to provide approximately $300 million annually to the Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) to fund freight projects vital to California’s economy.

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) released the call for projects for the TCEP at its October 18-19, 2017, meeting, applications were due January 30, 2018, and the CTC approved the awards at its May 16, 2018, meeting. This report provides a summary of the TCEP awards for the San Diego region.

Discussion

San Diego Region Project Submittals and Awarded Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Grant Request</th>
<th>Grant Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port of San Diego</td>
<td>Beyond Compliance Environmental Enhancement Project (Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal)</td>
<td>$5.67 million</td>
<td>$5.67 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund the expansion of the terminal’s existing shore power system; the purchase of a barge-based Advanced Marine Emission Control System bonnet system to capture and control vessel hoteling emissions while at berth; and a power needs assessment for full electrification of the remaining berths and cargo handling equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Grant Request</td>
<td>Grant Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of San Diego</td>
<td>Rail Track Extension Projects <em>(National City Marine Terminal)</em>&lt;br&gt;Fund a rail track extension to connect an upgraded rail car storage yard into an existing loop track on the terminal, and the realignment of a local road, Marina Way, to route all non-freight traffic away from the cargo terminal and provide separation between freight and pedestrian or personal vehicle traffic.</td>
<td>$9.184 million</td>
<td>$585,000 (for planning study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Otay Mesa Truck Route Phase 4A&lt;br&gt;Improve and extend the Southbound Truck Export Road, a dedicated one-way surface transportation access road used for freight trucks. The project reduces truck traffic on local surface streets and optimizes operations on the surrounding local roadways, thereby enhancing safety and providing more efficient border facilitation.</td>
<td>$6 million</td>
<td>$6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Sorrento to Miramar Phase 2 Intermodal Improvements Project&lt;br&gt;Right-of-way for 1.7 miles double track and curve straightening within the City of San Diego.</td>
<td>$10.5 million</td>
<td>$10.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans District 11/ SANDAG/ Imperial County Transportation Commission</td>
<td>California-Mexico Border System Project&lt;br&gt;Siempre Viva Road interchange; intelligent transportation system elements for improved traffic management, including air monitors at the Otay Mesa and OME POEs, expanding Casa Familiar's study, a non-profit group, currently tracking air emissions at the San Ysidro POE; a southbound State Route 125 to westbound State Route 905 freeway connector; State Route 98 improvements; and, Calexico East Port of Entry truck crossing improvements</td>
<td>$115.49 million</td>
<td>$82 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$146.84 million</td>
<td>$104.75 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attachment: 1. 2018 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program – Final Adopted Program of Projects

Key Staff Contacts: Robyn Wapner, (619) 699-1994, robyn.wapner@sandag.org<br>Mario Orso, (619) 688-2561, mario.orso@dot.ca.gov
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>Applicant Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North LA</td>
<td>CALTRANS, MTC, ACTC</td>
<td>7th Street Grade Separation (East)</td>
<td>Reconstruct existing four lane underpass at the UPRR mainline tracks to meet current geometric standards.</td>
<td>ACTC 4 of 4</td>
<td>Calif Ave to 1st St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North LA</td>
<td>MTC, ACTC</td>
<td>Freight Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)</td>
<td>Install and implement ITS elements and other technologies, which include portable message signs, closed circuit TV, fiber optic and Wi-Fi communications, traffic signal enhancements, vehicle and queue detection, train queue detection, weight-in-motion, information application, and smart parking system.</td>
<td>ACTC 2 of 4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North LA</td>
<td>City of Emeryville</td>
<td>East Zone Safety Engineering Measures</td>
<td>Install four quadrant gates, post median, and sidewalks at three grade railroad crossings.</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North AR</td>
<td>KCOC</td>
<td>I-80/99 Bakkenfield Freeway Connector</td>
<td>Grade separate east and west ramps, construct southbound auxiliary lane, new west collector distributor road, retaining wall, and bridge.</td>
<td>1 of 5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North SIL</td>
<td>CALTRANS, KCOC</td>
<td>I-50 Livingston Widening, Northbound</td>
<td>Widens 7.6 miles to 3 lanes, northbound direction only.</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North SC</td>
<td>Caltrans, LA Metro</td>
<td>thirty Avenue Grade Separation</td>
<td>Replace an at grade crossing with a new grade separated overcrossing.</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North SC</td>
<td>City of Tracy</td>
<td>Central Valley Gateway (4 projects)</td>
<td>Widens ramps, construct turning pocket, install bike/pedestrian improvements, and signal modification.</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South SIL</td>
<td>Santa Clara VTA</td>
<td>I-101 / 25 Interchange Improvements Phase 1</td>
<td>Construct/locate interchange north of the existing location by replacing a two lane bridge with four lane bridges/interchange, construct auxiliary lane, modify/construct frontage roadway, install bike lanes, sidewalks, and traffic control.</td>
<td>1 of 5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South SQL</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>I-680/680/12 Interchange, Package 1A</td>
<td>Construct a new two lane highway alignment and bridge, an off ramp, install ramp lighting and changeable message signs, and braced ramp connection.</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South STA</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>I-132 West Freeway / Expressway Phase 1</td>
<td>Construct two lane highway improvements with full access control and grade separation divided highway.</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL - SOUTH REGION** | 749,040 | 354,080 | 295,000 | 86,000 | 21,000 |

### North Target 217,000
**2018 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program**

**Final Adopted**

**Program of Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>Applicant Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Consensus Rating</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Total Requested Amount</th>
<th>Recommended Regional Funding</th>
<th>Recommended State Funding</th>
<th>Federal State Funding</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>A/W</th>
<th>PG&amp;E</th>
<th>PAGD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Border</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Caltrans, SANDAG, ICTC, SCAG</td>
<td>California-Mexico Border System Network Improvements (6 projects)</td>
<td>Construct Freeway-to-Freeway South-West Connector</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>39,255</td>
<td>$21,060</td>
<td>$21,060</td>
<td>$21,060</td>
<td>$21,060</td>
<td>$21,060</td>
<td>$21,060</td>
<td>$21,060</td>
<td>$21,060</td>
<td>$21,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Caltrans, SANDAG, ICTC, SCAG</td>
<td>1. Rt 125/905 Connector</td>
<td>Construct new interchange and begin site prep for the commercial vehicle enhancement facility, which includes drainage and utilities.</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>45,400</td>
<td>$45,400</td>
<td>$37,114</td>
<td>$32,398</td>
<td>$32,398</td>
<td>$4,610</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$4,610</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$3,970</td>
<td>$3,970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Caltrans, SANDAG, ICTC, SCAG</td>
<td>2. Rt 11/Siempre Viva Interchange and Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facility, Segment 2B</td>
<td>Begin site preparations which include drainage and utilities.</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>40,350</td>
<td>$29,770</td>
<td>$5,550</td>
<td>$5,550</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Caltrans, SANDAG, ICTC, SCAG</td>
<td>3. Otay Mesa East Port of Entry Segment 3A</td>
<td>Construct new interchange and begin site prep for the Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Facility, which includes drainage and utilities.</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>11,650</td>
<td>$3,370</td>
<td>$3,370</td>
<td>$3,370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Caltrans, SANDAG, ICTC, SCAG</td>
<td>4. Advanced Technology Corridors at Border POEs</td>
<td>Implement a fiber optic cable network to facilitate an advanced traveler information and border wait time system.</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>129,037</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Caltrans, SANDAG, ICTC, SCAG</td>
<td>5. Rt 98 Improvements</td>
<td>Widen Route 98 from four to six lanes, install associated sidewalks, Class II bike lanes, and curb ramps.</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>19,530</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Caltrans, SANDAG, ICTC, SCAG</td>
<td>6. Calexico East POE Truck Crossing Improvement</td>
<td>Widen bridge to add truck lanes and passenger lanes along with eight foot shoulders.</td>
<td>Medium High</td>
<td>13,120</td>
<td>$9,184</td>
<td>$585</td>
<td>$585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>Sorrento to Miramar, Ph2 Intermodal Improvements</td>
<td>Add 1.9 miles of double track in slowest area, install signal improvements and retaining walls.</td>
<td>Medium +</td>
<td>276,575</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td>Otay Mesa Truck Route, Phase 4A</td>
<td>Add at-grade crossing service road, redirect safety/traffic on adjacent road.</td>
<td>Medium +</td>
<td>126,258</td>
<td>$65,700</td>
<td>$41,700</td>
<td>$41,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Unified Port District</td>
<td>National City Marine Terminal Rail Track Extension</td>
<td>Construct connector track and bridge over main line.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>126,258</td>
<td>$41,700</td>
<td>$41,700</td>
<td>$41,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Unified Port District</td>
<td>Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal Beyond Compliance Environmental Enhancements</td>
<td>Expand shore power and purchase &quot;Bonnet&quot; system.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>372,461</td>
<td>$146,843</td>
<td>$44,665</td>
<td>$60,507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>San Ysidro/Chula Vista Mitigation for Intermodal Improvements</td>
<td>Construct HOV lanes between Carpentaria and Santa Barbara, reconstruct or replace bridges and overcrossing, install sound walls and ITS elements.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>276,575</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>Caltrans, SRTA</td>
<td>Rt 5, Redding to Anderson Widening, Phase 2</td>
<td>Add four to six lanes, replace two bridges, and install closed circuit TV and fiber optic cable.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>126,258</td>
<td>$41,700</td>
<td>$41,700</td>
<td>$41,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REGIONAL</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TARGETS</td>
<td>$805,000</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>$1,141,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>$840,166</td>
<td>$554,863</td>
<td>$1,394,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURPLUS</td>
<td>$35,166</td>
<td>$18,463</td>
<td>$53,629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REGIONAL</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TARGETS</td>
<td>$4,059,587</td>
<td>$2,071,580</td>
<td>$6,131,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>$480,166</td>
<td>$554,863</td>
<td>$1,034,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURPLUS</td>
<td>$35,166</td>
<td>$18,463</td>
<td>$53,629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California Transportation Commission

May 16, 2018
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18TH REPORT OF THE GOOD NEIGHBOR ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD – ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND BORDER SECURITY: A 10-YEAR RETROSPECTIVE

Introduction

In 2007, the Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB) addressed environmental protection and border security along the United States-Mexico border and, in 2009, issued an advice letter on the environmental effects of the border fence. In 2017, the GNEB revisited the theme of environmental quality and protection in the context of existing and proposed border security infrastructure and measures. It submitted the 18th Report, Environmental Quality and Border Security: A 10-Year Retrospective, to the President and Congress of the United States.

The Executive Summary and Introduction of the 18th Report are included as Attachment 1. The full report can be accessed at https://www.epa.gov/faca/good-neighbor-environmental-board-gneb-reports-president-united-states.

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

Attachment: 1. 18th Report of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board to the President and Congress of the United States – Executive Summary and Introduction

Key Staff Contact: Héctor Vanegas, (619) 699-1972, hector.vanegas@sandag.org
Environmental Quality and Border Security: A 10-Year Retrospective

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

September 2017
The Good Neighbor Environmental Board (GNEB or the Board) was created in 1992 by the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative Act, Public Law 102-532. The purpose of the Board is to “advise the President and the Congress on the need for implementation of environmental and infrastructure projects (including projects that affect agriculture, rural development, and human nutrition) within the states of the United States contiguous to Mexico to improve the quality of life of persons residing on the United States side of the border.”

The Board is charged with submitting an annual report to the U.S. President and Congress. Management responsibilities for the Board were delegated to the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency by Executive Order 12916 on May 13, 1994.

GNEB does not carry out border region activities of its own, nor does it have a budget to fund border projects. Rather, its unique role is to serve as a nonpartisan advisor to the U.S. President and the Congress and recommend how the federal government can most effectively work with its many partners to improve conditions along the U.S.-Mexico border.

The Board operates under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and membership on the Board is extremely diverse. By statute, GNEB comprises representatives from:

1. the U.S. government, including a representative from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and representatives from other appropriate agencies;
2. the governments of the states of Arizona, California, New Mexico and Texas; and
3. private organizations, including community development, academic, health, environmental and other nongovernmental entities with experience on environmental and infrastructure problems along the southwest border.

The Board also includes representatives from tribal governments with lands in the border region.

The recommendations in this report do not necessarily reflect the official positions of the federal departments and agencies that are represented on the Board, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products or private companies constitute endorsement. Following historic precedent, the federal departments and agencies represented on the Board and the states of Arizona and Texas have recused themselves from this report.

To request a hardcopy of this report, contact the National Service Center for Environmental Publications at 1-800-490-9198 or via email at nscep@lmsolas.com and request publication number EPA 202-R-17-001 (English version). www.epa.gov/faca/gneb
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The Good Neighbor Environmental Board would like to honor the late Eligio “Kika” de la Garza, who served for 32 years in the U.S. House of Representatives, 14 of these as Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. He passed away on March 13, 2017.

Chairman de la Garza passed H.R. 4059, 102nd Congress, the “Enterprise for the Americas Initiative Act of 1992,” which became Public Law 102-532. A champion of the North American Free Trade Agreement, Chairman de la Garza included the enabling legislation for establishment of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board in the Act. During 1992 hearings of the House Committee on Agriculture, Chairman de la Garza stated,

“Public input is vital in setting the environmental and infrastructure priorities of EPA’s U.S.-Mexico Environmental Plan for the Border. That is why last year I introduced H.R. 4059—which was approved by the Committee last week—to establish a U.S.-Mexico Environmental Board to bring together federal, state and private sector leaders to provide direction in setting these priorities to the President and to the Congress.”

This board became the Good Neighbor Environmental Board.

The Board appreciates everything Chairman de la Garza, a Texan from the Lower Rio Grande Valley, championed for the farmers of the United States and the residents of the U.S.-Mexico border region.
Transmittal Letter to the President From the Good Neighbor Environmental Board

President Donald Trump
Vice President Michael Pence
Speaker Paul Ryan

On behalf of your Good Neighbor Environmental Board, I am submitting to you our 18th Report, Environmental Quality and Border Security: A 10-Year Retrospective. In this year’s report, the Board revisited the issue of environmental protection and security along the border our country shares with Mexico, which the Board first addressed a decade ago in its 10th Report, Environmental Protection and Border Security on the U.S.-Mexico Border.

Much progress has been made in the past 10 years to secure our southern border. Although increased security has had positive environmental benefits in some cases, in many other instances more intensive security operations and security-related infrastructure have had, and continue to have, substantial negative environmental impacts.

The U.S.-Mexico border region possesses remarkable landscapes that are both beautiful and fragile and hosts many unique species of animals and plants that are already threatened or in decline. The plants, animals and natural areas of the region are important not only because of their biological diversity, but also because of the economic benefit they provide through a broad range of recreational activities. Habitat loss and disruption of migratory corridors from security related-infrastructure and operations are an ongoing source of concern and ecological stress.

As expanded security infrastructure along our border with Mexico is being considered, the Board urges a thoughtful and considered approach that heeds the experience gained from past efforts to construct security-related infrastructure in the border region. Much has been learned in the last decade on constructing infrastructure that is effective from a physical barrier standpoint and also allows some species to pass freely. There also have been great advances in monitoring and surveillance technologies during the past decade that make the wider use of virtual infrastructure possible, which could achieve security objectives with significantly less environmental impact and at much lower cost.

The Board strongly recommends that planning for additional security infrastructure along the U.S.-Mexico border include extensive and ongoing consultation with the people and communities that would be affected by any construction. The Board remains convinced that it is possible to achieve the security objectives we all desire and minimize environmental impacts through careful and thorough planning to identify the ideal design and technology required for diverse border landscapes.

Thank you for the opportunity to examine this issue and apply the Board’s many years of collective experience in addressing border matters. Our lives, communities, livelihoods and heritage are rooted along the border we share with Mexico, and we are committed to preserving and protecting them.

Sincerely,

Paul Ganster, Ph.D.
Chair
Good Neighbor Environmental Board
The Good Neighbor Environmental Board’s (GNEB or Board) 2007 report, *Environmental Protection and Border Security on the U.S.-Mexico Border: Tenth Report of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board to the President and Congress of the United States*, examined the environmental implications of increased border security. In December 2009, the Board issued an advice letter on the environmental effects of the border fence. In this current report, GNEB returns to the theme of environmental quality and protection in the context of existing and proposed border security infrastructure and measures. The previous GNEB documents focused on undocumented border crossings, hazardous materials (hazmat), and environmental effects and mitigation related to border security infrastructure. Although these issues continue to be important when addressing environmental protection in the U.S.-Mexico border region, some conditions have changed in the last decade. In this report, the Board focuses on five key overlapping challenges in which environmental protection intersects with border security:

1. Tourism and recreation economy.
2. Habitat integrity and wildlife corridors.
3. Water management, flooding, and trash and sediment control.
5. Air quality.

Security is a broad concept that can be defined in many different ways. “Border security” as used in this report focuses on threats and challenges to national security at the border associated with preventing terrorist activity or entry of potential terrorists and interdiction of illegal or criminal activities. This relatively narrow definition contrasts with broader concepts of “environmental security,” which includes the protection and preservation of natural resources, the environment and natural ecosystems. More expansive definitions of security often focus on critical sectors of the food-water-energy nexus. Thus, energy, water and food security are considered key elements of the broader “security” framework. Although this report primarily uses “border security” in its narrower sense, some recommendations may be relevant to the broader picture of environmental security. Although border security is an important national priority, environmental protection in the border region also is of great significance.

Chapter 1 provides background and context for this report, as well as recommendations on environmental protection and border security. Many defining features and characteristics of the U.S. border region with Mexico, a developing nation, make it fundamentally different from other regions in the United States. These features present challenges that regions located within the interior of the United States often do not have...
to overcome. The diversity of the border ecosystem, which ranges from areas of great natural beauty and value to areas of large and growing human settlements, creates an additional complexity when analyzing the border region and protecting environmental quality. This chapter addresses the key issues for environmental quality and protection in the diverse geographical regions of the border. Finally, Chapter 1 provides detail on the changes in border security since GNEB’s 2007 report that focused on security. These changes include stronger communication and collaboration among security and other agencies, significant increases in physical infrastructure and personnel in the border region, and improved border control and management, including faster border crossing times for goods.

The intersection of border security and the environment impose a number of challenges and opportunities on the border region, and Chapters 2 and 3 of this report focus on challenges and opportunities related to ecosystems, tourism and outdoor recreation; plant and animal life and habitat integrity; emergency response and preparedness; water management, flooding, trash and sediment control; and air quality. The shape and form of security infrastructure installed along the border is a critical factor affecting these areas of special concern. Also of importance are management practices by security agencies. Additional installation of security infrastructure along the border will have a large impact on the region, presenting both challenges and opportunities to enhance security while preserving or even improving environmental sustainability. Given the scale and cost of the program to enhance border security infrastructure, it is important to get it right the first time, avoiding costly mistakes and even more costly corrective actions. This requires careful planning and advanced coordination with stakeholders in the region.

This report examines the environmental implications of increased border security infrastructure within the context of its previous report from 2007 and its December 2009 advice letter, which both addressed border environment and security. The earlier GNEB documents provided general and specific recommendations for meeting the security and environmental needs of the border region. In this report, the Board’s recommendations focus on the intersection of environmental protection and border security in the five key areas identified above. The recommendations in Chapter 4 can help federal agencies to preserve or enhance environmental protection and quality while increasing the security of the U.S.-Mexico border.

Border fence cutting across the steep mountainside of Otay Mountain Wilderness Area in San Diego County. The foreground of the photograph is the Tecate River in Baja California, and the shot was taken from Federal Highway 2D in the municipality of Tijuana, Mexico. Note the winding road that was created by the U.S. Border Patrol to provide access to the fence.

Introduction
A decade ago in 2007, the Good Neighbor Environmental Board’s (GNEB or Board) Environmental Protection and Border Security on the U.S.-Mexico Border: Tenth Report of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board to the President and Congress of the United States (10th Report) examined the environmental implications of increased border security. Two years later in December 2009, the Board issued an advice letter on the environmental effects of the border fence. In this report, Environmental Quality and Border Security: A 10-Year Retrospective: Eighteenth Report to the President and Congress of the United States (18th Report), GNEB returns to the theme of environmental quality and protection in the context of existing and proposed border security infrastructure and measures. The 10th Report focused on two main issues, undocumented border crossings and hazardous materials (hazmat). The December 2009 advice letter addressed environmental impacts and mitigation related to border security infrastructure. All of these issues remain germane to environmental protection in the U.S.-Mexico border region today, but some conditions have changed during the last decade, including a significant decline in undocumented crossings linked to changing economic opportunities as well as to increased security measures. In this report, the Board focuses on five key overlapping challenges in which environmental protection intersects with border security: (1) tourism and recreation economy; (2) habitat integrity and wildlife corridors; (3) water management, flooding, and trash and sediment control; (4) hazmat and emergency response; and (5) air quality.

Security is a broad concept defined in different ways. For example, “border security” as used in this report has a focus on threats and challenges to national security at the border associated with preventing terrorist activity or entry of potential terrorists and interdiction of illegal or criminal activities. This relatively narrow definition contrasts with broader concepts of “environmental security” such as preservation of natural resources; protection of clean air, water and environment; and conservation of the natural ecosystem and the services or benefits provided. More expansive definitions of security often focus on the security and reliability of critical sectors of the food-water-energy nexus and the production of these inputs vital to sustain life and livelihoods. Thus, energy security, water security and food security are increasingly understood to be key elements of the broader “security” frame-work. Although this report primarily uses “border security” in its narrower sense, several sections and recommendations also may be relevant to broader framings of environmental security.

Border security is an important national priority, and environmental protection in the border region is of critical importance, given the rich natural resource endowments of the region. The border region includes the area 60 miles (100 kilometers) on either side of the international boundary, although border ecosystems and natural features extend beyond this zone. Of the 1,954-mile length of the southern border, almost 780 miles (40%) are U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) lands (Andrew 2017a). The U.S.-Mexico border region (within 100 miles of the border) contains 185 federal land units under DOI jurisdiction (Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management [BLM], Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [FWS], and National Park Service [NPS]) totaling 25,388,431 acres (Andrew 2017b), including national parks and protected areas (Figures 1 and 2). There are 26 federally recognized tribes within the border region, and the Tohono O’odham Nation’s land is split by the international border line. In addition, local governments, nonprofit organizations and U.S. states also manage protected areas along the U.S.-Mexico border.

Mexico also has significant protected areas within the border region. More than 6,500 animal and plant species reside within the U.S.-Mexico border region (Kolef et al. 2007). On the Mexican side, 235 species found in the border region are classified in a risk category. Of these, 85 are considered endangered under Mexico law. In the United States, 148 species found in border counties are listed as endangered under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (Kolef et al. 2007).

As of 2010, 14.4 million people live in cities, towns and rural areas in the U.S.-Mexico border; these communities need access to clean water and sanitation services, clean air, green spaces, and healthy environments. Tourism and outdoor recreation generate substantial revenues and support thousands of jobs in local communities, all of which depend on the quality of the border’s environment.

Despite its natural and human assets, the U.S.-Mexico border region faces serious environmental challenges, including an increasingly scarce water supply; prono-
trolled urban expansion. Climate change is projected to increase temperatures, decrease precipitation, produce more extreme weather events, decrease snowpack and runoff, reduce renewable surface and ground water resources, and bring about more frequent and intense wildfires and dangerous storm surges in the region (GNEB 2016). Traditional infrastructure systems are ill-equipped to allow border communities to mitigate these impacts, which will affect many sectors, including water, energy, trade, transportation and public health. The disadvantaged populations of border communities, including tribal populations, are particularly vulnerable to the health effects of climate change. Some animal and plant species and ecosystems in the border region also are at risk.

The fragile natural environment of the border region underscores the need for careful planning and coordination among federal agencies to mitigate the effects as border security infrastructure is built out and enforcement activities intensify. Although 10 years have passed since GNEB published its 10th Report, the southwest border environment and socioeconomic contexts are dynamic and require continual adaptation of policies and actions to respond to emerging challenges and changing conditions. In this report, GNEB identifies the most pressing environmental challenges that may overlap with border security and also provides recommendations to accomplish the goals of environmental protection cooperatively with border security.

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. Other examples of environmental issues that ultimately have only binational or international solutions include conservation, water quality protection, aquifer management, watershed management, and solid and hazardous waste.

The governments of the United States and Mexico have responded to the challenge of border environmental issues with a number of measures, including the 1944 Water Treaty for the Utilization of Waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande (1944 Water Treaty), the 1983 La Paz Agreement and its implementation plans (e.g., the U.S.-Mexico Border 2020 Program [Border 2020]), and the creation of the binational institutions of the North American Development Bank (NADB) and the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC). The trilateral environmental organization formed as a side agreement to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1993, the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC), also addresses border and transboundary environmental issues. Although these efforts to address border environmental problems have had very positive results, they still have been insufficient to meet the needs of dynamic border communities with growing environmental problems.

---

**Figure 1.** U.S. Department of Interior lands: California and Arizona.  
*Source: U.S. Geological Survey.*

**Figure 2.** U.S. Department of Interior lands: New Mexico and Texas.  
*Source: U.S. Geological Survey.*
INTRODUCTION

The North American Development Bank (NADB) and the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC) were established by the federal governments of the United States and Mexico in accordance with the North American Free Trade Agreement to prioritize, finance and build infrastructure projects that improve the environmental conditions of the U.S.-Mexico border region.

In December 2014, the respective Boards of Directors in each institution approved a resolution recommending that the two governments integrate BECC and NADB into a single entity to streamline its processes and increase operational efficiencies in providing services to border communities. This also helps the organizations make more efficient use of available resources. Under the integration, the mission, purposes, and functions of the institutions will be preserved, and the geographic jurisdiction and environmental mandate will remain unchanged. The merger went into effect on November 10, 2017.

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

Attachments:
1. NADB Press Release “Board of Directors announces full merger of BECC and NADB for 2017” (June 15, 2017)
2. NADB Press Release “NADB and BECC merge” (November 9, 2017)

Key Staff Contact: Héctor Vanegas, (619) 699-1972, hector.vanegas@sandag.org
PRESS RELEASE

Date:
June 15, 2017

Contact: Jesse Hereford, (210) 231-8000, jhereford@nadb.org

Board of Directors announces full merger of BECC and NADB for 2017

- New Chief Environmental Officer for NADB introduced

Hermosillo, Sonora. – During its semi-annual meeting held in Hermosillo, Sonora, the Board of Directors of the North American Development Bank (NADB) and the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC) announced that the Governments of the United States and Mexico expect to complete the legal formalities that will fully merge the two institutions.

Carlos Raúl Delgado Aranda, Deputy General Director of International Financial Organizations at Mexico’s Ministry of Finance and Board chair in 2017, reported that on April 27th, the Mexican Senate approved the second Protocol of Amendment to the BECC-NADB Charter, which merges the two institutions to create a stronger binational organization for high-impact infrastructure projects in the border region. The U.S. signed the Protocol in January 2017.

During the meeting, the Board introduced Mr. Salvador Lopez Cordova, who will serve as the first Chief Environmental Officer (CEVO) under the new merged structure of NADB. Under the amended charter, the position of CEVO was created to ensure the continued oversight and success of the functions and programs currently managed by BECC.

Selected by the Board through a competitive process, Mr. Lopez has over 20 years of professional experience in environmental infrastructure areas of NADB and BECC, as well as in public policy, finance and strategic planning, with an emphasis on the border region. He has a B.S. in Environmental Engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a M.S. in the same field from Stanford University and a M.B.A. from the University of California in San Diego.

Mr. Enrique Lendo, Head of the International Affairs Unit, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT), highlighted the importance of having a CEVO to ensure the environmental mandate of the merged institution.

Additionally, during the meeting, NADB and BECC presented to the Board the first combined report on the closeout results of completed projects that were supported by both organizations, which provides a comprehensive view of the indicators for each infrastructure sector. This report
includes the analysis of 60 completed projects: 48 in the water and wastewater sector, seven in solid waste, two in air quality through street paving, two in clean energy, and one for water conservation. These projects are benefitting a population of more than de 5.48 million and represent an investment of approximately US$711.8 million.

The main results include the installation of 13,414 new residential water hookups and 21.46 million gallons a day (mgd) of improved water treatment capacity, as well as the installation of 319,035 residential sewer connections and the reduction of 133.85 mgd in untreated wastewater discharges into rivers and other water sources, among others. Overall, between 84% and 100% of the basic environmental objectives were achieved, such as access to reliable water, wastewater, and waste disposal services and breathable air.

Finally, the Board was also informed of the outcomes of the third impact assessment carried out by NADB and BECC for a water and wastewater collection infrastructure project that was certified and implemented between 1995 and 2003 in the communities of Socorro and San Elizario, an area known as the Lower Valley in El Paso County, Texas. Among the results of the evaluation, water service increased from 48% to 100% of the population, and 93% of the population using deficient septic tanks or cesspools connected their homes to the sewer system. In addition, health conditions related to gastrointestinal illness, skin problems and acute hepatitis A have improved, while the medium household income and property values in the area have increased.

El BDAN es una institución financiera establecida y capitalizada en partes iguales por los Gobiernos de México y Estados Unidos, con el propósito de financiar proyectos de infraestructura ambiental a lo largo de su frontera común. Como institución pionera en su campo, el Banco trabaja para desarrollar proyectos sustentables desde un punto de vista ambiental y financiero, con amplio apoyo comunitario, en un marco de colaboración y coordinación estrechas entre México y Estados Unidos. Para mayor información, visite [www.nadb.org](http://www.nadb.org).

La COCEF es una organización internacional establecida por los Gobiernos de México y Estados Unidos, que trabaja para apoyar la preservación, protección y mejoramiento de la salud humana y del medio ambiente de la región fronteriza entre los dos países, al fortalecer la cooperación entre las entidades interesadas y al apoyar proyectos sustentables a través de un proceso de certificación binacional transparente en estrecha coordinación con el BDAN; instancias federales, estatales y locales; el sector privado y la sociedad civil. Para mayor información, visite [www.cocef.org](http://www.cocef.org).
For immediate release: November 9, 2017
Contact: Jesse Hereford, 210-231.8000, jhereford@nadb.org

NADB and BECC merge

• Merger goes into effect on November 10th
• Board approves US$13.4 million in financing for four water and wastewater projects

San Antonio, Texas – During its semi-annual meeting, the Board of Directors of the North American Development Bank (NADB) and the Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC) announced that, on November 10th, the amendments to the institutions’ Charter will enter into effect, integrating the BECC and the NADB into a single institution for the development and financing of sustainable environmental infrastructure in the U.S.-Mexico border region.

“This merger defines a new era for the institution that maintains its mission of helping to preserve and protect human health and environmental conditions for the communities in the border region. In addition, this merger ensures that the Bank’s functions and operations continue to be strengthened to serve border needs more effectively,” stated Carlos Márquez-Padilla Casar, Head of International Finance at Mexico’s Ministry of Finance (SHCP) and Board chair for 2017.

During the meeting, the Board also approved the certification and financing of four new water and/or wastewater projects that altogether represent an investment of more than US$17.4 million. NADB will provide loans and grants totaling an estimated US$13.4 million for construction of these projects.

Among the projects approved is a project to expand and improve the water and wastewater systems in San Luis Río Colorado, Sonora for up to US$10 million loan. The total cost of this project is US$12.15 million and will provide first-time access to sewer services for 11,974 households, which will allow an estimated 3.1 million gallons a day (mgd) of wastewater to be collected for treatment. Another 568 households will receive first-time access to drinking water services.

The remaining three projects will receive US$3.36 million in grants from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) through the Border Environment Infrastructure Fund (BEIF), for the construction of wastewater collection infrastructure that will benefit more than 92,000 residents in three communities.

These projects include the rehabilitation of part of a collector main (Collector Poniente), as well as the replacement of a few related sub-collectors, in the northwestern area of Tijuana, Baja
California. The US$3 million total project cost will reduce the risk of line failures, which have resulted in wastewater spills to the Tijuana River, a transboundary water body.

Likewise, the town of Marathon, Texas, will receive support for a project to replace the main trunk line that conveys wastewater to the treatment plant, as well as to decommission a lift station and extend the sewer system to provide first-time service to some homes. This US$1.55 million grant will benefit the entire community by preventing uncontrolled wastewater discharges, sewage backups and spills due to chronic line breaks, thereby reducing the risks of water contamination and the proliferation of waterborne diseases.

Finally, support will be provided for the construction of a wastewater collection system, including the installation of 993 residential hookups and the decommissioning of existing on-site wastewater disposal systems, for the community of Loma Blanca in the municipality of Juarez, Chihuahua. This US$1.74 million total project cost will provide first-time sewer services to 100% of the community. The new system is expected to collect about 200,000 gallons per day of wastewater for treatment.

______________________________

NADB is a financial institution established and capitalized in equal parts by the United States and Mexico for the purpose of financing environmental infrastructure projects along their common border. As a pioneer institution in its field, the Bank is working to develop environmentally and financially sustainable projects with broad community support in a framework of close cooperation and coordination between Mexico and the United States.

As of November 10, 2017, BECC is a standing subsidiary component within the Bank as the governments of the United States and Mexico agreed, and works to preserve, protect and enhance human health and the environment of the U.S.-Mexico border region, by strengthening cooperation among interested parties and supporting sustainable projects through a transparent binational process in close coordination with NADB, federal, state and local agencies, the private sector and civil society. For more information, visit www.nadb.org.

For more information, visit www.nadb.org
Next Steps

- June – Take Tribal Summit Proceedings to SCTCA and SANDAG Boards
- June – Present Strategic Actions to SCTCA and SANDAG Boards for further direction
Good Neighbor Environmental Board

18th Annual Report to the President and Congress of the United States

Paul Ganster, PhD
San Diego State University

Borders Committee
May 25, 2018

Good Neighbor Environmental Board

• Independent federal advisory committee to advise the President and Congress on environment and infrastructure needs along the U.S. border with Mexico

• Membership:
  • Relevant federal agencies (DHS, EPA, DOI, NOAA, DOE, HHS, Ag, IBWC, State)
  • State and local agencies
  • Private sector
  • NGOs
  • Tribal
  • Academic

• Issues annual report and occasional advice letters
• Provides a voice for border communities
18th Report

• Represents the 2007 GNEB 10th report on environmental protection and border security and a 2009 advice letter to the President on the same subject

• Available in English and Spanish: https://www.epa.gov/faca/good-neighbor-environmental-board-gneb-reports-president-united-states

• Border security is a combination of physical infrastructure, technology, and management approaches

• Border solutions depend on cooperation of government agencies, private sector, and communities on both sides of the border

18th Report

• Border security challenges are different at ports of entry / urban areas and between ports of entry in rural areas in different topographies

• Border security measures have had positive effects as well as negative impacts
  • Sensitive area protections; opened many border areas to recreation again (Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument)
  • Negative impacts on hydrology, fragmentation of habitat, migration corridors, threatened and endangered species, natural and cultural heritage sites, urban air quality, and others
18th Report Underlying Theme: Tailored Approaches Are Needed for Distinct Border Areas

Cat hole for ocelots Brownsville, TX
National Butterfly Center, Mission, Texas

Sample of Species Impacted by the Proposed Wall

- Slender Rush Pea
- Mexican Bluewing
- Texas Ayenia
- Ruddy Daggerwing
- Monarch

150-ft swath of private land taken by the Border Patrol

Rural Area: Southeast Arizona, San Pedro region

Urban Zone: Near Border Field State Park
Recommendation: Improve Agency Coordination on Security Infrastructure

- Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and federal, state, and local land management agencies
  - Particularly in west, with mainly public lands on border
  - Has improved since 2007 with agreements regulating Border Patrol activities on federal lands
  - Advanced planning is cost effective
- DHS and tribal authorities to identify tribal cultural and natural resources
- Ongoing environmental training for Border Patrol agents
- Coordination with International Boundary and Water Commission

Recommendation: Protect Wildlife Migration and Habitat Corridors

- Proactive planning is needed
- Protect threatened and endangered species
- Design vehicle barriers to permit movement of large mammals (deer, sheep, pronghorn, antelope, jaguar, and others)
Recommendation: Reduce Environmental Footprint of Security Infrastructure

- Avoid construction in sensitive areas
- Surveillance technology and presence of Border Patrol agents can fill gaps in hard infrastructure

Recommendation: Use Environmental Reviews to Mitigate Unintended Impacts

- Real ID Act of 2005 and subsequent laws enable Secretary of DHS to waive all environmental and cultural laws to enable border security infrastructure construction
- In fact, DHS has prepared environmental review documents, but without public input
- Environmental reviews help avoid unintended impacts and unexpected mitigation costs
Recommendation: Enhance Efforts to Reduce Flooding and Trash and Sediment Flows

- Coordinate with IBWC on bringing Rio Grande levees up to FEMA standards
- Border Patrol should coordinate with local authorities to reduce cross border flows of trash

Recommendation: Continue and Expand Cross-border Fire and other Emergency Response Systems

Recommendation: Reduce Border-Crossing Wait Times to Improve Air Quality

- Border security at POEs causes long northbound (and sometimes southbound) delays that create long lines of idling vehicles
- POEs and adjacent communities have dangerous levels of air contaminants, including particulate matter, carbon monoxide, Ozone, and others
Recommendation: Address Aging Environmental Infrastructure

- Wastewater infrastructure is inadequate or nearing the end of its designed life
- Frequent spills, contaminating surface water where security personnel operate
- There are well established binational mechanisms for funding and building wastewater infrastructure. Funding needs to be restored to EPA’s Border Environment Infrastructure Fund

Thank you

Comments & Discussion
NADB Presentation

SANDAG Borders Committee – May 25, 2018
Denise Moreno Ducheny
NADB Board Member

Addressing Environmental Issues on the U.S. — Mexico Border

May 25, 2018
**NADB**

Established in 1994

- **Mandate:** Develop and finance environmental infrastructure along the U.S.-Mexico border:
  - Review and certify infrastructure projects located within 100 km north and 300 km south of the border that improve the well-being of the population
  - Provide loans and grants for their implementation
  - Offer technical assistance for project development
- NADB and BECC merged in November 2017
- **Structure:** Owned and governed equally by the Governments of the United States and Mexico
- **Offices:** San Antonio, TX, and Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua
- **Ratings:** Aa1 – Moody’s; AA – Fitch

---

**2018 Amendments Between U.S. & Mexico**

- Transforming the BECC into a standing subsidiary component of NADB that is a fully integrated part of NADB, while preserving its purpose, functions, and operations as established by the Charter;
- Achieving the full juridical, operational, and budgetary integration of BECC and NADB, under a unified management structure;
- Streamlining the core project development and implementation functions and increasing organizational efficiency while preserving the environmental mandate, purposes, functions, geographic jurisdiction, and binational presence currently established by the Charter;
- Establishing the position of Chief Environmental Officer as a key position within NADB to ensure that the purpose, functions, and operations of the BECC are preserved and that the environmental integrity of projects financed by NADB is maintained; and
- Modifying the term of the NADB Managing Director and Deputy Managing Director from five to four years and allowing the Board of Directors to renew such term or terms for one additional period of four years.
Governance

Board of Directors

- NADB has a ten-member Board of Directors, with an equal number of representatives from the U.S. and Mexico.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Members</th>
<th>Mexico Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of the Treasury</td>
<td>Secretary of Finance and Public Credit (SHCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Secretary of Foreign Affairs (SRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator of the Environmental</td>
<td>Secretary of the Environment and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Agency</td>
<td>(SEMARNAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Border State Representative</td>
<td>Mexican Border State Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Border Public Representative</td>
<td>Mexican Border Public Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurisdiction

U.S.- Mexico Border Region

- Eligible projects must be located within 100 km (62 miles) north and 300 km (186 miles) south of the U.S.- Mexico border.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.91 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.20 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.18 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.05 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.34 m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Counties Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baja California</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.15 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.97 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.77 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo León</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.61 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.65 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaulipas</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.25 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>16.41 m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eligible Sectors

Types of Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water and Sewage</th>
<th>Residential, Industrial and Hazardous Waste</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Clean /Renewable Energy</th>
<th>Energy Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Water treatment and distribution</td>
<td>- Sanitary landfills</td>
<td>- Street paving and other roadway improvements</td>
<td>- Solar</td>
<td>- Public lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wastewater collection, treatment and reuse</td>
<td>- Collection &amp; disposal equipment</td>
<td>- Ports of entry</td>
<td>- Wind</td>
<td>- Building retrofits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water conservation</td>
<td>- Dumpsite closure</td>
<td>- Public transportation</td>
<td>- Biofuels</td>
<td>- Equipment replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Storm drainage</td>
<td>- Recycling</td>
<td>- Industrial emissions</td>
<td>- Biogas/methane capture</td>
<td>- Water utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Site remediation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Hydroelectric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Toxic waste disposal</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Geothermal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North American Development Bank

Projects

Project Financing and Technical Assistance

Loans
- Up to 85% of project costs
- Competitive fixed or floating rates
- Terms of up to 25 years
- Technical support and project structuring services

Grants
- Limited grants for communities where debt financing is not a viable option:
  - EPA-funded Border Environment Infrastructure Fund (BEIF)
  - NADB-funded Community Assistance Program (CAP)

Technical Assistance
- Support for project development:
  - Final design and related studies
  - Financial closing
  - Procurement
- Capacity-building through seminars and workshops

North American Development Bank
Leveraging Infrastructure Investments

December 31, 2017

- With an initial $405 million in paid-in capital contributions from the U.S. and Mexico, NADB has leveraged investments totaling $8.20 billion in the development of sustainable infrastructure.

- NADB has also managed $658.7 million in EPA grants for 78 additional projects, bringing total infrastructure investment to $9.31 billion benefitting more than 17 million residents.

Certified Projects with Financing

December 31, 2017

Projects: 244

Total investment: U.S. $9.31 billion
Outputs of Completed Projects

December 31, 2017

- 22 water treatment plants and 37 water distribution systems
- 53 wastewater treatment plants and 89 wastewater collection systems
- 22 water conservation projects
- 14 municipal landfills built or expanded and 12 dump sites closed
- 7.19 million square meters of roads paved and 229 km of rehabilitated roadways
- 15 solar plants, 12 wind farms, 1 landfill waste-to-energy facility and 1 cogeneration facility, with 1,917 MW of renewable energy generation capacity installed

Completed Project Outcomes & Impact

December 31, 2017

- More than 12 million border residents with improved drinking water and wastewater services
- Increased wastewater treatment capacity by 316 million gallons a day
- Saving 327,171 acre-feet/year of water in irrigation districts
- More than 2.7 million residents with improved waste collection and disposal services and capacity for the proper disposal of 1,550 tons of waste per day
Completed Project Outcomes & Impact

December 31, 2017

- Street paving and improved urban mobility benefiting 5.4 million residents, reducing exposure to air pollution from vehicular dust (PM$_{10}$) from traffic on dirt streets and exhaust emissions
- Annual generation of 8,180 GWh of energy from renewable sources, sufficient for the annual consumption of more than 773,381 households, which is helping prevent the emission of an estimated 3.20 million metric tons/yr. of CO$_2$
- Diverse economic benefits for the communities such as employment, income, stronger tax base and infrastructure for economic development

Impact in the Water Sector in Mexico

- Wastewater treatment coverage in the Mexican border region increased from **21%** to **87%** between 1995 and 2012; while the national average is currently about **46%**.
Projects in Baja California

Playas de Rosarito
ESJ 1, Tecate
Tijuana
Las Arenitas WWTP, Mexicali

Baja California

December 31, 2017

- 31 projects certified and financed
  23 projects completed and/or closed out
- U.S. $381.1 million in financing contracted
  U.S. $376.7 million disbursed (98.8%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Financing Contracted</th>
<th>US$ Million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensenada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 31.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicali</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playas de Rosarito</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tijuana</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>183.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baja California

December 31, 2017

- 42.5 million gallons a day of increased wastewater treatment capacity
- Approximately 3.6 million square meters of roads, have been paved, reducing vehicular dust (PM$_{10}$)
- 155 MW of installed wind generation capacity, which is helping prevent the emission of approximately 125,809 metric tons/year of CO$_2$, equivalent to removing 26,486 passenger vehicles from the roadways
- 76 low-emission buses in circulation

Participation in Baja California

December 31, 2017

- 31 projects financed
- U. S. $381.1 million in financing contracted
Projects in California

California

December 31, 2017

- 25 projects certified and financed
- 25 projects completed and/or closed out
- U.S. $413.1 million in financing contracted
- U.S. $405.2 million disbursed (98.1%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Financing Contracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bard Water District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brawley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Shores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixieland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Irrigation District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>130.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocotillo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California
December 31, 2017

- 15.4 million gallons a day of new water treatment capacity
- 10.4 million gallons a day of increased wastewater treatment capacity
- 9,647 acre-feet/year in water savings in irrigation districts
- 354 MW of installed solar and wind generation capacity, which is helping prevent the emission of approximately 236,043 metric tons/year of CO₂, equivalent to removing 49,860 passenger vehicles from the roadways

Participation in California
December 31, 2017

- 25 projects financed
- U.S. $413.1 million in financing contracted
Binational Gala Cocktail Event

In Benefit towards the Network of Young Adult Development

Friday, July 13 2018 | 7:00 p.m. – 11:00 p.m.

Ave Independencia 1350, Zona Urbana Rico, Tijuana Baja California 22010
Tijuana City Hall

Donation: $90.00 dlls