MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO)
The Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Tuesday, September 7, 2004
3 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

MISSION STATEMENT
The Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) will advise the Borders Committee of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) concerning both short- and long-term binational-related activities, issues, and actions; provide recommendations regarding binational border-related planning and development; and identify ways to assist and coordinate with existing efforts in the binational area. COBRO will serve as a working group to the SANDAG Borders Committee to facilitate a better understanding of the binational border-related issues and needs of the California-Baja California region.
Welcome to SANDAG! Members of the public may speak to COBRO on any item at the time that 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. Speakers are limited to three minutes. COBRO may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

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

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES
Tuesday, September 7, 2004

Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas
(619) 699-1972; hva@sandag.org

ITEM #                ACTION

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

+2. MEETING SUMMARIES OF JULY 6 AND AUGUST 3, 2004  APPROVE
(pp. 5-12)
   A. COBRO Summary of July 6, 2004
   B. COBRO Summary of August 3, 2004

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBERS’ COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO) on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each. This is also an opportunity for COBRO members to make comments or announcements.

CONSENT AGENDA

+4. STAFF REPORT (pp. 13-44)  INFORMATION
   A. Upcoming Events
   B. 2004 Binational Summer Conference Proceedings
   C. Potential Topics for 2005 Binational Summer Conference
   D. Report on 2004 Binational Summer Conference Evaluations

REPORTS

5. REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (RCP)-BORDERS CHAPTER  INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION
   (Bob Leiter, SANDAG)

The RCP is the strategic planning blueprint for the San Diego region. It provides a broad context in which local and regional decisions can be made that foster a healthy environment, a vibrant economy, and a high quality of life for all residents. The RCP, which includes the Borders Chapter, was unanimously approved by SANDAG’s Board of Directors on July 23.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I-15 INTERREGIONAL PARTNERSHIP (IRP) (Susan Baldwin, SANDAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The IRP was formed in 2001 to address the problems caused by the growing number of commuters across San Diego and southwest Riverside County. It is a voluntary collaboration funded through a grant from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The I-15 IRP may be used as a model for developing a partnership between San Diego and Baja California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7.</td>
<td>DISCUSSION OF FY 2005 WORK PLAN (Paul Ganster, COBRO Chair) (pp. 45-47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Ganster will facilitate discussion of the FY 2005 COBRO work plan in light of the draft work plan, issues raised through the presentations, and the findings of the 2004 Binational Summer Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>ADJOURNEMENT, AND NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next meeting of COBRO will be held on Tuesday, October 5, 2004, from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the SANDAG offices, located at 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+next to an item indicates attached report/material.

Visit us on the Web at:
www.sandag.org (under binational)
www.borderbase.org
COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO) SUMMARY OF JULY 6, 2004

The July 6, 2004, COBRO meeting was called to order by Chair Paul Ganster.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending. Self-introductions were conducted.

2. MEETING SUMMARY OF MAY 4, 2004

The meeting summary for May 4, 2004, was accepted.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS, COMMUNICATION, AND MEMBERS’ COMMENTS

No public comments were made.

4. STAFF REPORT

Hector Vanegas reported on a procedural issue that COBRO will adopt from now on to comply with the Brown Act. Voting members of COBRO need to be identified with a name tent marked “voting member” to distinguish members and non-voting alternates at the table. He reported that the Bi-State Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (BITTAC) met on June 17, and that the new Chair is the City of Mexicali, Baja California and the Vice Chair the City of Calexico.

Chair Paul Ganster commented that it is necessary to define the steps for taking off members from COBRO’s membership list in case there is no participation. There are still members that need to be considered; a decision should be made as to whether they will continue to be part of COBRO.

It was noted that Tecate’s multiday event on sustainable development is at the same time as the summer conference. Eduardo Gonzalez of the City of Tecate encouraged COBRO members to attend the events prior to the summer conference.

Viviana Ibañez of the Mexico Business Center of the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce reported on the event with Governor of Coahuila, who will be the next President of the Border Governors’ Conference. It was asked whether Governor Schwarzenegger would be participating in the Border Governors’ Conference. Sergio Pallares of SourcePoint responded that he believed he would be.
A report by Mario Lopez from Congressman Filner’s Office to update the group on HR 2525 was postponed due to Mr. Lopez’s absence.

Angelika Villagrana of the San Diego Chamber of Commerce reported on the implementation of the US VISIT Program. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has announced that it will be making the results of the contract process.

5. UPDATED COBRO CRITERIA FOR MEETINGS, MEMBERSHIP, AND LEADERSHIP

Hector Vanegas, SANDAG, reported that COBRO’s membership criteria is that when you miss three meetings you will no longer be a member.

Elsa Saxod, County of San Diego, pointed out that members need to notify staff why they will not be attending a meeting; otherwise, it will be considered an unjustified reason and they will risk not being COBRO members.

The Committee agreed by consensus on the criteria outlined in Item 5.

Consul General of Mexico Luis Cabrera asked if that policy was only for members, and Chair Ganster answered yes.

Sergio Pallares, SANDAG, pointed out that if we continue reducing the number of members, then COBRO will start losing its quorum.

Chair Ganster said that we still have the option of naming organizations that have irregular attendance as ex-officio members. This was the case for Imperial Valley. Chair Ganster asked what the mechanism was for filling vacancies. Staff responded that the SANDAG policy is to communicate with the representatives from the different regions and ask them to name a representative. If those same criteria were used for COBRO, we would ask the representative of Imperial County on the Borders Committee advice regarding the selection of representatives from that region.

Alex Hidalgo of San Diego State University (SDSU) suggested it might be more efficient to identify mid-level staff that are dedicated to participating in COBRO and not assume that the Executive Directors will attend on a regular basis.

It was determined during the conversation that the members of COBRO are the organizations, not the individuals. It is up to the representing organization to decide who their most effective representatives are. If a staff person representing a given organization leaves their post, the organization must notify COBRO and appoint a new representative, as was the case of BITTAC.

6. COBRO WORK PLAN FOR FY 2005

Hector Vanegas presented the draft work plan for COBRO for FY 2005. The framework for the work plan is the binational perspective of the Borders Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). He presented a tentative calendar of activities for the COBRO members to review and consider.

Motion: Incorporate new issues or action items in work plan from binational conference. Cindy Gompper-Graves made motion; Angelika Villagrana seconded; passed.
7. 2004 BINATIONAL SUMMER CONFERENCE WORKING GROUP REPORT

Chair Ganster provided an update on the plans for the binational summer conference. The agenda was set, and the final agenda was handed out to the members. Logistical arrangements are in place. The materials for the folders are being prepared, including a multimodal transportation map, FACT sheets on binational planning, and a background paper.

The main issue to discuss is additional promotion and the breakout sessions. Over 100 people have signed up online. Staff reminded members to sign up themselves, as we need to have a good count for meals, badges, etc.

The Committee discussed the possible topics for the breakout sessions and debated on how many and how specific they needed to be. Currently, the breakout topics coincide with the planning areas discussed in the Borders Chapter of the RCP; however, several members wanted to explore other possible topic areas including data sharing and governance and cross-border collaboration. Some members suggested keeping the topics very broad so as not to alienate anyone, while others felt it important to be more focused and specific. One issue that was raised several times was that the conference is for the whole border community and that recommendations should not be limited to what SANDAG can do; rather, recommendations should focus on what all member agencies can do and how they can work together.

It was agreed the recommendations from previous conferences would serve as a basis for the breakout session topics. Staff would e-mail at least the membership with the possible topics for feedback. Members need to respond within two days. Participants would sign up for breakout sessions on the day of the conference at the registration table. Facilitators who had volunteered will be meeting early next week to strategize on methods for efficient running of the breakout sessions. Hopefully, there will be two facilitators in each session—one from SANDAG and one from COBRO. In making the assignments, every effort will be made to assure that at least one person is bilingual. It was agreed that the maximum number of sessions is eight, and hoped that approximately 15 people sign up for each.

Chair Ganster recommended putting together a group of volunteers to see what results came out of the binational summer conference and, in August, have them work on the work plan. Staff noted that Nan Valerio will be the rapporteur and will provide the initial proceedings from the conference.

Motion: Appoint a group of members to go over the draft work plan and incorporate the recommendations from the Summer Conference into the FY 2005 draft work plan. Passed.

Mark Baza of Caltrans offered to send two staff members to help on the day of the conference.

8. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

The COBRO’s next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 3, 2004, from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. The City of Tecate offered to host that meeting.

THE ATTENDANCE LIST IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST.
The August 3, 2004, Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities meeting was called to order by Chair Paul Ganster. The meeting was held in Tecate, Presidencia Municipal. In attendance were: David Fege, U.S. EPA; Eduardo Gonzalez, City of Tecate; Sergio Pallares, Caltrans; Viviana Ibañez, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce; Monica Monge, Consulate General of Mexico in San Diego; Antonieta Beguerisse, Fundación Internacional de la Comunidad; Luz María Dávila, Tecate, B.C.; Gabriela Santucci, World Trade Center; Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego; Juan Pujol; and Bob Leiter, Hector Vanegas, Jane Clough-Riquelme, and Alejandra Romero from SANDAG.

The August 3, 2004, COBRO meeting was called to order by Chair Paul Ganster.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the City of Tecate for hosting the meeting, especially Eduardo Gonzalez, COBRO member. Chair Ganster welcomed the new representative from Fundación Internacional de la Comunidad. Self-introductions were conducted.

2. MEETING SUMMARY OF JULY 6, 2004

The Committee reviewed the minutes from July 6 but, as they were out of jurisdiction, tabled the vote until the September meeting.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS, COMMUNICATION, AND MEMBERS’ COMMENTS

Luz María Dávila reported on the Expo Regional Fair (Expo Feria Regional) that will take place from August 5-22, 2004, in the City of Tecate. The opening ceremony is scheduled at 8:30 p.m. on Thursday, August 5, and both Governor Eugenio Elorduy and Mayor of Tecate, Juan Vargas, will attend.

Viviana Ibañez, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, reported on the Ensenada Harvest Festival. On Friday, August 6, they are having a wine tasting event in Ensenada with the orchestra of Baja California. Funds raised will be used to open a museum for the missions of Baja California.

4. STAFF REPORT

Staff went over the events calendar.
5. REPORT ON THE 2004 SUMMER CONFERENCE

Chair Ganster reported on the Summer Conference. He thanked staff at SANDAG for the excellent work that was done. The dynamism was quite evident. Seven or eight of his students from the Joint Masters Degree UABC/SDSU attended the conference. They were impressed with the event and learned about cross-border governance. The main complaint was that there was not enough time for a thorough discussion during the breakout sessions. One suggestion was to lead off the breakout session with a concise introduction to get people started and a five-minute presentation afterwards.

Luz María Dávila, Baja Intermex and City of Tecate, apologized that representatives from the City of Tecate were not able to attend because it conflicted with their International Conference on Sustainable Development in celebration of signing the Earth Charter.

Viviana Ibañez, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, thought that overall it was an excellent conference. There were a few minor issues, like lack of time for lunch and the breakout sessions.

Dave Fege, San Diego EPA, commented that Dr. Robert Bach’s presentation was amazing. Interestingly, most speakers used the PowerPoint as a crutch, and Dr. Bach had everyone captivated with no props...just excellent ideas. Discussion sessions were filled with participants, almost all were from the United States. This Committee really needs to work on encouraging more Mexican participation.

Chair Paul Ganster recommended that one possible solution for getting more participants from Mexico would be to have the conference in Mexico.

Hector Vanegas, SANDAG, commented that there are no restrictions to having the conference in Baja California, but we would need to identify a binational forum on the Mexican side.

Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego, said that there are enough resources among the members of COBRO, such as Tijuana Trabaja, FINCOMUN, and the municipalities, to try putting together the Binational Conference in Mexico next year instead of San Diego.

Viviana Ibañez, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, pointed out that some agencies, such as the Tijuana Development Council (CDT) and the Tijuana EDC (known in Mexico as DEITAC), are looking at infrastructure issues, and they could help us attract more Mexican participants to the conference.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, mentioned that at the Executive Management Committee meeting they discussed the need for more outreach for getting elected officials to attend and understand binational issues and how they are related to member agencies. He also pointed out that other SANDAG conferences are videotaped and put on cable television. SANDAG could explore the possibility of doing the same with the conference and generate a lot of interest in the San Diego region.

Sergio Pallares, Caltrans, proposed considering working in collaboration with Baja California’s new Comisión de Conurbación.
Chair Paul Ganster added that when choosing the topic for next year’s conference, we need to consider: (1) increased participation of elected officials; and (2) Mexican participation.

Sergio Pallares, Caltrans, suggested defining the themes of mutual interest when picking the topic.

Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego, commented that if we are going to bring elected officials, we need to prepare them. If we are going to target them, we have to pick issues that will draw them. One of the big issues they will want to talk about is the issue of immigration. We could also work with the Comisión de Conurbación.

Luz María Dávila, Baja Intermex and the City of Tecate, suggested starting with the cities near the border.

Viviana Ibañez, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, wanted to know how often, according to bylaws, COBRO has to meet in Mexico. Staff answered that there is no rule, but the Committee has been trying to do it at least twice a year.

Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego, mentioned that every other month will not work because the Committee cannot vote when the meeting is outside San Diego.

Sergio Pallares, Caltrans, proposed sending a letter to Mr. Arturo Espinoza regarding the Comisión de Conurbación.

The Committee asked staff to send a letter to Mr. Espinoza, Secretary of SIDUE, to offer support for the Subcomisión de Conurbación.

Chair Paul Ganster suggested deciding the conference topic for next year as soon as possible.

6. REVISION OF COBRO WORK PLAN FOR FY 2005

Staff presented the background on the work plan. COBRO should incorporate the outcome of the Summer Conference into the FY 2005 work plan. It was recommended to discuss the outcomes of the Summer Conference by the months of September and October and have it presented for approval by the Borders Committee that same month, and then send the outcomes to the Board of Directors in November.

Chair Paul Ganster mentioned that we need to decide what we want to take to the Borders Committee. We need to define the specifics about what came out of the conference. We need to step back a bit and consider our role in SANDAG as a working group. What can we recommend that makes sense and is relevant to what SANDAG has the power to implement?

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, suggested considering the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) implementation chapter and whether the priority issues could be considered by COBRO. This group could also review the recommendations described in the Borders Chapter and subsequent encounters.
Elsa Saxod, City of San Diego, commented that the Borders Chapter is very broad. This group needs to focus on a more specific road map, on specific tasks or projects. Once we have defined what we want to do, we should then send it to SANDAG and ask for them to focus on those issues.

Sergio Pallares, Caltrans, would like staff to give a presentation about the RCP, including the Borders Chapter, and focus on how we should proceed.

Chair Paul Ganster reiterated that for the next COBRO meeting, the agenda components will be: (1) Priorities in RCP-Borders Chapter; (2) Outcome of the Summer Conference; and (3) Subcomisión de Conurbación.

Bob Leiter, SANDAG, mentioned that the I-15 Interregional Partnership (IRP) study was very successful with the transportation collaboration efforts between San Diego and Riverside counties, and proposed evaluating whether we could learn from this experience and implement a similar collaborative study with other partnerships between San Diego and Baja California. Perhaps the Committee could select the eastern border crossing or another corridor that is under development and see how we could avoid some of the previously made mistakes. We could also study the SR 125 and how it interfaces with San Diego-Baja California border crossing. Perhaps we could broaden the network, but stay focused on a set of roadways that make it more feasible to coordinate.

Hector Vanegas, SANDAG, mentioned the possibility of inviting SANDAG staff to present their work with the Riverside Interregional Partnership, known as the I-15 IRP, to see how this works and what lessons might be applicable to a similar partnership with Mexico.

Sergio Pallares, Caltrans, suggested inviting Arturo Espinoza to the next meeting to have him hear about the RCP and how it works. This would help get Mexico engaged in the idea of the conurbación and the partnership.

Chair Paul Ganster asked for a subcommittee on the work plan/recommendations. Elsa Saxod suggested that staff send a note to COBRO members to get volunteers to make a group of three or four people. Review material and formulate recommendations at the next meeting.

Chair Paul Ganster commented that the topics to be discussed for next meeting are the conference working group, the RCP-Borders Chapter overview, and the I-15 IRP presentation. He would also like to get the analysis of the conference's evaluations and some information about the attendees.

The Committee asked to include the attendance list in the minutes and make it public.

7. CITY OF TECATE

Eduardo Gonzalez, City of Tecate, reported on the First Annual Conference on Sustainable Development held from July 14-17, 2004. The focus of the event was to discuss the principles of sustainable development. Tecate signed the Earth Charter (Carta de la Tierra), which took close to 20 years to develop by different countries. Its main goal is developing a new global ethic for conserving the environment in the same manner as the signing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Earth Charter principles are: respect Earth and life in all its diversity; care for the community of life with understanding, compassion, and love; build democratic societies that are just, participatory, sustainable, and peaceful; and secure Earth's bounty and beauty for present and
future generations. So far, 127 countries have accepted the Charter, and Mexico adopted it at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002. It is hoped that these principles are adopted at the local level through SEMARNAT. Tecate is the second city to have adopted the Earth Charter. All projects for urban development will have to be evaluated as a function of the principles of the Earth Charter. Training workshops will be offered through the Commission for Sustainable Development so that other cities adopt the Charter as well.

Chair Paul Ganster commented that the consultative councils for sustainable development in Mexico are roughly similar to the Good Neighbor Environmental Board except that they are more independent. They are allowed to ask SEMARNAT questions.

Chair Paul Ganster asked about the status of the creation of a consolidated municipal commission mentioned by Arturo Espinoza, Secretary of Infrastructure and Urban Development (SIDUE) in Baja California.

Eduardo Gonzalez, City of Tecate, replied that the conurbanization (conurbación) between the municipalities of Tecate, Tijuana, and Rosarito has been mandated. The Urban Development Subcommission (Subcomisión de Desarrollo Urbano) will administer this interurban commission. Mr. Espinoza, Secretary of SIDUE, told him that agencies from different levels of government that deal with development issues (e.g., IMPLAN, Department of Ecology, SEMARNAT, Profepa, Water Commissions, and others) will also be members of the commission. This organization will have an office, but it is still deciding the best location. Also, it is in the process of defining where the suburban area will be located (zonas de amortiguamiento), since it is not included in state law. The next steps are working on a network and creating a work plan.

Chair Paul Ganster asked whether there was a model that was being followed. Mr. Gonzalez replied that there was, and added that SANDAG will be used as one. The Subcommission is headed by the state government and plans to begin working in November.

Chair Paul Ganster would like Mr. Eduardo Gonzalez to keep us updated.

Eduardo Gonzalez, City of Tecate, proposed that SANDAG invite the members of the new subcommission to observe the way SANDAG is organized, and report on what has worked and what has not.

8. ADJOURNMENT, AND NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

COBRO’s next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 7, 2004, from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. in SANDAG’s 7th floor conference room.
UPCOMING EVENTS:

WHAT: Tour of the Tijuana River Watershed
WHEN: Tuesday, September 7, 2004, 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
WHERE: Tijuana Estuary Visitor Center in Imperial Beach (301 Caspian Way)
MORE INFO: Oscar Romo, CTP Coordinator at the Tijuana River Estuary, (619) 575-3613
SPONSOR: Tijuana River National Estuarine Research Reserve’s Coastal Training Program

WHAT: Public Meeting for the Tijuana Estuary Management Authority
WHEN: Thursday, September 9, 2004, at 1:00 p.m.
WHERE: Tijuana Estuary Visitor Center in Imperial Beach (301 Caspian Way)
MORE INFO: Oscar Romo, CTP Coordinator, (619) 575-3613
SPONSOR: Tijuana River National Estuarine Research Reserve

WHAT: Border 2012 San Diego-Tijuana Air Quality Task Force
WHEN: September 22, 2004, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.
WHERE: Hotel Pueblo Amigo, Tijuana (simultaneous translation provided)
MORE INFO: Bill Powers (bpowers@powersengineering.com) or Saul Guzman (saul.guzman@semarnat.gob.mx)
SPONSOR: USEPA and SEMARNAT

WHAT: Border 2012 Borderwide Air Quality Forum
WHEN: October 6-7, 2004
WHERE: Camino Real Hotel, Tijuana
MORE INFO: Christine Vineyard, EPA, Region 9. E-mail: vineyard.christine@epa.gov
SPONSOR: USEPA and SEMARNAT

WHAT: Bus Tour of Tijuana
WHEN: October 1, 2004
WHERE: Contact South County EDC for details
MORE INFO: Cindy Gompper-Graves at cindy@sandiegosouth.com or (619) 424-5143
SPONSOR: South County Economic Development Corporation and the Building Industry Assoc.

WHAT: Border 2012 Imperial County-Mexicali Air Quality Task Force
WHEN: October 14, 2004 – 11:00 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.
WHERE: Calexico (location not yet determined)
MORE INFO: Christine Vineyard, EPA, Region 9. E-mail: vineyard.christine@epa.gov
SPONSOR: USEPA and SEMARNAT
WHAT: XI Border Energy Forum
WHEN: October 21-22, 2004
WHERE: Grand Hotel de Tijuana (www.grandhoteltj.com.mx)
MORE INFO: Soll Sussman at (512) 463-5039 or soll.sussman@glo.state.tx.us at the Texas General Land Office or go to www.glo.state.tx.us/energy/border
ORGANIZERS: BL Seamon & Associates, Inc.

WHAT: 14th Annual Economic Summit: “A Seamless Region Filled with Opportunities”
WHEN: SAVE THE DATE! October 22, 2004
WHERE: Holiday Inn at the Bay
MORE INFO: Cindy Gompper-Graves at cindy@sandiegosouth.com or (619) 424-5143
SPONSOR: South County Economic Development Council

WHAT: Trade Mission
WHEN: November 8-12, 2004
WHERE: Michoacán and Guanajuato in Mexico
MORE INFO: James Clark at jclark@sdchamber.org or (619) 544-1376
SPONSOR: Mexico Business Center and Merrill Lynch
SANDAG’S 8th ANNUAL BINATIONAL SUMMER CONFERENCE

Cooperation across the California-Baja California Border: Where do we go from here?

FRIDAY, JULY 16, 2004
Multicultural Complex, San Ysidro Middle School

Proceedings

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

The Hon. Crystal Crawford, Councilmember, City of Del Mar, Member, SANDAG Board of Directors, and Chair, SANDAG Borders Committee, called the meeting to order. She welcomed all to the 8th Annual Binational Summer Conference. The subject is Cooperation across the California–Baja California Border: Where do we go from here?

She stated that she was pleased to be at the conference. She noted that many elected officials also were in attendance. The conference had its highest registration ever. (Housekeeping information) Biographies of the speakers are available in the conference folder.

Ms. Crawford stated that she really didn’t need to remind folks where we were ten years ago. Ten years ago, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was signed. The commercial relationship between San Diego and Tijuana in the border region, already underway, was given a major boost. U.S. exports to Mexico have grown from $51 billion in 1993 to $107.2 billion in 2002. Mexico is now California’s number one trading partner. This partnership has bolstered relationships between the U.S. and Mexico. Various institutions have been created as a result of NAFTA, including the North American Development Bank (NADBANK) and the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission (BECC). The increased population, especially in northern Baja California, resulted from increased economic opportunities.

Increasing growth has resulted in greater pressure on the border. There are more industries, more congestion, etc., that adversely affects our quality of life.

Our ports of entry are among the busiest in the world. In 1995, SENTRI started; the pilot program was at Otay Mesa. Now, more than 50,000 registered users cross at San Ysidro and Otay Mesa. SENTRI is being implemented at other ports of entry with Mexico and Canada. The FAST program, similar to SENTRI for commercial crossers, is now in Texas. Soon it will be at Otay Mesa, too.
Unfortunately, after September 11, 2001, subsequent decisions in our capitols require that we need to protect our borders, too. There is a need, she stated, to balance our Homeland Security measures with our quality of life. Regional actors from both sides of the border have strengthened their relationships and balanced them. This binational region can be a strong competitor in the global marketplace.

For many years SANDAG has recognized the importance of border relationships. In 1996, SANDAG established COBRO—the Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities. Two years ago, with the reorganization at SANDAG, the Board formed the Borders Committee. The Hon. Crawford stated that she chairs that committee and they work with neighboring counties, the native tribes, and have a strong relationship with Baja California. The Borders Committee is working to strengthen issues related to transportation, access to jobs and housing, economic development, environment, energy and water needs, and Homeland Security.

The focus today will be on examining mechanisms of cooperation and sharing alternative models of cooperation at different levels and from different regions. The conference participants will then have an opportunity to go into more detail in the breakout sessions.

KEYNOTE

The Keynote speaker, the Hon. Arturo Espinosa Jaramillo, Secretary of Infrastructure and Urban Development, State of Baja California, was introduced.

Baja California has 90 percent of its population within the border area. He stated that the State of Baja’s development depends on communication with the U.S., especially in relation to its economic development as the state expands into world markets.

People come to the border for work and to improve their quality of life. That’s why Baja California needs to preserve its infrastructure and its jobs. He stated how important infrastructure within the border area is for the five municipalities. The State of Baja California needs to provide services and infrastructure for 3 million people. This pressure will intensify with the high migration predicted for the next five years.

Sec. Espinoza stated that the region’s geography has complicated Baja California’s relationship with Mexico City, but its growth goes hand in hand with the U.S. A strong relationship with the United States is critical to Baja California’s future.

The development in the Baja California-California border entails: a constantly growing population; a strategic geographic location; similar development opportunities; infrastructure alternatives and shared resources; a shared consumer base and increased social interaction; common environmental issues requiring collaborative solutions; the need for coherent agreements on migration and public safety; the need for modernization of our ports of entry; and a stronger binational coordination.

The Tijuana-San Diego region forms the biggest twin-city along the U.S.-Mexican border with currently more than 4 million—2.8 million in San Diego and 1.2 million in Tijuana. The growth rate in both cities is different. While San Diego maintains an annual growth rate of 1.7 percent, Tijuana has a 5.5 percent growth rate, attracting approximately 85,000 new residents every year. Therefore, it is estimated that by the year 2015, Tijuana will have the same population as San Diego (SANDAG, 2002).

We need a secure yet permeable border—a border so people and goods can flow from one side of the border to the other. Good intelligence systems for identifying border crossers will be helpful.
Baja California’s perspective is that the potential for development of Tijuana’s-San Diego’s economic region depends on a greater physical and functional integration, with better intergovernmental relations and a long-term shared vision. The starting point of this vision is to achieve a permeable and secure border. The approach to achieve this is by modernizing and widening the border’s infrastructure, by improving our binational metropolitan collaborative efforts, and by binational planning.

- Modernization and widening of the border’s infrastructure represents:
  - Border crossing efficiency
  - Smart (Intelligent) systems
  - Incorporating the border crossings to the city’s transit system
  - Transit security
  - Integrated binational multimodal transportation system

There are ways in which this binational region could share services, such as water and energy. He stated the importance of thinking this through together. There is a great need to share information, so that each side of the border knows what is happening on the other side.

- Binational metropolitan collaboration:
  - Shared agenda in economic, social, and environmental issues
  - Joint investment projects: water, revitalization, transit
  - Technology transfer
  - Cross-border governance
  - Binational participation and representation

- Binational planning:
  - Regional infrastructure
  - Balanced distribution of basic services
  - Fuel economic corridors
  - Binational system of geographic information
  - Binational development indicators

We need to reduce pressure on both sides of the border. The Rosarito Highway to Tecate is progressing well. The State of Baja California has planned the circulation and land use. Sec. Espinoza mentioned that they have received credit from the Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) for wastewater treatment, which is very important for the people of Tijuana. The residents will have better water and sewage services. A sewage treatment plant is part of the project and they are currently requesting bids on that project.

Another important environmental project is paving roads. Support for this is coming from the NADBank. The State of Baja California will pave 10 million square meters, or about 1,000 km, of streets. This will have a positive impact on both sides of the border in terms of air quality. It is very important for both sides of the border to know about this work.

Important investments are being made in Tecate in paving roads and other improvement projects. Currently, the cities of Tecate, Tijuana, and Playas de Rosarito are in the process of forming an interurban commission (Comisión Conurbada de Tecate, Tijuana, y Playas de Rosarito). State and local governments are working together in an orderly manner, under the law, in a cooperative and sustainable manner. The State of Baja California is working to promote the welfare of its people within the constraints of a limited budget.

Priority actions that need to be taken:
- Creation of an interurban commission that will be formed by the municipalities of Baja California
- Participation in binational organizations (COBRO, BTTAC, CRUCES FRONTERIZOS)
- Border crossing improvement projects
- Binational revitalization
- Joint water, energy, and gas projects
- Sharing of technology
- Inter-institutional coordination: SANDAG, CALTRANS, IVAG, SCAG, GSA, SIDUE, MUNICIPIOS

The Chair thanked Secretary Arturo Espinosa.

PANEL 1
SETTING A FRAMEWORK AND AGENDA FOR CROSS-BORDER COLLABORATION IN THE CALIFORNIAS

The Chair introduced the panelists: Dr. Robert Bach of the Inter-American Dialogue; the Hon. Luis Cabrera-Cuaron, Consul General of Mexico in San Diego; and the Hon. Joyce DeShazo, Deputy Consul General of the U.S. in Tijuana.

- Thematic Introduction: Dr. Robert Bach of the Inter-American Dialogue

Dr. Bach expressed his pleasure to speak to the conference. It is wonderful to be at the border – and so far from Washington and Mexico City, but so much in the middle of the activities that are bringing them closer and making them work together.

Everyone here is familiar with the old saying that U.S.-Mexico relations used to consist of two people standing at the border, back to back, never turning to address each other. For at least the last decade and a half we’ve seen improvement—those two people have at least turned around and are talking. Much of that historic turnabout happened because of the dedication, and in some cases leaps of trust, between members of Mexico’s Ministry of Foreign Relations and the U.S. State Department. The work of the Consuls from both countries, and perseverance through the Border Liaison Mechanisms, deserve much of the credit for that change.

This historic improvement has also involved the work of the individuals and groups represented in this audience, and especially SANDAG, the Borders Committee, and COBRO. The commitment that you have shown is again clearly reflected in the ambition for this year’s conference. As Chair Crystal Crawford phrased it, “the goal is to find ways to improve services and strategies for the greatest public benefit.” This conference could be an immediate success, and we could measure that success openly if one of the outcomes was to accept as both a principle and a planning objective that when we say “greatest public benefit,” by “public,” we mean the entire binational cross-border community.

Although I have served as an official with responsibilities here on the border, negotiated across the border, and have worked with many throughout this region, my role this morning is somewhat as an outsider. And my task is not to welcome you, but to challenge you. I want to frame a discussion of border issues in such a way that cross-border cooperation accelerates, and the commitment to providing benefits across the border strengthens.

To do that, I propose two framing questions to guide discussions throughout the day and in follow-up planning. First, we must be able to answer the following question: “What can we accomplish together (working across the border) that we could not do separately?” The second is more of an imperative than a question, “When can we get it done?”
I propose the latter as a framing issue because I must admit to a bit of impatience. A survey of what has been accomplished already in this region through the hard work of many organizations, universities, and individuals is truly an impressive history, as discussed in the background paper in your folder. Yet, even with all this activity, it is clearly not enough, and its direction is unclear, if not uncertain. What, after all, are the next steps in binational planning?

In turning to the question, “What can the cross-border region do together that it cannot do separately?” let us first turn to our federal authorities. In deciding what can and must be done together, both Washington and Mexico City have been unsteady and uneven participants. Washington and Mexico City must decide, and decide soon, if they are going to lead, follow, or get out of the way. In some ways their leadership has been and can be useful. Yet, there is a strong sense all along the border that their role is increasingly limited and in many ways counterproductive. Federal authorities on both sides of the border need to follow more often, support local initiatives much more vigorously, and pay a great deal more attention.

What can be accomplished together is increasingly defined locally, and it is time to call on local binational leadership to do more. Even when policies and programs appear to be federal initiatives, their origins often derive from local initiatives. For example, since 9/11, federal authorities have correctly made national security our number one priority. However, the federal program announced for the border—the so-called ‘Smart Border’ initiative—is more a long overdue and repackaged set of local initiatives than it is an innovative step forward.

Who knows better than the people in this room, for instance, that borders need, and have long needed, new technologies and better management—the essence of the Smart Border program. Who knows better than the people in this room that what is happening along the border today is not Smart.

The binational federal accord underestimates and misrepresents the nature of border communities, border responsibility, and border opportunities. In my experience as a federal official, none of the current examples of “smart” border activities, for example, would exist without the insistence and contributions of state and local officials in border communities. Here in San Diego, the spark behind a smart electronic inspections system using pre-clearance and computer technology was not a threat to the homeland, or even a clever technological innovation. SENTRI, as one system is called, could easily still be in a strategic planning background paper were it not for the demands, and then the support, of the local community fed up with extremely long waiting lines. Many of you may recall that at the time SENTRI began to be deployed, the same local demands were successful in attracting support for other initiatives to reduce wait times to 20 minutes. Today’s hour and two-hour wait times do not seem to reflect a smarter approach.

As Albert Einstein once remarked, “We are obliged to respond to today’s problems with a higher level of intelligence than we had when we created the problems.”

In El Paso, when Mexican and U.S. federal authorities were at a stalemate on a plan for a smart port, it was the decision and explicit intervention of the mayors of Ciudad Juarez and El Paso to reroute local traffic on both sides of the bridge that made the electronic and smart initiative work. Local funding was also decisive. Were it not for the local branch office of the Wells Fargo Bank, insufficient investment would have been available to make that unique public-private partnership possible.

And, in 1999-2000, one of the more innovative reforms along the border resulted from local binational leadership in Arizona and Sonora trying to solve a particular problem. In an attempt to improve services for business people, shoppers, and retailers, who had to cross the border to conduct routine activities, they confronted the outdated logic of a federal regulation—the 25-mile border zone—created in the 1950s and not updated despite passage of NAFTA and the cross-border
integration that has occurred in the last three decades. Were it not for local leadership and local innovation, it would have been unlikely that federal officials would have even thought about that old regulation.

Of course, federal authority has its time and place, and, in each of these examples, federal officials followed the local lead and helped make it happen. Still, the core lesson, in my view, is that what we can do together is not answered by a Washington-centered or a Mexico City-directed plan. By the way these plans develop, they impose on border areas and local communities, they tend to commandeer local personnel and other resources, they impose requirements that make sense from a national but not local perspective, and they easily generate a number of “unfunded mandates” that redistribute problems rather than solve them.

An implication for current activity, for instance, is that I do not believe it is sufficient for this binational region simply to be a so-called “test-bed” for Homeland Security initiatives. The binational region, in contrast, should be a leading venture investor, a collective research laboratory, a conscious social experiment that by meeting the needs of this region also directs Washington and Mexico City in new directions. Washington and Mexico should not have liaisons to the region whose purpose is to inform local communities on the plans and expectations of future initiatives; the binational region needs to educate and influence federal authorities on what is needed, how to do it, and how to make sure it is monitored and made to work.

If federal governments should follow or get out of the way, then the question becomes not only “What can we accomplish together that we can’t do separately,” but also “How can we do it, and when?”

In the past, public officials have argued that political obstacles to create cross-border regional initiatives were “insurmountable.” I recall being told by well-informed people from this region that certain ideas would simply not be acceptable to one or another level of state or federal government. I was present, for instance, when local San Diego and Tijuana law enforcement officials agreed to a joint press conference to announce the cooperative investigation and prosecution of a pair of felons. Both sets of officials were warned by their federal leaders not to do it. Yet, the investigation and prosecution went forward, together rather than separately, and the felons were convicted and sentenced to tougher prison terms than was possible without the cooperation.

The immediate practical question, then, for this audience and meeting is how to develop workable institutional relationships that function together across the border. I offer three general observations in hopes that they help frame a discussion.

First, in my view, the federal governments in Mexico City and in Washington, D.C., need to step back and yield to local initiative and authority. As important as the work of the Consuls are, the authority to form cross-border institutions lies with the people of the binational region as much, if not more, than with the formal rules and regulations crafted nationally during a different era. The challenge is here, in this region, for civic leadership to generate a level of binational education and binational citizenship that would support and give legitimacy to local planning and programming.

Secondly, local institutional authorities—local governments, foundations, civic groups—need to form binational frameworks to work together. These frameworks are different than much of what passes now as binational cooperation. Today’s binational programs are often parallel activities, separately operating on each side of the border, and simply staying in touch or having an occasion to meet at an episodic “binational event.”
A truly binational planning framework would have some of the following characteristics:

- co-chaired by local government leaders from throughout the region;
- works with a single, integrated budget;
- pursues an integrated agenda;
- fosters and gives priority to civic education in local communities on both sides of the border;
- receives support, but not authority or leadership, from federal agencies; and
- defines its goals as specifically cross-border initiatives.

SANDAG’s own Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) may be one of several models for working across jurisdictions and demonstrating that it is possible to do more together than separately. A cross-border framework would also not need to wrestle with new layers of authority or introduce new bureaucracies.

Many current institutions struggle with their own abilities or authorities to work across the border. Philanthropic foundations, for example, are stymied, by and large, by the border. Funding merely goes to groups on one side of the border or the other, and then separate funding is sometimes made available to encourage cooperation. Federal binational initiatives also are blocked from working in a cross-border framework. Even though agreements call for support of binational programs, the financial support typically ends up with each government supporting programs on its own side of the border.

Thirdly, civic leaders need to define their vision of cooperation. Simply put, “Do you want to be neighbors or partners?” Neighbors can be friendly enough, but they often do things separately. They define the line between their yards with physical barriers—trees, hedges, streets, or fences. They meet with each other only on special occasions and after a formal invitation.

Or do you want to be partners, where discussions, designs, and decisions require interaction, common effort, and shared commitments; where fortunes, losses, opportunities and risks of both are produced by and belong to both.

The difference can be profound. As we have seen, on the U.S. side of the border it is all too often tempting, even reasonable, to believe that problems can be solved alone. In the health area, for instance, many U.S. institutions believe that cross-border problems, such as tuberculosis, already create such a cost that an initiative that also involved Mexico would be hopelessly complex and expensive.

Yet, the problem cannot be so neatly divided and separated between risks on this side as opposed to the other side. Even if programs existed in the U.S. to treat every person with tuberculosis, the treatment itself is often so prolonged that the risk exposures simply continue to circulate across the border. Public health workers, rooted in programs that serve on separate sides of the border, are always chasing a hidden menace.

A truly cross-border regional health program, say one that worked with migrant workers in North County, would be able to organize treatment and prevention while they were in the County, and while they were home in Mexico. The health program would match the organization of people’s lives, rather than forcing individuals to access a program whenever it might be available.

Cross-border health programs could also organize treatments around the entire circle of exposure, prevent duplication of costs, and combine the best medical practices and medical delivery systems from both U.S. and Mexican experiences. We long ago discovered that border screening programs cannot prevent the transmission of health risks in a cross-border region. A truly cross-border program is clearly an instance where what can be accomplished must be done together, not separately.
Some of you will recall the U.S. movie some years ago called Dead Poets Society, in which a teacher at an eastern elite, all-male private school tries to teach a group of precocious boys a little about the meaning of life. He calls on each student to talk about what they want to be in life, and they dutifully answer—doctor, lawyer, business executive, etc. The teacher stops them and says, “These are all wonderful, important things, but they are how you make a life, not why you live one.”

Binational regional and local leaders might remember this lesson and dramatically lift their sights. Stimulating economic growth is a good, even necessary, ambition. Overcoming problems with water, pollution, transportation—the list is long—is also an essential building block to progress. Yet, these are the ways in which a region operates, not why the region exists. This region is a home, blessed with a rich diversity in its people and its resources. Why the region needs to plan together, rather than separately, is to maintain that home, and to sustain a community that values the well-being of each of its members.

- **Mexico Perspective: Consul General Luis Cabrera-Cuarón**

Consul General Cabrera stated that it was an honor to be at the conference. He recognized the Chair, Ms. Saxod, former Chair of COBRO, Dr. Ganster, current Chair of COBRO and other dignitaries, and SANDAG staff. He stated it is an honor to participate, and he made the following observations.

Regarding the bilateral U.S.–Mexico relationship, there is no more complex and broader relationship than that which exists in this border region. San Diego and Tijuana together is the largest metropolitan border region and underscores the issues. All the border issues between the U.S. and Mexico occur here. Few relationships between the two nations have had greater transformation than here.

The growth in this region has been immense, especially the changes produced by NAFTA and its impacts on the U.S. and Mexican economies. Also, the political changes in Mexico have been important to the implementation of NAFTA. Trade is valued at $253 million. Mexico buys about 13 percent of U.S. exports. Mexico also exports approximately 11 percent of the NAFTA-generated commerce grown exponentially in the past ten years. Mexico purchases more goods than many countries in Europe combined.

He stated that after ten years of NAFTA, we are entering a new stage with a stronger cross-border relation, and we should plan for new objectives besides those that have to do with trade and the elimination of duties.

NAFTA’s three stakeholders have to grow with “NAFTA plus” and have a new strategy for strengthening the competitiveness of North America as a region. This must be based and supported in the harmonized development such as that which occurs in Tijuana and San Diego. The challenge of China is a perfect example of the goals and objectives that will be present in the near future, requiring us to compete as a region in the globalized world economy.

One challenge of “9-11” is security, while guaranteeing the flow of people and goods. Another is preventive diplomacy that addresses problems but prevents crises. This would be for issues such as water, energy, organized crime, and other areas.

The Border Liaison Mechanism was established in the 1990s in the border region, specifically in the San Diego-Tijuana area. It has been a successful example of what can be done at the three levels of government. We also have coordinated between the Consuls General of Tijuana and San Diego in migration and consular protection, public safety and violence prevention, ports of entry, and the conservation of natural resources.
Barely two months ago the Secretary of Foreign Relations established an office at the border as a communications channel between the Secretariat, local businesses, and local authorities. With this presence the Secretary will be able to be informed about border issues and address the border’s needs. He mentioned that Licenciado Arturo Gonzalez Cruz was recently appointed to head that office.

In the bilateral area, an important phenomenon of migration is the great challenge that we face and the related social agenda. Just like we were able to create a legal framework for trade and commerce, we also need to address this social challenge. We need to regularize or adjust the labor market in the U.S. This is a sensitive subject that will be included in the U.S. election campaigns.

The rapid change in the last ten years in the U.S. and Mexico show that dominant matters can change in such areas as drug enforcement, with progress based on trust, which must be emphasized. Though we are no longer distant neighbors, this perception has not permeated many segments of our societies.

We may not advance much, but we have norms or rules on the border. The economy has been the engine of this. Transportation, and primarily education, can lead this change and lead to harmonic development on both sides of the border. SANDAG is an example of the cooperation that must prevail in the border region.

- **United States Perspective: Deputy Consul General Joyce DeShazo**

Deputy Consul General DeShazo expressed her appreciation for the invitation to speak on this important topic.

She stated that she was impressed by the degree of cooperation between the U.S. and Mexico on border issues. These areas of cooperation include migration, environment, water, and law enforcement issues. The border links the two countries in trade, culture, and other relationships, many through NAFTA.

350 million people cross between the two countries each year. There are official meetings at all three levels of government, meeting nearly daily to solve problems of health and well-being. The rapid increase in trade has impacted roads, ports of entry, and crossings of people and goods. Binational cooperation is essential and needs to be maintained.

There are a number of ways to do this. The Border Liaison Mechanism operates in ten pairs of border cities. The officials meet and often local officials join the meetings as well. They address short- and long-term issues. These meetings have helped reduce the strain in relationships in migration and expanded programs to help improve local matters.

Ms. DeShazo stated that she had had the opportunity to participate in the local Border Liaison Mechanism meetings. At our border we have discussed illegal migration. President Bush has appointed a high-level group to constructively address migration. Another area discussed is “search and rescue” activities and training for these workers. The U.S. Consulate has promoted public relations campaigns discussing the dangers of illegal crossings.

Environmental issues are another area of concern. Matters of degradation of the border environment are being addressed. This goes back 50 years to the establishment of the International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC) in 1944. IBWC is responsible for water and boundary issues. It constructed the sewage treatment plant at San Ysidro.
The Good Neighbor Environmental Board was established in 1992 to advise the two governments on border area environmental issues. It has broad membership and the Board advises on development, preservation, and protection of the border environment.

The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) is the first trade agreement to deal with environmental issues. Through the agreement, the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission was established along with the NADBank to address the design and financing of solid waste, water, and wastewater treatment issues.

The U.S.–Mexico Bilateral Commission was formed in 1981 consisting of representatives of federal agencies with responsibilities at the border to discuss unresolved issues along the border. The Commission will occasionally come up with innovative programs for dealing with water and other issues. It has 13 working groups to deal with specific issues.

Narcotics control is also an important issue and the border has areas of access by the drug trade. Mexico and the U.S. are working actively to address these issues in meetings twice a year. There is also an exchange between U.S. and Mexican legal profession members, with judges, lawyers, police, and others working jointly on interdiction efforts.

In addition to the federal cooperation, there is also cooperation at the state level. Since 1980, the Governors of the ten Border States have met annually to discuss local issues of agriculture, border crossings, health, tourism, and others. States have taken the initiative to address these local issues. They are looking at attracting industries to both sides. They are examining other issues including public health services.

Border regions have shown the ability to adapt to rapid change. Border communities share opportunities to resolve issues across the divide.

There are challenges facing these groups and commissions. “9-11” has brought into focus the issue of security. The U.S. seeks broad ways to protect the people, while encouraging cross-border trade. We need to strengthen our borders. We developed a 22-point plan with Mexico in 2002 to secure the border through a secure flow of people and goods, while preventing illegal entry. For example, SENTRI and FAST are being expanded.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you. We are dedicated to an efficient and secure border for both nations.

Panel 1 Questions

Question 1: At El Paso-Juarez, the Mayors waived local restrictions on traffic and rerouted the traffic, the banks helped with funding, and new lanes were opened, bypassing federal agreements with landowners. Local governments can break federal log-jams. Are there other examples of local cross-border financing?

Response: Consul General Cabrera-Cuaron: Infrastructure along the border has been overtaken by the accelerated growth resulting from NAFTA. There are bureaucracies in both countries that authorize new crossings or bridges, and they are very slow. We are trying to address this issue. We also are looking at the private sector to help with funding. This is one of the assignments for our new representative of the Secretary of Foreign Relations at the border.

Response: Deputy Consul General DeShazo: There is a complex system to work changes through the bureaucracy. For example, to expand SENTRI, there were so many departments involved on both sides of the border, and we must move all these agencies. Besides, there is a matter of funding.
Some say that it can’t be solved in a short period of time. The problem—and it comes down to this—is one of coordination and communication.

Response: Dr. Bach: Sometimes it takes finding other ways of doing things. The focus always seems to be on the “thin line,” which is a federal responsibility. For example, loading a truck is funded by private business. This can be done securely away from the border, thus reducing the slowness at the border. Management changes can be made and the private sector is funding new approaches to this.

Question 2: What strategies do you suggest for obtaining federal government support (for changes at the border)?

Response: Consul General Cabrera-Cuaron: We have complex issues on the border. We must be quick and do new strategies. We must revitalize the Border Liaison Mechanism so that at the border we can transmit matters from the base and grassroots. We must work in this direction.

Response: Dr. Bach: When I was in the Department of Justice, I wish that I had had the border groups that you have now to help me do my job. Step forward with your plan and demand a response from the federal government.

Question 3: Why have tribal governments been omitted from the border region discussion?

Response: Deputy Consul General DeShazo: This is a good question. For every issue there is an approach in historical terms. We address environmental matters, immigration, and drug issues. If there are issues that the tribes find important, they should bring them forward.

Response: Consul General Cabrera-Cuaron: As we said previously, this question has been answered. The federal government should be willing to help, not to hinder.

PANEL 2
POLICY MODELS FOR CROSS-BORDER COLLABORATION

The Honorable Diane Rose, Mayor of Imperial Beach and member of the Good Neighbor Environmental Board, introduced the panelists. Ms. Rose described the Good Neighbor Environmental Board, its charge, and its membership. She invited the participants to read the Board’s latest report on children’s health on the border, which is available at www.epa.gov/ocem/gneb.

- Borderwide: Border Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments-West

Edgar E. Ruiz, Program Director of the Border Legislative Conference of the Council of State Governments-West, was introduced.

The Council on State Governments was founded in 1933 and is headquartered in Lexington, KY. Other offices include one in Sacramento. Members are governors and senior officials of the states. The organization identifies “best practices” and advocates multi-state solutions through research, analysis, meetings, and other forums. State spending on international programs has increased to $200 million in 2002, up ten times in the past 20 years. State legislatures passed a large number of bills on international issues, including trade. Thirty-eight states have foreign offices, especially to encourage trade. Trade promotion is an important matter, and the organization works with the U.S. Trade Representative and with Mexico and Canada.

The Western Regional Office has a Border Legislative Conference to promote cooperation among the border states to improve the quality of life, empower legislators to engage in the binational
agenda, provide input into development policy, and to improve the capacity of legislators to deal with international issues. It is funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).

The ten border states have representatives and four members from each state legislature. There are policy committees. The organization has held eight forums since 2001 on security, commerce, water, alcohol and substance abuse, health, economic development, and the environment. It has active cross-border collaboration and partnerships with the Border Governors' Conference, the Border Liaison Mechanism, and others.

The participants have developed joint policy resolutions. The organization has three committees: environment, economic development, and health. The economic development committee has proposed a new vision for the border: secure, fast, and intelligent. Its proposals are aimed at enhancing competitiveness of the border region. Its recommendations will be submitted to the Border Governors at its conference, and it continues to work with the federal, local, and regional governments on both sides of the border.

The focus of the environmental committee is on the disposal and recycling of used and waste tires along the border, the exchange of information of state scrap tire disposal regulations, identification of best practices, and proposals for harmonization of regulatory frameworks concerning used and waste tires.

Mr. Ruiz named a number of other organizations that are binational mechanisms for collaboration, including the Border Liaison Mechanism, the International Boundary and Water Commission, the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission, the NADBank, the U.S.–Mexico Border Health Commission, and others.

Program challenges include the impact of “no re-election” of officials in Mexico, the centralization of services, multi-level governments, and limitations of state legislatures.

Priorities and goals include maintaining and forging new strategic partnerships, pursuing legislative strategies to improve the quality of life on the border, pro-active participation in the development of federal legislation and programs on immigration reform, border management, the environment, promotion of reforms so local and state governments can provide necessary services, and continued communication for exchange of information and formation of collaborative partnerships. The website is www.csgwest.org.

Mr. Ruiz concluded that we need to work hard and lobby both the federal and state governments for our border needs.

- State to State: Arizona-Mexico Commission

Mr. David Randolph, Border Coordination Officer of the Arizona-Mexico Commission, was introduced.

Mr. Randolph reported that the Arizona-Mexico Commission was formed in 1959 as a public-private commission. Its mission is to improve the quality of life by enlarging the relationship of Arizona with Mexico through advocacy, networking, and information. He quoted Gov. Fannin, who said at the Commission’s formation that “God made us neighbors; let us be good neighbors.”

The vision of the Commission is to be a globally-recognized public-private champion for improving the quality of life in Arizona through relationships with Mexico and Latin America. The organization looks at the arts, health services, and many other issues. It is a totally transparent organization, non-partisan, and single-minded about making things better along the border. It looks at Arizona as a region. Services include networking in business, culture, social activities,
education, political, and grassroots advocacy. The Commission is chaired by the governor of Arizona, with the president coming from private industry; it is important that the governor is actively involved. Board members come from many fields.

The Commission has ten committees in agriculture, arts and culture, border issues, education, the environment, finance, business, and legal, the health industry, and others.

It works with the Arizona-Sonora Commission and has two sessions with them, one in each state. The three-day meetings are well attended, and action items developed. The Commission reviews items that can be addressed within the next six months. These items are not headline grabbers, but we can make progress, and we have done so in the past. The governors and legislators meet also throughout the sessions to work together.

The expenses of the Arizona–Mexico Commission are paid (mostly) by private memberships and sponsorships. Memberships start at $35 a year for students and go up to $12,500 for sponsors. The Commission also raises money through dinners and other fund-raising events.

The Commission has sponsored meetings between the Arizona governor and the president of Mexico. The Commission has publications and reports on various trade and social issues and ports of entry. The Commission is working with the Arizona Department of Transportation on improvements to the San Luis Colorado port of entry and other matters that it feels it can influence.

The organization’s website is [www.azmc.org](http://www.azmc.org), and participants were invited to visit it.

- **City-Region: Whatcom Council of Governments, Washington State**

Mr. James Miller, Executive Director, Whatcom (Washington) Council of Governments (WCOG) was introduced. He expressed his thanks to Gary Gallegos, Executive Director of SANDAG, for the invitation to speak.

Mr. Miller described the organization of the Whatcom Council of Governments. The association is the lead agency for the International Mobility and Trade Corridor (IMTC) Project, which will be discussed as a model for cross-border collaboration. This is of interest to this conference because between 17 percent and 20 percent of goods entering the U.S. through the “Cascade Gateway” end up in California.

The IMTC is a voluntary forum focused on improving mobility, safety, and security through the “Cascade Gateway.” This focus is on the West Coast highways linking British Columbia and Washington state (primarily) in the Pacific Northwest.

The IMTC was initiated in 1997 to address problems of border congestion and increasing travel time, resulting from a growth in trade and population. A conference was held following the release of the GSA report on Federal Gateway planning. Local organizations had input into the program that developed the funding for the project.

The ports of entry in the “Cascade Gateway” region are Peach Arch, Pacific Highway, Lynden-Aldergrove, and Sumas-Huntingdon. South of these ports of entry are rural areas unlike other U.S.-Canada ports, such as Buffalo. This area is a good laboratory for new ideas and processes. The small towns can be a problem, however. Since “9-11,” infrastructure and manpower were not in place to deal with the new security procedures.

The border areas are growing faster, percentage-wise, than the two countries or the states/provinces. The growth rate is higher in the County (GVRD) of British Columbia than in Whatcom County.
In addition, the U.S. side is very sensitive to the exchange rate between the U.S. and Canada. As the exchange rate goes, so goes the traffic volume.

He showed in a chart the volumes of southbound truck crossings at three ports. The volume at Pacific Highway is decreasing, while that at Sumas-Huntingdon and Lyndon-Aldergrove is increasing. But volume at all the crossings is greater since the passage of NAFTA.

The IMTC project was begun with planning meetings even before the funding was received. Participants collaborated with the groups in Washington and British Columbia. “Seed money” was received from the Port of Bellingham, the Washington State Department of Transportation, and the General Services Administration. WCOG was designated the lead staff, and we formed the IMTC. The project has a Steering Committee, which meets monthly and makes recommendations. The Core Group meets three to four times a year and makes decisions. The Core Group is comprised of representatives from transportation agencies, other governmental organizations, inspection and enforcement services, the private sector, at-border municipalities, and other non-governmental associations. The General Assembly meets twice a year for discussion and reviewing information.

Institutional issues at the border include two-way system parity, service and retail sector benefits, data privacy, mobility and system efficiency, interdiction and security, congestion reduction, and others. IMTC is a forum, a platform for coordination, and an informal coalition based on trust. It is not an agency, source of funding, a recipient of funds, or a policy-making body.

IMTC has been working collaboratively to identify border gateway deficiencies, set goals for the “Cascade Gateway,” identify improvement projects, assemble match funding and support funding applications by member organizations, and provide advisory oversight of funded planning and construction projects.

The objectives of IMTC are to jointly plan the “Cascade Gateway” as a system, improve traffic data and information, and identify and fund needed improvements in infrastructure, operations, technology, and security. Some of the IMTC projects include the coordination of binational planning, support for technology improvements, cross-border traffic and transit studies, establishment of NEXUS (similar to SENTRI), among a number of others. The “100 km” border region on both sides of the line is supported and the region has lobbied in Washington for funds.

Indicators of success of IMTC include a seven-year history of activities, the development of a sophisticated identity for the Cascade Gateway border system, trust among the border organizations, and increased funding to the project. Our current funding is $12 million, with 44 percent from Canada and 56 percent from the U.S. Coalition funding is important to the success of IMTC.

He concluded that the essential elements of the IMTC project are coalition, funding, and focus, but, most importantly, coalition. Conference participants were invited to learn more about the project at www.wcog.org/imtc.

- **Our Experience: Committee on Binational Regional Opportunities (COBRO)**

Dr. Paul Ganster, Director, Institute for Regional Studies of the Californias, San Diego State University, and Chair, COBRO, was introduced.

Dr. Ganster noted that this binational region received Second Place at an international competition on sustainable design. This showed that we really need to look at the entire region—both sides of the border—to plan for our quality of life. We cannot continue to react to short-term goals, but rather we must be proactive.
In 1993 Dr. Ganster conducted a study of the border and looked at cross-border studies. Local universities were also looking at programs that would cross the border, with personal relationships. COLEF also developed research and studies of the border.

In the mid-1980s, the crisis in Mexico led to the boom in the maquiladora industry, which encouraged San Diego to focus on the border as “opportunity.” In 1986 the City of San Diego established its Binational Affairs Office to work with Tijuana. The City has continued to have an office for this function. In 1987 the County of San Diego established its Binational Affairs Office, but it fell victim to politics and budget issues in 1993. The County’s interest has continued, but activity has been dispersed. SANDAG’s efforts have been continuous.

At SANDAG, the Mayor of Tijuana was designated an Honorary SANDAG Board member in 1974. In 1986 SANDAG published BRIDGE, a guide to the maquiladora industry. SANDAG established the Border Issues Task Force in 1989, which made recommendations for continued cooperation in planning across the border. SANDAG also published the 1990 Census of Baja California. The Greater San Diego Chamber of Commerce looked at Mexican shopping impacts in San Diego, and this also raised interest at the border. Your background paper lists the many activities of COBRO.

We see an expanded interest in border-related issues. Much has been reactive. We have not institutionalized these activities. Private non-governmental organizations have had an “up and down” history.

Border growth has been overwhelming. We need to work quickly to develop a sustainable region. We need to institutionalize the past efforts across the border. SANDAG can do this, but the Border Liaison Mechanism and the International Boundary and Water Commission models could do so, too. We cannot expect the federal governments to fund the programs, as the federal governments have devolved the issues to the local levels without devolving the funds.

Our challenge is how to develop new institutions and funding to deal with border issues and find solutions. What happens in San Diego and Tijuana has a big impact on U.S.-Mexican relations, as the Consuls General and our Chair, Crystal Crawford, all said earlier.

We are looking for the audience to help us determine how we can have a sustainable future for our binational community.

Panel 2 Questions

**Question 1:** All speakers say there are lots of groups interested in the border. How do we get them to all speak with one voice?

**Response:** Mr. Miller: We have a smaller area and we have been careful to focus on our local issues. Make the “tent” as big as possible and get everyone into it.

**Response:** Mr. Ruiz: It is important to speak with one voice. We try to get everyone together. You need communication and collaboration on both sides; that’s what we try to do.

**Response:** Dr. Ganster: Orderly minds try to get everyone together. Ultimately, we must follow the money, which support the groups. The Arizona–Mexico Commission and WCOG had some funding to mobilize groups. Then, they got the money to do the work. Maybe we will end up with several groups that talk with each other. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has done this with its Border 2012 program.
Conclusion

Chair Crystal Crawford thanked the panelists and concluded the first part of the conference. Participants were invited to pick up their lunches and go to the breakout sessions for further discussions and development of recommendations.

Nan Valerio was awarded a certificate of appreciation and congratulations from COBRO.

REPORTS FROM THE BREAKOUT SESSIONS

The conference participants were asked to identify one of eight topic areas in which they would like to participate for breakout sessions. After the breakout sessions the conference was reconvened, and representatives from each of the groups were asked to report back to the whole conference in a plenary session. The following are the suggested actions of the groups, based on the reports of the representatives and the notes taken in each group.

- Border Infrastructure (20 participants)
  1. Improve performance standards for ports of entry (POE) operation. Most importantly, to reduce border wait times by increased use of technology; develop small corridors; provide information about access to POE facilities; expand SENTRI programs or other type of programs for passenger vehicles, pedestrians, and cargo; and the implementation of the US VISIT program. It is important to increase the hours of operation and staffing at POEs.
  2. Ensure linkage of POE improvements and transportation facilities that serve the POEs.
  3. Encourage innovative mechanisms for planning and financing projects
  4. Take into account lead time to plan, fund, and implement projects at the border.

- Environment (15 participants)
  1. Conservation and cross-border habitats—a few of the action that came out are that:
     a) There needs to be a mechanism for conservation efforts that facilitates coordination of NGOs and others, i.e., the website could be one component of it;
     b) There is a need for conservation areas across the border to help promote and organize workshops to educate the public in worldwide corridors on the importance of conservation. SANDAG could also work with appropriate Mexican agencies to help set up the transborder protected areas; and
     c) There needs to be a survey and inventory of species and habitats in the border region, and SANDAG could support the collection efforts.
  2. Watersheds. The discussion centered on addressing the institutional gap that exists. Suggested actions were:
     a) Setting up a formal binational mechanism to legally implement watershed objectives and planning; and
     b) To create a formal master plan with community-level subprojects, and the plan needs to be supported and implemented by appropriate authorities and government agencies.
• Housing (12 participants)

1. The group discussed housing issues within the interregional and binational context. They looked at housing and redevelopment agencies, mixed use, and how to get owners to convert upper floors for affordable housing. The issue of housing price disparities between regions (Calexico vs. San Diego or Tijuana vs. San Diego), as well as the gap between the median income and the median home price, was discussed. They also looked at transit needs, unmet transit needs, and models for connecting transit and land use utilizing Smart Growth principles. We need to provide education so the people will use public transit. Among their suggestions was the need to get more information on home ownership, community opportunities, developing incentives for public/private partnerships, and mixed-use opportunities/smart growth/more multi-family housing.

• Economic Development (10 participants)

1. Strengthen the approach that SANDAG is taking. Cooperatively and collaboratively work with Imperial County and Baja California, using a team approach for discussing the housing, water, POE, and transportation issues in a comprehensive way.

2. We need to form a team and begin taking inventory of our economic resources, and define binational clusters that will benefit all of us. When we begin understanding what these clusters are, we can then start marketing them.

3. Develop a Binational business/trade/industry promotion center, market a binational showcase, provide different services to businesses (banking, data banks, legal framework, inst. Issues) that wish to come to our region and find higher value-added industries.

• Water Supply (9 participants)

1. Reactivate the Border Water Council.

2. Teach a water ethic and make connections between water use in the U.S. and water needs in Mexico.

3. Examine the nexus between water and energy.

4. Study the Tijuana Master Plan as a best practice.

• Homeland Security (9 participants)

Align Homeland Security and regional needs.

1. Identify leadership/Education:

   a) Educate elected officials to make them understand the concerns of border stakeholders and the opportunities to create a “smart border” so that they can represent the region’s needs in Washington, D.C., and speak with “one voice.”

   b) Create a package of information (good data) about the region (e.g., statistics of cross-border traffic in goods and services flow to other parts of the country; importance of cross-border trade; potential smart border technological improvements, etc.).

   c) Hold Washington, D.C., accountable to share information with border stakeholders.

   d) Mexico needs to be in the information loop.
2. **Address Immigration Policy**
   a) Current unfairness - Canada vs. Mexico visa policy.
   b) Mexicans feel like second-class citizens (even though they are our largest trading partners).

3. **Continue advocacy for more “smart border” technology.**
   a) Think out of the box, e.g., visa application paperwork could be set up through the Internet to reduce wait time.

- **Data Sharing (5 participants)**
  The group agreed that many advances have been made in data sharing, but there are significant challenges. However, we need to:
  1. Train the different agencies about the importance of data;
  2. Classify data according to the different uses;
  3. Promote the harmonization of data on both sides of the border;
  4. Define the type of data that we need; and
  5. Not only be able to ask for data, but to share in the generation of data.

- **Governance and Cross-border Collaboration (5 participants)**
  1. Think and act like partners and create partnerships;
  2. Educate citizens and elected officials about each other and the issues;
  3. Develop regional consensus to speak on issues of mutual concern, e.g., US VISIT program;
  4. Set up local working groups with participation by decision makers from both sides of the border with local stakeholders to develop solutions to problems, e.g., Otay Mesa Commercial Port Working Group.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director of SANDAG, thanked the participants for attending. He said that we have learned about what is happening both on our border and on the northern border with Canada, and he closed the day’s event with a challenge to work collaboratively on making this region globally competitive. He urged the participants not to wait for the federal governments of either country to come up with solutions, but rather to be proactive in developing a vision for the region and a plan and strategies for innovative mechanisms for investing in our future.

Dr. Paul Ganster remarked that we have been working on these issues of the border for a long time, but more needs to be done. We must proceed. We must work with Washington and Mexico City, but we have to do it for ourselves.

HECTOR VANEGAS
Special Projects Director, Borders Planning and Coordination

Key Staff Contact: Jane Clough-Riquelme, (619) 699-1909; jcl@sandag.org
2005 SUMMER CONFERENCE STRUCTURE

Introduction

At its August 3, 2004, meeting, COBRO discussed options to improve the work, organization, and the results of the 2005 Annual Binational Summer Conference. Some of the suggestions included: having the event in Mexico to improve Mexican participation; working more aggressively to draw elected officials; and selecting a topic as early on in the process as possible to facilitate planning of the event. Staff was asked to provide some ideas on suggested topics at the September meeting based on input from the evaluations.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that COBRO links the structure of the summer binational conference to the results of its FY 2005 work plan and utilize the conference to showcase the advances made on key binational strategic initiatives upon which the Borders Committee and COBRO have focused during the preceding year.

Discussion

The 2004 binational conference served to review and made an assessment of border collaboration in the San Diego-Baja California border region for the last few years and learn from models of collaboration from other regions.

Framed within the context of the passage of NAFTA and punctuated by the tragic events of September 11, 2001, the binational community has had many successes and challenges. The guest speaker and panelists offered the participants some challenges and opportunities to further advance in the cross-border planning and coordination.

Secretary of Infrastructure and Urban Development of Baja California (SIDUE), the Hon. Arturo Espinoza Jaramillo, discussed the importance of integrating the infrastructure needs in this binational region as Baja California—because of its geography—is closer to the United States than its counterpart states in Mexico. He announced the development of a Consolidated Municipal Commission representing Tijuana, Tecate, and Rosarito, which will be working on issues affecting the consolidated metropolitan area.
Dr. Robert L. Bach, Senior Fellow at the Inter-American Dialogue, emphasized that: (a) this region needs to determine if we, in this binational region, will be just neighbors, or will go further and become partners; (b) solutions to cross-border planning should be led by the regional stakeholders, while the federal level should facilitate; and (c) a true cross-border framework for collaboration must be integrated, including governance and financing. He suggested that we should create a vision for the region in which the well-being of all in the entire binational region is considered. The outcomes from the 2004 Binational Summer Conference will be incorporated into the work plan of COBRO, while the Borders Committee has defined its priorities for FY 05.

The Borders Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) provides the framework for the Borders Committee work plan, adopted by SANDAG’s Board of Directors in July 2004. This chapter describes the planning areas: access to jobs and housing, transportation, energy and water supply, environment, economic development and homeland security, while strategic initiatives are described in the Implementation Chapter.

The binational strategic initiatives for FY 2005 are:

Set up an interregional partnership with the Republic of Mexico focused on energy and water, homeland security, and transportation issues. Continue engagement in binational environmental initiatives, such as the Border 2012 Program and the Las Californias Binational Conservation Initiative.

To optimize the work of COBRO as the binational stakeholders working group that informs the policy work of the Borders Committee, staff suggests that the binational strategic initiatives of the Borders Committee provide the basis for COBRO’s FY 2005 work plan. This would strengthen the ability of the Borders Committee to move forward on key strategic areas through COBRO’s focused expertise.

It is suggested that if COBRO takes the outcomes of the 2004 Binational Summer Conference as they relate to the Borders Committee binational strategic initiatives, and moves forward on key areas, this will contribute to the implementation phase of the RCP and provide the substance of the 2005 Binational Summer Conference.

HECTOR VANEGAS
Special Projects Director, Borders Planning and Coordination

Key Staff Contact: Hector Vanegas, (619) 699-1972, hva@sandag.org
REPORT ON EVALUATIONS OF 2004 BINATIONAL CONFERENCE

Introduction

Evaluation information on the 2004 Binational Summer Conference was solicited by three means: (a) from sheets available at the conference site (see Attachment 1); (b) from COBRO members during the meeting on August 3; and (c) from an on-line evaluation administered to the entire registration list via e-mail, with an Internet link (see Attachment 2). Although the responses were not sufficient to make any type of statistical analysis, they should serve the Committee as input for improving the planning and content of next year’s conference and as some indication of the types of issues that are, or are not, being addressed through the current conference format.

Discussion

Respondents

The majority of the respondents were from San Diego County and represented either expertise or interest in transportation (67 percent) or Economic Development (62 percent). Thirty-eight percent of the on-line respondents had either expertise or interest in social issues and 24 percent in the environment. Thirty percent of the on-line respondents were from academic institutions and 25 percent were from the business or private sector.

Overall

In general, the evaluations were quite positive about the event. In the written evaluations the responses were unanimous that the event met their expectations, with additional comments such as “Very well done, you took a complex issue and allowed us to see various facets of it and share our viewpoints.” In the on-line evaluation, 48 percent of the 20 participants who responded indicated they were very satisfied with the overall organization of the event, and 52 percent said that it met their expectations. One written evaluation remarked as to what was most interesting about the conference:

“Being able to see coordinated efforts by both governments (Mexico and U.S.) to improve the region, independently of the political line. I’m convinced that people who live in this region are more alike than our own countrymen (Mexico City and D.C.). That is why we should strive to get things done our way.”
More specifically, 67 percent of the respondents to the on-line evaluation survey were either very satisfied or satisfied with the location. Overwhelmingly, the respondents are satisfied with the conference running from 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. On other services like translation, 60 percent of the respondents were bilingual, so it did not apply. For those who did use it, the majority were very satisfied or satisfied. Eighty-five percent of those who responded to the on-line survey were very satisfied or satisfied with the catering services. Eighty percent of those who responded to the quality of the materials provided were either very satisfied or satisfied, while several written evaluations mentioned the excellent organization and materials. Among the qualitative responses to both the on-line and written evaluations, the participants would prefer more breaks and time for lunch and networking.

In terms of the agenda and speakers, overall, the respondents were very satisfied with the speakers. Among the qualitative comments made in “What did you find most interesting about the conference?” the majority of the responses indicated the presentation by Dr. Robert Bach. One respondent remarked, “I found Dr. Bach’s presentation to be particularly appealing. He offered a fresh perspective, concrete recommendations, and a new voice to binational planning in the region.” Although respondents liked the topics of the panels and the topics of the panelists, various respondents commented that the presentations were too long and not focused enough. There were also several comments regarding the inclusion of more members of civil society, and not so many government representatives. Various respondents mentioned that they were very satisfied with the panelists as it gave them “an opportunity to hear best practices from other regions.”

Respondents overwhelming enjoyed the breakout sessions, but there were concerns about the structure and timing of them. Several respondents mentioned that the breakout sessions should be more defined, but also more relaxed. The majority of respondents wanted more time dedicated to the breakout sessions.

Themes

There were a variety of topics suggested for future conferences, including:

- Cross-border land use planning and harmonizing systems
- More specific topics like the expansion of SENTRI with specific speakers who have a say in it
- Social aspects of U.S.-Mexico issues
- Sustainable Development topics
- Updates on initiatives and summary of results
- Housing and Jobs
- Infrastructure development opportunities: water, transportation, energy, housing
- Border success stories
- Tribal Government Issues
- Federal Legislation to create Southwest Regional Border Economic Authority

HECTOR VANEGAS, Special Projects Director, Border Planning and Coordination

Attachments

Key Staff Contact: Jane Clough-Riquelme, (619) 699-1909; e-mail: jd@sandag.org
## WRITTEN EVALUATIONS FROM 2004 BINATIONAL SUMMER CONFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met expectations?</th>
<th>Most interesting aspect?</th>
<th>What would you change to improve?</th>
<th>Future topics?</th>
<th>How did you find out about it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Bach's presentation</td>
<td>Panelists's presentations</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>COBRO members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breakout sessions</td>
<td>too long and detailed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Espinoza's talk</td>
<td>Better structured</td>
<td>ENERGY, less</td>
<td>Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>breakouts</td>
<td>government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>focused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arizona-Sonora Com</td>
<td>Better food for breakfast</td>
<td>Labor/Workers'</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>Rights in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAFTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>First panel excellent</td>
<td>Second panel too long</td>
<td>Human development</td>
<td>Employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breakout sessions</td>
<td>and not informative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dr. Bach's presentation</td>
<td>Ariz-Son too long</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Dev breakout</td>
<td>Whatcom not specific/too</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Please keep organizing;</td>
<td>More defined breakout</td>
<td>Fed. Legislation to create</td>
<td>Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>great public service</td>
<td>sessions/more relaxed</td>
<td>Southwest Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Border Economic Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Opportunity to hear best</td>
<td>No suggestions. Well planned</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practices from other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Breakout sessions</td>
<td>Reduce presentation</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The great work that is</td>
<td>Short breaks to allow for</td>
<td>Not a topic, but suggest</td>
<td>rEgion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>already being done to</td>
<td>stretching/more</td>
<td>to exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>address the many issues</td>
<td>comfortable chairs</td>
<td>contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>information for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>working on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>similar issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Borderbase.org?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Excellent organization</td>
<td>Include panelists from</td>
<td>Data sharing</td>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent materials</td>
<td>civil society/grassroots</td>
<td>for effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transborder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Dr. Bach’s presentation</th>
<th>Dr. Bach’s candidness/other areas ideas/solutions to regional challenges</th>
<th>How do we move forward to concrete action? Is there a magic formula?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less “sit and get” It’s hard to sit for 3 hours just listening Breaks and networking will happen whether you make time or not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Panelists provided a wide range of planning and implementing strategies</td>
<td>Dr. Bach’s framing of the conference was interesting and useful</td>
<td>Governance and advocacy in terms of specific social issues such as human rights and environmental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In terms of logistics, it is useful to have breaks between sessions to ensure active participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consul Cabrera outlined clearly the regional priorities</td>
<td>The translators needed to be farther from the tables/too much feedback</td>
<td>Social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COBRO meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. How did you find out about the conference? (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Save-the-Date postcard</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region (SANDAG newsletter sent via e-mail)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG Web site</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 21

(skipped this question) 0

2. Did the conference meet your expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 21

(skipped this question) 0
3. What should be changed to make future conferences better?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(skipped this question)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please indicate your preferred schedule for future conferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(skipped this question)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied</th>
<th>Not at all Satisfied</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Response Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall organization of event</td>
<td>48% (10)</td>
<td>43% (9)</td>
<td>10% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>38% (8)</td>
<td>29% (6)</td>
<td>19% (4)</td>
<td>14% (3)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>25% (5)</td>
<td>10% (2)</td>
<td>5% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>60% (12)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>55% (11)</td>
<td>25% (5)</td>
<td>15% (3)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>5% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>52% (11)</td>
<td>33% (7)</td>
<td>14% (3)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Respondents         | 21             |
| (skipped this question)     | 0              |

6. What did you find most interesting about the conference?

| Total Respondents | 20             |
| (skipped this question) | 1              |

7. What topics should be considered for future conferences?

| Total Respondents | 17             |
| (skipped this question) | 4              |
8. What type of organization do you represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business/private sector</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal government</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None--individual</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(skipped this question)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Were you representing an organization from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baja California, Mexico</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (other than Baja California)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego County</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No particular organization</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents 20

(skipped this question) 1
10. Please identify your area(s) of expertise/interest. (Select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland security</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance/public policy</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents** | 21

(skipped this question) | 0

11. (Optional) Name and e-mail address:

**Total Respondents** | 11

(skipped this question) | 10
COMMITTEE ON BINATIONAL REGIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (COBRO) WORK PLAN FOR FY 2005

Introduction

The COBRO reviewed its draft work plan for FY 2005 during its July 6, 2004 meeting, including a preliminary calendar of activities for the same period (see Item 7 Attachment). On that occasion, Chair Paul Ganster recommended integrating the outcomes from the binational summer conference in the work plan.

Discussion

The function of COBRO is to provide advice and recommendations to SANDAG’s Borders Committee on its role in binational border-related planning activities. The framework for SANDAG’s involvement in border-related planning issues is the Borders Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which includes a vision statement, goal and guiding principles, specific goals for each of the planning areas described, as well as policy goals and actions. The underlying principle of the Borders Committee is to build relationships within which transboundary planning issues can be discussed at a policy level. Based on this, the Borders Committee approved as one of its priorities for FY 05 the development of an interregional partnership with the appropriate counterparts from the Republic of Mexico. The planning issues identified by the Borders Committee as priorities with the Republic of Mexico for FY 05 are Transportation, Energy and Water Supply, and Homeland Security. Specifically, one of the Strategic Initiatives included in Chapter 9, Implementation, of the RCP states the following:

Republic of Mexico: Create a partnership with the Republic of Mexico to address binational border planning issues with a focus on: transportation and infrastructure; energy/water; homeland security; and the environment.

In the July 6, 2004 meeting, COBRO reviewed a preliminary calendar of activities for FY 2005 (see item 7 Attachment). A recommendation made by Chair Paul Ganster was that the outcomes from the binational summer conference be integrated in the work plan.

HECTOR VANEGAS
Special Projects Director, Borders Planning and Coordination

Key Staff Contact: Jane Clough-Riquelme, (619) 699-1909; jcl@sandag.org
PRELIMINARY CALENDAR OF ACTIVITIES FOR FY 2005

JULY 2004
Focus: 8th Annual Binational Summer Conference
Goal: Cooperation Across the Border: Where do we go from here?
Product: Discussions and preliminary recommendations from the conference

AUGUST 2004
Focus: Review conclusions from the 8th Summer Conference
Borders Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan
Goal: Initial discussion of the six border planning areas
Product: Initial draft of recommendations to be submitted to the Borders Committee

SEPTEMBER 2004
Focus: Continue discussion of the Summer Conference conclusions
Borders Chapter of the RCP: Review/discuss binational strategies included in the Implementation Chapter
Goal: Work guidelines included in the Borders Chapter of RCP
Product: Initial draft recommendations from the Summer Conference and guidance for actions on homeland security

OCTOBER 2004
Focus: Conclude discussion of the Summer Conference recommendation
Borders Chapter of the RCP: Review/discuss binational strategies included in the Implementation Chapter
Goal: Work guidelines included in the Borders Chapter of RCP
Product: Recommendation to the Borders Committee, and guidance for actions on Jobs and Housing issues

NOVEMBER 2004
Focus: Borders Chapter of the RCP: Transportation projects (including Imperial County perspective)
Goal: Work guidelines included in the Borders Chapter of RCP
Product: Recommendation from the Summer Conference to the Board, and guidance for actions on transportation issues

DECEMBER 2004
Focus: Review topic for the 9th Binational Summer Conference
Borders Chapter of the RCP: Review/discuss binational strategies included in the Implementation Chapter
Goal: Work guidelines included in the Borders Chapter of RCP
Product: Draft agenda for the 9th Binational Summer Conference
JANUARY 2005
Focus: Initial discussion of priorities for FY 2006
Review program and organization of the 9th Binational Summer Conference: Title, date and location
Borders Chapter of the RCP: Review/discuss binational strategies included in the Implementation Chapter
Goal: Work guidelines included in the Borders Chapter of RCP
Product: Program and support documents for the 9th Summer Conference

FEBRUARY 2005
Focus: Review program of the 9th Binational Summer Conference: Draft agenda
Borders Chapter of the RCP: Economic Development issues in a binational context (include participation of Imperial County)
Goal: Work guidelines included in the Borders Chapter of RCP
Product: Program and support documents for the Summer Conference

MARCH 2005
Focus: Guidance for the organization of the 9th Binational Summer Conference: Agenda and speakers
Goal: Work guidelines included in the Borders Chapter of RCP: Review/discuss binational strategies included in the Implementation Chapter
Product: Program and support documents for the Summer Conference

APRIL 2005
Focus: Summer Conference organization and priorities for FY 2006
Goal: Discuss areas of interest for FY 2006
Product: Direction for FY 2006 Work Plan

MAY 2004
Focus: Review status of issues on the planning areas covered during FY 2005
Goal: Discuss areas of interest for FY 2006
Product: Recommendations to the Borders Committee

JUNE 2005
Focus: (Optional meeting) Summer Conference organization and FY 2006 Work Plan
Goal: Discuss FY 2006 Work Plan
Product: FY 2006 Work Plan